

Doorkeeper Koehler: "Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes. Thank you.

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

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members, please be in their seats. Be led in prayer this morning by 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.

Goethe said: 'It is not doing the thing which we like to do, but liking to do the thing which we have to do, that makes life blessed'.

Let us pray. Heavenly Father, we beseech Thee to hear our prayers this day for the Members of this House of Representatives. We are grateful that they have given of themselves for this monumental task of serving the peoples of the State of Illinois. Thou, O Father, hast led them to this course in life; now, O Lord, give them the tolerance to bear the demands, the patience to persevere, and the fortitude to cope with all the challenges that daily occur. Give to them, Heavenly Father, Thy gift of love that they may know that Thou art pleased with their labours. We ask this in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Constitutional Amendments Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. House Joint Resolution 27."

Clerk Hall: "House Joint Resolution 27. Whereas, the Ninety-second Congress of the United States of America, at its Second Session, in both houses, by a Constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America:

Joint Resolution. Resolved by the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled two-thirds of each House concurring therein, that the following article is proposed as an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years from the date of its submission



by the Congress:

Article. Section 1. Equality of rights under law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex.

Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

Section 3. This Amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification; therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that such proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further Resolved, that a certified copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State of Illinois to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Illinois in the Congress of the United States. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, the staff of the Appropriations Committee has informed me that we've got some Bills that are to be substantive companion Bills to Appropriations Bills and we've got them on the agreed or short debate Calendar. And I think our policy is that we hold those Bills until the Appropriations Committee come out of Committee onto the floor. And I wonder if I'd have leave, if it's proper, Mr. Speaker, to have leave to remove 766, 995, 1098,...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, wait a minute, where are they?"

Matijevich: "I'll have the list."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Well, I'll...I'll recognize you at the proper time."

Matijevich: "2000."

Speaker Redmond: "What are they on?"

Matijevich: "They're evidently on the...the supplementary consent, or short debates Calendar and we...we feel that they ought to stay...."



Speaker Redmond: "I'll recognize you at the appropriate time."

Matijevich: "Oh, at the appropriate time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills Third Reading. On House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 2256 for which Representative Lucco is recognized."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like leave of the House to bring 2256 back to Second Reading for a purpose of putting on an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. 2256 be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Lucco: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco, do you want to move on the Amendment? Have you...it's now on the Order of Second Reading, have you moved the adoption of the Amendment #1? We didn't take any vote on it. You have moved, is that correct?"

Lucco: "Yes, I moved...."

Speaker Redmond: "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."

Lucco: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On Third Reading appears House Bill 1754 for which Representative Friedrich is recognized."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like for unanimous consent to bring 1754 from Third Reading back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, I think that's on the Consent Calendar."

Friedrich: "Well...."

Speaker Redmond: "If you amended it, I believe it'll have to come off of the Consent Calendar."

Friedrich: "Well, it's not been put on, it's not been published as a Consent Calendar, it's on the list...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that is correct. My point is, that it's fairly far down in the sequence and...and if we take, we'll take it off the Calendar now and it will be back in its regular place in Third Reading. I'm wondering if...."



Friedrich: "Well, it's an easement Bill, I'd like after that then to ask permission to have it put back on the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I... Does the Gentleman have leave to return 1754 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection leave is granted."

Friedrich: "I...I'd like..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, what's your inquiry?"

Schlickman: "My inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is when a Bill is taken from the Consent Calendar, does it go to the regular order or to the short debate Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Regular, it depends..."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this has not been ..."

Speaker Redmond: "If it's taken, if it's taken from the Consent Calendar, it will go to the short debate Calendar providing there's no Amendment. But when there's an Amendment, it's a completely different Bill. And then it would go on the regular Calendar. The only reason that I was raising the question, Mr. Friedrich, is I don't know procedurally whether you would be better off to let us pass it out of here and whoever your Senate Sponsor is, have him put it in there and then concur rather than take a chance on not...calling it before the 21st..."

Friedrich: "I...I think I would take a chance, it's an innocuous Bill in terms of controversy..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Chair.... Okay. Okay."

Friedrich: "In fact I'm going to make a motion to have it...it's not on the Consent Calendar at the moment as you know."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's not but it's..."

Friedrich: "The machinery's set up."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah.. Will you read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Friedrich. Amends House Bill 1754 as amended by inserting immediately after the last sentence in Section 3, the following and so forth."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this puts in the standard utility provision that the utility is to be reimbursed for expenses. It's a standard clause in Bills of this kind and I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption"



of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye',....Amendment #2. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 156. Representative Daniels is recognized."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd ask leave of the House to drop House Bill 156 from Third Reading back to Second Reading....Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections leave is granted. It will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. 156."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Daniels. Amends House Bill 156 as amended by House Amendment #1 with reference to the page and line numbers in that Amendment and so forth."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 is a recommendation from our studies in the Insurance Committee of the Senate. It deals with a reserve stabilization fund. It's a very technical Amendment. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, it's a very technical, I think the Body's entitled to an explanation."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the Amendment."

Daniels: "Stabilization fund by the Amendment that you have in your files there, Representative Madigan, deal with the manner in which the Patients' Compensation Fund will be operated and also the manner in which the reserves will be posted. This is a recommendation of the Department of Insurance and the Senate Committee and staff in line with this Bill that is presently proceeding on its way through the Senate at the present time. And this would bring it in exact line in the way which the Bill came out of the Senate Committee."

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

Houlihan, D: "I have a question of the Sponsor..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, D: "Mr. Speaker. Lee, on...on your Amendment #2...the first part of the Amendment by inserting before the period the following:



'but does not include physicians or hospitals'."

Daniels: "That's...that's correct. Would include physicians from the Patients Compensation Fund as represented to the Judiciary I Committee in hearing at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Houlihan, D: "Yes, if I may. with the Amendment now, who would participate in this compensation fund or who would be covered by it."

Daniels: "Hospitals and health care providers. Health providers would not include physicians. Hospitals were included from that provision as a definition of a health care provider but they are specifically covered by this Bill, physicians are not."

Houlihan, D: "Is there a threshold amount in here also?"

Daniels: "In the original Bill there was a lower limit of 200,000. It would have to exceed 200,000."

Houlihan, D: "Now, is that changed with the Amendment?"

Daniels: "No, it is not."

Houlihan, D: "All right. No further questions."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I move for adoption of Amendment #2. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Yoo hoo, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Redmond, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved the adoption of the Amendment.

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. Any other Bills on Third Reading that a Member desires to have returned to Second for purpose of an Amendment? No. Representative Harris, are you seeking recognition?"

Harris: "If I may, I'd like to bring Bill 2320 back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Returned to the Order of Second Reading. Read your Amendment, Mr...."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Harris: "I'm the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to table Amendment #1? Calendar



says only Amendment #2, is that correct, Mr. Harris?"

Harris: "This was floor Amendment #1. I'd like to have leave to table that Amendment and move to reconsider the vote on the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let's get this straight. Now the Calendar shows that there is a Committee Amendment #2. All right, what happened to #1?"

Harris: "1 and 2, Mr. Speaker, was Committee Amendments..."

Speaker Redmond: "They were, they were adopted, is that correct?"

Harris: "They were adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "So the Calendar is in error, should show Amendments #1 and 2, is that right? That would be Committee Amendments. Now what happened on the floor?"

Harris: "The floor Amendment is the one I'd like to have tabled to..."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the number of that? 3?"

Harris: "Committee Amendment #1. This is floor Amendment #3, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Where...what's the status of this Bill with respect to Amendments?"

Harris: "It has three Amendments, Mr. Speaker, Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait, Mr. Harris, what are we getting this down? It's in Enrolling and Engrossing. Better take this out of the record now. We'll get the Bill and then we'll get back to you. The uncertainty is some people are of the opinion that you had Committee Amendments 1 and 2 and we're not quite sure. Other than those Committee Amendments was there an Amendment on the floor? And if so, what was the number of that Amendment?"

Harris: "There was a floor Amendment, Mr. Speaker, #3..."

Speaker Redmond: "And that's the one you're seeking to table."

Harris: "That's the one I'm seeking to table."

Speaker Redmond: "May we take this out of the record until we get it back from upstairs and then we'll get back to you."

Harris: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'd like to take...leave of the House to have House Bill 2322 returned to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment or two."



Speaker Redmond: "What number is it?"

Hart: "2322."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman have leave to return 2322 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections....Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "2322, is that?"

Hart: "Yeah, I wanted to protect the Amendment, too. I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris'...."

Hart: "Well, he and I are Cosponsors of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 2322 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection leave is granted.

Be returned to the Order of Second Reading, now are there Amendments?"

Hart: "Representative Bowman apparently has a point he wants to make."

Speaker Redmond: "...Let's do it my way. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Von Boeckman. Amends House Bill 2322 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I only ask for...we finish Representative Hart, I thought you had finished, so...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, are you seeking recognition now with respect to this Amendment on this Bill?"

Madigan: "Only to ask for an explanation of the Amendment and to which pension fund it applies."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Hart, will you please explain the Amendment?"

Hart: "Yes, I will. Amendment #2 was suggested by Representative Von Boeckman and it....applies to the State Employees' Pension Fund, provides for a monthly annuity of a hundred dollars per month for widows of former employees provided the following conditions are met. One, the employee worked at least 15 years prior to the creation of the system in January 1 of 1944. And two, that the employee was killed in action during World War II while on approved leave of absence from the state. This would cost the Pension Fund about \$15,000 and there's no objection to it. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. I guess I neglected that."



Hart: "I move that...Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I have moved for the adoption of Amendment #..."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, to request that Representative Kornowicz be excused because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Hearing he will be excused."

Now the question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Any discussion? Any discussion on the Gentleman's motion? The question is, 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: "Amendment #3. Hart. Amends House Bill 2322 on page 1, line 1 and 5 and so forth."

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

Hart: "This...I move to table the Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #3. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Any further?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Terzich. Amends House Bill 2322 on page 1, line 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "If...if the electrician would just leave my light on, I think we could work this a little faster. Amendment #4 is suggested by Representative Terzich and allows members having prior service as an elected police magistrate or justice of the peace to purchase such credit provided that it has not been credited under any other system. The Member will be entitled to purchase the service based on his compensation and rate in effect at the time the service is rendered with interest at 5% per annum compounded from January 1, 1963 to the date of payment. The Amendment will allow credit for those persons who did not exercise their option in 1965. Originally, the cutoff date was within 90 days after July 1, 1965. And I move for adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried and the Amendment's adopted. Any further



Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Hart. Amends House Bill...."

Hart: "Amendment #5, Mr. Speaker, extends the widows' annuity to widows whose spouses died after November 1, 1970. Presently, the benefit applies only to widows whose spouses died after July 15, 1971. The Amendment is narrow in scope and would apply only to survivors of members who died between November 1, 1970 and July 15, 1971. The benefit would not be payable retroactively but only prospectively after the effective date of this Act. Approximately eleven would have been...would become eligible for benefits if this Amendment is adopted. And the impact is about \$10,000. I move...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan. With respect to this Amendment, Representative Ryan? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this Amendment has been distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Has not."

Ryan: "Well, then...slow down a little so we can have a look at it."

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

Ryan: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, any excused absences?"

Ryan: "Representative Kucharski and Dunn, for sickness, Mr. Speaker, Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to the records so indicating. Hearing no objection the record will so show. Now we return to 2320. Representative Harris. Representative Harris. ...The Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 748, for which Representative Ellis is recognized. Representative Woods Bowman. Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to...before you go to House Bills Third Reading, I'd like to move House Bill 911 back to Second for purposes of a...a purely technical Amendment. Enrolling and Engrossing discovered a...a drafting error..."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it?"

Bowman: "It's on now on the Order of Third."

Speaker Redmond: "911?"

Bowman: "I believe."

Speaker Redmond: "It doesn't appear on 911. Not on my Calendar. Let's



get Representative Levin's...."

Bowman: "All right. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Now what is, what Bill is it that you want? What number? Turn on Representative Levin, will you?"

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put...take 748 off of the short debate Calendar and put it back on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "There's a form to sign, if you'll come right up to the... Now, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I think 1911 is on the short debate Calendar and I...it needs a technical Amendment that...I thought I would ask leave of the House to have it removed from short debate...?"

Speaker Redmond: "There's a form on that, isn't there, Mr. Clerk?"

Bowman: "There's a form on that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Bowman: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond, "2320? 2320? Representative Harris."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, Bill 2320, I move that it be placed on Second Reading. I'd like to have leave to place it on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 2320 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Be returned to the Order of Second Reading...."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker,...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, 2 and 3 were previously adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Floor Amendment #3, I'd like leave to withdraw this Amendment, Mr. Speaker, and move to reconsider on adoption of the vote for Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman having moved on the prevailing side, moves that the vote by which Amendment #3 was adopted be reconsidered. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it."

Harris: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to table Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the tabling of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is tabled. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Abramson. Amends House Bill 2320 as



amended by deleting all of Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Amendment #4 conforms the Bill to the original intent of the Sponsor. Those originally drafted included all animals. One of the Amendments exempted mice and rats but the original intent of the Bill was to protect albino deer. Amendment #4 does just that. I move the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Harris."

Harris: "The Amendment, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, is a good Amendment and I'd like to accept the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 782..."

Speaker Redmond: "What number?"

Schlickman: "782."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it?"

Schlickman: "Well, presently, excuse me, 978, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "What is it?"

Schlickman: "978. It's at the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Speaker, that Bill had been at the...on the Consent Calendar yesterday. I took it off for purposes of Amendment. And I was wondering, if as a courtesy to the Sponsor who has not resisted my effort to amend the Bill, if we could go to the Order of Second Reading, call 978. Have the Amendment adopted so they can get back to the Order of Third Reading where it was yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is...Mr. Clerk, where is House Bill 978? Is that Representative Hoxsey's Bill? Okay. We'll go to the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 978."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 978. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Schlickman, Hoxsey. Amends House Bill 978 on page 1 by deleting lines 15 through 32 and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 978, as it was introduced and reported out of Committee, would have required the state to remit to units of local government for land owned by the state, at least to private interests, an amount that would have been equivalent to the tax payment due to the unit of local government, the county, if the property was not state-owned. This Bill provided a potentially significant financial impact on the state. Amendment #1 achieves the end that the Sponsor desires by providing that in any lease of state-owned property there shall be an express provision that in addition to the ordinary rent, the lessee shall pay to the state an amount equivalent to the tax payment. And that equivalent amount which will be in addition to the regular lease amount would then be remitted by the state to the county. As a consequence of this Amendment, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the original intention objective of the Bill is maintained. However, the Bill will insure that it will have no impact on the state fiscal situation. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 978."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, D: "The Bill, as originally introduced, appears to indicate that the payments are to be made from the money which are...to be derived from the lease. Now, if that be the situation, how could there be an impact on the state?"

Schlickman: "The lease may not...the amount in the lease may have been only for ordinary rent and may not have had a provision in it for the payment by the lessee of an amount equal to the tax payment."

Houlihan, D: "They could renegotiate that on the lease though, couldn't they, Gene?"

Schlickman: "They could but they may not. I just want to make sure that the state in all of its leases will have a provision whereby in addition to the ordinary rent, the lessee will pay an amount equal to the tax payment if it was privately-owned land. The state will collect it and then will remit to the counties. Now, there's another provision



here and that is, before the state enters into any lease it must so notify the county so that the county has an opportunity of determining what the tax payment will be, report that amount to the state and that amount, then, shall be provided in the lease so that the state will be collecting exactly what the county has determined to be the tax payment...."

Houlihan, D: "Who will be doing the remitting now back to the counties?"

Schlickman" The state will be...."

Houlihan, D: "....Be the state."

Schlickman: "The state will be serving as a trustee, so to speak, for the counties."

Houlihan, D: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Representative Bowman? Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Now, I think we've...we've straightened all of this out. The Bill to which I refer is House Bill 19..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait....you're...you're not addressing 978, is that correct?"

Bowman: "...No, I thought...."

Speaker Redmond: "We have...we have now adopted Amendment #1 to House Bill 978. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Now, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Okay. Sooner or later we will straighten this out. Okay.

The Bill which I was referring to earlier is House Bill 1911 appearing on page 20 of the Calendar for today under of Third Reading. I would ask that that be moved back to Order of Second Reading for a technical Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Order is House Bills Third Reading and House Bill 1911. Representative Bowman being one of the Sponsors has requested leave to return that to the Order of Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections leave is granted. It will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, will you read the Amendment?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Bowman. Amends House Bill 1911 as amended by inserting immediately after the enacting clause the following: 'Section 1' and so forth."

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

Houlihan, D: "Is this Amendment printed and distributed, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Amendment is not printed."

Houlihan, D: "Will you take it out of the record then until it is?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "I'll be happy to take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker, as a freshman I'd only point out for...as a matter of information to the Representative, that this corrects an error that was detected by Enrolling and Engrossing. And all it does is simply set forth the Sections of the Election Code which are to be amended by the Amendments that we've already adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't we take this out of the record and suggest that you go and see Representative Houlihan and if you straighten out your differences we'll abrogate the rule, which you voted for, out of the record."

Bowman: "Okay. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have on Third Reading, House Bill 1436. As a courtesy to Representative Abramson, last Friday I said I would move it back to Second. He has an Amendment which I'm going to resist but as this courtesy to him I'd like to have leave of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "House...."

Matijevec: "To move it back to Second."

Speaker Redmond: "House...."

Matijevec: "1436."

Speaker Redmond: "1436. Does the Gentleman have leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections leave is granted. Representative Bartulis, for what purpose do you arise?"

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. Today, we have visiting with us the eighth grade students of Benld Schools, some of Macoupin County's finest, directly above me."



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

Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's a long standing Gentleman with whom I have an acquaintance with not too well, who's in the balcony. I think he should be introduced. He's a man of great distinction and honor and let's hear it for 'Harlow' Ray. Where's he at? Where's he at?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson. Have you read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk, for 1436? Representative...Mr. Clerk, did you read the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Abramson. Amends House Bill 1436 on page 1, line 10 by deleting 'January 12, 1977' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1977'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1436 as is now drafted will require all laws enacted after January 12, 1977 to include certain language if it would preempt home rule powers. My Amendment changes that date to June 30, 1977. My legal opinion and the opinion of our staff, we'd have to go back through each Bill we passed so far and analyze what it did and put in the appropriate language if it in fact preempted home rule powers. I therefore move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I said, as a courtesy to Mr. Abramson, I moved the Bill back to Second Reading. However, this Amendment, and I believe it's Amendment #1, the board says 2 but this is Amendment #1. Amendment #1 would thwart the intent of House Bill 1436. The Bill intent is not to clog up this House and the Senate with the home rule Amendments that have been traditional. That's what....I have introduced the Bill for, and by the adoption of this Amendment, Bills that are now in this chamber will now again be cluttered and so much time of the House will be taken up by these Amendments, home rule Amendments, and therefore I would urge the Membership to resist and vote against Amendment #1 to 1436. And I would ask the Clerk to change that up there, that's Amendment #1."



Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, it's Amendment #1. Will the Gentleman from Arlington Heights obey the rules and not bother the Clerk? Amendment #1, will you put it on the board? The question's on the..."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill indicates that there was an Amendment before and the next Amendment should be #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The record shows that Amendment #1 lost and that the correct number is Amendment #2."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker..."

Matijevich: "I think this is the same Amendment...."

Abramson: "It's the same Amendment. We tabled the first one so they could move it on."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, yeah, but..."

Abramson: "...Send it back."

Speaker Redmond: "It had...the first one had had to have a number."

Matijevich: "I wasn't aware of that...go...you're correct."

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

Matijevich: "The Clerk's always correct I noticed."

Abramson: "In closing. There seems to be a direct disagreement between our staff and the Democratic staff on the effect of this Bill. Our staff thinks that it would have the result that he is afraid of if his...his Bill passes and the opposite. I believe that June 30, 1977 is the correct date to have on this Bill and I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 42 'aye' and 64 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1820 on Third Reading. This is the last one that we're going to return now. We'll be going to the Order of Third Reading. 1820, Representative Holewinski."



Clerk O'Brien: "1820 is on Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when we considered this Bill on Second Reading several Sponsors, or several people had proposed Amendments that were not printed yet. I agreed to move it back as a courtesy to them. So at this time I would ask leave to move House Bill 1820 back to Second Reading for the purpose of considering Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "I just asked leave to move 1820...."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to return 1820 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections leave is granted. 1820 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Terzich. Amends House Bill 1820 as amended by deleting all of Subparagraph 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich. Will the Gentleman between Representative Terzich and the Chair please be seated?"

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment #3 deals with the Lobbyists Ethics Statement. And, as you know, it has a corridor..... fifty dollars on political contributions. And I think everyone is aware of the fact if we put this type of a restriction into the statutes we would be coming back every year, every Session revising the amount of money. So, therefore, what Amendment #3 does is that it would allow for an inflation factor of ten percent annually to increase this here maximum amount which would make it reasonable based upon the current inflationary trend. I think that this is a good idea rather than having the Legislature come back every Session trying to amend this amount. And certainly it should be increased with the inflationary effect so I would urge adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 1820."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would oppose the adoption of the Amendment. I...I think that Representative Terzich may have an idea that's not totally unreasonable but I think it's unreasonable in the way the Amendment is drafted."



And that is, the ten percent a year escalator in the exemption for reporting would result in...you know, a few years down the line, there being nothing reported at all because the exemptions will be so. I think if we're going to do something like this, you'd want to do it on the basis of tying it to the current inflationary index. And I...I find the Amendment a little illogical and would therefore oppose it and ask for its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. ...All voted who wish? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Sponsor of this Bill, this Amendment is no more illogical than having a fifty dollars corridor and we'll say that this is going to be reasonable next year or the year after or year after. Ten percent is a reasonable amount. After the first year it would go from fifty dollars to fifty-five dollars. Now, if anybody thinks that unreasonable, it would be very unreasonable for the General Assembly to come back every Session to debate a Bill of this nature. And I think we should look at the intent of the Bill and not... necessary the fifty dollar amount. And the ten percent inflationary factor certainly is a reasonable request to make."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in speaking against this Amendment, consider the fact that a lobbyist will be subject to sanctions if he violates this Act. And to avoid violating the Act, to avoid sanction, he's going to have to be computing every year what ten percent accumulation there was from the original base. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, wise legislation puts people on notices to what they should be doing and what they should not be doing. Let's leave it the way it is. It's a flat amount. It will stay there. It will be subject to change in the future. If, in the wisdom of the subsequent General Assembly it should so be. But let's be concerned about the lobbyist also and let's put them in note that its a certain amount and it's not something that's going to be adjusted subsequently automatically without notice to them and cause



them to violate inadvertently the law. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Clerk will take the record.

Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like...ten percent a year adds up pretty fast and....I don't have my math calculation manual with me today but ten percent, and before long it's not going to be any good at all, if you have a ten percent inflation factor on that reporting date. And it should be...I don't believe that should be in the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 51 'aye' and 76 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Terzich. Amends House Bill 1820 as amended in Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that anybody can object to Amendment #4. I've been reading the editorials in the newspapers and these releases that we've received from the news media stating how they should apply pressure on their elected officials to make change and things of this nature, and I certainly don't see why the news media would not be covered under this Bill. Certainly they affect legislation just as well as any other lobbyist and even more so. I don't know of any pressure group that is affecting legislation any more than the news media. Now, they should be responsible and they should have honesty and they should be open to reporting the same as anyone else that will affect any legislation brought before this General Assembly. And I therefore urge adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is reason why this Amendment should be opposed and, I, certainly very strenuously oppose it. What this does is, to my mind, clearly unconstitutional in that it seeks to license, or it seeks to regulate, the press as lobbyists. I don't...I feel confident that no court would sustain a challenge to this section of the law and that it's our obligation to try and work within the perimeters of what we've



learned over the course of history and I think this is a very bad Amendment and would urge its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Terzich: "Certainly."

Byers: "Representative Terzich, would news photographers be included in this?"

Terzich: "I would say get the editorial column."

Byers: "How would you..."

Terzich: "They're...they're so smart in their opinions, let them file a report. I don't mind reporting but let's quit the editorials. If they...they make editorials and they don't know a damn thing about it. They make editorials about the Legislature and the son of guns...never been in the House of Representatives."

Byers: "Mr. Terzich, what person would make that disclosure? Would that be the person that wrote the article or the publisher of the newspaper?"

Terzich: "Let's get the publishers and the editorial boards."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this Amendment, I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Byers: "Think this is a ridiculous Amendment. I know that in this House there's 177 Members and I know there's no one's opinion that's influenced by a newspaper editorial because we all voted our conscience and we vote for what we think's right. And I'm sure newspaper editorials in no way reflect upon anybody to vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, this isn't any more ridiculous than the last statement that was made. Since when are we not aware of all the pressures put on by the news media? And why should we nail a few people when they're the biggest influencemongers in the entire State of Illinois? Let's get up and show them that we want a disclosure just as well as they can yell for one, why don't we have one by them? Either that or cut off their editorial department. They've got people coming from out of state here and writing about the State of Illinois and they don't know a damn thing about it. But let's show them



that we...we want to be open, too, so let's support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Terzich has made a good point.

I think we can see just how much influence newspaper editorials and newsmen have by the number of red votes on that...on that board."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Amendment is going down but two things ought to be told to the press and one is, I think it's about time the editorial writers identify themselves. They hide behind the editor...editorial pages and they write whatever they want to. No one can every identify who they are. And the other is, that when there are editorials written on behalf of some candidates or some issue, they ought to open up the editorial pages to ads so that opposing editorials can be written. I think this would go a long way to removing the veil of suspicion as to who really writes the editorial."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope we'll never come to accuse the newspapers of not being free. I hope we'll never put a stumbling block in their path. Tonight we're going to have a soul food dinner. You know why...do you know why we're going to have a soul food dinner? It may be...it may be that we wouldn't even be Members of this House if we hadn't had a free press. And even if they speak against me, I respect their rights to do it. If they editorialize against me, how can you living in a free nation, try to put props on the press? I tell you, I will not be a part to it, I will not be a part to it. It was a free press that, the northern free press that freed my people, do you hear? It's the northern free press that encouraged the marches with Martin Luther King. It was the northern free press that gave us this revolution in which we enjoy these privileges here."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 32 'ayes' and 104 'no'. Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Taylor. Amends House Bill 1820 as amended



on page 1, line 11...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, my Amendment comes about at a bad time but I'll...that exposés...statement that...raised by Representative Davis. But Amendment #5 is a very simple Amendment and one I that I think we all can live with. It just says on page...page 1, line 11, that we replace the word 'individual' with 'lawyers'. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 1820."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and...and all the lawyers here. Frankly, I think that lawyers are already covered if they're acting as lobbyists under the definition of the Act and therefore the addition of the word 'lawyers' is redundant. However, I have no strenuous objection to Representative Taylor's proposed Amendment and would accept it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the last Amendment I said 'free' but I want them to be 'fair'. I don't care about being 'free' but let's be 'fair' about it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Bill as a lawyer because the implication by inserting the word 'lawyer' after 'individual' is that I'm not an individual. I oppose the Amendment. It is not necessary. It's redundant. And, personally, it's offensive."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor to close."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, there's conflict of interest on that part of the ...part. I say that the word 'lawyer' replace the word 'individual'. And I move for the adoption. I think that we need this...this word in the Bill and it will make it stronger. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 64 'ayes' and 64 'no'. On May the 11th, Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as voting 'aye'?"



Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Record the Speaker as 'no'. On this question there's 65 'aye' and 65 'no' and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6. Byers. Amends House Bill 1820 as amended by deleting the first sentence of Paragraph A of Section 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment requires...."

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

Houlihan, D: "Is this Amendment printed and distributed, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Tell me it is. Page, give him a copy of it."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, it is distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "The answer is yes."

Byers: "Okay. Thank you..."

Speaker Redmond: "You have it, Mr. Houlihan?"

Houlihan, D: "No, I don't."

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

Houlihan, D: "Is this Amendment #6? Amendment #5 was Mr. Taylor's that we just voted on."

Byers: "Right. It's Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "By Byers."

Byers: "This Amendment requires lobbyists to disclose their expenditures from two times to four times a year and it also...makes the threshold for each expenditure or gift or contribution of twenty-five dollars. And I would move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the provisions that Representative Byers is addressing were changed. In working with the Subcommittee of the Executive Committee to make the limits higher and reporting less frequent. What his Amendment generally...does is change the reporting back to what's required in the current law. And frankly I would favor that approach and support the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."



Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. This information, could we determine whether or not the Amendment was distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record shows that it was distributed, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, could... he yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, D: "You're raising, or you're lowering the threshold amount, is that correct?"

Byers: "We're making it twenty-five dollars which was in the original Bill, was raised to fifty, now we're going to take it back to twenty-five. We're lowering it from what it came out of Committee."

Houlihan, D: "Well, did this come out of the Subcommittee?"

Byers: "Yes."

Houlihan, D: "And the Subcommittee's position was what? You're trying to change now the Subcommittee's position?"

Byers: "Yes, the original Bill called for twenty-five dollars and then the...there were several changes made in Subcommittee and we felt that twenty-five dollars would be a more accurate method of... threshold for reporting. And it was raised to fifty dollars in the Subcommittee."

Houlihan, D: "Well, who were the other Members of the Subcommittee?"

Byers: "Representative Yourell was on..."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, I can't find the Amendment and I can't hear the debate and I'd like to know what we're voting on. Could we get a little order here?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll try. Please give the Gentleman order. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Now has this Amendment been distributed? Tell me it's been distributed. Is there a breakdown on the Republican side for the first time?"

Byers: "I received this Amendment yesterday, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Could you give Mr. Wolf a copy of the Amendment?"

The records show it was distributed. Now proceed to explain the



Amendment. Mr. Wolf, explanation is going on now."

Byers: "This Amendment #6 to House Bill 1820 requires that in the present Act lobbyists disclose their expenditures four times a year as the present Act now requires. And it also makes a threshold for any expenditure or gift to be twenty-five dollars when they expend that much on...they have to report to whom that twenty-five dollars was spent."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1820 was heard in Executive Committee, as you all know, and it failed to get enough votes to be passed out, was put into Subcommittee with a lot of ethics Bills. And I'm Chairman of that Subcommittee and on that Subcommittee there were three Republicans and three Democrats and we met in order to combat some media talk that the Ethics Bills were put in the Yourell Subcommittee so that they would receive burial in that Committee. So the night after the Bills were introduced and heard in the Executive Committee, the Subcommittee met and we had staff individuals working with us to develop Amendments to House Bill 1820. The Amendments that were developed by the Subcommittee came out of that Subcommittee unanimously and subsequently when the Bill was... then was heard in the full Committee, I believe it...it...it received a unanimous vote with those Subcommittee Amendments on it. Now there's an attempt to bypass the Subcommittee recommendations with the very same provisions in the Bill as it was originally presented to the full Executive Committee. Now if we're going to be realistic, if we're going to be honorable about this House Bill 1820, we'll vote these Amendments down because the Subcommittee made their recommendations unanimously. The recommendations were adopted by the full Committee and the Bill passed out. Now they're attempting, by Amendments on Second Reading, to put the same provisions back in House Bill 1820 which did not receive enough votes in the full Executive Committee and was thus assigned to the Subcommittee on Ethics. And I would ask that you defeat these Amendments and leave the Bill in the shape that the Subcommittee recommended to the full Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

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



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Stuffle: "Representative Byers, who suggested this Amendment?"

Byers: "I had a dream and I...that's the reason...that's where it came from. This was in the original Bill and that's the reason we put it back to this way."

Stuffle: "Could I speak to the Amendment then, Mr. Speaker? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members, that this Amendment puts this Bill in such a posture that it's so onerous on the lobbyists and it makes such a situation that it may indeed have the effect of defeating what ought to be a good Bill and what ought to be opening up the so-called sunshine that we're always talking about. And because of that I would urge its defeat."

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

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a good Amendment and it requires, as in the present Act, for our lobbyists to disclose four times a year, that's what they're doing now. And Representative Terzich put his Amendment on the Bill which requires a ten percent escalator each year and I think twenty-five dollars would be a much more reasonable place to start out. And I would hope that this Amendment would have some rapport on the House floor today and be accepted."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 43 'aye' and 64 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills Third Reading. House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 612, Representative Lechowicz. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe House Bill 612 was put on postponed consideration last night."

Speaker Redmond: "Well..."

Ryan: "...Error in the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record, the Sponsor isn't here anyway. So, 612."



Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to make sure that it goes on the postponed...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, check and see where it is. 613."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 613. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the cost of living increases. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman. Out of the record. 644. Representative Katz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, might I make an announcement of interest...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Katz: "To the Members of the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "This is a very important announcement, please listen."

Katz: "On the Calendar today, there appears the beginning Group I of the Supplementary Consent Calendar, or that will be found in the Calendar beginning at page 35. Those Bills will be called today at 2 o'clock. This is to give you some additional notice that those Bills will be called at 2 o'clock. Members who desire to vote 'no' may rise at the end of the Consent Calendar and advise the Clerk of that fact. There also appears on the Calendar today Group II and Group III. Those will not be called until tomorrow at approximately 2 o'clock so that will give the Members an additional day to study Group II and Group III. Under the new rules that were adopted, the Bills on the Supplementary Consent Calendar of which a full list has been distributed by the Clerk and is on every desk, they will be added at the rate of two groups of fifty a day so that day after tomorrow there would then be added, tomorrow we will have Group IV and Group V and the next day Group VI and Group VII. And that is the way that they will be added. If Bills that are on the Consent Calendar are removed from the Consent Calendar, Members will be notified by a simple form advising them that that is...has taken place and the Bill will then, of course, be returned to the Order of Third Reading in the short debate. They will appear on the Short Debate Calendar. And so, this is to simply give you notice that at approximately 2 o'clock today the Speaker will be calling Group I of the Bills on the Supplementary Consent Calendar. If there are any questions don't hesitate to raise them with the Clerk or with the Parliamentarian or with me. Thank you."



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

Friedrich: "Well, just a clarifying question, I hope, from Representative Katz. After the Consent Calendar is called and Members indicate they want to vote 'no', they have to be there at the time it's called, right?"

Katz: "Yes. There is required of consent of the Members in order to vote or to change the vote as given, subject to no Member raising an objection, any Member is free to vote whichever way he wants or to later be given leave to vote. Under the House Rules, the consent of the House is required for that purpose whenever it is done."

Friedrich: "But if leave is given later on, might not that not change the vote and determine whether the Bill passed or not...."

Katz: "Well...."

Friedrich: "Not only, we have a right to change our vote or insert a vote if it does not affect the Roll Call. And that's...that's the reason I'm raising the question with....some people would want to vote 'no' on a Bill and would not necessarily want to defeat it, but just want to be recorded. And I just want to be sure when you have to put in your 'no' vote if you want to vote 'no'?"

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Friedrich, that is correct. But on the Consent Calendar I don't think we've ever had a situation where the margin of the passage of the Consent Calendar was so thin that the change of a vote would affect it. But it is true that a vote cannot be changed that would affect the result. It is also true that whenever an individual an individual desires to vote differently than he voted in the Roll Call, that the consent of the Members of the House is required."

Friedrich: "And it would be required to be put in that same Legislative Day?"

Katz: "Yes, that's correct."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, a suggestion perhaps to expedite the Consent Calendar. Instead of having everyone rise and state the Bills they want to vote 'no' on, wouldn't it be better to do as we have done in the past and just give the Clerk a list of the Bills that we want to vote



'no' on? It would seem to me that if we stand and...and we're going to be here for an hour and a half and with everyone standing and saying they want to vote 'no' on two or three or four Bills. And I think we could probably do that and it would probably be a lot quicker. I just make that suggestion to you."

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's either a question of Members either jumping out of the window or the Clerk's office jumping out of the window. And your last suggestion would have them all jumping out of the window and we...it just isn't feasible as far as the Clerk's Office...."

Jaffe: "Well, it was feasible in prior years...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's...well, that's the reason that we have.... that's the reason we have the machine and that's the reason we put the Roll Call in there because there's been so many instances where votes were changed and the Members were embarrassed about the whole thing. Let's try it and see how we go. I think we're anticipating something that really isn't there. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight, Representative Katz said that there was not an incidence where a change of vote influenced whether there was....a particular Bill passed or not on the Consent Calendar. There was indeed an incidence where several Bills were deemed not to have passed and the Consent Calendar passed two years ago, exactly two years ago. And I suggest that this...this question should be given considerable thought as to what to do for Members who want to change their votes. And it should be determined before the Bill is lost whether or not there's sufficient changes to influence passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Clerk would listen to this. Jack, I wonder if...I...I conceive that it could be time consuming with each Member jumping up on the various Bills and...and recording their 'no' votes. I wonder if after we have the...the one Roll Call for the affirmative vote, if he couldn't go down the list and say 'are there any 'noes' and then if there are any 'noes', for example, they could light...light up the board on that Bill just hit your button 'no' and that wouldn't be....save some time. I wonder if the Clerk would just whisper to you if that



would be a time-saving or not?"

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk advises me that if we're not following the Consent Calendar procedure it would be quicker to take individual votes and abandon the whole thing."

Matijevich: "Oh, all right. No, I was just going to say a 'no'... just a 'no'...."

Speaker Redmond: "It's isn't...isn't feasible from the Clerk's Office point of view."

Matijevich: "All right, I want to help the Clerk, he always knows that."

Speaker Redmond: "644."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 644. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School...School Construction Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was placed...for consideration this year because the Downstate School Construction Fund is in very bad shape. The applications received by the Illinois Office of Education for 1976 construction grants exceeded the state's ability to participate by approximately thirty million dollars. Applications received by the Illinois Office of Education for 1977 construction grants are estimated to require a hundred and twenty million in state funds to provide the state matching share. In 1974 and 1975, that year, a survey of public elementary and secondary schools revealed that 2,425 of the 5,422 existing school buildings were in noncompliance with the Health, Life and Safety Codes. The Capitol Assistance Program has made it possible to meet the needs of perhaps 200 of these during the last three years. Many, many more remain. The majority of the districts applying under the Cap Program have a grant index exceeding .6000. Without the state program it is doubtful that many of these districts could have replaced their facilities without state support. The Capitol Assistance Program allows the state through an evaluation and priorities to allocate and direct Capitol Funds to those districts with urgent emergency needs. There are no other provisions for some to pursue in time of disaster. I think that it's important also to acknowledge that this particular Bill deals strictly with new authorization for those funds that are allocated to downstate school districts. Those are the funds that



are depleted at the present time and have to have new monies in order to keep this program an ongoing one to insure that downstate school districts are going to be able to build new schools in this state over the period of the next several years. And I ask...will answer any questions but I ask for your support to enable us to build new schools and keep this program alive. I think it's a good one and everyone has certainly seen the effect of it in their particular district and it should be supported."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Skinner: "Things were chaotic when we left last night but I had the very strong impression that we were on House Bill 730, something to do with bottles and cans and stuff like that."

Speaker Redmond: "My Calendar shows that 612 is the next Bill to be called."

Skinner: "Well, your Calendar is wrong."

Redmond: "Well, I'm going to go by the Calendar."

Skinner: "Mr...."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't do anything differently."

Skinner: "Just a minute, Mr. Speaker, are you telling us that everybody in this room that was here when we adjourned last night and knows that we were on House Bill 730, that makes no difference whatsoever?"

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

Skinner: "Because...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of information for Representative Skinner, if he'll recall that that Bill was only called because it was...we were on the Motions at that time...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wasn't that, though, returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of doing something to an Amendment? And it was returned back and it was not called for passage on Third Reading?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I.....certainly...you were certainly correct on that, I...I understand where you were but certainly we heard 612 because it was



put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on 644. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Cunningham: "Representative Mudd, isn't the Appropriation Bill 643 for this particular Bill?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir, it is."

Cunningham: "In keeping with the tradition, are you willing to hold this Bill till the appropriation catches up with it?"

Mudd: "Representative Cunningham, I would think that this probably... regardless of what we do with the Appropriation Bill, and I certainly realize that both of them have to be passed before this will become law and...and these downstate school districts will be eligible to receive any construction funds, I would rather in the interest of time, because we have spent time on this Bill, go ahead with this particular Bill."

Cunningham: "So many on our side of the aisle feel that an orderly procedure requires them to be held together for there...be an intelligent decision. So, again, I urge you, hold it until 643 might be considered at the same time or at least be through our Appropriations Committee before we have any further vote on this."

Mudd: "Representative Cunningham, I hope you'll appreciate that the time limit that we have to hear Bills on the House is limited by deadline and if that Bill that is in Appropriations is exempt from deadline I think it's in the interest of this House to hear this Bill at this particular time."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on 644, is there any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be very careful about what we vote on here. This Bill...the fiscal implication is only three hundred million on this, now that is Capitol money, there's no question about that. But I think one thing we ought to consider and mind the rule of ten to one and that is, every ten dollars we borrow we're committed to paying a dollar a year back for both principal and interest. So this is all...this means that from now on until after the turn of the century we're committing, assuming



these bonds are issued, approximately thirty million dollars a year out of General Revenue Funds which could be of course used for other purposes such as teaching kids. So I think that we ought to realize that, first of all it isn't in the Governor's Budget, of course. And, secondly, the Governor has called for us to hold down on Capitol expenditures which during the Walker years bludgeoned to almost unimaginable heights. I think we have to at some point in time take a look at what we're doing here and for the good of the state and for the...the future generations that are going to have to pay this money back. The State of Illinois is getting into debt almost at the rate that New York was and we're heading that way. Fortunately we aren't there yet but if we keep handling Bills like this and at times when completely out of order with the appropriate process.... the appropriation process, we're going to be right back where New York was. So I think you ought to very seriously consider how you vote on this Bill because you're going to head us right in the state... where the State of Illinois is going to be in the process of defaulting and not only on its bonds but on its pensions. So I...I implore you at this point in time to vote 'no' on House Bill 644."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how many votes it takes to pass this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Wants to know how many votes it takes to pass the Bill. 644. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have a motion pending on this Bill to recommit to Revenue. I...I examined this Bill and found it to be very unfamiliar to me and I guess the reason is that the Bill never went to Revenue where it was supposed to go and I wonder what we're going to do about my motion to recommit?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Chairman, I believe...."

Speaker Redmond: "107 votes in response to your...."

Mudd: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Inquiry about the number of votes."

Mudd: "I believe...again...that we are on the Order of Third Reading and not on the Order of Motions and I think that...that I certainly...."



appreciate the comments of Representative Ewing but I think that his remarks are untimely at this time in response to a motion on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you. If Mr. Mudd will remember back that motion has been on file and it's been at the will of the Chair that it's not been called, been on file now for well over a week or maybe two weeks. It was on file before the Bill was ever moved from Second to Third Reading. And I think our rules are really very clear on this. This Bill and a number of others should have gone to Revenue and they did not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr...Representative Ewing would agree that his motion in effect is the same as striking the enacting clause of this particular Bill because there's no way possible that this could be referred back to the Revenue Committee for consideration and still meet the deadline of this General Assembly. So I think that his motion would be...have the same effect as killing this Bill and striking the enacting clause. And I think that most of the Members in this House would rather vote on this Bill than to take a simple motion just to kill it by some tactical maneuver."

Speaker Redmond: "The status now is that we call House Bill 644 to the Order of Third Reading. Representative Ewing called the attention of the Chair to the fact that he had on file under the Order of Motions a motion to commit to the Committee on Revenue. I've been advised that this motion is in order and takes precedence. Now the first matter here is on Representative Ewing's motion to recommit House Bill 644 to the Revenue Committee. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Chairman, in respect to Representative Ewing on the remarks I made earlier what this motion would do to this particular Bill. I would at this time move that this motion lay on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing has moved that...commit House Bill 644 to the Committee on Revenue. Representative Mudd has moved that that motion lie on the table. The question is on Representative Mudd's motion. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, do I have a chance to address that motion?"



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen, what we have here is very important and I think we're setting precedent in this House. This motion was filed because matters which deal with...."

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

Mudd: "Mr. Chairman, again, I think this motion is nondebatable."

Speaker Redmond: "Desires that the motion is not debatable. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion to lie this on the table indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Simple majority. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "May I then have the opportunity to explain my vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "You will within the limits of the Calendar here... the clock here."

Ewing: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewing: "I would ask for some 'no' votes up there, Ladies and Gentlemen. We're setting a precedent here where we're going to be passing Revenue measures out of willynilly Committee that will approve them. Now if you want that it doesn't really matter who's in the majority in this House but it's disastrous to the planning of the financial health of our state. And I would ask for enough red votes up there to turn down this motion to lay it on the table. Let's send this to Revenue where it belongs. Let it have a proper hearing so that we can bring it back here and discuss it. Thank you."

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

Mugalian: "I'm afraid I was asleep. What is the motion, to table?"

Speaker Redmond: "To table Representative Ewing's motion."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.

On this question there's 75 'aye' and 82 'no'. The motion fails.

Now revert...Representative Yourell. Yourell."

Yourell: "There's some lights up there that shouldn't be up there, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it will be reflected in this motion. But again let's caution, do not vote any switch other than your own. Question'scan you dump the board? Are you ready to.... The question's



on Representative Ewing's motion to commit House Bill 644 to the Committee on Revenue. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Would you cast me as 'aye', please...my switch is stuck here."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Mann: "Would you record me as 'aye', please, my switch is stuck."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. His switch is derailed. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think everyone's aware that I'm not on the Committee on Assignment of Bills and that there's one Member that can disagree at any time that I've been anything but fair when I acted as Chairman of the Executive Committee on all the Members' Bills of this House and can vote to strike the enacting clause from one of my Bills. I'll accept it. But I just want you to think a little bit before you do this. I would hope that you would give me the consideration of your 'no' votes. If you're opposed to this Bill at the time we vote on whether or not to pass it. And I would appreciate it very much. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "There's some lights up there that shouldn't be up there, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Call them off and we'll put them on 'present'."

Yourell: "Representative Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey here? Record him as.....

Representative Ewing, we're going to dump this Roll Call and may I again caution you, please do not vote anyone's switch other than your own. Dump the Roll Call. On this question, Representative Ewing's motion to commit House Bill 644 to Committee on Revenue. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'yes' vote, I think our rules are very clear. Rule 31-E says in part: 'All Bills except those Bills making a direct appropriation, the purpose of affect of which is to increase or decrease revenue of the state, either directly or indirectly, shall be referred or rereferred to the Committee on Revenue before final action is taken by the House'. That is all



we are asking, to follow our rule. If not, Mr. Speaker, I think these Bills should have been rereferred without the need of a motion. And I'm sorry they weren't. And I would hope that the House will see fit to follow our rules and refer them to the Committee on Revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit this Bill to the House Committee on Revenue. I certainly hope that the Members would fully understand that under the rules of this Session a vote to commit this Bill to the Revenue Committee is a vote to kill this Bill. Please remember that during the last Session the deadline for consideration of Bills did not apply to the Revenue Committee just as it did not apply to the Appropriations Committee. Had this motion been offered during the last Session the Sponsor of the Bill who has already received Committee approval of this Bill would then have had the opportunity to go to the Revenue Committee, cause the Committee to convene, present his Bill and his arguments to that Committee and have a fair opportunity to receive a favorable Roll Call in the Revenue Committee. Regretfully under our rules of this Session the Sponsor will not have that opportunity because the deadline for the consideration of House Bills applies to the Revenue Committee just as it applies to every other Committee except the Appropriations Committee. So I suggest to you, that in all fairness to the Sponsor who has already received Committee approval of this Bill, I do not vote to kill his Bill on this motion. If you disagree with me on this Bill then don't vote for the Bill on Third Reading."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the points are quite clear and some of the things the Majority Leader has said can easily be remedied. It wouldn't be difficult to change any rules necessary to have a Bill heard in the Revenue Committee where it should be heard, where it ought be heard and where the rules provide for it to be heard. That's all we're asking. The Gentleman on the other side of the aisle knows full well that he has the opportunity of the Members on the Committee. They control the Committee if they wish to do so."



and if they wish to make it a partisan matter. All we are asking is that Bills which rightfully belong in the Revenue Committee ought to be heard by the Revenue Committee. I'll be happy to join with the Majority Leader to suspend any necessary rules so that the Revenue Committee or any other Committee can hear Bills which should be heard by those people on those Committees. I think the Majority Leader, to preserve the process, to preserve the rules which he and I both voted for ought to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Every Member ought to be voting 'yes' so that the proper Committee could hear these Bills. So, Mr. Speaker, I make a plea to every Member to change your vote to 'aye' and let's hear this Bill, plus many others on the Calendar, that were never referred to the proper Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.

On this question there's 78 'aye' and 84.....Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to the Chair and ask the Chair to consider Rule 31-E that has been mentioned in connection with this matter wherein there is no discretion permitted the Committee on Assignment of Bills whatever that a Bill affecting the revenue of this state must be either referred or rereferred to the Revenue Committee. Now I would ask the Chair to rule on the applicability of that rule to this Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, why don't you make the announcement first of what happened on this motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "I did make the announcement. It's 78 'aye' and 84 'no'. The Gentleman's motion is lost. Representative Ewing."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Ewing: "I want to verify that Roll Call please."

Speaker Redmond: "I would...you know if you would only permit me an observation. It takes a 107 votes to pass this Bill. All you have to really do is to take a look at this thing and we've been about a half an hour...."

Ewing: "I think...Mr. Speaker, I think this there's something more important than a 107 votes here."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Okay. I'm just calling it to your attention that we have not passed one Bill today and it looks very much to me like we're going to be here Saturday. And I have an apartment and I have clean underwear and it's perfectly all right with me. Representative Walsh. Adeline says she doesn't have a....change. Representative Walsh. Anybody want to take Adeline out to dinner? Representative Madigan." Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Walsh is out of order since he called for a determination as to whether or not this Bill will affect the revenues of the state. The House of Representatives has clearly spoken on that issue on this Roll Call which is on the board and available for Mr. Walsh to observe. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Ewing is out of order in his request for a verification. It is dilatory and therefore ought not to be allowed."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think it's dilatory. He did this in the 79th Session so I know he's been waiting two years. Poll the absentees, Clerk. The answer...the Parliamentarian advises me that the answer is no."

Clerk Hall: "Antonovych,...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well,...."

Clerk Hall: "John Dunn,...."

Speaker Redmond: "We're polling the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Ralph Dunn, Flinn, Giglio, Hanahan, Huskey, Johnson, Kane, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Madison, Meyer, Mulcahey and Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah. Verify the Negative Roll Call."

Clerk Hall: "E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bluthardt, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen,...."

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

What purpose do you arise? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'm very sincere about these motions...."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't hear you, will you...."

Ewing: "I'm very sincere about these motions, did not want to be dilatory in this House. This Bill takes a 107 votes to pass. Some of my other motions may only take 89 to pass. I would like to withdraw



my request for a verification on this particular Roll Call but I would like to put the House on notice that any...any motion that I have that only takes 89 votes to pass that Bill, in the same posture I would have to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "He's withdrawn the motion. We thank you very much.

Now we go back to the question of House Bill 644 on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, first I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to have a Roll Call vote on my Bill. I did not under any circumstances introduce this piece of legislation to embarrass anyone. But I think that if you'll give it careful consideration of what this Bill does, I agree with some of the previous speakers that it is not in the Governor's Budget. That there are priorities that we should address ourselves to as educating the children of our state. But I offer also for your consideration it is very difficult these days locally to maintain any type of reasonable assessment of revenues to pursue these attempts to educate our...our local...our children in our local school districts. This is probably one of the best programs that we've had to answer the needs for our school districts' Building Construction Fund which we mandated through code enforcements and placed upon them. I think it's a good Bill. I think that every district in this state has seen the results of these school grants. I think it takes a pressure off of our local taxpayers and provides the necessary learning facilities for all the children in our state. It gives...it gives them the proper tools. It takes the pressure off of our local school districts. And I think it enables them to loosen up more monies locally to provide the teaching staff and the other tools necessary to educate our children. If you think schools are important, vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the noise level in here is very discourteous to the Sponsor of this Bill. At least let's have it...the noise level reduced so we can hear him."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you please break up the Republican conference in the aisle there? We can't hear. Please...please give the



Gentleman order. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to take this opportunity to introduce twosocial studies classes from my hometown in Streamwood, Illinois, and the principal, Mr. 'Morey' and the social studies teacher, Mr. Hart. And they're in back of us up here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, do you seek recognition? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, just in case anybody thinks he's still mad at me from a couple of years back, I want to introduce John Alesia up there."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I...I also wanted the great privilege and honor of introducing a great labor leader, Representative Matijevich beat me to it. But I also wanted this House to know, and the Members to know, that Johnny Alesia is a great friend of mine. And to the Members of this side of the aisle, and let's hear it for Johnny."

Speaker Redmond: "We're back on...we're back on 644. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "And Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, one more, Mr. Speaker. One more, Mr. Speaker. For these men who are always fighting for us and for whom we owe a great debt of gratitude, that those wonderful men, the firemen of this state, Tom O'Brien and Jim Defilly, the firemen. Let's hear it, Gentlemen."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on 644. Any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.
...All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 80 'aye' and 73 'no'. This...this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Having the courage of a lion, I'll turn the Chair over to Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Mr. James 'Kisner' State Senior Vice Commander of the American Legion, for a few words."
Jim 'Kisner'."

'Kisner': "Thank you, Larry, and distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen of this



great august Body. On behalf of the American Legion, and I'm quite sure joined by all the veterans' organizations, we'd like to take the opportunity to thank you for your support that you've given us in the past on the many, many veterans pensions and veterans Bills that you've seen fit to recognize and to pass. And we strongly would like to give you our thanks for the coming cooperation I'm quite sure that we, in the veterans organizations, will get. And if there's ...certainly anything we can do for you individually, or collectively, please be our guests and feel free to call upon us. Thank you very, very much."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Jim. And now I want to introduce Bob 'Bayer' Publicity Director for the American Legion. Bob 'Bayer'."

'Bayer': "Thank you, Larry. It's a pleasure to be here, Gentlemen, you guys do as much work in here as we do in our Department Executive Committee Meetings. We want to thank you for all your assistance over the years and hope you'll be with us as long as you're in Session. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 700. Short Debate Calendar, House Bill 700. Short Debate Calendar, House Bill 700. Out of the record, is that what you wish? 700."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 700...."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I understood that these Bills on the Short Debate Calendar were going to remain for at least one day."

Speaker Redmond: "If you'll look at 700 you'll see that maybe we weren't really serious about that. That has something to do with cannibals."

Walsh: "Taint funny, Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Redmond: "Been requested to take it out of the record. 701."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 701. A Bill for an Act limiting funds in the Road Fund for the purposes of the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain? Out of the record. 704.

Representative Tuerk. Out of the record. 714."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 714. A Bill for an Act creating the Depressed Area and Land Use and Community Development Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 714 creates the East St.

Louis Depressed Areas Land Use and Redevelopment Commission. In the East St. Louis area, and the territorial area of this Bill first of all, would be the City of East St. Louis, the Village of Brooklyn, Illinois, Centreville and Allerton. In that area there's a tremendous wasteful land use pattern as a result of large numbers of people leaving the area, and as a result:...."

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

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 714 is the companion Bill to 715 which is still in Appropriations I Committee and I think it more appropriate to hold the Bill here on the Calendar rather than do anything with it until the other Bill comes on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "That is the only concern that I have and that's passing this now what assurance do we have that we're going to be able to reach it prior to the 21st. Now it would seem to me that if we take it out of the record now there should be some assurance that we'll be able to take care of these matters..."

Matijevec: "Well, I was going to make a blanket motion later on before we get to the 21st but all of those substantive Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Okay. Representative Skinner."

Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly would agree but I wonder why Representative Matijevec or else the Chairman of the other Appropriations Committee didn't make a similar speech on the last Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge, you've heard the suggestion..."

Matijevec: "That wasn't on my list...."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that satisfactory to you?"

Younge: "What, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee has suggested that this hold its place until the appropriation is out of the Committee? ...He intends to make a motion that all of these substantive Bills that have a companion appropriation Bill, that the rule be suspended with respect to them so that we have assurance that they will be reached on Third Reading."



Younger: "Oh, I see, the deadline rule will be suspended so that I will know that I will have a hearing on this substantive Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "That is Representative Matijevec's intention to make that motion and I assure...assume it will carry although I can't be sure. I would think that that's an advisable procedure."

Younger: "All right. Yes....Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 718. Out of record. 719, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. 730, Pierce. Representative Pierce."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 730. A Bill for an Act in relation to the use, sale, distribution and return of beverage containers and amending an Act therein named in connection herewith. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, is this on the Short Debate Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "I would hope so. I think we had the long debate last night. You want Representative Schneider in the Chair?"

Pierce: "No, I thought Representative...Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen...Ebbesen, would be chair...executive in the Chair. He never changes his mind."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 730 is an important Bill. It's a controversial Bill. It's a Bill that's so important that the chief lobbyist against it gets...introduced from the gallery just before we call it. But it's an important Bill. What House Bill 730 does is through a voluntary system of refundable five cents deposits encourage citizens to return beverage bottles and recycle beverage cans. The bottles to be reused, the cans to be recycled. No administrative machinery is created. No bureaucracy is created. The five cent deposit which has been in existence as long as the soft drink and beer business has been in existence is an ongoing existing and continuing method of returning beverage cans. Some people ask, 'why don't we include other types of wrappers and containers?'. Maybe we should in the future but the reason we picked the beverage cans and beverage bottles now is that they have an established method of return. When I was young, and I'm a little older than some



people here, but when I was young most beverage containers were returned for one or two cents deposit. Then sometime after World War II in the 1950's we moved into our throwaway society and more and more cast away and threw away nonreturnable beverage containers which has helped create our litter and solid waste problem. The Bill also bans the flip-top can, where...with the fliptops are thrown all over the landscape sometimes injuring children, sometimes injuring livestock and being a general nuisance. Now what we...what do we hope to accomplish by the Bill? Why did we introduce the Bill? I tried ...to explain why we confine it to beverage containers because they have an established method of return. The soft drink companies, the breweries sell returnables right here and now. But why did we introduce the Bill? For four purposes. One, to reduce litter along our roadsides and our parks and our parkways and our forest preserves and our streams and creeks because we all know and we can all observe the beer and soda pop beverage containers comprise a large portion of litter. Second, to reduce municipal garbage pickup. Because when we throw, when we don't litter and throw the garbage containers.... in garbage cans they don't disappear. They're picked up by municipal garbage trucks or by...or by scavengers that are hired by the cities and they're hauled where? Fifteen, twenty, twenty-five miles to a landfill where they're buried, and we're short of landfill space and we're running shorter. Thirdly, the Bill is aimed to conserve energy and we know that we are in an energy crisis. There's no more energy consumptive industry than aluminum and steel making and in glass making. And they use lots and lots of energy to the extent that if we can reuse a bottle or recycle a can we are conserving energies for future use in this country. And the fourth purpose is to conserve natural resources. We don't have infinite amounts of bauxite in the world. Bauxite goes into making alumina which makes aluminum. Ninety percent of it is imported from the West Indies or South America. We'll run out of iron ore someday and to conserve the natural resources that go into making cans, that is, the bauxite and aluminum and the iron ore and steel we saved or reused in recycling of the cans. Who is for the Bill? We know a lot of people are against it, who is for it? The Illinois Agricultural Association is for it, our farm



Bureau officially in our legislative program. The Illinois Farmers Union is for it officially in its program. Many newspapers, Chicago Daily News, Chicago Sun-Times, the Paddock and Herald Newspapers, Lindsay-Schaub Newspapers, are all for it. The League of Women Voters has endorsed it. Many municipalities, the Village of Homewood, we have a former mayor of Homewood with us on the other side of the aisle, those of Homewood have especially endorsed the Bill, LaGrange, the Winnebago County Forest Preserve District, the Rockford Park District, the Village of Crystal Lake and on and on. Many municipalities have endorsed the Bill. Why? Because they want to cut down on the garbage on the solid waste that they have to take to landfills. The Glen Ellyn Chamber of Commerce has endorsed the Bill. The Illinois State Environmental Protection Agency has endorsed the Bill. Why am I supporting the Bill? Not because...not because of these endorsements. I'm supporting the Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman a little order."

Pierce: "I'm supporting the Bill because I feel strongly we must begin to move away from the throwaway society that we've become, the wasteful, slothful throwaway society. The conspicuous consumption that exist in our society that we live in our own filth and dirt to the point we're about ready to be buried in it. Now what about employment? There's been more misinformation about employment. There's been more scare tactics on the can and bottle workers than we can possibly imagine. We put a phase-in period till July 1, 1980, the attrition, that is the normal retirement and turnover in these industries will make certain that no existing worker in these industries loses their job. Less than half of these glass and bottles being made are used for throwaways and many bottles will then become returnables should this Bill pass. There will be a gain in employment. There'll be a gain in employment in supermarkets, there'll be a gain of employment by teamsters who return the bottles, in the recycling industries, in the soft drink industry and the brewery there will be a gain of employment to handle the resellable bottles and to recycle the cans. Do we live in such a sick society that the only way we can provide employment is to provide employment to make things to throw away? Is our American economy so sick that the only way we can provide jobs



is to produce cans and bottles that are to be tossed away into landfills and buried? If so, we're going to bury ourselves and our society because our children and grandchildren will find an economy where there are no more natural resources, where energy has run out. And they'll look back and say, 'who started us down the road to slop, to filth, our throwaway?' And they'll look at our generation and they'll say our generation was the most wasteful generation on earth. Our generation was a bunch of pigs. Their own grandfathers serving in this House to vote against the Bill, want to throw everything away into a landfill and live on their junk and use up the resources for our children and grandchildren and the energy are slothful. They're part of the conspicuous consumption throwaway society. And if that's the only way we can provide jobs in this country is to use something once and throw it away, then maybe we do deserve to see our standard of living decline over the years. This Bill is aimed at a first step, a first step to return and recycle and reuse bottles and cans under an established method, beer and soft drink has been sold this way for years. It can be done. And if the only way we can maintain our economy is drown in our own waste, to use everything once and throw it away, then believe me, our economy and our throwaway society shows the first signs of sickness that will lead to a decline in the lifestyle of our children and grandchildren. I ask you to support House Bill 730 to start us on the road of recycling and reuse to preserve our standard of living for our children and our grandchildren.

Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I testified against this Bill in Committee and arise to testify against it today. This Bill would have a tremendously adverse effect on the city that I come from and a neighboring city in my district, Granite City, which has a steel mill and Alton that has a glass company. But let me read a few other cities in Illinois and maybe you will recognize some of these. Streator, Chicago Heights, Gurnee, Mundelein, Dalton, East St. Louis, Lincoln, Hillsboro, Plainfield, Joliet, all those companies have...all those cities have glass manufacturers,



bottle manufacturers. I'll continue, Alsip, Barrington, Bellwood, Danville, DesPlaines, Elgin, Elmhurst, Hillside, Hoopeston, Itasca. I can go on and on, the list is endless. We come from one of the greatest industrial states in the United States. This is not a rural state and it cannot in no way be compared to Oregon. We are facing a tremendous loss in jobs. It's been estimated that if this passed we would lose nine, over nine thousand jobs in Illinois. The previous speaker talked of a phase-in. There is no phase-in period for people who lose their job. Who comes to the aid of these people? Who comes to the aid of the poor working man when he goes home and tells his family that he can no longer support them? We're not talking about menial, low-income minimum wage jobs. We're talking about skilled blue collar employees that have worked fifteen and twenty years of their life in order to reach a decent living. Now when they've reached that we're telling them that 'no, we don't need your job in this state, we don't need to supply Iowa and Indiana and Oregon with bottles and cans. We don't need to be the supplier of the United States. What we want to do is put you to work at a minimum wage job in a city five hundred miles away'. This is a ridiculous answer to this problem. Why don't we take a look at actually who litters in this country? It's not the 98% of the people that are really concerned about this state, it's the 2% of the people that really don't care what our state looks like or what happens to it. And we are going to pretend that by putting a 5¢ deposit on bottles we are going to stop that inconsiderate, irresponsible 2% of the population from littering. That's ridiculous. They're going to continue to litter and one nickel, one ill-spent nickel is not going to stop them doing just that. So the question here before us today, as the question is everyday, is one of priority. Are we going to choose a fairytale dream highway or are we going to choose decent paying jobs for the men and women who work in this state? I think that...I think the answer is obvious. We have little choice when it comes to choosing priorities. We must opt for full employment. And we choose to clean up our society in sensible ways and not by taking a ridiculous approach. I urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."



Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker....thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Contrary to what the Sponsor of this legislation has said and was quoted in the papers as saying that.... you know, I don't have any of these companies in my district but I most assuredly have these companies that I feel responsible for in my state. And my opposition to House Bill 730 is certainly not based on the objectives of the Sponsor. But my opposition is based on the discrimination, the discriminatory nature of what the proposal in House Bill 730 calls for. Now everyone recognizes that litter is a problem but I don't think that a 5¢ deposit on bottles and cans is the answer. The dictionary, I looked it up this morning, describes litter, as things lying about in disorder, especially bits or scraps of rubbish scattered about. Then I went on and looked up rubbish and it said it could be classified or defined as anything that was rejected or worthless material that is thrown away. Now rubbish also can be described as a worthless or a foolish idea and House Bill 730, in my opinion, in its present form is a foolish idea and it's also a very costly idea. It's costly because a state-wide switch to returnables could cost more than it saves and this means a burden to the consumer in the form of increased cost. And I'm sure that if the beverage business found it profitable to use returnables they would be doing it right now, they don't have to have a mandate coming out of the General Assembly in Springfield for that purpose. Now this Oregon plan which has been referred to here is similar to what House Bill 730 proposes and it's been demonstrated in the State of Oregon that the employment factor is another very important dimension in this particular issue. The Owens Glass Company in Illinois has...has been indicated, has over 12,000 employees and the can industry over 9,000. A total of 20,000. And when this similar legislation that we have before us today was passed and then initiated in Oregon the results have been tragic. There's been no decrease litter but they put the can industry completely under and they have suffered a 43% loss as far as the Owens Glass Manufacturers are concerned. Now if you project that kind of a loss as was indicated means between nine and ten thousand jobs in this state and to me we can't tolerate that.



I don't have to remind anybody the ramifications of the decrease of jobs and its impact and ramifications throughout the entire state as far as revenue and personal and family income. The litter problem is..itself, in my opinion, is a matter of self-discipline and you can't legislate self-discipline. We have to educate self-discipline. I think this Bill should be defeated and the problem of litter can be recycled right through this General Assembly at some other time when we can take into consideration what they are doing in the State of Washington where I think that the beverage companies themselves are far ahead of this General Assembly in their willingness to participate and promote an educational program just to remind ourselves, just to remind ourselves, that the problem can and should be answered with self-disciplined, not unrealistic costly impractical mandates from government. Now that Oregon plan called for a special tax of so many dollars for every million dollars in sales...in millions of...of volume. Now it could serve at least if nothing more than a point of departure for this General Assembly to consider. And I'd like to also say that a litter can be a stretcher. We ought to take this particular wounded, ill Bill and put in the litter and put it on a litter and put it back in the Legislative Reference Bureau where it belongs. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, we've heard this fine rhetoric for a couple of Sessions now and I don't think it's going to change one vote so I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', those 'no'. Representative...motion carries, Representative Friedrich for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, you let the Sponsor speak to this Bill and then you let any number of people get up and speak against it. Why don't you let it divide up and some...us that are for it speak out? I don't think that's fair."

Speaker Redmond: "Previous question has carried. Representative Pierce to close."

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



Gentleman spoke against it, the first Gentleman, had a most inconsistent argument that's always used against this Bill. First he said, it won't....first he said it's going to cost a lot of jobs.... lots and lots of jobs. Secondly he said it won't work, they won't take back the bottles and cans. Well if they don't take back the bottles and cans then there won't be any loss of jobs because certainly the only loss of jobs he claims is that bottles and cans will be reused and recycled and there'll be less and less bottles and cans manufactured which is the aim of the Bill. Then he argues all people who litter anyway they won't obey, the 5¢ deposit won't be enough. So he's about as inconsistent as every opponent of this Bill arguing on the one hand it's going to cost jobs, on the other hand they're going to litter anyway and that...and so being completely inconsistent. There's nothing in this Bill that requires anyone to bring back a bottle or a can. If they continue to litter, if they continue to litter, then the can and bottle manufacturers will continue to make.... can and bottle manufacturers will continue to make bottles and cans. They'll be thrown away, that'll add to our landfill, that'll bury us in garbage and debris, so as I said, when your grandchildren look back on this generation they'll say 'what an irresponsible, wasteful, slothful generation of conspicuous consumption'. Now the Gentleman from DeKalb thought this Bill came out of the Reference Bureau. This Bill wasn't the creation of the Reference Bureau, or my creation, it's been a law in Oregon. It's been the law of Vermont. Yesterday we had a Vermont Representative here and she said how well the Bill works in that state. The Republican Governor of Oregon said, 'we're proud of the Bill, how...how well the Bill's worked in Oregon'. The State of Michigan by referendum last November adopted this Bill. The State of Maine by referendum last November adopted the Bill. The Connecticut House of Representatives has passed a Bill this spring. This Bill wasn't made up in the Reference Bureau and the Gentleman knows it. It works well in Oregon, it's decreasing litter there, the people in Oregon are happy with it. In fact, no politician can get elected in Oregon today who doesn't favor and support the Bottle Bill. Now he's right, and the Gentleman from DeKalb is completely right when he says, 'we should look at old things, in addition, in



addition to beverage containers'. And I certainly would support legislation requiring separation of newspapers from other garbage so that newspapers can be returned, bound and returned and recycled as newsprint or paperboard. And that can be done and that should be done. The same is true of much of our garbage and litter that can be recycled and reused. But what happens to beverage containers when it gets in the garbage? No one recycles it. It goes to a landfill. It's buried in a landfill. Representative Geo-Karis' area is surrounded by landfills and it could have more and more landfills if we keep throwing away things that can be reused and recycled if we're wasteful, if we're slothful, if we continue the throw away society that has made America the most wasteful consumptive nation in our history. Do you have, do you have the guts to stand up to that or do you believe the only way we can create employment is to make things to throw away? To make things to waste? And that's the only way we can have full employment in our country. If you believe that, then I can understand how some of you are voting against the Bill. I ask the rest of you to support House Bill 730."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, most of you know that I have been named to the Dirty Dozen, I'm not usually on this side of a question. But I became so obsessed by the tin cans and bottles that are being...been strewn up and down the roads and streets and farms in my area that I decided the time has come to do something about it. A lot of the arguments have been presented here by the opposition are plain hogwash..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Friedrich: "A lot of the statements that have been made by the opposition around here are just plain hogwash. People are not going to stop drinking beer and coke and all the other drinks. They're going to keep on drinking and they're going to be put in some kind of a container and somebody's going to make them. We don't reuse the cans now. You make new cans. With this Bill you'll be making new cans. Now who's going to be out of a job? It's going to take the same number of



cans it did before. All we're going to do is take these cans back in and recycle them and put them to use. And I don't know about you but I...I've got my fill of tin cans and bottles that are dumped in my yard. The bottles are broken on the parking lots and on my street. And I think it's time we've got to do something about it. This is the way to approach it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question....Representative Dyer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's just on the advise of my attorney, Representative Ebbesen, I would like to say I do have a conflict of interest in this Bill however I will go ahead and vote my conscience with this 'no'. There's a better Bill coming out of the State of Washington."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 42 'aye' and a 144 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bills, Third Reading Consent Calendar. Supplementary Consent Calendar, pardon me. Appears on page 35. Is the elected Clerk within the sound of my voice?"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 134. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 135. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 136. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 137. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 138. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 139. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 140. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 141. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 142. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property



Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 143. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 144. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 145. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 147. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 148. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 149. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 150. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 151. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 152. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 153. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 154. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 157. A Bill for an Act relating to the study of mines subsidence problems and regulation in Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 158. A Bill for an Act to add an Article to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 196. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 197. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 198. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 234. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill.



House Bill 244. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill. "

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

Schlickman: "Well, House Bill 244 was just read and I believe that was taken from the Consent Calendar earlier today."

Clerk Hall: "244 is off the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 245. A Bill for an Act to increase the penalties for second and subsequent violations of certain controlled substances offenses. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 252. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 258. A Bill for an Act to license and regulate grain dealers. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 272. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 320. A Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 379. A Bill for an Act designating a design for the Great Seal of the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 384. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 404. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 413. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 427. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 501. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 507. A Bill for an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges connected with the sales on credit and the lending of money. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 508. A Bill for an Act relating to the acquisition, possession and transfer of firearms and firearm ammunition. Third Reading of the Bill.



House Bill 519. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 520. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 541. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 548. A Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale on credit and the lending of money. Third Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 608. A Bill for an Act concerning willages and incorporated towns and to repeal certain Acts therein. Third Reading of the Bill.

The following Bills have been objected to and removed: House Bill 244. House Bill 485 and House Bill 504."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I believe 501 has been removed too."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, has 501 been removed?"

Clerk Hall: "501 has been removed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "In the...in the list of Bills just removed, when he was reading he skipped 520, has it, has it also been removed?"

Speaker Redmond: "520, is that on or off? That's on."

Tipsword: "It's on?"

Speaker Redmond: "Right."

Tipsword: "Representative....I know Representative...told me...they filed a list to take it off."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Tipsword: "No, I'm...I'm sorry, I'm looking at the wrong one. Not 520, the one just below that, is that 528?"

Speaker Redmond: "528 is not on here, is it? Or...are you looking in the printed Calendar?"

Tipsword: "I'm looking at this, I'm having trouble reading it."

Speaker Redmond: "Well in the printed Calendar look at page 27."

Tipsword: "Yes, I see. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Speaker, did the Clerk read House Bill 191?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't see it on here."



Walsh: "Well, I don't either. It was just brought to my attention that you did not read that, okay."

Speaker Redmond: "We didn't read that and there's a lot of others we didn't read. You want us to tell all the others we didn't read?"

Walsh: "Nope. Nope. That'll be all right."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other questions? The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Mautino. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'aye' and no 'nay' and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Representative who? Representative Tipword. Wait a minute."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I believe we...it was indicated we'd have an opportunity to register our 'no' if we wished to on a Bill without having to take it off?"

Speaker Redmond: "Would you do it in writing, Representative Tipword, we have some form up here?"

Tipword: "Okay, fine, thank you. We'd been told it'd be...they'd be called and we could get it from our Calendar...."

Speaker Redmond: "Sometimes we don't correspond with the Clerk exigencies. Representative Jaffe. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, did you indicate that we would now have forms?"

Speaker Redmond: "There are forms here. Come up here and see George here."

Jaffe: "I had suggested that previously....you came around to my..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...."

Jaffe: "Point of view, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "...To the Order of House Bills Third Reading, 737.

Aside from the Consent Calendar we've had final action on two Bills in two hours and twenty-five minutes. We had a total of 680 or something like that. House Bill 737."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 737. A Bill for an Act to license and regulate tree experts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very noncontroversial Bill. It was introduced on behalf of a number of



municipalities and the Tree Expert Examining Board and the Department of Registration and Education so as to plug up certain existing loopholes in the Tree Expert Act of 1967. A similar Bill passed the House last Session but failed to be acted upon in the Senate. Under the existing law a company may hold itself out as being a licensed tree expert company yet the person so licensed may be in fact a parttime employee or a consultant who holds himself out for two or more tree firms. This Bill makes some minor changes in the examination requirements. It has been...has the support of the Illinois Commercial Arbors Association, Midwest Golf Course Superintendents Association, City of Evanston, City of Lake Forest, Skokie and I'd ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Tipsword. ...Pass.

Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I reluctantly rise to oppose this Bill and suggest that the State of Illinois has more licensed, licensed, parenthesis, professions, closed parenthesis, than any other state in the Union. And I submit to you that in most instances these licenses are for the benefit of the licensees rather than for the public interest. Too often these people are interested in having their particular trade or profession licensed in order to limit the number of persons who may participate. So I suggest to you that tree experts really need not be licensed. There's no great public interest in tree care. I submit that any one of us could take care of a tree probably as well as a...an expert who might become licensed under this Act. And I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman to close, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can't quite understand my good friend, this Gentleman from LaGrange, making that statement. Possibly he hasn't gone out in the forest and gone through the City of Rockford and the City of Evanston and various cities in the state to see what's happened with our Dutch Elm Disease. If there's any...any profession that requires some expertise it's this one. This is...been a profession that's been licensed since 1957. It's on behalf of the people that...that these licenses should be enforced and this is mainly to plug up some loopholes in the



existing law. ...Request your affirmative approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 737 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Neff to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think this is another piece of legislation that...is unwisely. Illinois now as has been brought out here, has one of the most strictest of licensing of tree experts and this Bill just adds another restriction. And keep in mind this will keep the people that work on their own, working as free-lancing, from operating and also it would keep them...the small people from changing jobs by the having of this licensing and therefore I think it definitely should be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Since I decided to Cosponsor this Bill when I saw McCourt was going to introduce it because I had some problems with this...on accountability Session when we're talking about accountability. We advertise for bids because of the Dutch Elm Disease we lost some 3,000 trees in the Village of Elmwood Park, so when I advertised for bids for a replacement tree program in our community, I've had outside people that were not regulated by the state who were trying to sell and came in and bid, underbid and undercut everybody that bid on that job that was licensed in the State of Illinois. Now I absolutely turned them down but I had to do an awful lot of explaining to newspapers why I had to give the bid out to a higher tree...higher bid because they were more reliable and a more reputable firm. I feel that everyone that is in forestry and especially if you go along the highways in the suburban areas of Cook County, you'll find trucks from Tennessee, you'll find trucks from Kentucky, you'll find trucks from the Sunbelt states, selling you evergreens and there...you bring them back home and they're loaded with disease and there's all types of ...no guarantee that the tree that you're buying is a healthy tree or it will grow. And I think that any kind of a restriction we can put on there and the good people in the business want this kind of Bill and they want to be regulated and they want these restrictions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who...."

Conti: "I urge a vote...I urge a few more green lights up there."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 51 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 743, Representative Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 743. A Bill for an Act establishing in the Illinois Department of persons suffering from hemophilia, establish a Hemophilia Advisory Committee. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Bradley. Well, I don't know when we'll get back to it. Take it out of the record. House Bill 758, Representative Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 758."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It was removed from the Consent Calendar, Mr. Clerk. Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schlickman: "Parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "When a Bill was taken from a Consent Calendar, doesn't it go to the Short Debate Calendar?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Sponsor removed the Bill all the way so it reverts back to the original Calendar."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 758. A Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that we debated the other day on a couple of Amendments that Representative Hanahan offered and we defeated the Amendments. But this Bill amends the Minimum Wage Act to provide the exemption for the overtime provisions, to pick up the...the time between...the time when House Bill 1930 went into effect and the few months prior to that. It also adds an agreement between employees of the same employer and exempts them and picks up the commissioned employees. It's a very good Bill. It's much needed to eliminate overtime provisions for some workers that don't need it and I would urge the support of this House in the movement of House Bill 758."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Hanahan."



Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I...I'm always amused by people saying that somebody don't need a protection of the law from exploitation or from the provisions of...of an employer who maybe so greedy as...enforce work rules that a employee has no right to argue against it except quitting their job and adding to the unemployment rolls of this state. The rationalization of why we have a Fair Standard Act in the United States is because some people cannot protect themselves against the economic power of an employer that mandates they work overtime against their will. Because as everyone in this House should be aware, there is no right to refuse reasonable overtime in the State of Illinois. Now in the area of House Bill 758, we're talking about people who...who are...who have been considered as executives and have been people who...for a short period of time had the ability to collect overtime for work done in excess of 40 hours. This retroactive type of legislation that will exempt them from the law of coverage, I think is unfair and unfortunate because of one of the things that I receive most of in my mail is the thank you's I received from many housewives who finally had their husbands home for dinner and home on the weekends to be with their children. Now this isn't all that this Bill does. This also includes that the people who have a work agreement, anyone who would have a work agreement to exchange hours, would be exempt from the provisions of the overtime provisions of 40 hours in a work week to have their employer not be forced to pay time-and-a-half. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you and I know that many times an unscrupulous type of employer will have the ability to force those so-called voluntary agreements to be entered into where people will be forced to work against their will even though the law says 'voluntarily' to enter into, that this isn't true when it comes to the work place. Number three, this Bill will exempt the big ticket salesmen. And let's listen to how it exempts them. It exempts them if they make around \$3.70 an hour that those salesmen will no longer be allowed to be paid time-and-a-half after 40 hours. Now I don't know, in a reasonable society I may...you may disagree with my feelings on maybe the exemption of executives from the Overtime Act but this one provision of the Bill makes this Bill a bad one because uniquely the federal law really calls for a very



minimal type of exemption for the big-ticket salesmen. And when I offered the Amendment the other night on this Bill I sincerely felt that Illinois should at least address themselves to the position of that if you're a big-ticket commission salesman, that the very minimum exemption, before the exemption is applied to your employment, the very minimum standard should be at least twice the minimum wage, that's all I asked for: That comes to a grand total of \$4.60 an hour. Now what this Bill will do...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hanahan, kindly bring your remarks to a close."

Hanahan: "What this Bill will do, and the....this part of the Amendment is, say that every commissioned salesman that is paid \$3.67 an hour is exempt from the provisions of time-and-a-half after 40 hours. And I think for that kind of law and that type of regressive step to take place on our State Minimum Wage Law is a bad step and I urgently ask everyone to vote 'no' on this kind of bad kind of Amendment to the State Minimum Wage Law."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think what Representative Hart is attempting to do has 'got' clouded here by the tirade from the Gentleman from McHenry. He's making a bigger deal out of this than actually exists with this Bill. Now Representative Hart is addressing himself to a period between the time this Legislature fouled up a situation on the exemption for overtime for executives, et cetera, and the time in which we did some remedial legislation last fall. Now Representative Hanahan was involved in that, as we all know. And what we did last fall to correct the situation has been done. Now what Representative Hart is attempting to do is just take care of a period of the four or five month period between the time that the Legislature fouled up the Act and what he's trying to do is straighten the whole thing out which is one piece that we didn't take into account last fall. I think it's good legislation. It shouldn't be clouded by a lot of arguments which Representative...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Representative Tuerk, Representative Hanahan on a point of order. What's your point?"

Hanahan: "Would you inform the Gentleman that there's an Amendment to the



Bill that he does not seem to even understand is on the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. Representative Tuerk, would you kindly address yourself to the Bill as amended?"

Tuerk: "Well, I still reiterate what Representative Hart is attempting to do is take care of one...one area of the law which needs some remedial legislation and I think the Bill does that and I would solicit your support for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hart to close."

Hart: "Well, Representative Tuerk is absolutely right but there are some additional provisions in the Bill which were debated on Second Reading the other day and provide for an exchange between employees and then with reference to commission employees. One of the Members asked me while the debate was going on, if any employee would have to give back any money and the answer is no. And the Bill would not affect any claims that were pending when it becomes law. This Bill, what this Bill does is to finish the efforts of the General Assembly when we passed House Bill 1930 recently. And the entire problem started when we passed House Bill 3318 several months ago. I think it's good legislation and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 758 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Tommy, give me 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 33 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 743, Representative Terzich requests leave to bring that Bill back from Third Reading to Second. Is there any objection? Hearing no objections, the Bill back on Second Reading. 743. Representative Terzich."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change the board."

Terzich: "Would like to have leave to adopt Amendment #4. This was as a result of an error in drafting of the Bill which would exclude insurance payments being payable on account of hemophiliacs and I would urge adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Terzich moves the adoption of Amendment



#4, is there any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; all those opposed.... Amendment #4 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments? Representative Terzich on Amendment #5."

Terzich: "Amendment #5, again, when the Bill was drafted in figuring the person's net worth it was...the income was...their income was excluded from the Bill and Amendment #5 will include income as part of their net worth. And I would urge adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? All those in favor of Amendment #5 signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed... Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Representative Dawson, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Not enough? Take it out, okay. House Bill 760, Representative Jaffe."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 760. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 760 deals with evidence of the prior sexual history of rape victims and provides that in prosecutions for rape or devious sexual assault the prior sexual history of the rape victim is inadmissible as evidence except as...for two things. One is opinion evidence concerning the prosecuting witness' reputation for chastity; or two, is evidence concerning the past sexual conduct of the prosecuting witness with the accused. However, in the Amendment to the Bill, we put in one thing and this provides for an in-chambers hearing to see whether or not the evidence is relevant before it goes to the jury. The purpose of the Bill is to protect the rape victim from being harassed and abused as they have been in the past. I might say that a much stronger Bill was passed out of the House last year by us by an overwhelming vote but actually died in the Senate because of time restrictions. I would be happy to answer any questions and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I speak in favor of House Bill 760. As Representative Jaffe pointed out, there was a Bill that was up



last term which had a very significant constitutional defect which has been cleared in this Bill. At that time, it just outright made that the prior sexual history incompetent evidence. It was suggested that perhaps the way to get around it rather than having a fishing expedition would be have a Session, in camera Session before the court as to the relevancy of any past sexual history and have the court rule prior to making it public. This has now been incorporated, House Bill 760, it gives, now news protection to both the defendant and the prosecution witness. So I would certainly join with the Representative from Skokie and urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 760."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "No, I'm sorry...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think everyone one understands the Bill. I would just urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All those in favor...on House Bill 760 will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'ayes', 3 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. The Bill receiving a Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to announce that we have the Sacred Heart Eighth Grade Class from the 30th District which has Phil Collins, Frank Giglio and myself...and Senator Sam Maragos, as a representative, in the gallery."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome, welcome to Springfield. May I also point out that Ernie...two boys are in the class, we want to welcome them as well. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye' on the last Bill, my...my switch is stuck here, will not change the results."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave? And Mrs. Martin asks for the same question. Peggy Martin. Yes. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't have this opportunity very often but Sacred Heart happens to be a fine Croatian school and as you know, Representative Matijevich and I, we certainly wish to welcome these fine children who attend this Croatian



school."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 782, Representative Schlickman. House Bill 782, Representative Schlickman."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 782. A Bill relating to the compensation of crime victims, amending certain Acts therein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Telcser, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Who do you want to introduce?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like at this time to introduce two colleagues of mine, two friendly retailers, who serve their community, who try and provide good health services to their friends and neighbors, who are sometimes my political friends and sometimes my political adversaries, but always my friend and your friend, Norman Garfinkel and Don 'Bross' in the balcony."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 782, Representative Schlickman. Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want the Assembly to know that Harold Adam's sister is back here again. Right over here. Would you kindly arise, Mrs. Adams?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. House Bill 782, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Has the Bill been read, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, Members of the House,..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's have a little order."

Schlickman: "Significant and substantial consideration has been and is being given this Session with respect to the problem, if not the crises, of crime in Illinois. An aspect of this problem or crime that is considered by this Bill, House Bill 782, is the victim. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the victim of a crime is twice victimized. The victim is victimized by the criminal and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the victim is also victimized by our criminal justice system. Now a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Illinois with a few other states pioneered the concept, the program of compensation to victims of crimes. Unfortunately this program has not provided the relief that the state is responsible for providing. The program is not well known. It is not adequately funded."



And there is certain deficiencies in it. Last year there was a thorough analysis of the Illinois Compensation to Victims of Crimes Act. That appraisal appeared in the law journal of Loyola University and I should like to briefly quote from it with respect to our program, generally speaking and specifically. These are direct quotes, 'It is clear that the success or failure of any Crime Victims Compensation Program depends on the efficient and quick settlement of the victim's claim. Delay, delay in providing claims in Illinois is traceable to the Legislature's original inadequate draftmanship. The problem which has plagued deficient operation of the Crime Victim's Compensation Act is the lack of financial resources and administrative personnel. The requirement that a victim must have been employed immediately preceding a crime may be overly harsh in some circumstances. For instance, a homemaker would not be entitled, is not entitled, to any compensation for loss of earning since she has, technically, no employer. The low number of rape victims compensated thus far under the Illinois Victim's Crime Compensation Program points out a major deficiency in the Act when one considers the number of rape victims who qualify as potential claimant'. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this analysis stated, 'the Crime Victim's Compensation Act is a significant step in the right direction. The Act imposes a legal and moral obligation upon the state to aid innocent victims of violent crimes. However, the Act does not compensate all innocent victims. It denies recovery to victims who are related to or sharing the same household as their assailant. The Act purports to compensate rape victims but the statutory definition of pecuniary loss is so restrictive that it denies meaningful relief to most victims of one of the fastest growing violent crimes'. House Bill 782 is correctly described by the synopsis. Specifically, it provides, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that fines be imposed for other than parking offenses and traffic offenses except the severe one such as driving while under the influence and reckless driving, may include a surcharge of five dollars or ten percent of the fine. You would say a novel approach. It's approach that is in use in the State of Ohio and it's an approach, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that puts the burden where it most properly lies, and that is, upon the criminal.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion?"

Schlickman: "The Bill also, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, makes more efficient the administration of the Act. It provides for notice such as the Miranda notice that is given to criminals will now have a notice requirement for victims. And it takes care of rape victims by insuring that they will be provided with the necessary psychiatric, psychological treatment following a rape. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is a significant Bill. It's one that will substantially contribute in a positive, affirmative way, to the high incident of crime that exists in Illinois. I sincerely and respectfully solicit your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Giorgi: "Mr...Representative Schlickman, from whence has these improvements emanated from?"

Schlickman: "As I indicated earlier, this Bill...no, let me finish, may I please?"

Giorgi: "No, I was on the original Commission, Gene, I want...I'm asking you from whence did these improvements come from? From the Attorney General's Office, yourself or from specific group?"

Schlickman: "It came as...from at least two groups, part of the Bill was initiated by me, part of the Bill was initiated by the Attorney General. The Bill, generally if I may conclude, this Bill generally and specifically responds to the criticism, the appraisal that's contained in the law journal of Loyola University, Spring, 1976."

Giorgi: "Okay. What does the Bill do to the...inordinately, durably long length of time that it takes to file a claim and finally get the adjudication and get it to the Court of Claims, what does it do about that schedule? That's where the abuse is in this program. What does it do about that?"

Schlickman: "That is one of the problems that is contained in the existing program inasmuch as we have the Attorney General, we've got the Secretary of State, we've got the Court of Claims. What the Bill does is to make more efficient the organizational structure so that these claims can be expeditiously processed to insure that the time between



the crime and the recovery will be shortened."

Giorgi: "Does it specifically state in the Bill, does it provide a time schedule in the Bill?"

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, what is that, Sir?"

Giorgi: "Does it provide a time schedule in the Bill? Does it say ninety days or a hundred-and-twenty days or a hundred-and-eighty days or two years like it's taking now?"

Schlickman: "Well, I would like for that to be in there but it can't be because there has to be an investigation with respect to the crime to determine what participation, if any, the victim had in the crime. To insure that the victim was an innocent victim and not a party to the crime itself. And you just can't arbitrarily set a time limit because of the variety of crimes that are performed and the complexity of some of them."

Giorgi: "One more, one more question. What's going to become of the money that you're going to surcharge on...on violations other than traffic? What's going to become of that money? What...what's it earmarked for?"

Schlickman: "It goes into the Compensation to Victims of Crime Fund."

Giorgi: "Well, if I....just speak on the Bill a couple of minutes. It seems to me that...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Giorgi on the...on the issue...."

Giorgi: "The author of this Bill doesn't really know what's been happening to the Compensation of Victims Crime situation. I happened to be on the original Commission in 1965 that studied this program and took us eight years to enact the necessary legislation. What's happening now is, I had a...two specific cases in my district where the people haven't been paid yet, it's been over a year. I think the people that wrote this Bill deliberately ignored that deficiency in the Act. They...they didn't address this part of the Act which is the one that caused the most concern. These people are given duns for bills that they can't pay, they're waiting for the money we promised them. We're just...complicating the problem for the victim. I think this is a terrible thing terrible thing that they put together."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Kosinski."

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



the House Sponsor on getting this Bill out of Judiciary Committee. I thought I had it bottled up there and then I went to lunch. You know, I see a certain similarity between this Bill and House Bill 227 which got 89 red lights. I see again a good program, and I say it's a good program, compensation to victims. I voted for it. ... I also voted for the appropriation to get it off the ground and I think that's the way we should go. I think legislation should come in here to continue to fund that very fine program but I don't think this is the way we should proceed with additional hidden taxation on certain elements of our traffic problem. I think this affects the poor. I think this is a situation of a sneaky way of appropriating things with...out...outside of the budget. I think they deserve the other 89 votes that House Bill 127 got. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Cunningham."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Cunningham: "Representative Schlickman, when the Bill left Judiciary II, it was my understanding...and been provided that all types of traffic offenses including speeding bore the penalty of the...of the additional charge. Is that correct or incorrect?"

Schlickman: "No, in Committee, in Committee we amended out all traffic offenses except for reckless driving and driving while under the influence."

Cunningham: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Stearney. Stearney."

Stearney: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he does...will."

Stearney: "Representative, does this Bill provide that a housewife may make a claim of loss of earnings for...up to \$500 per month even though she is unemployed?"

Schlickman: "The Bill provides that in the case of a homemaker who is a worker, and a very vital worker, with respect to families and society will be presumed to be receiving the sum of \$500 which is approximately the minimum wage."

Stearney: "...Already..."

Schlickman: "...Presumption is made with respect to determining the amount



of benefit or compensation that that homemaker victim of a crime would receive."

Stearney: "Well, do you know of anywhere else in the law where we create such a presumption of \$500 to be allocated to a housewife?"

Schlickman: "With respect to wrongful death, there is assumed that there is great pecuniary loss. Right here we're restricting it to a specific amount which I think considering the valuable services that a homemaker provides is minimal."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in speaking to the Bill I might say that the Gentleman's analogy is not apt and not correct. A wrongful death cannot be applied or analogized to a situation where a person is a victim of a crime. The problem that we have here now is in funding this...this particular operation. Any individual, any woman who is a housewife, who is a victim of a crime may very well allege that she is unable to work or fulfill her responsibilities as a housewife and therefore collect up to \$500 a month. Now I know in the area, Personal Injury Law, the insurance companies would not, would not consider a housewife to be worth \$500 a month or to give...or to compensate her for that. Now, the problem we have here is that any individual, any woman, and this Bill does not provide that she has to substantiate that she's completely disabled in order to collect up to \$500 a month. All she need allege is that she is unable to work, unable to fulfill her responsibilities and the state would have to compensate her up to \$500 per month and there's no limitation as to the...well, the limitation is \$10,000. But nevertheless I think a Bill should be drawn a little bit more specifically and with more limitations because it's the state's money that is going to be used to compensate these...these persons. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Byers."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The previous question has been moved. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed.... Previous question is moved. Representative Schlickman to close."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to yield to Representative Leinenweber who is the Joint Sponsor of this Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Leinenweber to close."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we've had a rather adequate debate on House Bill 782. There've been some points raised which I think deserves to be dealt with. Representative Giorgi rightly points out that there have been rather lengthy delays between making of a claim and settlement of a claim through an award of money from the Court of Claims. However, that is probably endemic to this particular type of claim and has to go through the Court of Claims because the Court of Claims can make an award and there's nothing that can be done until the General Assembly sits and appropriates money for that award. So there's a built-in delay. What this Bill does as far as the delay is concerned, it mandates that immediately upon receiving the six months notice of injury, or notice of claim, the Attorney General must immediately commence the investigation. This will materially cut down on the length of time it takes to present a case to the Court of Claims. As far as the so-called 'award of money for the homemakers' everybody knows that if you have to hire someone to take over the duties of a homemaker in your home it's going to cost you at least \$500 a month 'cause that's pretty close to the minimum wage. And it's not...it certainly is not a novel approach. For those of you who happen to support a particular Bill called no fault insurance there was an identical provision in there, in fact it was higher, making an award of money under no fault insurance to a homemaker who is not otherwise employed. They certainly, a homemaker certainly does have valuable services to offer her family. These services must be replaced in the event of her disability. So certainly reasonable that these people, these families should not be punished when the homemaker is put out of work, put of commission, for a substantial period of time. Finally, I'd like to say that this Bill takes into account what our Governor said in his budget address. This is a fiscally responsible Bill. It does materially increase the benefits available to victims of crimes but it does so in a responsible way by...by providing replacement funds not from the General Revenue Fund. The money that will be raised through the fine surcharge will be more than adequate to pay the estimated expenses of...of paying the claims that we made under the Crime Victims Compensation Fund. These funds are there to protect



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the victims of crimes. Too long the criminals for example in a fight, the criminal gets hurt, he's arrested, the state takes care of his...of his medical bills but the victim for too long has not. This is a long overdue Bill. It's a fiscally responsible Bill. And along with Representative Schlickman, I urge you to vote 'aye' on House Bill 782."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 782 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Representative Geo-Karis to explain her vote, the timer's on."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is probably one of the most constructive and needed Bills that the House could ever pass. There's no question in my mind that the services of the homemaker are very valuable. I know, I tried to get a housekeeper for years and I couldn't get one for much more than \$500 a month. Number two, why shouldn't the criminals help pay for some of the damage they do? Has any one of you ever represented a victim in a rape case? I have. Many of them. And let me tell you it's not easy. It's a horrible situation to put anyone through. I would suggest more 'aye' votes for this Bill. It's a needed Bill. It will take the burden off the General Revenue and we need to do some positive good where it's needed the most."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Daniels to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you've got...made a good decision and keep it that way, vote for the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ewell. All right. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 23 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Madison, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, by leave of my Leader I have the pleasure of introducing a class from the Suder School in Chicago with their supervisor, Mr. Tyrone Sharp, they're from the 20th District ably represented by Representative Huff, Domico and Stearney.



Would the Suder Class please stand?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "And my pleasure, one of the red coats up in the balcony, August 'Benasi' up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Simms, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to be recorded as voting 'yes' on House Bill 758. It would not change the outcome."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there objections? Hearing none you will be so recorded. House Bill 783, Representative Jones."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 783. A Bill for an Act in relation to the definition, licensing and regulation of community currency exchanges and ambulatory currency exchanges and the operators and employees thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jones."

Jones, E: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 791, Representative Richmond."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 791. A Bill for an Act in relation to registration of plumbing contractors and to prescribe penalties for violation thereof. Third Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 791 does just exactly what the synopsis would indicate. It creates the Illinois Plumbing Contractor's Registration Act which would provide for the promulgation of rules and regulations by the Department of Public Health. The Bill provides both penalties for violation of the Act and administration...administrative procedures. The effective date would be January 1, 1978. This piece of legislation is designed to protect of this state from the serious consequences of plumbing work by people who have not fully developed the required skills of a professional plumber. The specific legislative intent is to protect the people against toxic and explosive gases caused by improper installation and disease asphyxiation, explosion and fire covered by faulty plumbing. This Bill was heard before the Veteran's Affairs and Registration and Regulations in the Committee



and was passed out 15 to nothing. It does not create a board. It is...it is an effort by the industry, the Plumbing Contractor's Industry, to...in self-regulation and it certainly is for the purpose of the protection of the consumer. This Bill is thoroughly endorsed and supported by the contractors as well as the plumbing unions throughout the state. And the Department of Public Health had a great deal to do with the drafting of it because they, as you know, do set down rules and regulations that regulate the standards of plumbing in this state. I would endeavor...answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, if the Gentleman would yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Skinner: "Am I correct in assuming this won't cost the state any money because the increase in fees is more than enough money to pay for the additional personnel to be regulated under this Act?"

Richmond: "Yes, that is correct. There is a fiscal impact statement that indicates that there would be more than enough money that...is collected through the fees to implement the program and these fees, of course, are paid by the contractors themselves. So it is... they do finance their own self-regulation."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, may I commend the Sponsor for his extremely responsible approach to increasing federal...or to increasing state government. At least he's paying for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Richmond: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Madison: "Thank you. Representative Richmond, I noticed on analysis of this Bill that it says it does not apply to plumbers or apprentice plumbers who are employees of a plumbing contractor, I would assume then it applies directly to the contractor himself."

Richmond: "That's true. The plumbers are already licensed by...under laws of this state but not the contractor."

Madison: "Representative, what about a...an individual who does not put himself out necessarily as a contractor but just small plumbing jobs on his own? Is he required to post a bond of \$20,000?"



Richmond: "He would have to apply for a certificate under this Act and if he qualifies why then he would have to live up to the provisions contained therein."

Madison: "Is this bond..."

Richmond: "...The bond is one of them."

Madison: "Is this Bill at all related to the need for a plumber who's a tradesman, an individual tradesman, to be...to have a union card?"

Richmond: "No. No, it is not. It's quite possible that he could be a certified plumber under this Act, plumbing contractor. It doesn't address the situation to being a union...have any union overtones whatsoever."

Madison: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to applaud the Sponsor for this concept but I have some problems with it. In my community, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of individual tradesmen who apply their trade in the plumbing business who are not contractors per se, they're tradesmen and they do individual jobs. And they're not able to get in the unions because of the problems that we've had with union discriminating against minorities as it relates to getting...to getting a union card to...to actively ply their trade and...and these gentlemen who have been plumbers for 15 and 20 years, Mr. Speaker, may not...the jobs that they are going to have may not involve hydraulics or whatever the examination is going to relate to so that they probably would not be able to pass the exam in that regard. These are plumbers who do very, very small jobs. They will come in and...and...and fix the tile under your floor, if you've...you're in a building that's fifty years old and they're having problems with the plumbing there. But these guys don't know anything about hydraulics, they would not be able to pass the exam therefore they would not be able, under... under this Bill, to ply their trade. And even if they could pass the exam, for a guy to have to put forth a \$20,000 bond for a job that he's going to do for me that's only going to net him \$200, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me is stretching the point. While I agree with the concept I think it has problems and I think we ought to take a long, hard look at this Bill or else we're going to have some



small plumbers going on welfare because of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last speaker was absolutely correct. Why should someone who may not be bondable be required to submit a \$20,000 bond on a relatively small job, for example routing the pipes, there's...this is duplication. Plumbers are already licensed. I've heard nothing in this debate that demonstrates a need for...in addition to licensing a plumber, licensing that plumber as a plumbing contractor. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this discriminates against the small operator in favor of the big plumbing contractors and it is a special interest matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is no advantage to me where the licensing fee results in more than the cost of administration. This, in effect, is a tax when it produces revenue for the state. It's a tax not on the plumbing contractors because I'll bet you that they want this. It's a tax on the people that call for plumbing services. It's a tax on all of the people of the State of Illinois and I urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes does it take for this Bill to be become law? I ask that because it...the Bill may be in derogation of home rule power."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get back to the question. Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Neff: "Representative Richmond, there...isn't it true today that the plumbers must have a license to operate?"

Richmond: "Yes...oh, excuse me."

Neff: "...And...that's correct. And to be a contractor they would have to be a plumber first. And therefore, I would...that's what I'm wondering about, we've got some legislation here that isn't necessary because these fellows will automatically be...be licensed, it looks to me like."

Richmond: "Lee, responsibility and liability for a poorly constructed



plumbing job would lie with the contractor and not with his employees and therefore this is an effort to help regulate the contractors in the interest of consumer protection. This would not in any way change the status of the licensed plumber or the case that Representative Madison talked about because this does not address that situation. As far as the \$20,000 bond, there is....I think we're going to correct that in the Senate with a...liability insurance policy. You wouldn't have to have this of course on this \$200 job, you'd have to have it on file which covers your operation. So therefore this...this Amendment will be placed on in the Senate concerning the \$20,000 bond."

Neff: "And speaking on the Bill...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Clarence, if Representative...if David Epstein is within distance of my hearing voice, I'd like to have him come back to the podium. Proceed."

Neff: "I respect what the Sponsor is trying to do here and I think again... always we analyze it out, this is unnecessary. I think we're putting some more red tape and some more laws on the books that I don't believe is going to be...do the people any good. And after all, if it isn't going to do the people any good why put it on even though I'm sure he has good intentions on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Wolf...Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Previous question has been moved, we've got to wait. Representative Mugalian asked for a parliamentary inquiry in reference to the number of votes that are required on House Bill 791, whether this affects home rule units or not. The Parliamentarian has just returned, he's in the process of reviewing the Bill. What we'll do is, we'll have Representative Richmond to close now."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm curious to know the decision also but I do know that this Bill would not in any way force any strict...or restriction on any municipality than...than...I mean if they have restrictions that are already in effect that are in excess of this Bill, of course, they would...they would still be maintained. This Bill is purely an effort that embraces the cooperation of labor, management and the



Illinois Department of Public Health in an effort to self-regulate an industry with the consumer being the ultimate benefactor. I...I think that this is something that they've been trying to get through the House for the last several years and it's been amended and changed to the point now where it's completely acceptable by all those who had objections to it before. And therefore I would move for its passage."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Parliamentarian points out that he doesn't see anything that preempts home rule, so he said it takes 89 votes. On the question. The question is, shall House Bill 791 pass? All those in favor...in favor of the Bill will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. Representative Ewell to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, I just want to urge the Members to take a very close look at this particular Bill. I think it's an unwanted interference in the...what's left of the free enterprise system. I can't understand the actual need for it. I have to question the priority of the Committee being heard by Veteran's Affairs. If I'd heard about it earlier in another Committee I would have come in and opposed it. I think it's a bad Bill. It's a bad principal to establish and I don't think the state wants to get into the business of trying to settle every little wrinkle between competing forces. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Richmond to explain his vote."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that the Illinois Department of Public Health who is very vitally interested in this Bill and in the...the quality of plumbing throughout the state, they do have the responsibility of the regulations, feel that this is a very vital Bill to...to insure that people who pay for plumbing...for quality plumbing get just that. And this certainly has no intent to violate anyone's rights. It's just purely a consumer Bill. I would appreciate your reconsideration and help me get this over to the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question there are 67 'ayes', 53 'nays', 20...recorded as 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is declared lost. House Bill 795."



Representative McBroom."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 795. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Credit Union Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Before you proceed with that Bill,...."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hold on. Representative Lucco for the purpose of introduction...."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we have with us this afternoon, to my rear in the upper balcony, some students from St. Mary's of the Angels school children from the district of Representative Brandt, Farley and Abramson, that's the 14th District. With them are Father Greg 'Helminski' and assistant principle, Miss Emily 'Clock' we certainly want to welcome them to the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "....Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I've got a number of people I'd like to introduce in the balcony...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Not at this time. Representative McBroom."

Telcser: "I'd...I'd like....Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Telcser: "I've introduced quite a few people in the last couple of days. We have one young lady who's back for a return engagement, I'll introduce her later because she's going to wait, she was so well received yesterday. But I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce two very lovely young ladies who have been here watching their husbands work, Marge Campbell and Barbara Hudson, up in the balcony here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 795, Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, are we....Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. Please proceed."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, are you quite sure we're finished with introductions for a while?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

McBroom: "Getting a lot of help here, Mr. Speaker. This simply increases the legal rate on the credit unions may charge from 1% to 1½% and I appreciate a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

McClain: "Mr. McBroom, what would that mean, like per month on a \$2,000 loan?"

McBroom: "Well...."

McClain: "Just take a figure could you, I...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you hear the question, Mr...Representative McBroom?"

McBroom: "Well, one...I don't know what the thrust of your question is, Mr. McClain, I...I'll be happy to try to answer it if you're serious about it."

McClain: "Well, Mr. McBroom, in my Bill analysis it says 'House Bill 2557 and 3042 were introduced during the 79th General Assembly' and it said, 'however both of them failed' and that must...and I know that you're a tremendous Sponsor and it'll probably fly out of here ...but I just wondered why the 79th General Assembly saw fit to defeat both of them and now maybe the 80th might pass them. And I was trying to get a handle, maybe the cost was horrendous per month to pay off because the increased interest rate or could you elaborate a little more on the Bill and what it means to the consumer?"

McBroom: "Well, Mr...Mr...Mr. McClain...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me, Representative McBroom...."

McBroom: "We....in order to recall...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned in debate. Representative McClain is usually a little more accurate than he is today. The Bill that he speaks of passed out of the House last Session, Representative, and was killed along with several other Bills in the Senate. And I'm sure all of the Bills that you passed out of here last year did not pass the Senate. So let's make it clear that this Chamber did pass this Bill out last Session."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think I was....I didn't think the Minority Leader was that sensitive. I didn't mean to impugn his



...his ability or integrity at all. All I am saying is that the 79th General Assembly did defeat both those Bills at some point in time, I didn't say the House or the Senate or Conference Committee. I would like to know a little bit more about the Bill, if you don't mind, Mr. McBroom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr...Mr. McClain. Representative McClain. I have no pride of authorship in this Bill. If you'll give me a loan figure, I'll be glad to try to compute it for you on a monthly basis or a yearly basis. And we've got several educators here, Representative Hoffman, if I'm not able to do it, I'd be glad to give...turn you over to him. And I would suggest that you consult with Representative DiPrima as to the type of legislation that I handle. I'm confident that he is supportive of this measure. And if you can't get an answer from either one of us, go ahead and vote for it, come over to my chair, I'll explain it to you after it passes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. McBroom, thank you very much for pointing out what special interest group that you're close to. I go back again that my original question was, on a few thousand dollar loan, and I'll add paying off in three years, what would it cost the consumer to pay it off additionally now in interest payments?"

McBroom: "Mr...Representative McClain, it's one-quarter of one percent per month more. One percent a month, the way I figure on a \$2,000 loan is \$2.00 a month. A quarter of a percent more would increase it to two and a...no, twenty, all right. Pardon me. So that would increase it to 25. It's permissive. It's...I have no pride of authorship, Representative McClain, do whatever you choose, whatever makes you happy."

McClain: "Mr. McBroom, all I'm asking is a question, don't get so...."

McBroom: "No, I'm not mad..."

McClain: "Thank you very much."

McBroom: "I'm not the least bit mad, I hope....pride authorship....do whatever you choose...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will all the unauthorized persons ... remove themselves from the chamber? All unauthorized persons now remove



themselves from the chamber? All unauthorized persons now remove themselves from the chamber? Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, what this Bill does, it raises the interest rate from 12 to 15% a year and I think that's pretty evident with the 1/4% a month. And I think that's a fairly exorbitant interest rate and I would recommend a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, under the Installment Loan Act the maximum usury there is 1 1/2% per month or an 18% percent annual interest charge. The credit unions are not covered under the Installment Loan Act and what they're asking for is very reasonable, to increase 1/4 of 1% and still below...be below the 1 1/2 maximum. Standard Oil, Penney's, Household Finance, anybody, Sears, whatever,...charging at the maximum which is 1 1/2% and I think this request is very reasonable to increase it 1% or 1/4% and be in a competitive situation. Because you've got to remember the income from these loans go back to the credit union in the form of dividends and back to the people who do save money with the credit union."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative McBroom to close."

McBroom: "Appreciate a vote....a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 795 pass? All in favor will...signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Glenn. Dawson. Representative Madison, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, our resident expert on credit unions, my district, may exempt the law as voting for this Bill and that's good enough for me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there isn't anything wrong with this Bill. This is for the small credit unions of the State of Illinois..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me..."

Ryan: "It's permissive legislation. And that's why I am voting 'aye'. And I think that if we can get enough green votes on there we'll get it out of here. And I see no reason why this Bill should not pass..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Sharp."

Ryan: "Certainly something..."

Sharp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, one of the previous persons who spoke in behalf of this Bill indicated that like Household Finance and some of the small credit lenders institutions could charge a percent and a half. Well, I think in a credit union, unless I'm mistaken, you have to deposit funds there before you can take a loan which would make that loan a bit more secure, a bit less riskier and I can't see any need to raise it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 21 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill receiving the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 802."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 802. A Bill for an Act increasing the compensation of constitutional officers, Members of the General Assembly, department directors and assistant directors and certain other state officials. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ted Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this Bill raises the salary of the state constitutional officers, the directors and others whose salary is set by the statute and Members of the General Assembly by one dollar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question...the question is, shall House Bill 802 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Collins to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Collins: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that every Member of this House is worth this magnanimous raise but I wonder if the others in the Bill are?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Meyers to explain his vote."

Meyer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really don't think there's anything to explain about this Bill. I mean either that you're...everybody in the chamber knows what it's about, it's the salary increase. And if you...if you feel that the Governor and the Attorney General and the Secretary of State won't be able to get a salary increase because they're going to be locked in for...for seven years, aren't deserving of a salary increase and if you don't think that the...that the General Assembly



and the directors and the assistant directors are deserving of a salary increase you vote 'no'. If you feel that there is some merit in the...in the commission that the Governor is presently appointing to review salary commissions and...then you'll vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would urge that we put the 89 votes on the board. As you know, the Governor is at present having a commission and is going to come out with some sort of finding as to whether or not the General Assembly and other areas should have a pay increase. It's my feeling we should give the Governor time to work. We should send this over to the Senate. When they come out with a report, hopefully they will come out with a decent report, and we will be able to put an Amendment on in the Senate and get a pay raise which I think we...which we really need in this particular House. You know, I see that we now have 92 votes on the board. I really think it should be much more than that because I do think that we need a pay raise and I have not in the past been hesitant to say so and I think this is the vehicle for it. We ought not hide that it's the vehicle for it because we just ought to give it the votes and we can go ahead and look at it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 47 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. What? And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Let me also point out to the Membership that it's the intent of the chair to go to the Short Debate Calendar approximately at 4:30 this afternoon. There have been a number of people since their Bills are coming up in numerical order, are asking that their Bills be removed from the Short Debate Calendar. I would ask that, because they don't have any idea when the Short Debate Calendar is going to be called, let me point out to you that it's the intent of the Chair, that if you possibly can, get there at 4:30 this afternoon. We're not down to it yet, my friend. House Bill 806, Representative Holewinski."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 806. A Bill for an Act to protect the interest of potential real estate renters by providing for the licensing and regulation of the operators of real estate and rental finding services."



Third Reading of the Bill."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that would regulate the real estate rental finding services that operate in the state. I would hasten to clarify these are not real estate brokers who are already licensed but are people who engage in the business of securing rental property for a fee. In the last few years we've had a great proliferation of these businesses and a great number of consumer complaints about people who are paid a fee and not gotten any sort of service in return for that fee. I have approximately 20 complaints from people who are not only from my district, or from Chicago, but are even from suburban areas about the nature of the operation of these businesses. What they generally do is charge a fee from forty to sixty dollars for people to look at a list of available rental properties. The problem that has been uncovered is that oftentimes those rental listings are derived from local newspapers or city newspapers. They are not confirmed. They are not available or in some cases have been false. Last week, or two weeks ago, the Attorney General announced the indictment of a series of these agencies because of...violations of Consumer Fraud Act. What this Act seeks to do is, one, license those businesses. And two, establish some standards. It requires that they are...be licensed under the Commissioner of Real Estate and the Department of Registration and Education. And that with regard to their services, that they disclose to their clients how they obtain the listing and the full details with regard to that listing. It...further requires that they confirm that listing with the landlord every two days so that people are not going on wild goose chases trying to find rental real estate that is not available. The Bill further requires that if they are unable to secure or substitute housing for the individual who has commissioned their services within 60 days, that the fee be returned. It applies also to landlords who commission these services and says that if they are able...unable to find a tenant for the landlord within 90 days they shall return the fee. This is patterned after legislation in effect in Detroit that was established several years to deal with the very same problem I'm talking about today. I'll be happy to answer any question and would ask for your support."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "It looks as though we're about to create another licensed profession in the State of Illinois and because we are and because I really don't think that's the way to solve most problems, there are a couple of questions I'd like to ask."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Skinner: "Would you please explain to the General Assembly what the need for this Bill is outside of the home rule City of Chicago?"

Holewinski: "The...it's my understanding that these services operate over the entire state and not just in the City of Chicago. That consumers in Chicago certainly have had this complaint, or the Chicago area, some of the complaints I have are from Hinsdale and Hoffman Estates in the suburban area but they are also in operation in the downstate area. And I think it's to our benefit to have one statewide standard and one expectation for all consumers."

Skinner: "Can you tell me why the Attorney General Consumer Fraud Division is sufficient protection for the people who are being defrauded?"

Holewinski: "It is sufficient...well, it may be sufficient protection for those who are being defrauded but the...the problem is not only a question of fraud, it's a question of standards. It's a question of what you get and what you pay for and what we're establishing here is some standards for that industry."

Skinner: "What would the cost of administering this new licensing program be?"

Holewinski: "The Department informs me that their estimate is \$90,000 and the income would be \$100,000 resulting from the fees, that is the estimate for the first year of operation. So \$90,000 cost, \$100,000 income."

Skinner: "Have you filed a fiscal note?"

Holewinski: "I have not filed a fiscal note because I've been unable to obtain it. I have talked to the Department for four weeks. I just talked to them by phone about a half hour ago, and those were the figures that their legislative liaison, Jim Braun, gave me. I...tape defective...apologize profusely but I have been...tape...unable to...tape...forthcoming I am told."

Skinner: "Will you file it with the House Clerk when it arrives?"



Holewinski: "I'll be more than happy to."

Skinner: "...Now, if I might ask the Chair?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Skinner: "Could you tell me how many votes it takes to pass this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get that answer to you."

Skinner: "97!"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Skinner, we'll get that answer for you in a minute. Do you have any further questions? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "We again have one of those Bills where there is a set of findings set forth at the outset and if we pass this Bill we will be adopting those findings. Specifically, could you advise me as to what the basis for the declaration that there presently exists and there may exist in the future, certain things that are set forth here indicating a problem?"

Holewinski: "Representative Schlickman, that...declaratory statement at the beginning of the Bill is meant to put the legislation in perspective in that many people do not know what real estate finding services are and...and...it...somewhat presumptuous to presume people in the future will the...the purpose of that first paragraph is to put the legislation in perspective for all those who may examine the Act now or in the future."

Schlickman: "In other words, you have no basis in fact with respect to these findings?"

Holewinski: "We probably could substantiate them based upon the allegations...well, if you wanted to, you base them on the allegations or complaints made by consumers that I've received and whose names and phone numbers and addresses I do have, or upon the findings of the Attorney General and his complaints against these services."

Schlickman: "Can you tell us the number, exact number, of real estate rental finding services that presently exist in Illinois?"

Holewinski: "I do not know the figure that was supplied to me, and it may be a guess, by the Department was that there are one thousand."

Schlickman: "How are these one thousand geographically distributed, do



you have any idea?"

Holewinski: "I frankly don't have any idea. As I suggested, Representative Schlickman, that number I think is a ball park figure that was supplied to me by the Department of Registration and Education."

Schlickman: "There were four Amendments adopted, is that correct?"

Holewinski: "That is...I believe is correct."

Schlickman: "Does one of these Amendments have to do with the home rule section of the Bill?"

Holewinski: "There was one Amendment that deleted a final section that... I believe it was Amendment #3.....deleted Section 25 of the Bill."

Schlickman: "What is now the posture of the Bill with respect to the City of Chicago, the County of Cook and other home rule units the state?"

Holewinski: "It does nothing with regard to those powers. In other words, they...the City of Chicago, my understanding, could regulate these things concurrently if they...if they chose to do so, as could any municipality."

Schlickman: "Well, you could have duplication and conflict at that time, then, couldn't you? In other words, the City of Chicago or the Village of Arlington Heights, if you will, could subject the services to regulation, could subject each of these services to a registration, initial registration fee, and an annual renewal fee and to differing sanction."

Holewinski: "The...the...there is not a municipality...in the state that I'm aware of that has done anything in this regard. This would require statewide standard. I would imagine you're right, a municipality could establish standards as long as they were not in conflict with state law."

Schlickman: "Well, you took Section 25 out. And there is nothing in this Bill, as it presently stands, as amended, to prevent a home rule unit establishing its own program for registration and regulation which not only could be duplicative but could be conflicting."

Holewinski: "I don't believe it could be conflicting."

Schlickman: "What is the position of the Department of Registration and Education with respect to 806?"

Holewinski: "It was communicated to me this morning that they are now



opposed to it, they did not testify in Committee nor indicate a position in Committee on the Bill."

Schlickman: "R and E opposes this Bill?"

Holewinski: "That's my understanding."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Schuneman: "Representative, in many of the small towns of Illinois, the real estate brokers are acting in the capacity of finding real estate rentals now. In what way would your Bill affect that system?"

Holewinski: "It would not, they are excluded specifically by the definition since they are all ready licensed and their practices are regulated by the state. It was felt it was not necessary to add an additional licensing requirement."

Schuneman: "So this would...this would not impose then a double...."

Holewinski: "That is correct."

Schuneman: "Licensing standard. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Skinner, in reference to your inquiry, as far as the number of votes, the Parliamentarian informs me does not preempt home rule, the ruling will be...it requires 89 votes. Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ebbesen moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; all those opposed... The previous question is moved. Representative Holewinski to close."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is an important piece of legislation. The number of complaints that I've gotten, the documentation by the news media in the Chicago area is broader in its implication than just the City of Chicago. The complaints brought by the Attorney General are further, I think, substantiation for the need for this legislation. This does not seek to put anyone out of business, it seeks to establish some uniformity in this industry. To give consumers an idea of what they can expect when they put forty to sixty dollars out of their pockets for this service so that they indeed do get a service and not do...



and are not buying an illusion. I...I...I think it is an important thing that we can accomplish this year for people who are looking for housing and I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 806 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Conti to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I can understand what Holewinski's trying to do here but I think this is creating another agency. I think that the Attorney General has enough now to knock these unscrupulous fact finding real estate service acts out of business without creating any new legislation. I notice that there's a note there that there is a moratorium with the Department of Registration and Education, they don't want any more licensing or any more agencies. I'm totally against these fact finding service Bills. And I am going to vote 'no' on the Bill because I don't even want this to exist. I want it to knock these people out of business. I think they should be out of business. You have real estate boards, you have real estate...registered real estate brokers in the State of Illinois and we certainly don't need this kind of service."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Marovitz to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill does not create another agency. It...it...involves the Department of Registration and Education and the Commissioner of Real Estate who presently indicate that there is a need for this Bill. And this Bill would actually help the Attorney General, not hinder him, it will help him enforce the problems that this Bill deals with. This is a problem that goes far beyond the purview of the Chicagoland community. There have been complaints right here in Springfield. So I think there is a need for this. It will help the Attorney General and it does not create another commission or another agency. It exists presently with the Commissioner of Real Estate in the Department of Registration and Education and I would ask for an additional 'aye' vote and I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote, I'm voting 'no'"



on this. I have some serious reservations about it but I'm not sure in my own mind as to what effect this may have on the Representatives that do have universities within their area because in Champaign, the University does provide such a service as this to the students and if this, if they should come under this Act, and I see nothing to exclude them, that could create a real basket of worms."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Levin. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, when I was an Assistant State's Attorney, we ran into the problem that this Bill attempts to address, where we found where real estate firms that were attempting to provide a service to people in terms of real...in terms of rental and they were really ripping people off. But because they were not within the definition of real estate, legally, our office...whereas the State's Attorneys Office was not able to do anything about this problem. I urge some more 'aye' votes because I think this is a way of dealing with the ...this problem which is a major problem in the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Stearney to explain his vote."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in opposition to this Bill. This is just another incidence of legislating for the sake of legislating. There is no great groundswell of public opinion calling for an act...enacting of this legislation. As a matter of fact, the Gentleman says that he has had complaints in Chicago but if you were to look at his Bill on the last page, on page 11, line 28, and the following, that exempts the home rule unit of Chicago. This Bill wouldn't apply to Chicago. That's all. It says it doesn't affect any home rule unit. That being the case, what is the justification for this? We're going to regulate another branch another segment of private enterprise and not only that, he says that 'anybody who violates this Act, or a rule or regulation, that the Department of Registration and Education enacts. Another rule-making agency. They're subject to a Class A misdemeanor. They can go to jail for up to a year. They can be up...fined up to \$5,000 for the violation of a nonsense Act. I think this is an instance in which we should kill because it's a situation which we're legislating purely for the sake of legislating. And there's no groundswell, there's no justification for this Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly bring your remarks to a close."

Stearney: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Bill is a needed Bill and there has been no doubt there's been unscrupulous dealers who really take advantage of people who don't know, who are not too well educated. And I think it's a good Bill. I think we need some more 'ayes' votes. And if I may have leave from the Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Not right now."

Geo-Karis: "Representative...Representative DiPrima to explain his vote."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can't for the life of me figure what all the opposition is about this Bill. This Bill is approved by the Illinois Association of Realtors. So why in the heavens are we opposing this Bill is beyond me. If the Illinois realtors are for it, why the opposition? Let's get some green lights up there and pass this Bill. This is a good Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Darrow. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this problem is not just a metropolitan area, it affects western Illinois. Over the past year we had a number of these people opening up their offices. The realtors were opposed to them and our Democratic State's Attorney was able to close them down. Evidently, Ellis Levin worked for a different State's Attorney or one that was not of the same political faith...but the Democrats were successful in closing them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Sandquist. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 32 'nays', 14 recorded as 'present'. This Bill received the Constitutional Majority...is declared passed. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure by leave of the Minority Leader, George Ryan, to introduce the 94 students and their chaperons and teachers, Sandy 'Holder', Clara 'Calagara', Don Keller, Sharon Utterbach and Lynn Townsend from Zion, Illinois. Represented in the 31st District by Representatives Greisheimer, Matijevich and myself. I welcome them to Springfield. They're right down here."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 810, Representative J. Dunn. One moment, you know, yes, sir, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're serving here now in the month of May, we've got a lot of first-termers who are serving in this Body for the first time. And...and I would like to take a moment to introduce in absentia, if I may,...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's out of order."

Telcser: "Some former great...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's out of order. Shut him up. All right."

Representative J. Dunn, House Bill 810. Let me just point out to you, you know we've got a lot of Bills here on this Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen, and we're going to go into....810, let's go."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 810. A Bill for an Act in relation to the operation of self-service gas stations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Dunn, J: "Mr. Speaker, I request that this Bill be taken out of the record at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 814, Representative Shumpert. Out of the record? House Bill 818, Brummet. Don Brummet."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 818. A Bill for an Act to amend the Soil and Water Conservation District Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill to take care of sediment control in the State of Illinois. This is a very serious problem. Every twenty-four hours over twenty thousand ton of our top soil is dumped in the Gulf of Mexico. What this Bill does is to amend the Soil and Water Conservation Districts Law, it provides for development by the Department of Agriculture of a comprehensive state erosion and sediment control program and for establishment by the Department of guidelines for the implementation of such programs by local soil and water conservation districts. It sets out the procedures for this. These will be handled by the local Soil and Water Conservation Districts and these Districts have been very successful in the past several years in addressing such problems. We have attempted in this Bill to take care of everyone and I think there are not many objections left to it. What we have done is at the insistence of the Municipal League is to leave cities and villages out of the Bill except those that have already petitioned into the



Soil and Water Conservation Districts. We have given the municipalities a year to get in if they would care to get into the operations under the Soil and Water Conservation Districts. The Soil and Water Conservation Districts will be designated to handle that part of the Federal 208 Clean Water Bills. Those of you who believe in local government should like this Bill. It will take three years for it to become operatable. I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Brummet: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He will."

Schlickman: "Does the definition of land disturbing activities, as contained in the Bill as it was originally introduced, remain without having been changed by Amendment?"

Brummet: "Yes."

Schlickman: "In other words, a land disturbing activity could be the development of a subdivision."

Brummet: "Very definitely."

Schlickman: "You indicated that...."

Brummet: "It...I...Mr. Schlickman, if it happens to be in the district. Now if it's in a municipality and they have decided not to go into the district, it would be up to the municipality who would be controlled by the EPA."

Schlickman: "Well, I...heard you say that the Bill had been amended to remove municipalities."

Brummet: "Right. Unless they chose to go in."

Schlickman: "To satisfy the objection or concern of a Municipal League."

Brummet: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "What I'm interested in or concerned about are the unincorporated areas, say of Cook County, where land use regulations is governed by the County of Cook ordinance. And I am concerned about the prospective or potential conflict that may exist between what you have in this Bill by the increasability that you give to Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the present authority and function of the County of Cook to regulate land use in the unincorporated area."

Brummet: "Mr. Schlickman, I think you'll find that most of those



unincorporated areas are working with the Soil and Water Conservation Districts at the present time."

Schlickman: "And it...."

Brummet: "At their choice."

Schlickman: "And it's going well now but you've increased...."

Brummet: "Right."

Schlickman: "Oh, you're providing by the Department of Agriculture which certainly has got no expertise relative to land use, you're giving to the Department of Agriculture the authority to set...set standards relative to land development subdivisions...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Representative Schlickman, you any questions or...."

Brummet: "....If, let...if you do not give it to the Soil and Water Conservation Districts the federal government is giving it to the EPA. In fact, the EPA already has it. Now it's a question, in my opinion, whether you want to be under the control of the EPA or whether you ought to be under the control of your local Soil and Water Conservation District."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ewing."

Schlickman: "One more...one more question."

Brummet: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Schlickman, one more question."

Schlickman: "Isn't it true that the Soil and Water Conservation Districts are governed not by people but land owners?"

Brummet: "Well, this comes back to a one man, one vote deal."

Schlickman: "But do...."

Brummet: "Now if you had your municipality into the Soil and Water Conservation District, each one in that municipality would have an equal vote with your land owners."

Schlickman: "But there's still the requirement in the law to be on the governing board of the Soil and Water Conservation District you've got to be a land owner."

Brummet: "No, that is not true."

Schlickman: "When was that law changed?"

Brummet: "It's either a land owner or a land occupier, which could be a renter."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Very good. Representative Ewing. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. Two years ago we had a very similar measure which was introduced into this House. In fact, I shouldn't say a very similar measure, it was much more far reaching. In fact it would prevent you from even planting your garden without a permit. I think a great deal of good work has gone into reviewing this Bill over the last two years. We're going to have safe guidelines and yet we're going to have local control. We're going to have a pay as you go basis. We're going to put the money that the state can afford into this program. It does allow cities and villages to come in and provide this service, if they desire it, but they're not mandated. I think if any of you have ridden across this state, or at least central Illinois, since the tornados and the tremendous floods of just a week ago you'll see how much need there is for more conservation and soil erosion protection in this part of the country. And I would certainly urge that we get behind Representative Brummet's Bill and pass it out. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Brummet to close."

Brummet: "I would appreciate your support on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 818 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', 1 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. The Bill receiving the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 820, Representative Kucharski. Skinner, you want to handle that Bill? Okay."

Skinner: "Right. This Bill is similar to Younge's...."

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

Skinner: "And we would like to hold it until the appropriation Bill keeps up with it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 830, Representative Satterthwaite."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 830. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 830



is the same Bill as we passed in the Legislature two years ago.

It was then House Bill 330, sponsored by Representative Von Boeckman. And we passed in both the House and the Senate, went to the Governor, I think the Governor did not understand what its purpose was and it was vetoed there. It provides for refund of excess contributions that were made by a few employees into the Retirement System. This would just provide for a refund of that money that they...part of the money that they paid in to put them on an equitable level with others who bought into the system. And I would urge your support of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 830 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Ebbesen to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Yes...yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on this particular Bill, this goes back to something that took place when it was interpreted that service credit was military service credit erroneously in...I think two years ago or four years ago, the General Assembly corrected that and stated very clearly that you could not pick up time on your pension for time spent in the military but it was talking about service within the educational arena. And there was a mistake made and now they're asking us to come up with a \$110,000 and I know that in...in Committee this had a...it did get out with the necessary ten votes but there was great opposition, seven negative votes and I would encourage everyone to take a very close look at this particular precedent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill, a Bill similar to this that I sponsored last year passed the House and the Senate. The Governor agreed to sign it and then for some unknown reason he vetoed the measure. What happened, that the General Assembly passed a smaller requirement for the people to allow them to get into the system. And what happened before that was the...the Commission...issued a notice to each one of the members that were eligible saying they had to pay up by July the 1st of 1974 which they did and then in July of that same year, Governor Walker signed this Bill allowing them at a reduced rate. And I think it's unfair



to allow certain people to get in for half price and I think it's a good Bill and we should pass it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Miss Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "In explaining my vote I'd like to correct an error that a previous speaker made here. This is for people who are in military service, has had military service when that service is in the midst of their government employment. I think they deserve to buy into the system. They have bought into the system. The money that would be refunded if this Bill passes is their money that is now in the system. It is not General Revenue Fund. It is money reserved for them in the system. And I would urge your support of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was killed twice in the 79th General Assembly. It was killed because the Pension Laws Commission did not approve the policy effect. Basically, what this Bill does, it says that the only system in the state that at one time allowed military service, even though the military service was before a person became an employee of in the university, could use that time to buy into the university's retirement system. Now this is the only system that even allows prior military service to count towards...towards their eligibility into the system and now the people because the Legislature changed the contribution of the employee from 12% to 10%, now they want to get their 2% back. This is completely wrong. It's just a bad policy. And the right vote here is a red vote, a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Based on that explanation, we'll have to recognize Representative DiPrima, the spokesman for the veterans."

DiPrima: "Boy, I don't know. How cheap can we get? A \$110,000 these veterans that overpaid in their pension fund, that's all we're asking for, a \$110,000. And the state is getting back their end of the contribution, so where do we lose anything? Let's get some green votes up there will ya, for the veterans anyway."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'ayes',



35 'noes', 10 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 853, Representative Daniel. Out of the record? House Bill 869, Representative Tipword."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 869. A Bill for an Act to establish the rights of public school employees to organize and bargain collectively.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative...."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 869 sets up a means of collective bargaining for teachers throughout the State of Illinois and it establishes an education employment relation board to handle all of the various problems relating to collective bargaining. To the determination of a...of a representative group as to whether or not there shall be representation by units in a school district, unfair labor practices, all the various grievance procedures, all of various unfair labor practices procedures would be handled by this board. And it's provided by the board that the board shall be a board of three members, one of them to serve as chairman. And that that board shall be full time. They shall have no other employment. And I can assure you and I think we all well know what the situation we've had in the state for several years, this board probably, very definitely will have to be full time. It provides in this Bill certain duties and powers of the board which are very clearly set forth to which they must act. It provides who is a school employer and defines who are school employees and accepts from no school employees elected officials and governing board members and management employees and administrators or those who have that power to hire and fire, it sets forth what is an employee organization. It defines when there exists an identifiable community of interest and provides a means whereby if...30% of those people within a bargaining unit petition for a bargaining unit to be recognized then the board, this state independent board, shall call an election and provide specifically that in any election to determine whether or not there shall be a bargaining unit. There shall be a provision on the ballot for no representation. It provides further that if not one of the groups listed receives a majority on the ballot then the two top issues, and those issues may



include no representation of one of the two, shall be again voted on to determine whether the majority may lie. It provides that if no representation wins an election there can't be another petition for twelve months. It provides that a grievance procedure must be negotiated into a contract by the parties when there is a negotiation of a contract. It does not provide for mandatory arbitration. It provides solely and only that there shall be arbitration when the parties mutually agree to binding arbitration. And this is strictly in a line not only with what the organizations of teachers and school employees desire, this is what the administrators desire and want in a contract. They do not want binding arbitration. This is also one of the guidelines set forth by the Governor of this state in saying what he would find if a collective bargaining Bill comes to his desk. And among those things were that he should not be binding arbitration but a provision for it by mutually agreeing to arbitration. It provides in here a mediation service to be provided by the board. And sets forth when that mediation service can be invoked and when they reach a certain point and impasse in the...in a negotiations the board may step in and provide mediation services. It provides fact finding which shall again be conducted by the board by impartial persons and the board shall provide the mediators and the factfinders. It specifically sets forth, solely and only, when strikes may occur. It provides the time period and frame within which negotiations can occur. It sets forth what all must be taken, what all steps must be taken before they can even arrive at the possibilities of a strike. And let me tell you what I heard an administrator when the largest districts in central Illinois say to a group of administrators on collective bargaining. He said, 'don't be afraid of it, collective bargaining is a fact of life. Whether we like it or not, whether there is a law or not, no matter what your emotional feelings may be, we have collective bargaining'. He also said, 'do not be afraid of a strike, a strike is the only power that the employees have and you can not have meaningful negotiations if you take away from them their only means of protecting themselves'. He said, 'you can teach at any time'. It does provide in here however an injunction procedure that if a...if a strike becomes a clear and present danger to the health or safety



of the public then the Board of Education can ask for and is entitled to an injunction provided the board itself has clean hands in the negotiations. This is also one of the principals that the governor asked for in his letter in which he...he delineated what he would require in a collective bargaining Bill that might be laid on his desk and which he would sign. It also says...it specifies what our unfair labor practice is for the employees as well as for the employers. And it provides for a determination on those unfair labor practice charges through the board and eventually by aggrieved persons injured of course. I urge and request and solicit your vote for this Bill for collective bargaining for the teachers and school employees in the State of Illinois. We have had turmoil in our schools. Let us set forth some guidelines that gives the board some idea of when and how they must negotiate, how they go about this. Give us an opportunity to give to school employees a means of settling their differences without arriving at the point of a strike. Let us have some means of knowing how we are going to proceed in the State of Illinois. I submit to you that by having these guidelines we can get a handle on the kind of turmoil that we have regrettably seen. We can provide a system and means whereby both sides know they must bargain and I solicit your vote for this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, did I understand you correctly to say in your Bill there is no compulsory binding arbitration?"

Tipsword: "There is no compulsory binding arbitration and I assure you that neither side desires it, neither the employers nor the employees desire binding arbitration. It does provide for a mutually agreed binding arbitration however."

Geo-Karis: "Yeah, but they do provide a right of strike so..."

Tipsword: "There is a right to strike after there have been certain steps that have been followed in the negotiation procedures and proper notices have been given. And by the way, the negotiation time period, or the frame of negotiation, is set up during what we usually term as the vacation period from school."



Geo-Karis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I regret that I have to speak against the Bill because I am unalterably opposed to possibly the strikes by public employees. Because I said yesterday we cannot stop paying taxes where our services are cut out and I think we have to consider that. And incidentally there is a City of Pana case, I think it came from the Sponsor's own area, decided by the Supreme Court in Illinois which in essence followed the Supreme Court of United States' rule that public employees do not have the inherent right to strike because they do affect the health, safety and welfare of the people."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise somewhat reluctantly to oppose this Bill because of the fine Sponsor that the Bill has but Rollie I think you might expect it. I think the arguments against House Bill 869 that were used the other day for collective bargaining in the public sector could be used again on this one and maybe even more so where it involved teachers. Now as the system is now, schools in various districts can enter into this agreement but it's pretty much a local matter. It's up to them as to what they want to do. I will say that if this Bill passes what we are really doing is putting the state seal of approval on the concept of unions and collective bargaining but principally unions and union dominated control of the...of the wages and the hours and everything else in our schools and I believe that this is the wrong direction to go. It's a dangerous direction. We won't have fewer strikes, we'll have more strikes, in my opinion. That's the history in other areas where this has been entered into and in addition, and here is the main point that I feel that I can make, I honestly feel that as we do this, as we put the state seal of approval on this concept what we're doing is transferring our legitimate powers as Representatives of the taxpaying citizen over to a private...private organization, which in this case will be a union...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hudson, bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Hudson: "Yes, Sir, I will. And I believe this to be the wrong thing to do. We are disenfranchising every other interested party to the



exclusion of the union. We have no real right to do it. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, my colleagues, I would urge a 'no' vote on this dangerous and bad concept."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Leinenweber."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative Tipsword, what would be permissible under House Bill 869 for a district to include an agreement with the employee organization that all employees of the district must become a member of the employee organization within a period of time or be terminated?"

Tipsword: "That specifically provides, in the terms of this Act, that the ...all employees do not have to be members of a bargaining unit and ...and provides only in relation to those employees, in...well, I wish I had...I could cite the exact provision for you here..."

Leinenweber: "Well, I was going to ask you..."

Tipsword: "...Only that they can agree in the contract to a...to a fair share provision of the cost of the negotiations if...for those employees who receive the benefits of it and are not members of the bargaining unit."

Leinenweber: "Is there, in other words, is it your position that under House Bill 869, there is no way, the union shop would be illegal?"

Tipsword: "It's my understanding and I hope that I am not misstating the case that...that a union shop would be...would not be an entity under this necessarily."

Leinenweber: "...You do provide for the agency shop but..."

Tipsword: "We do, we do provide and that is a...a matter of agreement, by the way, between employer and employee and it is not full dues, it is only on the basis of...of benefits."

Leinenweber: "I've looked the Bill over and I cannot find a specific, now whether you would say that by permitting an agency shop you are thereby excluding the union shop, I do..."

Tipsword: "I don't...I find no language that says specifically there cannot be a union shop, no sir, I do not see that."

Leinenweber: "Well, I think the Bill needs some provision if that...that's your intention to prohibit the union shop's agreement. I think the Bill would need to be cleaned up in that respect and that would make



the Bill better."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Kozubowski. Kozubowski. Third row and on the right."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed.... The previous question has been moved. Representative Tipword to close."

Tipword: "I'd like to yield to one of my Cosponsors, Representative Stuffle, to close if I might."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Stuffle to close."

Stuffle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has received full debate here. Again, it is in our opinion as the three principal Cosponsors, Representatives Lucco, Tipword and myself, a Bill which has been widely debated, widely discussed and widely worked over, over a period of many years. It provides the most comprehensive piece of legislation that's ever been brought before this General Assembly regarding the question of collective bargaining for a public educational employee. I think Representative Tipword well illustrated how far it goes in attempting to avoid strikes. No one wants strikes but it's a reality in this day and age that there are such strikes. And it's a reality that we can no longer bury our heads in the sand and try and avoid the question of collective bargaining because it already exists throughout the State of Illinois. Its time has come and the only way we can deal with it is through some sort of systematic legislative mechanism that recognizes that it's a statewide problem that can no longer be dealt with by piecemeal action, piecemeal court cases, piecemeal injunctions from district to district and place to place. The demand is placed upon us to recognize the problem. House Bill 869 recognizes that problem and meets it head-on with specific provisions for mediation, fact-finding and impasse to avoid strikes and to make it possible for us to settle disputes between labor and management prior to the beginning of the school year. I would urge every Member here who believes, who understands and who realizes that we are in this thicket and we've got to come out of it but we've got to bring order



out of chaos, to back House Bill 869 and give it an affirmative vote today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 869 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Glenn. Have all voted who wish? Representative Rigney to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Rigney: "No, Mr. Speaker, is it too late for a parliamentary inquiry? Is there any extraordinary majority required on this vote?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll check it. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm supporting this Bill. I am listed as a Cosponsor of the Bill. I support the Bill basically because it's an avenue of approach to a...to solve a much needed problem in our school systems of collective bargaining. It doesn't....it doesn't reflect...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Go ahead. Please proceed."

Hanahan: "It doesn't encompass all the public employees of the state just narrowly into the school system but it's a step in the right direction. And a long time ago I learned that if you can't take the whole piece of pie, be settled, be happy with a slice of it. And this is a slice of the collective bargaining pie and if we could adopt this Bill into law at least part of our problems in the public sector, it has to be addressed to by the fact of collective bargaining law will be addressed. So I support House Bill 869 and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? According to the Parliamentarian it takes 89 votes. Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes', 39 'noes', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill received...receiving the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Ryan. House Bill....Matijeivich. Representative Matijeivich."

Matijeivich: "Mr. Speaker, I know that it's 4:30 and John Fary's former aide is getting so reckless up there he stood up and he's getting bored by the whole process. I think we ought to get to the Short Debate Calendar now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, we will, right away. House Bill 875, Representative Getty. Yes, passed."



Getty: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Madison. Wait a minute."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I know Representative Matijevich is here but I would like leave of the House to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 869."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Hearing none, it will be so recorded. House Bill 875, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 875 is a Bill which would create in Illinois a statewide probation system. A system that has been long over and sorely needed in this state. It provides that probation employees will be maintained as county employees under the standards set by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Court. It provides for circuit correctional policy boards. It will, however, continue to be administered under the Chief Judge of the Circuits throughout our state. It provides that training capability so necessary for our probation officers to carry out their duties. In addition to that, in our communities throughout our...throughout our state those areas that are without funds, those small counties would be eligible to apply for and receive full funding. In all other areas it would be fifty percent state funding. This is the Bill that would permit us to do what we talk about doing in corrections. This is the Bill that would permit our having a presentence investigation before a man is sentenced to incarceration or more seriously before he's placed on probation. Maybe probation on probation on probation. This is the Bill that will permit presentence investigations and court services prior to the sentencing so that the judge knows, the prosecutor knows and the even the defense lawyer knows what the background of the defendant is before that sentence is meted out so that we don't have the problem that was so well highlighted in newspapers. Especially in the northern part of the state where judges, because they didn't know, and prosecutors because they didn't know and, yes indeed, even defense lawyers because they didn't know this man was already on probation. He's placed on probation again. I certainly think that this is a Bill that is greatly needed. It has been supported by the...by Judge Gulley, the Office, his Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, the League of Women Voters, the



many court organizations, the Probation Association in Illinois, that is supported by even the Cook County Probation Department testified in favor of it, Dick 'Napali'. I think that this is a Bill that we need. It addresses the problems throughout the entire state. And I earnestly solicit your support."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 875. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections and the title of an Act, the Organization of Court Services and Probation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Daniels: "Representative Getty, as I understand, presently the Probation..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Lee, could we have a little order, please?"

Thank you. Proceed."

Daniels: "Under the present system the probation rules, so forth, are set by the Circuits throughout the state individually, is that correct?"

Getty: "That's correct."

Daniels: "And under your Bill, and the proposal in this Bill, they would have a statewide standard throughout the state and it'd be uniform throughout the state?"

Getty: "That's correct, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Now, who...who would run this under the various Circuits?"

Getty: "The Probation Departments would remain under the Judges of the Circuit in which they reside. They are, and I think philosophically, properly, an arm or an extension of the court. And they should remain as under the direct control, the day to day supervision, of those Judges who are sentencing the individuals."

Daniels: "So in that regard it remains the same as far as the local control, is that correct?"

Getty: "That's right, but it has the statewide standards that must always be met."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed. The timer's on."

Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, many of our mass media have brought attention to the abuses that we found throughout the State



of Illinois in the probation system. We have heard this Bill in the Judiciary II Committee and have studied it rather carefully and the funding request under this Bill is at a 50% level. I think that the Bill as contained and presented to this House is reasonable in the provisions that are set forth, would give us a uniform standard throughout the State of Illinois. So there are basically no differences between the various districts and yet at the same time maintain local control through the various Circuits as we experience today. I think it's a reasonable approach that Representative Getty is asking us to accept in this legislation. I think it's one that's going to encourage a very, very logical approach to our probation system and I suggest and recommend your favorable support for this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ryan: "Representative Getty, you may have answered the question, I've been a little busy here. Can you tell me the cost of this program?"

Getty: "Yes, Representative, I have...there was no fiscal note requested this year. However, the fiscal note which I have in my hand which I obtained a year ago was for five point four million dollars of General Revenue Funds. That would be approximately two times the appropriation requested for just the subsidy Bills offered by other Representatives."

Ryan: "Is that for the whole year, Representative Getty?"

Getty: "That is for a half year period for the first six months. It would become effective in January, so it'd be half of a fiscal year. I might also add that they would be approximately half of the cost or less of a full state funding system which has also been under consideration. I believe that this is the proper medium, the proper way that gives us both the statewide standards and yet is responsibly fiscally responsible under the state's economic situation."

Ryan: "Was this in the Governor's budget for this year?"

Getty: "I understand that the Governor indicated through his representatives that he did indeed support the subsidy Bill. I have not discussed this with him. However, Representative Ryan, I would point out to you that the fiscal impact is just approximately two million, or two



million, a little over two million more than the fiscal impact of the subsidy Bill which he has supported. And, as I say, about half of...of full state funding. We wouldn't want to get this confused with the full funding Bill."

Ryan: "What part of the program would be initiated in the first six months?"

Getty: "Initially Judge Gulley's Office would begin to organize and set out the standards, there would be quite a bit of organization in that regard. And then we would go into having the present employees throughout the state qualified and brought under the system."

Ryan: "Would the counties be mandated to take part in this program?"

Getty: "...I'm...I'm sorry, Representative..."

Ryan: "Are the counties mandated to take part in this program?"

Getty: "Yes, this would be a statewide system. However, I would point out to you that since some counties are fiscally unable, that is dealt with in this Bill, and they would be eligible to apply to the Office of the Illinois Courts for their funding. Now I point out that, for example, Polk County I think was bankrupt two years ago. Under this Bill, they would be eligible to apply for full funding. However, the impact on a county like that is really not so much, it's organized on a circuit basis and presumably a county, most counties, would continue paying what they are now paying and the impact would be minimal on most counties. It wouldn't cause an increase."

Ryan: "Well, isn't there a limit on the amount of money that a county can apply for?"

Getty: "The limit that they could apply for would be 100%."

Ryan: "Well, how much can they get?"

Getty: "They could get what...they could get a maximum of a hundred percent. Each one would be entitled, each Circuit...entitled to fifty percent."

Ryan: "Well, letlet me get....well, I understand it, that they can get a grant of up to only \$30,000, maximum of 30,000."

Getty: "Well, I don't think there would be any of the counties who would qualify in the category of being unable to pay for probation services. So whatever need will be requiring more than that. Yet we're talking about a very few counties that would possibly come under this stress



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

sort of situation."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Representative Getty, I have to oppose this Bill based on the fiscal impact that it has and the fact that I...as I read the Bill and understand it, waters down certainly local government and county government and takes away some of the privileges that they now enjoy. And so I would certainly hope that we could keep enough red votes on the board to keep this Bill from passing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for years we have been concerned about proper judicial judgment in felony cases, have been very concerned about the serious need of statewide probation. To this point, for political reasons in certain counties and obvious monetary reasons, this hasn't become a reality. But this is the nearest to a reality we're going to get. You know, all of us have been very critical of Judges who have been giving probation on probation. And we've asked what's wrong with the judicial system that this occurs? Well, the fault in essence was ours, we didn't give them the tools. We now can give them the tools of presentencing information so they will know the person who is up before them has already received probation. To this point in time the only person who knew you had previous probation was the defendant and how could the poor Judge properly rule? Now in this period of the swinging pendulum, in this period when it's imperative that we get behind every possible law and order consideration, I think statewide probation is one of the tools we can give to our people, our Judges, our Courts. It's time, it's positively time, that statewide probation be enforced. That the Judges know what they're doing and that we properly deal with defendants. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "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 Getty to close."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I just want to respond very briefly. The...possibly there's some misunderstanding on the other side of the aisle, possibly Representative Ryan didn't understand



that the Chief Judge of the Circuit still will retain control over the Judges, or rather the probation officers within that Circuit. The only county that may not want to have a system like this would be a county that had no probation officer, who is not taking care of their community, who isn't interested in the criminal justice system and in rehabilitating people. A county who wants to have substandard people working for it may...may oppose this although none testified against it. There was no opposition to this Bill. I know of no county who has ever expressed any opposition to it. The fiscal impact? Yes, there is a fiscal impact. The fiscal impact is just slightly more than the subsidy Bill, pure subsidy Bill, that the Governor has endorsed. And I would suggest to you Members of this House that what we need is just not a subsidy, what we need is a statewide probation system with standards that can take us a step forward in having the criminal justice system that we so sorely need in this state. And I would point even today to an editorial in one of our major metropolitan newspapers, they pointed out this fact, and I would earnestly solicit your affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we heard four Bills in Judiciary II, this is one of the best Bills we have and I think all of them should be voted on and let the Governor make his mind up. It's a good Bill and I urge its support."

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

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'aye' and 14 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar. The first one is 399, Representative Skinner. You want to take it out of the record?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 399. A Bill for an Act in relation to auxiliary policemen receiving compensation upon their death in the line of duty. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. According to the rules the Sponsor has two minutes and then one opponent has two minutes and



then we go to the question. And I will put the timer on so we'll be timed and we'll be cut off at the two minutes. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, colleagues in the General Assembly, I'm not sure any of you would yield this privilege to me or would like to take it away from me. If any of you would like to be the first guinea pig on the new short debate list, you're certainly welcome. This Bill is a Bill that would make quite explicit in the state law that those auxiliary policemen and auxiliary firemen and auxiliary civil defense workers, or whatever we call them now, never did get that straightened out, will have the same death benefits that will...those people who are on regular duty if they get killed in the line of duty. That seems about as innocuous as a Bill can get. The Attorney General's Office indicates that there would be no fiscal impact because some fluke of the law they're already paying for these if they already exist. But they do comment that it would be a meritorious strengthening of the language of the law, making it absolutely explicit what the intent of the General Assembly is. I would support of the General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Anybody in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was off the floor. Is this one of the limited debate Bills, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "It...it is."

Wolf: "We're not...somebody didn't ask a question? Am I correct in that, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was your question?"

Wolf: "Are we permitted under this Short Debate, Limited Debate, to ask a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "If...if you're an opponent, yes."

Wolf: "Well, then, let me take the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Two minutes, don't forget now."

Wolf: "If there's no one else let me take the devil's advocate, Mr. Speaker"

Speaker Redmond: "Two minutes."

Wolf: "I'm just looking at the Digest on this and I'm just wondering if



these, you know, paramedics and firemen and...and others are employed by local municipalities. In the way of a question, I guess, taking the devil's advocate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, will you respond?"

Skinner: "I'm sorry, I didn't even figure out what the question was."

Wolf: "I was wondering, Mr. Skinner, if they're all local municipal employees, if it became the state's obligation to...to pay this compensation?"

Skinner: "Well, this is...this is above anything that the local government might pay. And basically, what we're saying is, it doesn't matter whether you're a fulltime employee or a parttime employee or just a volunteer, if you get killed in the line of some hazardous duty that the state ought to pay the same death benefits."

Wolf: "Thank you..."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Wolf: "It...it will be \$20,000?"

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and none 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 432. Representative Greisheimer."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 432. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greisheimer."

Greisheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 432 is a Bill that provides a policy for the Department of Public Aid to follow with regards to the reimbursement of physicians for medical services rendered to welfare patients. As I understand it, the Bill and its contents have been adopted as administrative procedures of the Department and they are willing to comply with it at the present time. You will all recall approximately two years ago the Department of Public Aid was not paying doctors or giving them any reasons for nonpayment. All this Bill does is require that the Department of Public Aid pay doctors within 90 days after their bills are submitted or advise them why their bills are not being honored. And to that extent, that is the part of the entire Bill. It also



provides that they will take into consideration what local fees are in the locale. It is not mandatory language saying that they must pay them that amount but they will consider it. The Department is following this now. I think it's a reasonable Bill. The Medical Association supports it. The Dental Association supports it, obviously. And the Department of Public Aid feels that it is reasonable and is following this as a policy at the present time."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there an opponent? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapman. Let me, let me caution the Members, unless you are seated and in your seats there's no way I can tell who is rising to be the opponent. So please be in your seat. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill was given a do pass recommendation by the House Human Resources Committee. The Department of Public Aid seems to feel they could live with it but now I see the fiscal note which they have provided in which they indicate that the course of House Bill 432 could run as much as one hundred million dollars for ...six practitioners alone. I had a little Bill last year that would have been...last night, that would have been less than a million dollars fiscal note and I'm surprised that nobody has been interested in a possible fiscal note of one hundred million dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 26 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 477. Representative Beatty. It's on the Calendar in there, take it out of the record. 491. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise?"

Barnes: "Just an inquiry, Mr. Speaker, I know we're starting on this anew and I was just wondering under the rules that we're under now in the Short Debate, are you allowed to explain your vote under this system?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, you are."

Barnes: "You are?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Barnes: "Okay. Thank you, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 491. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code.



Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 491 is jointly sponsored by myself and Representative Keats. It provides that when the State Superintendent declares the existence of an energy crisis in the state, a district may operate its schools on the basis of a four day week, extending each school day by one hour. The state aid claim of the district shall not be reduced under the circumstances. It's supported by the IEA, the Illinois School Board Association and the Illinois Office of Education. Appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there an opponent? Please sit down, I can't identify the opponents if everybody is standing. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 504. I understand there was one taken off in there. 504. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Back here somewhere. House Bill 504. A Bill for an Act in relation to tax upon persons engaged in business of removing or extracting coal. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 504 is part of the package of the so-called Mine Subsidence Bills of 157 and 158 which originally was sponsored by Representative 'Steele' and now we are Cosponsors of those Bills on this Bill. House Bills 157, 158 passed on the Consent Calendar and this one was knocked off probably in error because of a misunderstanding. In the first place, this furnishes the method for financing an insurance pool for the Mine Subsidence Insurance. Without this, House Bills 157, 158 are useless or with some other method to finance them and there's none in the hopper to my knowledge. So because of that misunderstanding, I would ask that you give me a favorable vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman in opposition."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I originally was



in opposition to this Bill and I was the one that removed the Bill from the Consent Calendar but that was prior to my being informed of an Amendment which caused me to remove my opposition. And I shall be voting for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Rules provide for but one opponent, what are you rising for, Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "Obviously rising and saying you're not an opponent, he is not an opponent...he is not an opposition speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "I know that there's a fiscal note for \$2,000,000 and from reading the Digest and the Amendment I have no idea whatsoever how the Department of Revenue got that high. Can you tell us how it could possibly cost \$2,000,000 when all they're going to do is collect statistics?"

Flinn: "No, I can't tell you how...the reason they went that high is because they took the \$2,000,000 which is a limit for one particular year and a limit for the total amount to be placed in the...in the placement pool. But you can imagine that not anywhere near that amount of money will be expended in one year and the simple reason is that the insured must pay insurance to the insurance companies, pay premiums. And this is only in the event there's a loss by some insurance company and they can draw from that pool to recover their loss. We would expect years and years to go by before there's any money drawn out of that pool and even if when there is there will be very little money drawn out of that pool. And I...I doubt very much if we will ever reach the \$2,000,000 figure under any circumstance."

Skinner: "Well, perhaps you could just explain what the Amendment does, apparently what's in the Digest doesn't adequately explain it."

Flinn: "Well, I don't think I can explain in the rest of your two minutes what it does but I'll try."

Skinner: "It's all yours."

Flinn: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 138 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 510."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 510. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Members please sit down."

Clerk O'Brien: "Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce. Pierce. 510."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 510 is aimed at giving some recognition to those middle class Americans who pay their own children's way to college or to elementary and secondary schools by paying tuition and receiving no scholarship aid. Now the wealthy can afford to send their children to college, the poor receive Illinois State Scholarships or other scholarship help but the vast majority of middleclass Illinoisians cannot qualify for state scholarships and can't afford to send their children to college or pay for elementary and secondary school tuition. What this Bill seems to do is through the deduction of the Illinois Income Tax of a maximum of \$2,000 or tuition, whichever is less, give some recognition to those middleclass Illinoisians. The \$2,000 deduction, if that's what the college tuition is, will only result in a savings of \$50 in our present 2½% rate on individuals. So it's not a large sum but is some recognition of the financial sacrifice of middleclass Americans that send their children to college, either public or private college, or to private elementary or secondary schools. This Bill did pass the House four years ago and was bogged down in the Senate. I urge your support of the Bill. I think your constituents would recognize, although it is a modest amount of saving, at least the Illinois General Assembly is realizing the need to help and assist the average American who's sending his child to college or to grade school or high school, paying the tuition and receiving no help from anyone."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Boucek. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I very reluctantly arise to oppose this Bill and probably of the Members of the House I'd benefit the most having four children in private schools; and next year two in college and two in law school. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as a Member of this House, as a



Member responsible for fiscal integrity and responsibility, we have a Bill here that has an estimate impact of \$15,000,000 on the State Treasury. Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the supposed beauty of the Illinois Income Tax is that it's simple without any deductions, without any credit. I'm fearful that if we pass this Bill and establish a precedent of deductions and credits subsequently the income tax is going to be more adversely affected by other special interests asking for deductions and credits. And it's for these reasons I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote on this Bill, I think there's a lot of merit to the concept here but, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we... if we approve this Bill we're...we're starting on a whole new road, as far as the Illinois Income Tax is concerned, and I think it's a precedent that needs a lot more study than to be passed out on any Short Debate Calendar and I think we should put this... 'no' votes up there and bring this back if we have to in another year."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 65 'aye' and 54 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 513. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "I'm doing 50% better than I did on the Bottle Bill so thank you all., one and all."

Speaker Redmond: "513."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 513. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 513 establishes within Illinois a formalized program for personalized license plates. It's based on the California plan and would provide that effective 1979, individuals who previously have not secured personalized license plates may do so upon application with the Secretary of State and pay \$15 extra for the privilege of a personalized license plate. This Bill, by its passage, will not affect anyone who has a personalized



license plate today and it will, upon its effectiveness in 1979, reimburse the Secretary of State for the cost of administration as well as to add some needed money to the motor fuel tax or road fund of the State of Illinois. I should say, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill will give to many citizens in the state something little from state government. It will expand the combinations that can be made available. The Bill was reported out of Motor and Vehicles Committee without a dissenting vote and I solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs in opposition."

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is one that the Secretary of State opposes. And the reason that the Secretary of State opposes this Bill is the fact that there's a fee of \$12.50 that must accompany your license when you order your license in order to get a personalized license plate. Now, if you should order a four-letter or five-lettered word, for instance, like Bill, at the present time you could get Bob without any charge. You can get Bill if you pay \$12.50. Now, if the license plate has already been issued, the Personalized License Bill, the money for your license after it's been received and the request for the personalized license plate, there's...the money is deposited, according to law, within 48 hours. There's a lag of approximately four weeks. So what happens is, the money plus the \$12...."

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

Jacobs: "Twelve dollars and a half would have to be refunded and this could go on and on and on and would cost the Secretary of State a lot more than \$12.50 per license."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, first of all, it's \$15.00 not \$12.50. And the \$15.00 figure is the one that was established by a Subcommittee of Motor...Motor and Vehicle Committee. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the Secretary of State can give any rationalization he wants to a Bill.



such as a previous Secretary of State gave to support of his opposition to multiyear plates and then two years later it turned out that instead of costing the state money it would save the state money. This is an excellent vehicle for satisfying motor vehicle owners in this state and an excellent vehicle for providing needed money for the road fund of the state. And I urge your support."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the explanation of my 'yes', this Bill when it originally came into Vehicles Committee was put in the Subcommittee which I chaired for consideration and at that time a 15, 12 and 10 cost attached to it. We reduced it to a straight \$15.00 and put in a grandfather clause so it'll affect no existing plates. The cost of administration is high to the Secretary of State and the Subcommittee felt this Bill was justified."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question there's 65 'aye' and 70 'no' and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 526."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 526. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 526 in its original composition dealt with the idea of exempting teachers from the Ethics Act. And its basic direction was to really bring it into line with the idea that state university instructors are themselves exempt. And it seemed to be that if the purpose of the Ethics Act is to identify conflict, for those who are in policymaking decisions then teachers themselves certainly were not in that position. However, the Executive Committee amended the Bill and changed it to include firemen and policemen and teachers as well and boards which received remuneration for less than a thousand dollars. I also amended it, since we could not exempt those groups, to threshold level of \$30,000. Now the Clerk and the Secretary of State's Office have indicated that there's a lot of paper work involved in processing paper for individuals who are in no obvious conflict. So it seems to me, a correct proposal, and one that is just. And I would ask



support for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms in opposition."

Simms: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this. What we're doing is destroying the Governmental Ethics Act and we are treating, very frankly, one group of people different than another. You've raised the exemption on the Governmental Ethics Act to allow those that are earning substantially more than Members of the General Assembly in exempting them from the requirement. If we're going to have the Governmental Ethics Act, it should be kept intact. If you're going to start making exemptions I think then that Members of the Legislature should be in that category. And in essence you're making the Legislature, the Legislators a...a group of people that would have to file whereby people that are earning as much or more would be exempt.....from the provisions of filing under this Act. And for these reasons I would urge that this Bill be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Schneider to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Representative Simms obviously hasn't read the Ethics Act nor does he understand it. The idea is to get a conflict, exempting Legislators would of course, be quite inconsistent with the intention of the Ethics Act. Again, this.....just merely deals with those individuals who are interested going about their work and not dealing with conflict, they are not in that position to be in conflict. And, again, I'd ask for 'aye' votes."

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

Sharp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'd urge the Members to look at this carefully. All we're doing here is excluding teachers who maybe have been teaching for 20 years in a school system, they've gotten to the threshold of \$20,000 on the pay scale and now they're required to fill this form. I think, you know, the Act was not intended to...to put these people under it and what we're trying to do is eliminate paper work and confusion on the part of the people that are...are in the classroom teaching and really are not in a position of having



a conflict. So let's, you know, give it the votes that are necessary so we can exclude these people."

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

Conti: "I...I...I'm not only concerned about the teachers in there, I'm also concerned about the tradesmen and the firemen and the policemen. All have to file an Ethics Bill now. I think this is a good Bill as amended and it should be...."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Conti: "Voted on."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'aye' and 30 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 528."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 528. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greisheimer."

Greisheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to attempt to describe this Bill in two minutes and I don't really think it's physically impossible. First of all, there has been no attempt to change the fishing license or hunting license fees in the State of Illinois for twenty years. There's not a person in this state that's a hunter or fisherman that doesn't realize that we have one of the poorest systems in the state, in the country, and this is due to the fact we have continually shorted the Department of Conservation of money. This Bill would raise hunting and fishing licenses so that they are equatable to other states even in our own vicinity and certainly, modestly, within the entire United States. There has been a complete itemized plan prepared by the Department of Conservation as to where this money will be used to benefit hunters and fishermen only. The money will only go into the Fishing and Game Fund. It is not useable for any other purpose other than to benefit hunters and fishermen. For your information, the specifics on the increases on some of the areas where they'll be increasing, the fishing license will go from two to four... two to five dollars. Commercial fishing license from five to twenty-five, nonresidents from six to fifteen. Hunting license from three to ten and deer license from five to twelve-fifty. It was requested



of me last time we discussed this Bill on Second Reading as to what neighboring states charge for similar fees. I've itemized these all out. In Wisconsin, it's four and a quarter, Michigan...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle in opposition."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, this Bill is a verily poorly guise tax without referendum. It doubles, triples, quadruples and otherwise increases the fees for hunting and fishing licenses in this state. Twenty years ago may be the last time this was done but these are outrageous. To say the least, they are excessive. To say the most, they are oppressive. Every downstater here has received letters, hundreds of them in case, against it. Not one individual has written me on behalf of this Bill. It would put a tremendous burden poor people, otherwise on middle income people, who want to hunt and fish. It's unfair to them. It's unfair to the people of this state to do this in the name of hunting, fishing and conservation. And we ought to vote 'no' on the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the speakers who spoke, the only speaker that spoke in opposition to the Bill, indicated that the fishing license and hunting license in Illinois were outrageous. Well, you heard the Sponsor of the legislation tell you, and those of you...those of you that have purchased fishing licenses know, that they are only \$2.00. We have exempted in previous legislation in other Sessions senior citizens and others, handicapped individuals, veterans and others and it's time that we put the onus on this fishing license to the people who use it. Those that fish and hunt in Illinois should be willing to pay the cost. If we're going to have continued improvement and success in our fishing and hunting areas, we've got to finance them. If we ever hope to have the cold and warm water hatchery in Illinois, this is the only way we're going to get it. If we don't do it this way, then the people in Illinois who do not hunt and fish will be saddled with the tax for which they receive no benefit. And I think this is a good Bill. It should pass. And if you go to up to Lake Michigan and



see the tremendous sport fishery we have up there in that area of the state, and we invite you all up there to enjoy it, many of you have gone to Waukegan and fished from the charter boats. You know the fish are there for your taking. And please give us the money and tax the people that if you so wish to call it a tax to those people who enjoy the magnificent hunting and fishing in Illinois. We want to bring the people from other states in and I suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of my vote, let me say that all of the mail I have received upon this legislation is in favor of it. Believe me, I have hunted and fished all of my life and I certainly feel that the cost of the license is a minor part of the cost of hunting and fishing. It's really a minor part of the sport and I would certainly urge everything that we could to have a green vote on this so it might pass and keep our fishing and hunting program good in the State of Illinois in comparison to other states. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the debate it was mentioned by, and I'd like to explain my vote, by Representative Stuffle. I've got a lot of mail."

Now you might think some of these sports groups around the state represent all the hunters and fishermen in this state but they don't. If you go talk to people that are now paying for hunting and fishing licenses, they're opposed to this increase. I was Chairman of a Study Committee that went all over the state last year, Illinois outspends states like Missouri and Kentucky in the area of conservation. And I think this is just a tax on the people that use the hunting and fishing. We don't take the people that want to hike and ride bikes in this state. But they're always telling us what we ought to do with our parks and system. So you better think twice before you vote for this additional tax."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would hope that the Sponsor would take this out of the record. There may be a few things wrong with the Bill but there're some more things wrong with the Department



of Conservation. I would appreciate it as a personal favor if some more of our colleagues who are voting 'yes' would turn off that green light and vote 'present' so he can pull it out of the record until tomorrow. Maybe we can work out some of these problems with the Department."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson to explain his vote. Robinson. Robin...it's the Short Debate, yeah."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with the Representative who just spoke. In the Springfield newspaper last week, there was a quote from the Director of Conservation who when informed of this Bill said, 'well, he wanted increases but he didn't think this Bill went far enough and that he would introduce an Amendment to raise the fees when it got over to the Senate. I think that Representative Greisheimer may be taken here by the Department of Conservation. I think we deserve an explanation from the Department."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative...Representative Lauer. Explain his vote."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I would like to point out to the Members of the House of the impact of this Bill is not upon the middle income group, it is not upon those who are between the ages of 25 and 55. Many times the only recreation that senior citizens can afford is...."

Speaker Redmond: "You'll be able to talk after 6 o'clock. Proceed, Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Many times any people who can afford to...to...this is the only recreation that people on fixed incomes can afford. And it's also one of the major recreation of kids under 21. I don't see that we should take away from people on fixed incomes the sport because it does take out of their food budget. And a food budget that I'll grant that the wildlife resources of the state whether they be fish or four-legged or two-legged with wings, should have incumbent upon them. Also, the young people are avid fishermen, they're avid hunters and they're income is also somewhat limited. You show me a kid that is out on the stream banks or on a lake fishing or out on in the field hunting and I'll show you a kid that's not getting into trouble. I think that we are perpetrating an absolute outrage if we raise



these fees to this extent. I solicit your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd like to see those green lights back up there because there's a lot of misconception here. Number one, the people that are over 65 are exempt. The children are exempt for the same reasons that were given in opposition and the cheapies who don't want to spend money in Illinois turn right around and spend huge sums, Wisconsin, Minnesota and every place else and we can't improve ours without this money. I suggest we get it back and pass it."

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

Greisheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote. I'm also the Sponsor of the Bill. Let me, let me say this. What really disturbs me in this case is that I have just heard the reason why one of my fellow Republicans asked to have this Bill taken out of the record. And I think that if he goes to the newspaper with this he might have a hard time getting reelected next time. I've never heard of such trivial, petty stuff on any man's part that because he can't get deer permits he's going to penalize every hunter and fisherman in this state. I think it's despicable. Now look it, I understand that this might have an impact on the hunters and fishermen but it's going to be a good impact. Who, who is in favor of this? Not only the Department of Conservation has endorsed it, the Governor of the State of Illinois has endorsed it, the Sun-Times has endorsed it, the Illinois Wildlife, the Illinois Wildlife, the Bass Fishermen of Illinois, the Deerhunter Association of Illinois, the Bow Hunters, Hunting Association of Illinois, the Southeastern Illinois Sportsmen Club. This has vast support among sportsmen. Now for your own political reasons you might not want to vote for it but if anybody took their vote out of the record because of the hue and cry of some Legislator for personal reasons I think it's really a questionable time of how we're voting on Bills down here. Look at the benefit to be gained. If you don't believe in the benefits, then of course, don't vote for this Bill. But I don't think we should base this upon personalities we're supposed to be above that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."



Bluthardt: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at the beginning of the debate it was explained that there hasn't been an increase in the fishing and hunting license in Illinois for about twenty years. And we know the inflation that's taken place in the past twenty years. I think it's a shame that our fees are so low for fishing and hunting in Illinois. I go up to Wisconsin, I pay \$12.50 for the privilege of fishing up in Wisconsin. If I want a family license it's \$18.00. We're only asking for \$5.00 to go fishing. I think that anybody who likes fishing will be very happy, pleased, to pay that \$5.00 and know that that money is coming back for conservation and for improving the facilities for the sportsmen of Illinois. You ought to vote in favor of this Bill."

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

Wolf: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I was referred to by the previous speaker. His remarks don't even deserve an answer as far as I'm concerned. I would urge everybody to give him a green light on this. We'll talk about this off the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to dignify it with an answer but those of you who have been voting 'present' go ahead and vote green. There's absolutely nothing wrong with the Bill. I'd asked a personal favor. It is not because I couldn't get deer permits and I'm not going to ...on the floor now, I'll discuss it off the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers. Representative Byers, explain your vote. Representative Byers."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He's got the right to explain his vote."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know what's wrong with people having fishing and hunting license that don't cost very much money. There's a lot of people in the State of Illinois their average income is only about \$7,000, they don't have the money, many of these people, to buy these. Secondly, we're talking about raising deer permits from five to twelve-fifty, that's over two-and-a-half times what the present price is. And there's over 90,000 people that apply for those. And I think that this is wrong and I think that we should vote 'present' on this Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye' and 48 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Mudd. Gentleman has requested a verification. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Greisheimer, are you going to have this Roll Call when you extend the invitation to the Coho Salmon Outing if you have one? The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Poll the absentees, please."

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

I'm sure we'll be here Saturday. Mr. Clerk, call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett, Deavers, Deuster, Ralph Dunn, Giglio, Hoffman, Johnson, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Madison, McGrew, Von Boeckman,..."

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

Von Boeckman: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "...Withdraw my request."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has withdrawn his request of the verification. 550. Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "I had my light on before, I believe, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I know I did. I'd like to have my vote changed from 'present' to 'yes' if I may."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'yes'. 550. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 550. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 550 passed out of Financial Institutions, 26 to nothing. What it basically does is permit a...a temporary currency exchange for a foreign fare, international fare, in...at O'Hare Airport. The problem is right now the State of Illinois Banking Act does not permit a currency exchange. The way I've drafted the Bill it's very narrowly drawn. It means if the United States Commerce Commission approves



the international fare then a temporary currency exchange can be situated and I urge adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Members please be in their seats. Who...who's risen in opposition? Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Greiman: "For a point of parliamentary inquiry. Would this vote, would this require a 107 votes or 89 votes since it seems to affect..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman has posed a parliamentary inquiry. Representative McClain. David."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, my point would be that it amends the Banking Act, does not create a new Act. And it's not branch banking, Representative Hart informs me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, the issue raised by the Gentleman is whether or not this would be branch banking under the Illinois Constitution. All this Bill does is to allow the establishment of a facility at an international trade fair for the purpose of exchanging foreign currency and I do not believe it would be branch banking in any form. And I would suggest that it takes 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "89 votes is required. Who's in opposition? If you don't sit down I can't tell. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?Shall take the record. On this question, there's 130 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 551."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 551. A Bill for an Act creating a Commission to study Illinois laws relating to real property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 551 passed out of Committee 13 to 7. What it basically does is create a commission to investigate and study our property laws in the State of Illinois. Through my studies I've found dozens of chapters and sections that amend property laws of some sort. And being on Judiciary II two years ago for that Session I found dozens



of Bills that amended real property laws and they corrected a situation and created more problems. What this Bill would do is require a recodification or at least proposed legislation presented to the General Assembly by February 2, 1980. It set up sixteen Legislative Members, I mean, sorry, eight Legislative Members and public members and hopefully we can recodify the real property laws in Illinois so that we have some consistency in our real property laws. And I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? If you can't sit down I can't tell. Representative Catania, are you rising in opposition? I don't know. Anybody rising in opposition? Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, it's a mild form of opposition. I think the property law in Illinois is pretty well established by statute and by case law. And I practice in the real property field quite extensively and I think one of the things that real property lawyers are opposed to is to have drafting changes in the law because it's been developed so slowly and so meticulously over the period of years. I don't think this commission is necessary. I think after Representative McClain has been in the practice a few years that he will probably agree with me. And so I see no necessity for this. It's just going to cost money to do something that doesn't need to be done. And I would suggest we defeat the Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker, since Representative McClain has moved over to me by my...being my seatmate I know he's been kind of tricky and...and I...I don't see any...companion appropriation Bill with it and I know he's trying to slip one over on us."

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

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, would just more people vote so I can end up with more votes than the Bottle Bill please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 44 'aye' and 90 'no' and the Bill having failed to receive Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost."



562. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded, leave of the House to be recorded voting 'aye' on House Bill 806. It will not affect the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 806? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Representative..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 562. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Local Library Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the third Gentleman standing in front...in front of Mrs. Chapman sit down? Representative Chapman. Representative McClain. Down."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this measure responds to a situation in the Third Legislative District. Eight hundred families are double-taxed for library services because they live both within Elk Grove Village which provides library services and taxes for it and within the Township of Schaumburg which provides library services and taxes. for those services. So these eight hundred families are double-taxed. They pay their taxes twice for library services and do not get any additional service since the library card is good at any of the various libraries in the area. We are, they...they probably don't read twice as much, Representative Giorgi, but that's a good suggestion. We are proposing to solve this in this manner for the townships to abate the township library tax and then for the Village to split its tax 50-50 between the township library and the municipal library. This is...is fair. I discussed it with the libraries in the area and also in the state, with the State Library Association, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 562 because what this Amendment does is it requires that the township abate its library taxes on property within the municipality and that the municipality then will pay half of the cost of the taxes collected in the area and the township in the area...in the township through the township."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all



voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Chapman to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Yourell has explained the Bill accurately. What is done is for the township library to...the township to abate its library taxes but then the village will split its taxes for library purposes just as 50-50 with the township. I can't think of anything that would be fairer. The alternate is that either the township would not receive any library taxes or the village would not receive any library taxes. And this really doesn't make any sense because this area is going to continue to remain both within the village and within the township. There is precedence for this. You may recall that when the township road and bridge tax is collected 50% of the township road and bridge tax goes to the village, 50% of the tax that is collected within the village. That part of the township that resides without a municipality delivers 100% of its road and bridge tax to the township. In this way township residents have their responsibility for paying their township taxes but where there is assured responsibility the taxes are shared with the other governmental unit. And since, Mr. Speaker, there's 84 votes I'm...I'm going to ask you if you would poll the absentees. This...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Chapman: "...is a problem and...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you....thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm the Chief Cosponsor of this Bill, we have enough votes so I won't take anymore time."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 92 'aye', 32 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The power of Macdonald. It's one minute and I gave you two minutes and five seconds."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 607. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there are literally thousands of people in Illinois who make self-government work. Many of them are nonsalaried and certainly a lot of them are minimally salaried and this is an attempt to take out those people who earn a thousand dollars or less in connection with their elected office from filing a statement of economic interest. I would point out to you some of the things... Number one, I don't know of anyone that goes and looks at them in the first place. They're filed with the County Clerk and the only person I know that has to go look at them in our area is when a school is audited, you pay a C.P.A. to run around the various county seats to check to see whether the School Board Directors have filed their statement of economic interest. I think that this is an unnecessary thing and it creates a lot of paperwork and actually discourages a lot of well-qualified people from running... from these nonsalaried and low salaried public offices. And I would certainly appreciate your vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers, in opposition."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill also besides school districts, covers municipalities and townships, special districts where someone serves... is selected and makes less than a thousand dollars a year. And I would remind you that you're handling taxpayers' dollars. It's another effort to loosen the ethics law that was passed recently and I think that we should be tightening up. They're handling taxpayer dollars and as a result, there's sewer projects being built, schools, school buildings that we're appropriating more money for education than any other area in the State of Illinois. And I think that the public has a right to have these filed and that I see no harm in keeping this in. I don't think we should be loosening the Governmental Ethics Act. I'd urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor



vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?

Representative Schneider, to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Bill that we just passed out, that was associated with me, is similar to the one that Representative Friedrich had. They both came out of Executive with the same Amendment and they're kind of running in tandem in what we know as 'Let's see whose gets to the Governor's desk and who is assigned which one'. So if we voted for mine, I suspect we ought to vote for Dwight's also."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...Representative Katz."

Katz: "It seems to me that the Bill misses the point. It's not how much the individual is earning, the individual may be sitting on a board that's spending \$100,000,000, and he's exercising public power; it seems to me that people are entitled to know when you are making contracts and engaging in business relations on behalf of the public. They're entitled to know something about your own sources of income as they do the sources of income of those who make laws. And so as long as you are exercising that kind of power, and this Bill makes no distinction between whether the individual is earning under \$1,000, is owning property in the area of the school district or the city, is engaging in transactions with the city. Accordingly, it seems to me that the Bill is not in good form and that it is too broadly drawn so that it can exempt people who, in fact, have conflicts of interests. It ought to be known by the public. And so I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Let's take a look at Planning Commissions and Zoning Boards. Nobody gets paid for this work; but don't you think the people in the community have a right to know if there are major landowners in the area? I do and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I would tell you again that I don't know of a single instance in my whole area when any...when anyone has ever gone to look at a statement of economic interests filed by a School Board Member, or a Township Auditor or anything of this kind. There are



laws where a man can be prosecuted the same as you can if you use your public office in committing a crime...of using a conflict of interest. This does not abate a violation of the law and a conflict of interest law. And all I'm doing is saying that this causes real problems. And a heck of a lot of people work, not only for the County Clerk, but they run around getting these things for...for nothing actually. That's what it amounts to. And I think that it's just a layer of government which we can get along without. And I think we ought to encourage people to take these minor offices and not discourage. It's hard enough to get capable people to run now. And I certainly would appreciate your vote. It is similar to Representative Schneider's Bill, which you did pass. I'd appreciate your vote on this one, too."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 73 'aye' and 67 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed...640...lost."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 640. A Bill for an Act requiring the Department of Corrections to provide food for certain state institutions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all this does is to obligate the Department of Corrections to furnish foodstuff, or what they can furnish, for not only the Department of Corrections but for the Department of Mental Health. To give you an idea of how much we taxpayers are spending this year for foodstuff, the budget up until June the 30th of this year will be almost \$17,000,000. Now in the past, it was always the Corrections Department who raised their own food. They had canneries in these different institutions. They were well-fed in these institutions because they did raise their own food. I have watched this for several years and when a Governor takes over and he appoints a new director of the Department of Corrections the first thing they do is they start letting up on the food production and then along about the last year of the Governor's Administration they decide that this isn't too bad an idea and they go back into it whole hog. Well, here comes along another Governor and the same thing happens over and over again. Two years or a year ago last August, to be exact, the Department of Corrections took out the last canneries that they had. I happen to think that they can still can and preserve their own food, that they can furnish this foodstuff, that it will give the inmates something to do to keep them out of trouble. I understand that the wardens in the different institutions are behind this. I can tell you that I've talked to the Governor about it and he is behind this Bill and this will amount to one whale of a savings for the taxpayers in the State of Illinois. I have checked with other states, they are going into this by leaps and bounds, there was a tendency for a while to let up on it but now they're going back into it. The State of Kentucky is producing 70% of their....."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition because I can't help but think that this should be a good idea but we requested a fiscal note from the Department of Corrections and the Department



of Corrections has indicated that the bottom line expenditures would amount to approximately \$650,000 to upgrade the operations of the three downstate institutional farms. Above this expenditure would be incremental cost relating to the upgrading of farming and food processing operations at our northern institutions. If the Department were to accomplish all that House Bill 640 might indicate, the Department could feasibly spend \$7,000,000 on the upgrading of farming operations. They also indicate that the operations would continue to cost more than they produce. I...I'm surprised that this Bill got on the Consent Calendar or Short Debate Calendar. I really don't think it should be and the expense of this Bill just don't warrant it being passed at this time. We ought to debate it on another Calendar."

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

Brummet: "I would like to say this. In the first place, there should not have been a fiscal note on this and I tried to talk Representative Totten out of it. In the first place, the Department of Corrections or rather the...the industrial part of the Department of Corrections does not want to have anything to do with it. We are going to have to force them to do it. The \$7,000,000 figure they turned in is absolutely absurd. So is the \$650,000 figure. We're going to have to get somebody to work out the figure that's without...that is not that Department to start out with. And I'm quite sure it can be worked out where it's satisfactory. In the second place, the Department, the Industrial Department, works out their own money end of it. In other words, they do not come to the Legislature for it. Their own funds are generated within that Department. So it's not going to cost any \$7,000,000 to the taxpayers. On top of that, if you'll take 70% of \$7,000,000 you can see that you can save quite a bit of money the first year. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 21 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 646."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 646. A Bill to an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was a....a simple Bill that would require municipalities whenever there's an annexation, disconnection and annexation, or disconnection of territory or change in numbering a building or lot, or changes the name of any street, avenue or alley or any public place within thirty days, to notify the Election Authority and the Post Office. There may be some confusion...if you read the House Amendment #1 added in Committee and and House Amendment #2, that I added on the floor, I've checked the second one out with the Municipal League, they have no objection to it. And basically what it did was revert what was originally in the Bill which called for an automatic voiding of the action if they didn't make the notification. And Amendment #2 leaves that voiding out. It just requires that within 30 days they do have to make the notification. We've had quite a bit of confusion in the DuPage County area with the City of Aurora with its own Election Commission coming into DuPage County and not knowing who is changed within these Election Authorities. I have checked this out with the Municipal League and with the Amendment that I have they have no problem with the Bill and I would ask your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor...Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "One question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, if I may?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Lechowicz: "This affects the home rule units?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Well, I...I would have to say that it amends the Municipal Code in such a way that if...if they are already affected by what we're amending, it would."

Lechowicz: "I'd like to have a ruling then, Mr. Speaker, how many votes does this require to pass?"

Speaker Redmond: "107 votes. Limitation on the home rule power. Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to speak in opposition to the Bill because it supposedly takes something



away from the home rule units. I was...I asked the question specifically for that reason. I don't believe that the Bill as is presently drawn provides sufficient notice of changes to the election and postal authorities in the proper amount of time. I believe that when it deals with an area as complex and in turn the magnitude and size of the city, I believe that they should have their own provisions in providing a sufficient amount of time to correct the situation. The amount of time that's addressed in the Bill, I...you know, the City Council and City of Chicago, not only meets once a month, and in turn, I don't know if they could comply with the recommendations that are contained within this Bill. And that's why I think that I would have to oppose this measure at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "If that, if that's the Gentleman's problem, I'd be willing to extend the time with an Amendment in the Senate. I'm not hung up on the amount of time, what I'm trying to do with this Bill is provide some notice to the election authorities, in our area at least, where we have a rapidly expanding area that these changes do occur. I'm not hung up on any particular aspect of this Bill but I think there ought to be some notification requirement."

~~Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."~~

Lechowicz: "Based on that, I withdraw my objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been withdrawn. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...hereby declared passed. 651, out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 723. Representative James McLendon."

McLendon: "...Be recorded as 'aye' on that last Bill, Mr. Speaker... with leave of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections... Representative Winchester, with the same request? Does he have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 723. A Bill for an Act concerning supermarkets. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a



Bill that would provide for meat sales after six in the northeastern corner of the state which is the entire Chicago area. As probably all of you know, we do have that now but it could be only temporary because the contract still needs to be negotiated. It will be up for renegotiation in September and we'd like to guarantee that all of the shoppers in that section, of that section of the state, that is more than half the population of the entire state, will still have the convenience that Mayor Bilandic so graciously negotiated for them at the beginning of April. This is supported by the Illinois Farm Bureau, the Illinois Farmers Union, the Illinois Livestock Association, and as I've said, all the shoppers who live in the northeastern corner of the state. It has 92 Cosponsors. It is similar to Representative O'Brien's legislation. I've had this in since 1973 and I would ask for an equal chance for it to get over to the Senate. I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in....

Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. First of all, it's just on the basic principle that to legislate against a contract that was freely entered into and in some way hope to prevent a duly entered into contract in any kind of employment, not only in the area of sale of meat or anything else, but I'm opposed to this kind of legislation. And I think that it's an intrusion and invasion in a free society, those of you who worry about free enterprise and a free society, in the United States we're allowed to have duly entered into contracts between voluntarily entered into between employers and employees. And no matter how much you may not like the provisions of that contract, as long as they are voluntarily entered into and agreed between the two parties, it seems that the Legislature should not invoke its will against the voluntarily free enterprise system especially in this area of contract negotiation. We don't legislate, for example, the hours that a pharmacy should be open or a real estate store should be open or any other store, why should we take out and single out the enterprise of the sale of meat in a grocery establishment? I think that this is bad legislation. It's a bad practice. And I oppose the Bill."



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

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've already got one Bill on this subject and I think that's enough and we're just clouding up the Journals of the House and if this would pass, the Senate, and I think one Bill is enough."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my 'no' vote on this piece of legislation. I certainly don't oppose the concept of allowing and providing for the sale of meat after six o'clock. I've already voted in favor of a Bill sponsored by Representative O'Brien which would accomplish that purpose. However, I suggest to you that this piece of legislation goes far beyond that immediate purpose because what this Bill provides is that there shall be restrictions upon the parties involved to enter into a free and open collective bargaining process to arrive voluntarily at a point where there can be agreement on both sides to provide for the supply of these products at all hours of the day. To go beyond where we are now is to unduly restrict both to this process. You not only are restricting and limiting the union, you're restricting and you're limiting the suppliers and the providers. And for that reason I vote against the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'aye' and 26 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 725."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 725. A Bill for an Act to authorizing and engineering examination of the Saline River. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 725 directs the Department of Transportation to make a flood control study of the north, middle and south fork of the Saline River and the civic areas in Hamilton, White, Gallatin, Saline, Williamson, Franklin and Hardin Counties. We've had a lot of problems with tributaries flooding in this area. The Amendment that was put on the Bill would require that they take into consideration and work with the flood control studies that have been



made by the Corps of Engineers in portions of the area. The fiscal impact is less than \$50,000. Very much needed and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten in opposition. Will Members please sit down? It's hard to distinguish the opponents."

Totten: "Well, thank you..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 725 for two reasons. First of all, this has become a very low priority project for the Department of Transportation, the Corps of Engineers in fact decided not to do this because it was such a low priority project. Secondly, with the deadline that's in the Bill, the Department of Transportation has said that in order to meet that deadline the cost will be considerably more than the \$50,000 that the Sponsor indicated. In fact, they indicate in order to complete that by May 1 of '78 that they'll have to put four people on and it could cost as much as \$600,000. And I just don't think we should do this at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hart to explain his vote."

Hart: "Well, yes, it's strange that the Department of Transportation talked to Representative Totten and talked to no one else about this kind of a matter. I would be very pleased to work with the Department in the Senate to amend it to extend the deadline. That's the first I'd heard that they had any problem with the deadline and certainly it could wait a little longer as far as completion of it. But it does need to get started and I would urge the Members to help me get the Department started on this very, very much needed flood control project down in my area and the area of Representative Winchester, Brummer, O'Daniel, Roscoe Cunningham and others to get this job done. Please give me 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 23 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 476...746."



Clerk Hall: "House Bill 746. A Bill for an Act providing for the submission to the electors of the state of a certain question of public policy. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 746 would place or would ask that the Equal Rights Amendment question be placed on the ballot in November of 1978. Representative Capparelli and I are sponsoring this measure. The results of this referendum would not in any way be binding upon any Members of the 81st General Assembly. It would be an advisory vote which would give every Member of the 81st General Assembly a very clear reading, a very clear precise reading of how their constituency feel about the Equal Rights Amendment. Now, since 1979 will be the last year that the Equal Rights Amendments will be considered I think certainly that the people of Illinois have been exposed to the ERA proposal should have an opportunity to express 'theirself' on an issue which is considered to be important whether you're a proponent or an opponent of the Equal Rights Amendment. And I would ask that you favorably support this proposal to place ERA on the ballot in 1978."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure opposition is the right word. I'm really tantalized by this particular proposition. I'm the first name on the Equal Rights Amendment and I suspect that if there was going to be a referendum I would make all the talk shows and I would be on all the...get all the great publicity, I would become a well...well-known figure around town. And you know, as a politician that's doesn't...excuse me, Mr. Giorgi please. That doesn't particularly offend, you know, as...as a politician. On the other hand I think that I would not as a politician, although my district I believe has sixty or seventy percent in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment, I don't believe that I would want to have my campaign inexorably bound into the Equal Rights Amendment. I don't think you would either. I don't care if you're for it or against it, I'm telling you that I don't want a lot of people coming to my door with loaves of banana bread, whether they're for it or against it, during that election. You know, we're going to have a Governor



running, we're going to have a....an Attorney General, we're going to have all the county offices running and the issue is the rallies and everything will be around the Equal Rights Amendment. If you're a politician, and I am, I think I'm a good one, I don't want to have my campaign and your campaigned tied up. I, also by the way, there are men here who are going to vote 'no' I suppose when I call the Equal Rights Amendment, I don't want them to look silly when their district votes...votes in favor of the ERA. They're going to look foolish. Now Henry Hyde is a great politician in my judgment, Henry once put in the same kind of thing and he thought better, he said, 'wait a minute, y'know this isn't really a very smart thing to do' and Henry had the good sense, the very good sense....that Mr. Kelly probably should do the same thing. I...I ask you whether...whatever your position is on the ERA just vote 'present' or vote 'no'."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I, too, would enjoy the debate that would go on around the state and the television inquiries and to just what the ERA question would bring to the citizens. I think too often we hide behind the fact that the citizenry does not really know what ERA is all about. Some people think it means Earn Run Average. I think that the citizen should hear this throughout the state and we should debate it and we should have the people of Illinois speak on this issue.. After all, if it's such an important issue, if as the proponents of ERA say it is, what have they got to lose and what have they got to fear? That the people of Illinois would find out what a crucial issue this is and I'm sure that in Illinois the eleven million citizens would make a wise decision like they did in New York and New Jersey and everywhere else that they had an opportunity. They'd probably turn it down around three to one and all them frenzied liberal women that run around the state saying what a panacea for all the ills of discrimination that there is, that they would probably, you know, hide their heads in shame and would forever forget about ERA and its phony issues. I think that if we want to end discrimination we could end it in handicapped people, we could end it for



the aged, we could end it for a lot of other things more important than the area of sex. I think that this would be a good referendum. I'd enjoy speaking with Mr. Greiman around the state, you know, debating the issue and I'm sure the citizenry would enjoy it. As for me, I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in rising to explain my 'no' vote on this issue, I would point out that here this would put the ERA on the ballot with other state officers, with other legislative races and the day-to-day issues that we all want to speak would be obscured, confused, clouded by the emotional feelings of this issue. And so I think it's improper for us to support this. It's an exercise in futility because it means nothing. It would merely be advisory and it's up to us as Legislators to actually make the decision anyway on this issue. So why go through a mammoth exercise in futility and let's vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think Mr. Kelly should move to put this back into Interim Study and next year if, I hope this won't happen, the ERA isn't approved by then I think he should bring it out of Interim Study and we should have it on the ballot in '78 because the voters in my district voted by about two-to-one for ERA and I'd love to run on an ERA platform in...in my district. So I would support Mr. Kelly's motion to put this back into Interim Study."

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

Kelly: "I think at this time the way we're going it probably would be a good idea to place it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 747. 747."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 747. A Bill for an Act...."

Speaker Redmond: "Members please be in their seats."

Clerk Hall: "...Concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 747 would prohibit gas and electric public utilities from establishing special or extra charges for customers



who use solar energy for heating or other energy needs. The legislation was prompted by the filing last year by Northern Illinois Gas of a tariff to charge users of solar energy four dollars a month extra. This is one of the absurdest actions I have ever seen in the six years I've been involved in the public utilities area. It flies in the face of both national and state policy to promote the use of solar energy and it is effectively a tax on alternative energy sources in our conservation. Subsequent to the introduction of the legislation because of the adverse reaction Northern Illinois Gas did remove the charge although in other states there are charges that do exist. What this does is to prohibit such charges by utilities. It is supported by the Division of Energy of the Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development. There was no opposition in Committee. And I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition, if anyone? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? ...All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 748."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 748. A Bill for an Act concerning Public Utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Amendment #1 which is effectively House Bill 748, is a product of the Subcommittee on the Fuel Adjustment Clause of the House Public Utilities Committee. It was voted favorably by the Subcommittee by a six to nothing vote and by full Committee by a fourteen to nothing vote. It was...."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 763."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 763. A Bill for an Act amending Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Ladies...."

Speaker Redmond: "Please sit down, Representative McLendon."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this is a clean-up Bill. It puts a few pension systems of governmental employees in the same posture as the majority of our pension systems in this state. It affects governmental employees and does not affect death benefits or retirement benefits. It only covers the situation of temporary disability where somebody can receive a benefit under his pension plan and also workmen's compensation and thereby receive up to 135 to 140% of his gross wages. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Municipal League and all other governmental agencies affected this pension system plan. I ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Question...Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise reluctantly against this Bill as an original proponent of it. Having looked at it and having had heard the testimony from various groups it appears that since we're dealing with pensions systems which now do not have this particular offset that we may very well be unconstitutionally impairing or diminishing a benefit that deals with a disability. And for that reason I have to rise to oppose it."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mugalian to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The constitutional question is not a serious one, it would...it is very unlikely that an...a person covered by this pension plan and affected by this Bill would go to court and ask the court to say that he's entitled to a 130% of his gross. For a constitutional question to even get into the courts someone would have to take that initiative. I doubt that the Illinois Supreme Court could hold that the Constitution would have such an effect."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 97 'aye' and 21 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 769. Representative Matijevich."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I notice some of my soul brothers have left and I know....I can tell by looking at you you're on a diet but some of us aren't."

Speaker Redmond: "We're going to...we're going to go to 784 and that's Representative Corneal Davis and we'll be addressing it so be real quiet and let's get to Corneal Davis. Not quite yet. 769. Corneal will be the end...couple Bills, we'll keep everybody quiet until that one. 769. Somebody has inserted that in this Calendar, is that ...should that be on there? Who put that one on? 769. Representative Schlickman, do you know anything about the mystery of.... Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "It's my...it's my Bill, Mr. Speaker, and was knocked off the ...off the Consent Calendar and onto the Short Calendar and I don't know what your procedure is...."

Speaker Redmond: "Who knocked it off?"

Kempiners: "Representative Schlickman."

Speaker Redmond: "769. Okay, wait a minute. The Clerk tells me that that does something bad for his old system here and if you repent between now and tomorrow with Mr. Schlickman we'll take care of it. 775."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 775. A Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of public accounting in the public interest and to provide penalties for violations of the provisions of this Act and to repeal an Act therein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 775 was on the Consent Calendar and at my request it was removed. In two minutes I would like to explain to you what this Bill does and what it does not do. What it does, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is to codify the existing Chapter 110½ of the Public Accounting Act in modern terms. The existing Act goes back to 1943. It makes only the following substantive changes. Number one, it requires continuing professional education for the renewal of licenses of public accountants. Number two, it provides more explicit definition of the attest function which because of third party reliance is the only function that in the public interest is restricted to CPA's, licensed as



public accountants and this has existed since prior to 1943. It clarifies that bookkeeping and accounting system work are not regulated and that any persons may perform such services. The present law is confusing in this respect. It improves the ability of people who are not licensed to be licensed with respect to the experience requirement. It provides within the Department of Registration and Education a Commissioner of Public Accounting to facilitate the regulatory process. Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it includes two non-CPA members on the Public Accountant's Registration Committee to respond to growing concern over representation of consumer interest in governmental regulation. What House Bill 775 does not do is to set up a second class of accountants and it in no way adversely affects those accountants who have determined for one reason or another not to be regulated. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, by the more explicit definition of the attest function those accountants who are not licensed can clearly and legally engage in functions that now are under question. They can also more easily become CPA's if they so desire. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is supported by the 20,000 members of the...public accountant...Certified Public Accountant's Association and the Department of Registration and Education supports its passage by this House. I earnestly solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler in opposition."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, you folks have heard this Gentleman who filed the Minority Report for the Accountant's Act Study. He didn't tell you that his Bill puts 12,000 accountants out of business. Anyone that is not a CPA cannot do book work or tax work unless they are under the supervision of a CPA. He didn't tell you that in the Study the Department of Justice has reasons to believe, at least they're making a study, that this is a restraintive trade. I could go on and on but the Bill analysis that I find in the Bill Book says, 'the operation of tax services and bookkeeping services could be done only by CPA's under this Bill. I want you to take good note here, this Bill does not give us anything that we already have. It's a new Bill. It leaves out of the Act that he has drawn Section 11 that does give persons other than CPA's the right to a livelihood. And I want a



resounding 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Schlickman to close."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman who just spoke, an unlicensed accountant, has absolutely and completely unfortunately misstated the situation. This is a codification of the 1943 Act. It does, as I said, it has no adverse affect on independent or unlicensed accountants. In fact, this Bill makes it easier for them to be licensed accountants...."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, they...the procedure you explained to us was two minutes each and he can explain his vote but I didn't think that he could also close."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, we can close. Representative...bring your remarks to a close."

Schlickman: "...Advised by the Parliamentarian that I could close and that is in the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "He didn't consult with you, John. Bring you, bring your remarks to a close."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill opens up the practice of accounting to unlicensed accountants. What it doesn't do and what certain people object to is that it doesn't set up a second class of accountants which is contained in another Bill, House Bill 1079, to be considered at a.....date."

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

Schuneman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker, none of the other speakers in favor of a Bill has been permitted to close, is this...."

Speaker Redmond: "They didn't ask for it."

Schuneman: "Procedure we're going to follow?"

Speaker Redmond: "They didn't ask for it."

Schuneman: "Will all speakers be permitted to close...."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, they will."

Schuneman: "From now on?"

Speaker Redmond: "One minute."

Schuneman: "Thank you. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Matijevich, one minute to explain your vote."

Matijevich: "No, Mr. Speaker, all I want to show you is House Resolution 232, 91-F, Bills on Short Debate Calendar shall be called on that order pursuant to Rule 37 but debate shall be limited to two minutes presentation by the Sponsor and a two minute presentation by an opponent. And I think he was out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60... Representative Skinner," to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I understand why you want to get out of here quickly because we have a competing dinner but this is an extremely important Bill and you have an extremely fast gavel there. And I really think..."

Speaker Redmond: "Not fast enough you better hurry up."

Skinner: "I....for your sake...."

Speaker Redmond: "You've got one minute."

Skinner: "For your sake, Sir, I hope you've not become a target of all the CPA's in the state in your next reelection bid."

Speaker Redmond: "Look at my Ethics Statement, you'll find out. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record...Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Is the board open?"

Speaker Redmond: "What...you...you asked recognition, I've recognized you, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Well, to explain my vote but I understand that the... the voting machine is locked which affects my ability and those of other Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, dump the record, give Representative Schlickman a chance to explain his vote. Take a new Roll Call. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schlickman to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, unlike doctors, unlike lawyers, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there are this class or group of accountants, some of whom are licensed and have been licensed for a number of years and who are able by law based on



education and experience perform a third party reliance provision or function which backed to a test, and it's used in financial matters, it's used in governmental matters. The State of Illinois traditionally has allowed certain...other accountants who are not licensed to practice law. This Bill has nothing to do with unlicensed accountants. Rather, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it's trying to clean house of the certified accountants which they want to do. Now, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that there are those who want to be licensed who don't desire to become CPA's, who want to be registered and regulated without the experience requirement. That's contained in another Bill, House Bill 1049, it's an entirely different issue and I'm sorry that they've raised by misstatement the issue and to adversely affect this Bill. The Bill does exactly as I said and I solicit your support."

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

Representative Caldwell to explain his vote."

Caldwell: "This Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is a minority report of a Study Laws Accounting...an Accounting Study Laws Commission. We worked for at least a year, we heard all of the CPA's, we heard the opponents, we heard the people from the University of Illinois who administer this Bill and I'm convinced that this.....this bill is not the best...in the best interest of the accountants of this state. Now, I have all the respect in the world for CPAs but I would submit to you that there are a lot of other people who have made their livelihoods and continue to do so who aren't CPAs but they're damn good accountants. I would suggest a 'no' vote on this Bill because Representative Schlickman was in ...in the study throughout, he listened to all the testimony, this Bill is a product of his reaction and thinking and the majority report which all of you received is the product of the rest of the Commission." I suggest a 'no' vote."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a good Bill. I know that in my daily life, not only in the public but in the private life, that I depend day after day on work done by CPAs because I know that when I get a report from them it's a reliable report that I can bank on. I'm



sure that all of you find yourselves in the same position. This does not put the little public accountant who does tax work out of business but this does strengthen the CPA law on which so many of us depend in government and private life. I don't....I can't understand why you're withholding your vote."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think many Members of the House are getting House Bill 1079 confused. This Bill does nothing more than codify the existing the Certified Public Accountants Act. As Representative Friedrich has very clearly pointed out, it does protect the general public for...going to individuals that are certified public accountants that render opinions dealing with accountancy and with the Internal Revenue Act. And this serves more to serve the citizens of Illinois, it does not put out of business anyone that is doing tax work. But it is a codification, it is a move in the right direction and I think it deserves more green votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Yes, I would like to urge a 'yes' vote on this. I have here a letter from a very prominent woman in Illinois who is a certified public accountant, Mrs. Gertrude Miller, in Chicago and she confirms just what Representative Simms and Representative Schlickman have just said. This is simply a codification of the law as it applies to certified public accountants. It's very much needed. It would be very helpful to many people in this time when people have complicated tax forms, when we do need our statements precisely audited by CPAs. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Schlickman, do you seek recognition?"

Schlickman: "Consideration Postponed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Consideration Postponed. 781, Representative Lucco."
Lucco."

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

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 781...."

Lucco: "Bill 781, oh, I'm sorry."

Clerk Hall: "A Bill for an Act to require state agencies to pay fees for services rendered for them by County Recorders and registrars of



and to amend certain Act in connection therewith. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Sorry and thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 781 is a Bill that's been put together by Art Gottschalk of the Urban Counties Council, passed out of the Executive Committee 19 to nothing. It's the same Bill which was Senate Bill 626 last year which passed both Houses and was vetoed by the Governor. This particular Bill would say that the state and its various agencies would pay as individuals do for registration, certification and so forth at County and Circuit Courts offices. At the present time the states are exempt...or the state is exempt from the payment of those fees. In the adoption of the Constitution the various collection of fees by the county for collection of taxes and so forth by various state, township and other municipal and other tax collecting bodies was taken away from the county and this is a means to restore back to the counties some very much needed revenue. And it would be just taking money from here and there and we would be actually helping the county governments where state universities and other state agencies are prevalent or...or important there and much money would be restored back there which is very badly needed by the counties. So I would solicit an 'aye' vote for House Bill 781."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz in opposition."

Katz: "It seems to me to be an inappropriate time to impose new costs on the State of Illinois. We are sitting here wondering how we're going to get through the next biennium without a tax increase. I really think the Gentleman must be living in the wrong world because if there's anybody that needs help it is the State of Illinois if we're going to get through the next two years without a tax increase. And I would impose any Bill that will impose new and unnecessary costs on the State of Illinois during the next two years which this Bill will do."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



Have all voted who wish? Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I think that Mr. Katz and I have enjoyed the privilege of the same world for a long time but if I'm in a different one tonight, I'm enjoying that also and I respect him very, very much. I do think, however, that this is not a burden on the state particularly, it's just something that is owed to the counties and the counties are hurting and if we don't give them this means of increasing their revenue they will have to come back to us in some other method of increasing their revenue. And I think this would be very, very much apropos to this day."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 'aye' and 52 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. The last Bill. 784, Representative Davis. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, before we get to that last Bill, I, for one, like that Short Debate Calendar. As far as I'm concerned, I'd be amenable to putting everything on a Short Debate Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved we put everything on Short Debate Calendar, all in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Everything Short Debate. Representative Davis."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 784. A Bill for an Act adding Sections in relation to the State Finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Sit down, Representative O'Brien, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr....Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill simply adds this Section to the Finance Act. If you will recall, we were amending all of the Appropriations Bills with these regulations. The Senate objected that it was too many Amendments and all we had to do was amend the Finance Act. We're not changing the Finance Law, we're simply saying to the...to add this Amendment to the Finance Act that the Illinois Fair Employment Practice Commissioner of the United States Legal Employment Practice Commissioner of the United States cannot expend these appropriations upon...in violation of their rules. That's all it says. This is the law."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Anybody dare? And now the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Davis."



Davis, C: "Mr. Speaker, the line is forming at the Soul Food Dinner."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Davis, C: "We appreciate your coming?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.

On this question there's 123 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

Representative Woods Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I was out of the room when 582 was debated...."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you speak up, I can't hear."

Bowman: "Yes, I was out of the room when the vote was taken on 562, Representative Chapman's Bill, which passed. I would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 562?"

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, also, on the following Bill, I did not hear the full debate on it, I would like to be...."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't hear you."

Bowman: "On the following Bill, on House Bill 607, I did not hear the full debate on it, I would like to be...have my vote changed from 'aye' to 'no'. It will not change the outcome...."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to have his vote recorded? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Introduction and First Reading. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2396, Cunningham, Ryan..."

Geo-Karis: "I was wondering if I could have leave to change my vote to 'no' on House Bill 802 because at the time I voted I couldn't change it because it already...."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave?"

Geo-Karis: "Doesn't change the results."

Clerk Hall: "A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey. Committee on Assignment."

Huskey: "...I'd like leave of the House to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bills 818 and 875."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? Hearing no objections leave is granted. Committee Reports."



Clerk Hall: "Representative E. M. Barnes, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations II to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 11, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendations: do pass House Bill 1334. Do pass as amended, House Bill...or Senate Bill 486.

Representative Matijevich, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations I to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 11, 1977, reported back the same with the following recommendations: do pass as amended House Bill 966, 1594 and 1595."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, what's your desire concerning convening tomorrow morning?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ten o'clock."

Madigan: "Did you say 10 o'clock?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ten, yeah. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move to adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved that we adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	12:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond	Constitutional Amendment	
2		Clerk Hall	HJR 26	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Matijevich		
3		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco	Return HB 2256 bact to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	Granted	
		Lucco	Amendment adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
3-4		Friedrich	Return HB 1754 to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1754, #2	
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted	
5		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Daniels	HB 156, leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 156, #2	
		Daniels		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Explain	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Daniels		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	12:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond	Constitutional Amendment	
2		Clerk Hall	HJR 26	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Matijevich		
3		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco	Return HB 2256 back to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	Granted	
		Lucco	Amendment adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
3-4		Friedrich	Return HB 1754 to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1754, #2	
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted	
5		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Daniels	HB 156, leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 156, #2	
		Daniels		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Explain	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Daniels		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
6		Daniels		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan		
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Harris	HB 2320 back to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
7		Harris	#1	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Hart		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bowman		
		Hart		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#2 2322	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hart		
8		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call for attendance	
9		Hart		
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted HB 2322	



3.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	#3, HB 2322
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	#3 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	#4
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	#4 adopted
10		Clerk O'Brien	#5
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
	12:20	Ryan	Excused absence
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	HB 911, question
		Speaker Redmond	
11		Levin	Take 748 off short debate
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Harris	HB 2320, leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	#1, 2 & 3 adopted previously
		Speaker Redmond	
		Harris	Move to reconsider #3
		Speaker Redmond	



4.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Harris	Move to table #3
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	#4
12		Speaker Redmond	
		Abramson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Harris	Accept amendment
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading
		Schlickman	HB 978
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 978, 2nd, no CA
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:26	Clerk O'Brien	#1
13		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Redmond	
14		Houlihan, D.	Question
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading
		Bowman	HB 1911, leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
15		Clerk O'Brien	#3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Distributed?
		Speaker Redmond	Not printed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Houlihan	TOOR	
		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Matijevich	HB 1436 return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bartulis	Point personal privilege	
16		Speaker Redmond		
	12:35	Telceer	Introduction	
		Clerk O'Brien	#2	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Abramson		
		Speaker Redmond		
16-17		Matijevich	Against	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Abramson		
		Speaker Redmond	Fails, 3rd reading	
18		Clerk O'Brien		
		Holewinsky	HB 1820, return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#3	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Terzich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman		
20		Speaker Redmond		
		Byers		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Fails
		Clerk O'Brien	#4
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:45	Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	Oppose
21		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	Question
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	#4
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Redmond	Fails
		Clerk O'Brien	#5
23		Speaker Redmond	
		Taylor	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
	5:52	Schlickman	Oppose

6.



7.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Taylor	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	'aye'
24		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
		Clerk O'Brien	#6
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Printed?
		Byers	Explains Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
25		Mudd	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Yield
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	Asks for order
		Speaker Redmond	
26		Byers	Explains Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:59	Yourell	
27		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	Question
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	#6 lost, 3rd reading
28		Ryan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 613, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	Announcement
29		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	Question
		Katz	
		Jaffe	
30		Speaker Redmond	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
31		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 644, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
32		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
	1:15	Skinner	
32		Speaker Redmond	
		Cunningham	Question
33		Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
34		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
		Ryan	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	HB 644, motion pending	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd		
35		Speaekr Redmond		
		Ewing		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd	Moves Ewing's motion be tabled	
36		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Address motion	
		Mudd	Non-debatable	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mugalian	Question	
		Speaker Redmond	Mudd's motion fails	
	1:25	Yourell		
		Speaker Redmond		
37		Mann	Cast me 'aye'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Yourell		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
38		Madigan	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Telcser		
39		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh	Appeal to the chair	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lechowicz	78 'aye' 84 'no'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Verify	
40		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
	1:35	Clerk Hall	Polls absentees & affirmative	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Withdraw verification	
41		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd	HB 644, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ebbesen	Asks for order	
		Speaker Redmond		
42		Stanley	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Telcser	Approve HB 1375	
		Speaker Redmond	Bill lost	
		DiPrima	In Chair, introduction	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Kinsner, James		
		Bayer, Bob		
43		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk Hall	HB 714, 3rd reading	
44		Speaker Redmond		
		Young	Sponsor	
		Speaker Redmond		
	1:48	Matijeovich	Asks hold Bill	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Redmond		
45		Young		
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Clerk Hall	HB 730, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
45-46	1:52	Pierce	Sponsor	
47		Speaker Redmond		
47-48-49		McPike	Against	
		Speaker Redmond		
50-51		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kosinski	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Frédérich		
		Speaker Redmond		
52-53		Pierce	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:10	Frédérich		
54		Speaker Redmond		
		Dyer		
		Speaker Redmond	HB 730 lost	
55-		Clerk Hall	Consent Calendar, 3rd reading	
56		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	HB 244	
57		Clerk Hall	Proceeds	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Freidrich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipsword		
		Speaker Redmond		
58	2:20	Walsh	Question	
		Speaker Redmond	Bills on Consent Callendar passe	
		Tipsword	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Jaffe		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 737, 3rd reading	
		Lechowicz	In Chair	
60		McCourt		
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Walsh		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	2:30	Walsh	To close	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Neff		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Conti		
61		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 737 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 758, TOOR. 743, 3rd	
		Schlickman	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Hart		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
62		Hanahan		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Tuerk		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Hanahan	Point of order.	
64		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Tuerk		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Hart		
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 758 passed HB 143 2nd	
	2:48	Terzich	HB 743, #4	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Adopted	
65		Terzich	#5	
		Speaker Lechowicz	#5 adopted	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Lechowicz	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 760	
		Jaffe		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Leinenweber		
66		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Jaffe		
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 760, 3rd	
		Dawson		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mann		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Terzich		
67		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk Hall	HB 782, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Telcser	Introduction	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	2:55	Schlickman	Sponsor	
68		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Giorgi	Question	
69-70		Schlickman		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Giorgi	Speaks on Bill
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kosinski	
71		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	
72		Stearney	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Byers	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	3:05	Schlickman	Yield
73		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leinenweber	To close
74		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	Explain vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 782 passed
	3:10	Madison	Introduction
75		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matijeovich	Introduction
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Simms	Leave of House
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jones	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			16.
		Clerk Hall	HB 791, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Richmand	
76		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	Yield
		Richmond	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	Yield?
		Speaker Lechowicz	
77		Richmond	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	Speaks on Bill
78		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mugalian	Question
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Neff	Question
79	3:20	Richmond	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Neff	Proceeds
		Speaker Lechoiwcz	
		Totten	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Richmond	To close
80		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ewell	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Richmond	Explain vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 791 lost
		Clerk Hall	HB 795, 3rd
		Speaker Lechowicz	
81		McBroom	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Lucco	Introduction
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Telcser	Introduction
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		McBroom	Sponsor HB 795
82		Speaker Lechowicz	
		McClain	Yield
	3:30	McBroom	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ryan	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Lechowicz	
83		McClain	Continues
		McBroom	
84		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Byers	
		Deavers	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		McBroom	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Ryan	Explain vote	
85		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Sharp		
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 795 passed	
	3:35	Clerk Hall	HB 802, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Meyer		
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 802	
		Collins	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	3:37	Meyer	Explain vote	
86		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Jaffe	Urge support	
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 802 passed	
		Clerk Hall	HB 806, 3rd reading	
37		Holewinski		
88		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Skinner	Question	
89		Holewinski		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
90-91		Schlickman	Question	
	3:50	Holewinski		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schuneman	Yield	
		Holewinski		
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	19.
		Ebbesen	MPQ	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Holewinski	To close	
92		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Conti	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	3:55	Marovitz		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Wikoff	Vote 'no'	
93		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Levin		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Stearney	Explain vote	
94		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		DiPrima	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Darrow		
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 806 passed	
		Geo-Karis	Introduction	
95		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Telcser		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk Hall	HB 810, 3rd reading	
		Dunn, J.	TOOR	
	4:01	Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20.
		Clerk Hall	HB 818, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Brummet		
96		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schlickman	Yield	
97	4:05	Brummet		
98		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Ewing		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Brummet	To close	
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 818 passed	
		Clerk Hall	HB 830, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Satterthwaite	Sponsor	
99		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Ebbesen	To explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Von Boeckman	Explain vote	
100		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Satterthwaite		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		McCourt		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		DiPrima		
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 830 passed	
101	4:16	Clerk Hall	HB 869, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
102-103		Tipsword Speaker Lechowicz		
104		Geo-Karis Tipsword Speaker Lechowicz	Yield	
105		Hudson Speaker Lechowicz	Against	
106		Leinenweber Tipsword Speaker Lechowicz	Question	
107		Kozubowski Speaker Lechowicz Tipsword Stuffle	MPQ Yield To close	
108		Speaker Lechowicz Rigney Speaker Lechowicz Hanahan Speaker Lechowicz Matijevich	Parliamentary inquiry Support HB 869 passed	
109	4:38	Getty Speaker Lechowicz Madison Speaker Lechowicz	HB 875, 3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 875, 3rd reading	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	Yield
		Getty	
110		Speaker Lechowicz	
111-112		Ryan	Yield
		Getty	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kosinski	
		Speaker Redmond	In Chair
		Taylor	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	
		Getty	
113		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Explain vote
		Speaker Redmond	HB 875 passed, HB's 3rd reading short debate
	4:48	Clerk O'Brien	HB 399, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
114		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
115		Wolf	Question
		Skinner	
	4:52	Speaker Redmond	HB 399 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 432, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greisheimer	
116		Speaker Redmond	
		Chapman	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	23.
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Barnes, E.M.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 491, 3rd reading	
117		Speaker Redmond		
		Winchester		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 504, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Flinn		
118		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner		
		Flinn		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
119		Clerk O'Brien	HB 510, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Pierce		
		Speaker Redmond		
	5:05	Schlickman	Oppose	
120		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 510 lost	
		Pierce		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 513, 3rd reading	
		Schlickman	Sponsor	
121		Speaker Redmond		
		Jacobs	Oppose	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	Explain vote	
122		Speaker Redmond		
		Kosinski	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 513 lost	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 526, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schneider		
123		Speaker Redmond		
		Simms		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schneider		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Sharp		
124		Speaker Redmond		
		Conti		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 528, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
	5:15	Greisheimer		
125		Speaker Redmond		
		Stuffle		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Yourell	Explain vote	
126		Speaker Redmond		
		McMaster	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	25.
		Mudd	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Wolf	Explain vote	
127		Speaker Redmond		
		Robinson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lauer	Explain vote	
128		Speaker Redmond		
		Waddell		
		Speaker Redmond		
	5:29	Greisheimer	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
129		Bluthardt		
		Speaker Redmond		
	5:30	Wolf	Point of personal privilege	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Byers		
130		Speaker Redmond	Passed - HB 528, mudd requests verification	
		Yourell	Poll absentees	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Von Boeckman	'aye'	
		Mudd	Withdraw request	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McBroom	Change to 'yes'	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 550, 3rd reading	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain		
131		Speaker Redmond		
		Greiman	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hart		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
	5:35	Clerk O'Brien	HB 551, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain		
132		Speaker Redmond		
	5:37	Hart	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain		
		Speaker Redmond	HB 551, lost	
133		Stanley		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 562, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Chapman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Yourell	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
134		Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Macdonald	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 562 passed
135		Clerk O'Brien	HB 607, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
	5:40	Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
136		Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
	5:42	Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
137		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 607 lost
138		Clerk O'Brien	HB 640, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brummet	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	
139		Speaker Redmond	
		Brummet	
		Speaker Redmond	640 passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 646, 3rd reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
140		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Lechowicz	
141		Speaker Redmond	
141		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 646 passed
		McLendon	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	HB 723
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	
142		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	
143		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	723 passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 725
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
144		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 725 passed
145		Clerk Hall	HB 746, 3rd reading
	6:08	Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	Oppose
146		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	Explain vote
147		Speaker Redmond	
		Steele, E.G.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	PPC
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	HB 747, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Levin	
148		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 748, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Levin	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk Hall	HB 763, 3rd reading
149		Speaker Redmond	
	6:15	Mugalian	Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mugalian	Explain vote
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Matijevid	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	HB 775, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
150-151		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Birchler	Oppose
152		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevid	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schuneman	Point of order
153	6:25	Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevid	Reads Resolution



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	31.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	Explain vote	
154		Speaker Redmond		
		Caldwell	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich	Support	
155		Speaker Redmond		
		Simms	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Dyer	'yes' vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	PPC	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco		
		Clerk Hall	HB 781, 3rd reading	
156		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Katz	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 781	
157	6:33	Lucco	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond	Lost	
		Matijeivhc	Motion	
		Speaker Redmond	Everything short	
		Clerk Hall	HB 784, 3rd reading	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Redmond	
158		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huskey	
		Speaker Redmond	
159		Clerk Hall	Committee Reports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Adjourn
		Speaker Redmond	Adjourned

