

1.

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

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

Rev. 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.

Henry Ward Beecher said: 'When God wanted sponges and oysters, He made them, and put one on a rock, and the other in the mud.

When He made man, He did not make him to be a sponge, or an oyster; He made him with feet and hands, and head, and heart, with vital blood, and a place to use them, and said to him, "Go, work!"'

Let us pray. Almighty God, the Father and Creator of all things, we come to Thee this day with heartfelt gratitude for the gift of life which Thou hast bestowed upon us; we acknowledge this gift and the responsibility that goes with it. May we ever be worthy of Thy love and may we be willing instruments in the transmittal of that love to our fellow men. As Members of this House of Representatives, may we be given a special power to do that which is meaningful and necessary for the good of Thy creation, thereby making the State of Illinois a better place in which to live and to work; through Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading, Supplemental Consent Calendar, Mr. Clerk. Third Reading, Second Day. Third Reading, yeah, Second Day."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bills, Third Reading, Consent Calendar, Second Day, Group Three. Oh, excuse me. You're right. Group Two starts on page 31. House Bill 614. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 621. A Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 639. A Bill for an Act in relation to sexually dangerous persons. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 641. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 658. A Bill for an Act in relation to educational opportunity discrimination. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill



672. A Bill for an Act relating to sex discrimination in criminal law. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 681. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 706. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 709. A Bill for an Act to amend the Law Enforcement Officers, Civil Defense Workers, Civil Air Patrol Members, Paramedics and Firemen Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 712. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 732. A Bill for an Act to amend the Veterinary Medicine and Surgical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 733. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 738. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 740. A Bill for an Act providing for the organization, operation of mosquito abatement districts. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 761. A Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 773. A Bill for an Act to create the State Council on Nutrition. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 778. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to recorders. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 808. A Bill for an Act to provide insurance for employers who have been rejected by carriers requesting coverage under workmen's compensation. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 827. A Bill for an Act to amend the County Cooperative Extension Law. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 829. A Bill for an Act to amend the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 847. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 859. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to attorneys and counselors. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 872. A Bill for an Act to establish programs to enhance and improve control of high blood pressure. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 873. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Library District Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 874. A Bill for an Act to amend the Local Library Act. Third Reading



of the Bill. House Bill 879. A Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Hazardous Substance Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 880. A Bill for an Act in relation to water works systems. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 889. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Appellate Defender Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 890. A Bill for an Act relating to emergency services and disaster operations. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 893. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 902. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Conservation to sell certain state-owned land in Peoria County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 903. A Bill for an Act in relation to county zoning. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 905. A Bill for an Act concerning the right of medical personnel, medical facilities and persons receiving medical care to be free to act in accordance with their conscience. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 908. A Bill for an Act in relation to criminal identification and investigation. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 910. A Bill for an Act relating to conservation rights and real property. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 822. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 935. A Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 936. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 956. A Bill for an Act in relation to form and cost of publication required by law. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 957. A Bill for an Act concerning fees and salaries. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 968. A Bill for an Act to create the Richard J. Daley Memorial Statue Committee. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 969. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of General Services for the purpose of procuring the creation and placement of a memorial statue to Richard J. Daley. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bills, Third Reading, Supplemental Calendar, Second Day, Group Three. House Bill 979. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1002. A Bill for an Act to prohibit the use of telephone



and telegraphs for sending of messages which are obscene. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1010. A Bill for an Act concerning indecent liberties with a child. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1015. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Uniform Gifts to Minors Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1020. A Bill for an Act to amend the Community Mental Health Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1027. A Bill for an Act in relation to the creation of maintenance, operation and improvement of the Chicago park district. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1052. A Bill for an Act in relation to firearms training for peace officers. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1062. A Bill for an Act vacating a public roadway easement in Kane County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1063. A Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1076. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1077. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1097. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to townships. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1105. A Bill for an Act requiring employees, employers to notify the appropriate licensing-issuing authority of the discharge or suspension for reasons relating to competence of any employee who is a licensed health professional. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1116. A Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Insurance Laws Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1145. A Bill for an Act to vacate an easement in Grundy County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1148. A Bill for an Act to vacate an easement in St. Clair County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1152. A Bill for an Act to vacate an easement in Champaign County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1155. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1157. A Bill for an Act to vacate an easement in Fayette County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1165. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1166. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill. House



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Bill 1167. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1169. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1177. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1179. A Bill for an Act in relation to payment of coal mining rights. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1191. A Bill for an Act to provide for availability of certain health care benefits. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1197. A Bill for an Act in relation to the power of courts of this state to exercise jurisdiction in the matter of child custody. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1198. A Bill for an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1201. A Bill for an Act to amend the Drainage Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1212. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1228. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1230. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1248. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1249. A Bill for an Act to provide the right, to exercise the right of eminent domain. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1252. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1255. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1257. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1279. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Coal Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1283. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1297. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1315. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1327. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1332. A Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bills # 318 and 1098. Passed by the Senate May 11, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been called to our attention that at least one Bill, namely 651 that was on the Short Debate Calendar yesterday, through a printing error does not appear on the Calendar today. It was taken out of the record. I would suggest that all Members consult the Calendar and if any of their Bills met a similar fate, please call it to our attention so we can issue a Supplemental Calendar and include those Bills which through printer's error had been omitted. Any... that was 651. Anybody have a Bill on Third Reading that they want to be returned to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment? If you do, please come up to the Clerk's office... podium here and give us the number. Good morning. Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for unanimous consent to have House Bill 1754 returned to the Consent Calendar. I moved it back to Second yesterday for a technical Amendment. It's the Highway Easement Bill and I think it would speed up the process if we put it back on Consent Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe according to our rules since it has been changed by Amendment, it should go back to that group of four people that we had and have them recommend it."

Friedrich: "All right, fine, but they had agreed to it yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "But that's the best way. We'd get ourselves into a mess."

Friedrich: "I had asked the Majority Leadership yesterday and I thought that had been done, but I'll ask them to do it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Fine, thank you. Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like unanimous consent to bring House Bill

2176..."



Speaker Redmond: "Did you give that to the Clerk?"

Simms: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, when he gets the list, when then we'll go right down them."

Simms: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, do you have a list of those Bills? Okay, we're getting the Amendments together on those. Now, the next... Roll Call for attendance. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Kornowicz is excused because of illness and Representative Domico is excused because of illness and that Representative Laurino is excused to be with his mother who is being operated on today?"

Speaker Redmond: "No objections, the record will so show. Representative Ryan, do you have any excused absences on the Republican side?"

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Kucharski and Ralph Dunn due to illness."

Speaker Redmond: "The record will so show, there being no objections. Agreed Resolutions. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions. The rules say the Members aren't supposed to bother the Clerk, Representative Simms. You're not supposed to bother the Clerk. Doesn't bother Chalkie. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 734, Yourell. 234 is the first one I have. 234, Yourell. 235, Matejek. 236, Kelly. 237, Dawson. 238, Pechous. 239, Yourell. And 240, Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 234 by Yourell honors the 50th Golden Wedding Anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. Drawert. 235 by Matejek honors the Polish-American Democratic Club of City of Chicago Heights. House Resolution 236 by Kelly denotes the Silver Anniversary of the Homewood Baptist Church. 237 by Dawson talks about James Panagas. 238 by Pechous talks about the American Sokol Organization of Berwyn, Illinois. Yourell, House Resolution 239, the 100th birthday of Oak Lawn. And House Resolution 240 by Terzich talks about St. Symphorosa and her seven sons Paris. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."



Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries and the Resolution's adopted. Any further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 233, an additional one on Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "House Resolution by Christensen, 233, talks about Paul Scott's 50th Wedding Anniversary. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Resolution's adopted. Any further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of Representative Lucco, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce a class that is from the 47th Legislative District, ably represented by Representative McMaster, myself and Representative Neff. They are located on the Democratic side. I don't know there's any significance to that, but I'd like to welcome the sixth grade class from Cambridge, Illinois. Their teachers, Mr. Ramley and Mrs. Becker. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on Executive, to which the following Resolutions were referred; action taken May 12, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations: be adopted House Resolution 112, tabled in Committee House Resolution 77."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. We're going to take a limited number of House Bills, Third Reading where the Members want to have Bills returned to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment. Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction. From the home town of Representative Jack Davis, the eighth grade class of Beecher Elementary Schools, accompanied by the Principal Bob Guthrie,



Bill Mitchell, Marilyn Anan. The eighth grade from this school, back here, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, have you got any Bill numbers?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 651, Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 651 is now on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Beatty desires to have this returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beatty. Amends House Bill 651 on page 1, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "With leave of the House, I'd like to table Amendment #1 because that's just embodied in Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Amendment #1 is tabled."

Beatty: "Amendment #2 speaks to the problems with the Bill, reduces the amount that these people will be getting and takes this, changes the title back to arbitrator rather than industrial injuries judge and also does not tie any salary increase in the future for the judges' scale but keeps it on its own basis. And I ask for a adoption of Amendment #2."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Just for the record. Amendment #1 on 651 was tabled. Amendment #2 on 651 was adopted. Next number, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1699."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. 1699. Representative Pullen. Does she have leave to return this to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, returned to the order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Schlickman. Amends House Bill 1699 on page 1, line 3 and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very simple Amendment. It simply provides that townships in counties of over one million may by referendum acquire open space. This would extend to those townships the same privilege that is now extended to townships below a million and over two hundred and fifty thousand. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen, any observations with respect to Amendment #1? No objection, the question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read another one."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1784."

Speaker Redmond: "1784, what is that one? I don't see it in my Calendar. 1784? I don't see that one on the Calendar. We'll have to check that. Take it out of the record temporarily. What is it? It's on page 39, they tell me. It's a Supplemental Consent Calendar. Representative Neff, you want to remove it from the Supplemental Consent Calendar?"

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I have a technical error in the Amendment #1 which was placed on this and, therefore, I need to move it back to Second Reading to remove this Amendment and add the correct Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff, the procedure is that if you take it off of the Supplemental Consent Calendar and return it to the Order of Second Reading and amend it, it then goes back on the Regular Calendar. It does not go back on the..."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just leave it on. It's just about one word, technical error and we'll remove it in the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, but my point is that it does not go back automatically on the Consent Calendar, it goes back on the Regular Calendar. And to get it on the Consent Calendar, you would have to have the four-man Committee meet. Now, the question that I have for you, Mr. Neff, is do you want to leave it on the Consent



Calendar and attempt to make the change in the Senate or do you desire to make it here?"

Neff: "I would like to make it in the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I think that's wise. Will you read another number? Will all unauthorized persons leave the floor? We're going to have to escort them out pretty soon. Noise level is inexcusable. It may be the fault of the members, but at this point I can't tell. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 477 on Consideration Postponed, page 41 on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "477. 477. Where is this Bill? On page 41, Consideration Postponed is the order of business. Representative Beatty is requesting that it be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. It's on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beatty. Amends House Bill 477 by deleting lines 33, 34, 35 on page 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what this Amendment does is ties any future increases of salaries... it cuts it away from the judicial salary, merely leaves this... these commissioners salaries on their own. So anytime they wish an increase, they have to come in here to get it and I ask adoption of this Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Returned to the Order of Consideration Postponed. Third Reading. Read another number, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1978, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "1978. Representative Yourell requests leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Collins-Yourell. Amends House Bill 1978 on page 2, line 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1978 makes technical Amendments, changes in the Bill that are necessary. But more importantly than that, it provides for the Judges of election and for the method of retention. And that's very important and I... shifts it back to the election of each even numbered year. The Bill calls for the odd numbered years and this is in the consolidation of elections under the code and I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1978."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Any other Bills?" Got any numbers, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "2322."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As we are sort of in a lull here, I would wonder if it would be proper at this time if I could ask leave of the House to waive the rules concerning posting so we can have a supplemental posted for Monday. Would that be appropriate at this time, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Barnes: "Well, for the record, Mr. Speaker, I would request leave for Senate Bill 318 to be heard Monday."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Any objection? Hearing no objection, posting rule... 318 to post. 2322. 2322 appears on the Order of House Bills, Third Reading. Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, I'd like to ask the Clerk, this Bill was taken back and we put some Amendments on the other day and then some of them were not circulated. How far did we get? Did we have... put Amendment #4 on? All right, I think we adopted Amendment #4 and this would be



Amendment #5. I explained the Amendment the other day. It wasn't circulated. I move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

Hart: "Is it back to Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's asked leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 2322 is now on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Hart. Amends House Bill 2322..."

Hart: "I move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Hart: "I've got the next Bill, too. It's 2325."

Speaker Redmond: "2325, he asks leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Hart. Amends House Bill 2325..."

Hart: "This Amendment would reduce the appropriation from two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars to one hundred and eighty-seven thousand, five hundred dollars and I move for the adoption of the reducing Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Mann. On Third Reading appears House Bill 1915. Representative Mann requests that that be returned to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Amendment. 1915."

Clerk O'Brien: "Is there an Amendment filed, Representative Mann?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann, I... I guess it's on the Order



of Second Reading already. It's not Third Reading. It appears on page 4. 1915."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I yield for a moment to Representative Leinenweber. I just want to indicate that the Gentleman has offered an Amendment which he thinks threatens... strengthens the Bill and I'm perfectly willing to let it go on."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1915. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, there is one Amendment from the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends House Bill 1915 on page 1 by deleting lines 10 through 31."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "There is an Amendment offered by Representative Leinenweber which he feels will strengthen the Bill and I concur in its being put on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber, to explain the Amendment."

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly the Amendment #1, formula #1 to House Bill 1915 is basically technical in nature. It, in my opinion, clarifies some of the definitional problems that I found exist in the Bill. It also closes what I felt was an unintentional loophole and I... as Representative Mann points out, we worked this out with staffs on both sides of the aisle and as Representative Mann points out, it's now an Agreed Amendment that I think definitely improves the Bill. And I would move its adoption."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "You want that... the Order of Third Reading now, Representative?—Third Reading. Representative Brummer, do you have a Bill on Third Reading you want returned to the Order of Second



Reading for an Amendment? Relatively uncontroversial. I thought you had a matter on Second Reading that we could..."

Brummer: "I have a matter on Second Reading. It's not on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, you want to proceed with that one? What's the number?"

Brummer: "1958."

Speaker Redmond: "1958. 1958 appears on page 4. It's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1958. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Representative Madigan, will you come to the podium?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, McGrew. Amends House Bill 1958 on page 1, line 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew. Representative McGrew on the floor? Representative Brummer, what's your wishes with respect to Amendment #1?"

Brummer: "Amendment #1 does not deal with the substantive portion of the Bill or the issue that I was addressing. I would not support Amendment #1. Here comes Representative McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 addresses the problem that we've had in school finance since last year. What it is addressing itself to quite frankly is the impaction aid part of the school aid formula. As some of you that have some of these districts in your school districts in your legislative district may know, last year in about October after the school districts were already into their normal budget, they received a phone call from I.O.E. or a letter that said, 'Sir, we just cut out your impaction aid.' Now, this amounted to \$2.2 million. They had no foreknowledge and it seems apparent that the same thing is probably down the road for them again. What Amendment #1 does is add the words, 'and such facility as located in that district'. In essence, what we're saying is that school districts that have a state-facility in their school districts will receive impaction aid. Those that are located adjacent to such a facility will not.



This will cut the cost more than half. The total appropriation for that would be less than \$1.1 million on a straightforward basis. Actually, the total cost will be something more closely to five hundred thousand because the school districts are switching from Strayer-Hague plus impaction aid to the resource equalizer and recouping part of that loss. This is an opportunity to fund the three school districts of Macomb, Charleston and Normal that truly have an impaction aid problem. And I would move for its adoption or answer questions."

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

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the... House Bill 1958 addresses itself to a problem which resulted from a multiplier being certified to school districts after the time that they statutorily were required to file their tax levy ordinance. The Amendment #1 addresses itself to a totally different and separate section of the School Aid Code. It addresses itself to Strayer-Hague issues and impaction issues. It is not a relevant portion with regard to this Bill and, therefore, I would prefer that it, that Amendment not be adopted. It is not a question that we were addressing in the Bill. I think it is an item which should be a separate consideration in a separate Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge you to aid my distinguished colleague, my Democratic colleague in his efforts to help the 54th District. Vote 'no' on this Bill, on this Amendment. It doesn't make any sense to handicap Representative Brummer's efforts to help the Effingham and 54th District. Representative McGrew is a strong horse and he can find somewhere else to tag his Bill on. But if you put it on this Bill, it'll handicap... too bad in the big race. Vote 'no' and we'll take care of McGrew on another Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's going to be a number of Amendments offered to this Bill. I would just like to say that we looked at this particular problem in the Subcommittee on school finance on the House Education



Committee and we came to the conclusion that this was a severe problem and one that ought to be dealt with and it doesn't only affect the 54th District. It affects a number of districts across the state. It's an item that ought to stand alone and be considered on its individual merits. I'm not here to discuss the merits of any of the other Amendments that may be proposed, but I'm here to say to you that it is a serious problem all across the state. House Bill 1958 addresses that problem specifically and it should be addressed that way. Each of these other suggestions that are going to be made are items that ought to stand alone rather than confuse the issue. So for that reason, I would oppose all attempts to amend House Bill 1958."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to Amendment #1. The Bill as it stands is a necessary Bill not only for the parochial interests of Representative Cunningham as he seems to think it is, but for the entire state where you have a school district that hasn't anticipated correctly what the state Department of Local Governmental Affairs is going to do with their multipliers. Now, I would submit that school district officials ought to be able to figure this out by now, but apparently some can't. The Amendment offered is not a bad concept. It's a heck of a lot better than the state impaction aid formula is now which gives money to school districts that just have state employees living in them whether or not an institution exists in that particular district. But I would suggest that there is no justification whatsoever for any impaction aid. We have the resource equalizer formula in a somewhat gutted form, I will admit; but nevertheless if the local assessment base is not there because of a state institution which is nonassessed, then extra state aid comes from state government to replace that. Now, we didn't give any special privileges to Rockford because they're the highest assessed county in the State of Illinois. We told them they could go jump. I would suggest we tell the university towns the same thing - no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew. Pardon me, Representative Stuffle."



Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, I thought there were other speakers. I rise to move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Representative McGrew, to close."

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let me correct some erroneous statements. The Gentleman from Crystal Lake said that we did not have special legislation. I wish he would listen for a moment. Mr. Skinner, I would like to correct the record. You indicated that we did not pass any special legislation for Rockford because of their particular situation. I submit to you that you are totally wrong. We, in fact, did do a very special Bill that was introduced in the Senate by Senator Hickey and it is now on the state statutes for Rockford alone. Now, to the real merits of this issue. What we are attempting to do is to protect those school districts in the State of Illinois that have the state facility located in their districts. This is the real meaning of impaction aid as alluded by Representative Skinner. The only objection as it has been voiced that has any credence is that it doesn't belong on this Bill. Well, you all know the deadline is passed for new legislation. If we are indeed to make a good correction, then it must be made in a Bill of this form. I submit to you it's a good Amendment and a good Bill and we need both. Thank you."

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

Skinner: "Well, fortunately, the Gentleman mentioned my name in debate and so I rise to a point of personal privilege. I would point out that the Bill to which he refers was not passed this Session, that the Bill Representative Simms introduced to benefit Winnebago County which is still being taken to the cleaners by the state aid formula was tubed in a Subcommittee of which the... of the Committee on which the Gentleman served. I would further submit that as a Member of the House Elementary and Secondary Committee,



if he really has a Bill he can sell to his colleagues who know more about the state aid formula than as a general Member of the General Assembly that he can bring a Committee Bill out of Committee. And that ought to be sufficient reason to kill his Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think those people that should know what district this is going to help and if you live in Macomb or Charleston or Mantino, I would suggest that you support this. Otherwise, I would suggest you do not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. Come to order. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 28 'aye' and 80 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Kane. Amends House Bill 1958 on page 11, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #2 does to House Bill 1958 is to make the same change that we made two years ago in the state aid formula. It was passed by both the House and the Senate. Unfortunately, it was vetoed by the then Governor. What the Amendment says is that whenever a school district passes a referendum to increase the education or operations building and maintenance fund tax rates by direct referendum, then the school district would receive increased state aid to match that increased tax rate in the school year following the passage of the referendum. This would eliminate the two year lag that presently is in the formula. The school aid formula that we have is a reward for effort formula and what school districts and school administrators and teachers have been telling their school districts when they come up with referendums is that if you pass an increased tax rate, then the state will give you more money. Unfortunately with the two year lag, the people in the



districts feel that they're being sold out because what often happens is that in the school year following the passage of the referendum, their state aid actually decreases rather than increases. And they feel that they've been sold a bill of goods by their school administrators and by their local politicians. This Amendment addresses that problem and what it would do simply is to say that those school districts that increase their tax rates by referendum is that they will be rewarded for that effort as the formula indicates in the following year rather than two years later which essentially means three school years after a referendum is passed, that a school district receives credit for that increased tax rate. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hoffman: "What is your estimate of the cost of this Amendment, Representative Kane, for the coming fiscal year?"

Kane: "When this Amendment was put on House Bill 535 which was your Bill two years ago, the estimated cost at that time was approximately six to seven million dollars. That, I believe, is high for this year because at that time, there were a number of large school districts that had passed referendums which would have been eligible. The two years have run, so those school districts are eligible for increased state aid anyway next year. So I would estimate that the cost of this Amendment to increase entitlement is probably in the neighborhood of three to four million dollars."

Hoffman: "All right, fine. Thank you very much, I think that particular figure is somewhere in the ballpark. Let me make a couple of three points in reference to what the Sponsor of the Amendment said. Number one, school districts who pass tax rate increases if, in fact, their state aid is reduced at some future point in time, it's caused by problems other than the increase in the tax rates. It caused either a reduction in the enrollment in the school numerically which we addressed last Session with the three year average or, in fact, their assessed valuation has been increased in the meantime. And, therefore, they qualified for more local



aid. We did attempt to deal with this in a previous Session and were unsuccessful. Seems to me that the seriousness of the problems that are raised by House Bill 1958 as opposed to the suggestions that are going to be made by the various Amendments is so great and affects so many of our school districts across this state that I must restate my opposition to all Amendments to House Bill 1958 so we can address that issue by itself and separately and not confuse it with any other Amendments. So for that reason, I rise again in opposition to an Amendment to House Bill 1958."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I share the point of view that the Brummer Bills as they are presently drafted without Amendments seriously deal with the problem that has to be resolved very soon. I think once we begin the burden that proposal and his concept with Amendments that we face again the serious problem of a total veto and/or the problem of trying to deal with an amendatory veto later on. So I would suggest again we defeat this Amendment and others that are pending on the floor at that time. So I vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I'd move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put?"

Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Amendment does is reward, is increase and make more direct the concept of reward for effort that is a foundation of our present school aid formula. What we're saying in the school aid formula that if a school district increases its tax rates, then they will be rewarded by increased state aid. At the present, however, that connection is very tenuous. And what this Amendment does is make it more direct and shorten the time period from probably now a realistic two and a half years to the following year. What happens is that school districts do not pass tax rate increases by referendum until they have severe financial problems and we need



to give them the aid when they need it. It's been said that what we'd need to do is to keep this Bill clean and that we should be introducing separate legislation to take care of these problems. Well, I was assured during this whole Session by the leadership of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee that that Committee was going to consider all proposals for changes in the school aid formula and come out with a Committee Bill. And so I was waiting until they had a hearing so that they could come out with a Committee Bill and I was going to present this proposal to them at that time. However, they changed the game plan at the last minute and they decided to reject the idea of coming out with a Committee Bill which I think was the appropriate way to come. And for all these reasons, I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 38 'aye' and 71 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails and the Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Kane. Amends House Bill 1958 on page 12 by inserting immediately after line 12 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #3 does is also address itself to the problem of reward for effort, making the reward to our local school districts more direct and more immediate. What Amendment #3 does is to remove the 25% limitation on increased state aid in any one year for that portion of the state aid which would reflect the higher tax rate that has been approved by direct referendum. In response to the same question that Representative Hoffman asked me on the second Amendment, I would estimate that this Amendment would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of one million dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, again, I introduced 1958 with regard to a specific



problem. This Amendment deals with a different problem. I guess it's my unfortunate situation of being a freshman and handling a Bill here, the first Bill that I'm handling that suddenly it's very popular with regard to other people attempting to attach Amendments. I would respectfully request a 'no' vote on this."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we understand what this Amendment does. It removes the 25% limitation on increased state aid for that portion of increased state aid that reflects the increased tax rate that have been passed by referendum by the people in a school district. I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The 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 wished? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see that this Amendment is going the way of the last. I think they're both good Amendments but while we're in the process and obviously it's not going to change either, could I have unanimous consent to be recorded as 'aye' on Amendment #2?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait until we conclude this, Representative Waddell. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 34 'aye' and 82 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Now, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement and introduction. Forty business and professional women from Mendota, Illinois, in the 38th District represented by Representative Roxsey, Ewing and Breslin. Will you please stand?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, I've been authorized by our leader, Art Telcser, to introduce up in the gallery, Bill Watson. Let's hear it for Bill Watson."



Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Brady. Amends House Bill 1958 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. Amendment #4 is a very serious Amendment and if I could, we would say that the Bill in the Sponsor's present form deals with the problem of forgiveness. It's suggesting that in his area of the state they'll be dramatically hurt if they don't have forgiveness on their portion of the money that they get from the state aid formula and they'd have to return it to the General Revenue Fund a year later. What my Amendment does is give forgiveness for an area in the north-eastern corner of the state, Chicago, to be specific, that has very drastic and dramatic troubles in meeting its financial commitments and keeping quality education in its school. This Amendment, I believe, in the full funding that we will achieve will will not dramatically affect any other area of the state. It impacts two years from now and will mean that Chicago will not have to give back in a penalized form money to the state. This is the same principle that the Sponsor is trying to achieve in his Bill where he said because of the way that they approach the recommendations for funding in their area, they are going to be penalized. I submit to you that we're all for quality education for the children of the State of Illinois. I would hope that we're as much for it for the children of Chicago as the children of Representative Brummer's area and I urge your favorable consideration of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen and especially those new Members that are in their first term, I remind you Section 1812 of the School Code before it was amended last year by House Bill 1 provided that a school district which failed to have a legal school calendar of 176 days of children's attendance, would have their state aid claim reduced by 1% for each day short of the legal school calendar. House Bill 1 changed that penalty for each day short from 1% to .56818 which is 1/178th. Chicago's



penalty under that law went it was a 1% per day penalty amounted to fifty-three million, two hundred and fifty-seven thousand, five hundred and twelve dollars. Then as a result of House Bill 1 in changing that 1% to .56818, the penalty was reduced and I point out to you it was reduced to thirty million, two hundred fifty-nine thousand, eight hundred and fifty-three. One-third of this penalty or ten thousand, eighty-six... ten million, eighty-six thousand was assessed this year for fiscal year 1977. Amendment #4 to House Bill 1958 would cancel, would cancel the next two years of the penalty which would amount to ten million the first year and ten million the second year or over twenty million dollars that rightfully should go to all the school children in the State of Illinois. And I very, very respectfully request a 'no' vote on House Bill #4 so that we can put that twenty million dollars back into effect for all the children in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I was not here last Session. I was not involved in the readjustment of the penalty for the early closing of the Chicago schools. I am not fully acquainted with that situation. That is not my Bill. I would prefer that this matter be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join Representative Brummer in urging you to recognize that the problems are not comparable. We sympathize with the problem presented by the maker of the Amendments, but the numbers here are so out of proportion, a hundred times as much money involved in the Amendment as involved in the original Bill. The original Bill doesn't seek to touch on the question of lack of school attendance. It's a technicality in regard to computation of the rate. Vote 'no' as you voted on the other. The piranha mustn't piggyback to ruin the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as with the other Amendments, I think we ought to vote this one down, keep this Bill



clean. If Representative Brady wants a separate Bill dealing with Chicago again, why, I think we should consider it. But I don't think we should put it on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "One must admire the proposals to rip off the state government that some of the Chicago Representatives come up with. This one is truly monumental. The Sponsor says that all of us are for quality education. He's certainly correct, but I would suggest there is a significant difference between those from Chicago who will support this Amendment and those of us from the rest of the state who hope they will oppose it. The difference is that Chicago wants us to pay for their quality education while we're willing to pay for our own. Representative Brummer's Amendment is an attempt or his Bill is an attempt to allow local taxpayers to pay for quality education. The Sponsor's Amendment, on the other hand, wants us to pay for their strike two years or last year. There's absolutely no reason that anyone outside of the City of Chicago should vote for this Amendment because if it passes and this Bill is enacted, your school district's state aid to education will go down. And that money will be transferred to the City of Chicago's school district. For that reason, I would respectfully ask for a negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall... on... Representative James Houlihan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

J. Houlihan: "Representative Brady, when this controversy was discussed, various alternatives were recommended and it was my feeling that the Board of Education acted irresponsibly in choosing the alternative to close schools rather than some of the other reductions in administrative costs. If we forgive them this penalty, won't we be encouraging them to if they face a dollar crunch in future years, to close school early and not give the students there their required number of days?"

Brady: "Well, Representative Houlihan, I certainly hope not. What I'm trying to say, though, is that I'm not for forgiving a Board anything."



I'm for trying to improve the quality of education for our children as well as the children in the rest of the state and I think we need a required amount of money to do that. If we're faced with a situation where we take one area of the state and are under drastic financial problems and penalize them further while giving to another area of the state a forgiveness of a great deal of money, I don't see much equity in the situation. I'm not here standing and saying what the Chicago Board of Education or any Board does is holy, true and right. I'm for trying to make them respond as best they can and as best we can get them to respond to the needs of our school children. But I don't think that they can adequately meet that responsible need if we don't give them the tools and the money to do it. And that's what I'm trying to do."

J. Houlihan: "Are you aware that the Chicago Board of Education is the only Board, at least the only one that I've come across, that does not release the names of its employees, will not make them available and some of the other districts downstate are districts that actually publish those names in a local paper for general circulation?"

Brady: "Representative, I am not aware of that and I would agree to work with you to try and make that list public and available and any way you want to do it, whether it's by statute or whether it's by us getting together and talking with them, I'm totally in favor of what you're asking for."

J. Houlihan: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, it's been alleged to me that we downstaters shouldn't be concerned by this Amendment because it doesn't affect us. But indeed it affects us to the tune of twenty million dollars over a two year period. Representative Polk clearly pointed out correctly that last year an agreement was made to reduce the penalty which had been on the books for years and indeed it reduced the penalty by twenty million dollars for Chicago. Now, after the agreement was made on that Bill and the people who were here remember that, I wasn't a Member then. I remember quite well from working on it in the Senate. The agreement was there. Now



-- you come back and try and wipe out the rest of the agreement.

And I think that's unfair to the downstaters and it's unfair to Representative Brummer's Bill to put this Amendment on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady, to close."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. There have been several interesting comments made with reference to this Amendment. Among them - rip-off, among them - it affects us greatly, it affects something else. Well, let me tell you what we have here in front of us. We have an Amendment to a Bill that affects all of us. It affects education in Illinois. We're asking for a change in the formula in the Bill and we're asking for it in the Amendment. The estimates of the cost of the Bill range far beyond that, of the estimates of the cost of the Amendment even in proportion to the area of children served. I would ask you please to consider that what we're looking for here is an equity position in trying to educate the children of the State of Illinois. We're not trying to take money that won't be available which would be redistributed to other areas. I, for one, am pressing for full funding this year. If we don't achieve it, I sure hope we... there next year. And if we're there next year, all it means is that we will not be penalized in giving money back to some other area of government that we can expand and use the money for but will keep it in education where we desperately need it. In the area of Chicago, we need it all over the state. We need it in Representative Brummer's area, but I think we have to look at this as a situation that affects all of Illinois. We have a serious affect happening here in Chicago in my area and I urge your favorable consideration of this Amendment to put this Bill in shape that gives equity to all of us."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't want to hear this nonsense about our Bill, his Bill because when the thing becomes law, it becomes all of our Bills. And I think that we of the City of Chicago... Could I have just a little order?"



Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Ewell: "I'm tired today..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Ewell: "Wait, I haven't finished."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Ewell: "My voice is a little weak today and I can't yell as loud.

But I want to point out to you Members who are voting in the red talking about this will take a little money from your district downstate or somewhere else, we in the City of Chicago are the prime providers of the sales tax and we don't ask you to give us all the dollars that we kick in in the sales tax back to us. We in Chicago are the prime providers of the racetrack money, but we don't talk to you about your fairs, state fairs and tell... ask you to justify why the City of Chicago should have to pay for 'em. We provide the income tax and we don't wit up and cry simply because you want to dip into General Revenue for all your particular items. We provide the fuel tax in the City of Chicago that supports the state road system, but yet we don't cry to you and tell you why don't you just let us keep all of our money. We in the City of Chicago, we share with the rest of the state. Now, we ask the rest of the state very simply why not share with us? Now if we were asking it for the adults, I can understand. But we're asking this for the school kids of the City of Chicago. We all know we have a great problem there and I think you people are reluctant to perform your duties. I think you owe it to the City of Chicago because you remember, we're going to get to the Appropriation Bills and you're going to be asking for yours. All we ask for is just a little help and a little sympathy from some of you other Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 54 'aye' and 82 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Richmond. Amends House Bill 1958 on page 14, line 16 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

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



This Amendment applies the same concept as contained in House Bill 1958 to those school districts that's experienced an unexpected increase in 1975 equalized assessed valuation over that of 1974 and, therefore, lost state aid for the 1976-77 school year. House Bill 1958 applies to the 1976 equalized assessed valuation compared to that of 1975. Down in my part of the state there are some districts that are in dire need of this type of legislation and I earnestly urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer. Representative Brady, please be seated. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Richmond, will you please be seated?"

Brummer: "Just distributed, I think. I had checked with Illinois Office of Education with Bob Pyle. I understand that this, the dates are such that we cannot do this. I just... I don't know if that's correct or not, but again it addresses itself to a different year, to a similar problem, and in keeping the Bill clean, I would prefer that this matter not be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman. Representative Campbell, please be seated. Representative Deuster, be seated."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Subcommittee of the House Elementary and Secondary Education Committee gave very serious consideration and heard considerable testimony upon House Bill 1958. I had the Amendment proposed by Mr. Richmond dropped on my desk about five minutes ago. We heard, we did not hear from any of these school districts during our consideration. I think one of the compounding problems is the problem that was alluded to by the Sponsor of the Bill and that is the timing. The reason we have the particular timing in the Bill that we have is because it can be addressed from this point in time. I am not certain at this time that we could address the problem timely that Representative Richmond brings to us in Amendment 5. He, of course, is to be commended for looking out for X-number of districts in his area. We have no idea what this would cost, but again because we've spent so much time and so much study on House Bill 1958, in all due deference to the fine



Sponsor, I must rise in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment presented by Representative Richmond does much to help school districts in our area. We passed a law in this last General Assembly that was to adjust the assessing in the various districts and various areas. We have many rural areas where the assessed valuation is going up drastically in those areas, meaning that the local support because of increased state aid... increased assessment. That means less state aid and we have to do something to help those small districts that are being penalized by this increase of adjustments caused by this General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, will the Sponsor of the Amendment, yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Richmond, this seems to be the most incomprehensible piece, written document I've ever seen in my life. Would you run that by once more? What is the net effect of this Amendment?"

Richmond: "The net effect would be that, well, personally I'd say that the Bill without this Amendment applies to the 1976 equalized assessed valuation compared to that of 1975. The net effect of my Amendment would be that it would take it back one more year because that is the year that a great number of changes were made and that had the biggest effect, adverse effect on a great number of our school districts. As to the cost, it, of course, doesn't cost anymore, but it's just going to be so many..."

Leinenweber: "I'm not asking what it costs. Just tell me this. What type of situation is this meant to help? Is this the type of situation where you have a large increase in assessed valuation in the local school districts, this would give additional state aid to that type of district? Is that the situation?"

Richmond: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, one of the... as I understand the purpose of the school aid formula, it was as much as



possible insured that an equal amount of money would be spent on each child of the state regardless of the local situation. Obviously, if a district has an increase in assessed valuation, they're going to have more local tax revenues coming in and should correspondingly receive less state tax revenues which should go to those districts that either have the decreasing assessed valuation who are relatively stable. So it seems to be quite out of step with the idea of... of the school aid formula and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond, to close."

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

In answer to Representative Brummer's doubt about whether it was too late or not to have this type of action or Amendment placed on this Bill and whether or not could be implemented, the answer is that there is plenty of time and we just had this word... it's just checked through I.O.E. I simply ask for your support of this Amendment. It's badly needed. We do have some districts... it's true that once the assessed valuation goes up, you'll have more taxes in the future, but we're talking about the 'hold-harmless' part of this piece of legislation. And in order to keep a few districts in my area from absolutely almost going out of business, this is very direly needed. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 59 'aye' and 74 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill 1119. Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris has asked leave to return House Bill 1119 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1119, on the



Order of Second Reading. Is there an Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Harris. Amends House Bill 1119 on page 1, line 8 by deleting the word 'river'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to have leave for Amendment #1 that it be adopted."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "What is the effect of deleting the word 'river'?"

Harris: "It was a technical error, Mr. Schlickman, and the word 'river' should never have been in the Bill in the first place."

Schlickman: "It's nonsubstantive then. Thank you."

Harris: "Thank you."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1206. Representative McClain asks leave to return 1206 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted and returned to the Order of Second Reading. There an Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, McClain. Amends House Bill 1206 on page 1, line 13 and so forth."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to 1206 reduces the minimum salary for teachers in the State of Illinois. I've listened to the concerns of Bill Walsh and Harlan Rigney and Rolly Tipsword and because of their concerns that maybe my sights were a little bit too high on the minimum, I reduced the minimum salary from ninety-five hundred to ninety-two hundred and then incrementally, I've reduced every increment by one hundred dollars also because of their concerns. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to 1206."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."



Walsh: "The Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Walsh: "I see that the estimate of cost at the local level, local school boards is about five million, four hundred thousand dollars with the original Bill. What would that estimate be with your Amendment, if adopted?"

McClain: "Mr. Walsh, I don't know. I'm trying to get that figure. It would reduce substantially the cost effect. My understanding, I had a computer printout on what school systems had their starting salary around ninety-two hundred, nintey-three hundred and increment problems, so I tried to bring it down to be sort of equal to the average there. I'll get that figure to you, Sir, as soon as I receive it. I won't call the Bill until I receive those figures."

Walsh: "Would you leave the Bill on Second Reading until we receive those figures?"

McClain: "Well, Mr. Walsh, I'd just as soon not because I don't want to end up having a variety of Amendments for every person that maybe had a School Aid Bill defeated in Committee or on the House floor trying to amend 1206 for that purpose. I'd like to bring it back to Third and as soon as I get that figure, I'll come to you."

Walsh: "It's been pointed out to me that there are two Amendment #1's. I wonder if the Clerk would... Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, can you illuminate?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Well, they've discovered this error upstairs and we don't... we only have one Amendment 1 down here. We don't have any other Amendment."

Walsh: "And that Amendment is Mr. McClain's."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Amendment we have is Mr. McClain's."

Walsh: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been quite a few organizations who've indicated some interest in this Bill and I think Representative McClain is attempting to meet the needs of all those people, to meet the needs of some of them anyway. And



by this Amendment itself, it will reduce the cost that we were concerned about. Now whether you're for or against the Bill, I think... the Amendment is correct. I think the Amendment should go on in case the Bill gets out. It will reduce the cost to the local school districts and I would certainly support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, you seeking recognition?"

The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Are you the bearer of another Amendment, Representative McClain? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I understand that Representative Luft did not intend to offer that other Amendment. Perhaps it ought to be tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you have an Amendment #2 to House Bill 1206, Representative Luft? It's not down here so we can't... we'll just have to..."

Luft: "If it is filed, I'll ask leave to table it."

Clerk O'Brien: "I have another Amendment shown as Amendment 1 from Representative Luft to House Bill 1206."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Luft."

Luft: "If that's on file, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to table it."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #2. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Yeah, just for the record..."

Speaker Redmond: "If we could have leave to change the numbering of this on it's face to make it Amendment #2, then Representative Luft's motion is to table Amendment #2. Is there any objection? Hearing none... Amendment #1 is adopted, Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Mahar, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask for a Republican Conference in Room 118, about thirty minutes, lunchtime."

Speaker Redmond: "We have one more Bill to go back to Second Reading. Which number is that? 1615? 1650. 1650, Representative Marovitz."



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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz asks leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1650 is on the Order of Second Reading. Is there any Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Marovitz. Amends House Bill 1650 on page 1 by deleting lines 13 through 18 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an Amendment that was prepared in conjunction with representatives from the Governor's office, the members of the Illinois State Medical Society, the Department of Public Health, and the Sponsor of the Bill. It creates a Technical Advisory Council made up of doctors, pharmacists and pharmacologists to prepare a positive formulary for the operation of the generic drug bill in which only those drugs that are listed on the positive formulary may be substituted."

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

Polk: "Well, to my distinguished colleague from Cook County, I ask a question. You indicated that the Governor... are you indicating that the Governor is supporting this now?"

Marovitz: "I am indicating that the Governor does support this Amendment. The Governor has indicated publicly that if the Bill gets to his desk, he will sign the Bill and he and his representatives were in a meeting with us preparing this Amendment. And this is an Agreed Amendment between the Governor's office, the Illinois State Medical Society, the Department of Public Health and the Sponsor."

Polk: "Thank you, Mr. Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Madigan, are you seeking recognition?"

Madigan: "I was seeking recognition, Mr. Speaker, to offer a motion that we recess until one o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. We're on the Amendment right at the moment.

Anybody that wants to address this Amendment? Representative Peters."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker, in regards to the Amendment, let me just indicate that the Amendment makes a questionable Bill a little bit better. I would support this Amendment but in regard to the extent of support the entire Bill receives to the administrative... from the administration, I think that determination will be made when the final product of this House is laid, if it's ever laid before the Governor. Up to this point, I would think that the Amendment is acceptable. However, let us not infer it from that full support for the Bill and the contents."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. I understand that Representative Williams has requested a fiscal note. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Fiscal note was filed on May 10 and I have a time stamp on that."

Speaker Redmond: "You have what?"

Marovitz: "I have a copy of the fiscal note and it's stamped, filed May 10."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. If there's any problem with it, why, we may have to bring it back. Now, to give you an idea what the program is. The Republicans have requested a Conference and Representative Madigan... What room is that, Representative Ryan? In Room 118. Representative Madigan has moved that we recess until one o'clock. The program is that we will go to Third Reading promptly at one o'clock. I don't know. We'll go to Order of Third Reading for final action at one o'clock. We will not break for dinner tonight. Those of you that are hungry, I would suggest that you stoke up during this hour and fifteen minutes and we will work quite late tonight. And we have 493 Bills on the Order of Third Reading. That does not include the Bills that are on the Consent Calendar. So you can draw your own conclusions with respect to Saturday. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would concur in what you said about



being here and attending to business. And I would also like to say that all of the Republican Members should be sure and attend this Conference that we're going to have in 118. I'd like to have all of you down there. We have an announcement to make to you and we'd like to have you all there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, are we again going to have the supplementary consent at two o'clock? I think that was a good policy."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't know exactly what the time is, but we're going to take... we address ourselves to those Bills that are on the order of final action. And I may say now, please do not invite your aid, your secretary, your friend or anybody to be on the floor because as of one o'clock, nobody will be permitted on the floor except House Members. Now, please don't embarrass me or embarrass any of your friends because they will be escorted out. The question's on Representative Madigan's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. We'll be back promptly at one o'clock."

House in recess

Doorkeeper: "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 reconvene in five minutes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper, will you make sure that all unauthorized persons are off the floor? Will you make the announcement?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Let the Journal show that Representative Geo-Karis gets the Redmond Perfect Attendance Medal. Representative Ebbesen seek recognition?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have House Bill-1973 which abolishes the General Assembly Scholarship. It's on Third Reading and with those



in attendance, could I have leave for the Attendance Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Use the Attendance Roll Call to abolish the General Assembly Scholarships. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yeah, I was going to say, could we have the leave of the Attendance Roll Call to abolish the General Assembly? That ought to bring everybody back here."

Speaker Redmond: "Just one of the chambers. Now, is there any discussion as to which chamber should be abolished? We'll make it unicameral. Upper? Why do you want to abolish the House? Anybody drawn up the exchange papers between the Governor and the Legislature of Vermont and the Governor and the Legislature of Illinois to exchange Members? It seems to me we're going to trade a Vermont Member for an Illinois Member. I don't remember which Member it was in the House that had been elected. You have a fire sale on light clothing. Representative Ebbesen, will you rise please? Representative Mahar, Representative Totten, Representative Conti."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been accused of being everything from the Good Humor Man to Colonel Sanders and I just would like to... I'd like you to know that I'm taking orders, chocolate or vanilla?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which the legislative scholarships were abolished and I ask for a verified Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of putting the motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Why is it that always it's my noncontroversial Amendments and Bills that they're offering to reconsider? I kind of take offense to that."

Speaker Redmond: "All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Open the Roll Call for the one that's up on the board. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed



vote 'no'. Want to get a record of whatever the record is. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the Attendance Roll Call ought to be used to allow lawyers to advertise or opticians to list prices or optometrists to go out on the street and haul in customers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis moves that the gun control, abortion, E.R.A., lifeline, generic drug Bills all be considered in one Roll Call. The question is on the Lady's motion."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. I think we're going to need some drugs to go with all those things in one call. But I just want to comment, Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege. It's too bad that people who are nonlawyers have to take advantage of the Bar Association, their area and go to Europe on a sponsored Bar trip where they can get the cut rates like one of our Assistant Majority Leaders. And I won't tell you who it is, but his initials are Z.G."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there's an investigation under way to see who's related to lawyers that abuses lawyers and included in that is sons-in-law, students that are in free legal training. Representative Matijevich wants to include crossbound on those non-controversial matters that..."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, on that Roll Call regarding that whole list, I'll grant leave that Adeline changes her vote from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "When it's timely, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Speaker to consider the possibility of a legislative junket to Europe to consider crime control on an international basis."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that you'd have to eliminate Ireland because there is no crime in Ireland. We're going. I don't know where the Croatians are, but wherever they are maybe we'll include that. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Ireland, it's just a product for exports, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Greiman: "It's a product for exports."

Speaker Redmond: "They call it something else. Representative Birchler."



Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, the suggestion made by Representative Kosinski, will that have to be formed as a Committee Bill so that we can get it out at once?"

Speaker Redmond: "Probably. I would think, though, if the Parliamentarian was here, I'd ask him. But he's not here. But that's an unusual situation for him to be off the podium when needed. Representative Peters, you seek recognition? You have somebody to introduce? I understand that the entire, the entire support from your legislative district is sitting in the rear gallery on the Republican side. Is that correct? Those are all Representative Peters' supporters. On Postponed Consideration appears House Bill 368 for which Representative Griesheimer is recognized. He has requested that it be removed from Consideration Postponed and returned to the Order of Second Reading of an Amendment. Is that correct? Does he have leave? 368. Hearing no objection, it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait till we read the Amendment. What does this do? Authorize the dynamiting of fish in Lake Michigan?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Griesheimer. Amends House Bill 368 as amended in Section 6 by deleting Subsection 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Proceed, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all this Amendment does is delete the language that was suggested by Representative Matijevich when the Bill was first voted on on Third Reading which made the Bill subject to home rule provisions. It completely deletes all references to preemptory rights of the State of Illinois and I have discussed this with Representative Matijevich. And that's the entire scope of this particular Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Returned to the Order of Postponed Consideration.

Representative Stanley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to have my vote changed on House Bill 802 to be recorded as voting 'no'. It will not change the result."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? This is Representative Stanley. Leave is granted. House Bill 1110. Representative Griesheimer, where is that one?"

Griesheimer: "That is on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Order of Third Reading, 1110. Representative Griesheimer requests leave to return that to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, McClain-Griesheimer. Amends House Bill 1110 on page 4, line 15 by deleting 'all facilities' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to 1110 is now, I understand, an Agreed Amendment. If you remember, there was some dispute..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Representative McClain and I were trying to talk by sign language here. We're tabling Amendment #1 and we're going to put Amendment #2 on."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #1?"

McClain: "I'm for... (inaudible)... and his hand signal. Bill and we need it in the House. I move to table."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment 1. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Griesheimer. Amends House Bill 1110 on page 1 by deleting line 1 through 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 accomplishes the suggestions that Representative Lechowicz mentioned in Committee on this Bill. It specifically removes any requirement that an airport carry all forms of fuel or that individual retailers of gasoline be licensed



in Illinois. It redefines what an aircraft fuel wholesaler is and states specifically it is a manufacturer of the fuel and one who supplies it to a retailer. It narrows the provisions of the Bill to the way I believe Representative Lechowicz wanted the Bill to read and I also wanted it to read. I'd move for the adoption of this Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Sandquist. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like leave to be voted 'aye' on House Bill 420 which I inadvertently missed getting on that."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted."

Sandquist: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar.

On House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 191. Is anybody going to handle that for Representative Kornowicz? Out of the record. 244, Representative Ewing. 244. Out of the record. 485, Representative Porter. Out of the record. 501, Representative Leverenz. House Bill 501."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 501. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 501 provides for the Secretary of State to issue one registration plate for each vehicle. It would make one rear plate for all Class A automobiles. This would perhaps put four to five million dollars, at least over four additional Road Fund money or eliminate the front end costs or the additional costs to the multi-year plate. I'll respond to any questions. The Secretary of State's position is neutral. The Confederation of Police, I understand, are for it, Fraternal Order of Police-for it, the State Police are neutral. The only one we haven't heard from is the Sheriff's Association."



Speaker Redmond: "Who is to speak in opposition to this Bill? Anybody?"

Leverenz: "Ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's... - Representative Mann."

Mann: "My machine is not working properly. All of a sudden the volume is but I can't push down the 'yes', 'no' and 'present' and I'd like to be recorded as voting 'yes'. I'd also like to try to get some help on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Electrician. Where's Ed? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 117 'aye' and 15 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 674, Representative Deuster."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 674. A Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The timer is on."

Deuster: "Oh, 674 is very simple. It permits the identity of a minor to be given to the victim of an offense where the minor is adjudicated a delinquent. As you may know under the Juvenile Court Act, you have to go and get a court order and normally hire a lawyer in order to find who it was that victimized you. This Bill is narrowly drawn so at least the victims of vandalism or other offenses by minors could find out the identity of the minor and the police or the correct information would be available to the victim. This is a correlary and complimentary to the law that we have making parents responsible for vandalism, damage of their minors to at least the victim can find out who the person it is or was that caused injury to him. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Representative D.L. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. I submit that the disclosure provision which is contained



in the Bill violates the entire spirit of the Juvenile Court Act. I would point out that this Bill is strongly opposed by the Juvenile Court in Cook County and I would ask for a negative Roll Call."

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

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason we're down here in Springfield is to provide... try and provide justice. I think anyone who is injured or is damaged feels that he ought to at least find out who the person was that caused that damage to him so he can be compensated. This Bill does respect the spirit of the Juvenile Court Act generally but makes one small exception and that exception is when somebody has damaged your property or caused personal injury to you and happens to be a minor, you at least ought to be able to find out who that person is. I would urge more 'yes' votes up there. And I think if this has ever happened to you, if you've ever been victimized, you would certainly want to find out who it was. That's all the Bill does."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to explain my vote because as a matter fact, Representative Deuster, this very thing happened to me just exactly eighteen months ago. A minor burglarized my garage three nights in a row and took approximately twelve hundred dollars in property. He was apprehended burglarizing another garage about a week later. He was brought into the police station. He admitted to everything, told them that he had the property and didn't intend to return it. He processed under the Juvenile Court Act. I couldn't even get his name to get my property back. And I think that this is a terrible breach of justice and I think if we're going to make any law and order work, we're going to have to get these minors subject to some sort of law so that they don't become professional criminals and completely immune to normal process. And I think this is a Bill that well deserves support. It does not destroy the Juvenile Court Act."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski, to explain his vote."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting on this Bill with a 'yes' vote for an obvious reason. We have no recourse. Neighbors of mine have had problems on a juvenile situation for property damage and loss was involved, had no way of determining whose parents they should talk to. They had no recourse in this situation. I'm concerned about juveniles and protecting them as much as possible. However, if you look at the record, you'll find that a great amount of our crime, a great amount of our problem is perpetrated by people under seventeen years of age. And they hide behind the Acts that protect them. I'm very much in accord with this Bill and I wish we could get a lot of green votes on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is probably a very constructive Bill because it provides that police and court records of minors be kept confidential and not be divulged except with specific court approval. Now, you and I know, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that young people who start getting into a path of crime and keep repeating it and repeating it because they think they're getting away with it, those are the ones that become the hardened criminals. We may be saving some boy's life in the future if we support a Bill like this. And I would like to urge more 'aye' votes because this is true. It's getting to be so common, vandalism by young people if they're not checked properly... is that if they're not known so they can be corrected so they can become better citizens in the long run, we're not helping our young people. We're not helping them by coddling or pampering. We could be firm and kindness a provision. I urge a lot of more 'aye' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For a number of years I've prosecuted juvenile cases in Rock Island County and I'm extremely familiar with the Juvenile Court Act. What some of the speakers mentioned today just is not true. If you want the name of the person who committed a crime against



your property or against your person, all you have to do is go to the Juvenile Court Judge, ask him for that name, give him sufficient reason and he will enter a court order allowing that information to be divulged to you or to your insurance company. We have done it on numerous occasions. This law is not needed. If you want to get that information, all you have to do is ask for it. I would ask those who are voting green to reconsider and vote red. This is unneeded and against the spirit of the Juvenile Court Act."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele, to explain his vote."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One thing that we hear back home, I think, most often is that we need to get some common sense in government. It seems to me that right here is the elementary reason that the victim, the one who's been burglarized or mugged...(microphone turned off)..."

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

Deuster: "I'm very sorry, Mr. Speaker. I know how busy we are, but I feel strongly about this and I'd like to ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill came to the Judiciary II Committee in the form the Sponsor originally had it, it would have permitted anyone to find out what juvenile had committed an act of delinquency against their property. In its amended form, it is limited solely to the victim of that juvenile delinquent act. It does seem to me that limited in that form, that a person whose property has been damaged is entitled to know the name of the person who damaged it. That that person ought to have a right to go and see the parents of that juvenile if they want to register their complaint with regard to the act that the other person's child did to them. And in that limited form, it does seem to me to be a sort of elementary right that if your property has been damaged by anyone be they an adult or juvenile, you are the one person that ought to know who did it so that you can do something about talking to the parents and trying to rectify the situation. That is the reason that I am



voting 'aye' with regard to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, we've heard conversation about how easy it is to go up in front of a Judge and get an order releasing that information. I, too, was an Assistant State's Attorney. And I, too, prosecuted criminal cases and I would tell you that it isn't easy to get that order unless your Judge is very willing. Some may be very unwilling and I think this clears up an ambiguity in the situation and allows that information to be given out. And I think, too, we should have some more green votes up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill.

Prior to my coming down here close to eleven years ago, I was a probation officer in the Cook County Juvenile Court for a number of years and dealt with youngsters. It has been my observation that something is going to have to be done in the case of vandalism, et cetera and particularly, although I don't live in the suburban area, it's becoming a very serious problem outside the inner city. I recently had occasion to appear as a witness in the... before the County Board when Commissioner Mary MacDonald introduced and had enacted into the county laws a Bill of this nature. I think that the parents should be held responsible for the vandalism because it's not petty... children's pranks anymore. It's a very serious matter and I think that Representative Deuster in introducing this legislation is performing a very worthwhile public service."

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

On this question there's 98 'aye' and 50 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 758."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "That Bill's in the Senate. It passed yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "What?"

Hart: "It passed yesterday."



Speaker Redmond: "Well, 766."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 766. A Bill for an Act to create the Land Resources Management Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill passed the House last year. It did not get out of the Senate. It was on the Consent Calendar but was taken off because of the Companion Appropriation Bill. I later talked to the Appropriations Committee Chairman who indicated that after my explanation that it perhaps should not have been taken off because I do not wish to wait for the Appropriation Bill because this Bill might get lost in the shuffle. And moreover, it's possible that we can do without the substantial Appropriation because if the Bill is passed, we may get some foundation money to do the very important work that this Bill would call for. Now, this is not just another Commission. It should be compared to the Economic and Fiscal Commission and the School Problems Commission. I don't think that a Joint Committee of the House and Senate can do the job either because there would not be an adequate... would not be adequate time or adequate staff. What we need in the area of land resources management is essentially three elements. We do need legislators on a Commission to give continuity and to give their legislative experience. But we also need public members, we need representatives of municipalities and representatives of planning groups and so forth as this Commission Bill would provide. We also need an interaction between sometimes suspicious and hostile groups in the area of land use planning. Now, let me make it perfectly clear this Bill does not have any preconceived solutions to our land use problems. It merely calls for a two-year study of this very, very complicated and very important field. For example, we have sixty Federal laws that already..."

Speaker Redmond: "Two minutes to explain the Bill, Representative."

Mugalian: "Well, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call because I think that this Bill is of priceless importance to the state. I think it's worth billions of dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anybody in opposition? The question is,



shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye', 42 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 769, Representative Kempiners."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 769. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Library District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is similar to a situation that was presented yesterday by Representative Chapman. We have an area in Joliet that is not within Joliet proper. It's in Crest Hill and Troy Township that the Troy-Shorewood Library District would like to enact through a referendum, but it is non-contiguous to their area. This Bill would provide for that possibility in an existing district if it is through a referendum in an existing district and the Bill has an automatic expiration date of one year so that they would have an opportunity to hold a referendum for this territory to be included in this district. And I would ask the support of the House for passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "There anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'... Representative McClain."

McClain: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Mr. Kempiners, did I understand you correctly? You say it would permit the area that wanted to divorce itself from the district?"

Kempiners: "No, to connect to the district by referendum."

McClain: "Yeah, but it would have to leave another district, right?"

Kempiners: "No. It is in a situation, the area or part of the area is in the City of Crest Hill in Troy Township where 90% of Crest Hill is in Lockport Township which has a Lockport Township Library District so it can't go into that. It can annex to the City of Joliet which has a library district, so there's only one alternative and that's the Shorewood-Troy Township District. So they



want to hold a referendum and if it passed, hook up to that district. And if it doesn't, the law expires in one year so they've got one year to try it."

McClain: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question 136 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 97...796."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 796. A Bill for an Act in relation to meetings. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 796 is a Bill which came out of the Executive Committee by a unanimous vote. It is a Bill which this House has passed on several occasions in previous years and has problems in the Senate. It has to do with guaranteeing the news media the right to record public meetings which are subject to the Open Meetings Act. That does not apply to the General Assembly so that our own rules would continue to govern in that instance. I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... anybody in opposition? Representative Katz. Please sit down, Representative Holewinski and that stranger."

Katz: "I had a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Katz: "Why does it not apply to the General Assembly?"

Pullen: "Because of the fact that it is an Amendment to the Open Meetings Act and the General Assembly is covered under the Constitution and, therefore, it's exempt from the Open Meetings Act."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'. Representative D.L. Houlihan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

D. Houlihan: "Would this allow..."

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

Ewing: "Is this short debate and do we have the right to question?"



Speaker Redmond: "No, you do not. But if somebody wants 89 votes, I would suggest that maybe discussion might be the better part of valor. Do you object to answering a question, Representative Pullen? It's on short debate and it's not supposed to be. Representative D.L. Houlihan or Daniel Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Under the provisions of this Bill, Representative Pullen, does this allow pictures to be taken during court proceedings or the TV taping of courtroom proceedings?"

Pullen: "No..."

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

Schuneman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. It was my understanding that short debate..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, you're correct. You can't answer any questions. The question is, who stands in opposition to this Bill? Anybody standing in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 797. Representative Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 797. A Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of athletic trainers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Two minutes."

Bradley: "What House Bill 797... what 797 does is it addresses itself to what I think is a rather crucial problem in Illinois and it provides, it creates the Illinois Athletic Trainers Act. It provides for the licensing of athletic trainers who meet certain qualifications and pay the required fee by the Department of Registration and Education who will be in charge of making sure that the gentlemen who or women who apply to be athletic trainers meet the requirements that are established in this legislation. It's... the Bill would require all junior high, high school and college athletic trainers to be licensed by the Department of



Registration and Education. They must meet the athletic training curriculum requirement for the college or university approved by the Department. They must hold a Bachelor's Degree with at least eighteen hundred clock hours of on-the-job training. Essentially, what we've found, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that we have people who are operating or working as athletic trainers and saying they're athletic trainers who are not qualified to be athletic trainers and we would like to eliminate those people from the athletic fields and this Bill is supported by the Professional Athletic Teams, by the Athletic Trainers..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, time is expiring."

Bradley: "And I would move the adoption and I would respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Who stands in opposition? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I reluctantly rise to oppose this Bill not because of the substance of the Bill that I'm reluctant..."

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

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm not rising in opposition, but I want to raise a point here. I thought it was understood that Bills that had companion appropriations in Committee would not be called on Third Reading. This Bill has a companion appropriation which is scheduled to be heard next week in Appropriations II."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley, what's your wish? Representative Schneider, sit down."

E. Barnes: "The appropriations for this program has been scheduled to be heard in Appropriations Committee sometime next week."

Bradley: "There is an Appropriation Bill along with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, but I'd like to see if we can go ahead and pass this Bill out of here and we'll catch the Appropriation Bill up with it over in the Senate. One's not going to do any good without the other one, but I think we can go ahead and move this Bill now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. to conclude his opposition. The only rules that we have here provide for Sponsor two minutes, opposition two minutes and then a Roll Call and you can



explain your vote if you wish. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, my reluctance is not due to the substance of the Bill but my reluctance is due because of my respect for the Sponsor. This is another Bill,--Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that would set up a licensing procedure for the benefit of a particular group. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't-know where the welfare of this state requires that we give to athletic trainers and monopolistic position relative to their occupation. It's not necessary. It will add to bureaucracy of state government. It will add to the cost of state government and for no one's benefit but the athletic trainers themselves. I urge a 'no' vote on 797 in the name of good government."

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

Schneider: "Well, I think some of the remarks recently made by, just made rather by Representative Schlickman are appropriate but when you sit in at athletic contests as a high school teacher as I do very frequently, you realize that sometimes we are hiring people to provide first aid and athletic care who are not really qualified. We'd take a teacher who needs an extra form of compensation and that person who's willing to do it, learns how to wrap an ankle or apply a bandaid but there are times when you need quick and competent emergency care. I think this would go a long way toward providing that so I support the proposal and hope we can pass it out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's not our intent here to put anybody out of business. Now we've given a lot of thought to this Bill and what it's supposed to do. What we're simply saying is that those people who are qualified and can meet the qualifications may, therefore, have the standard set beside their name that they are qualified as a trainer. We're establishing or stating that any small school, junior high school or country school has to have a trainer. But if they have a man or a woman who says



they are qualified to take care of the types of bruises that our young athletics get, they should have the qualifications to do so. We're simply saying if you've got the qualifications, you have the right to be known that you are a trainer and we have had the support of the Trainers Association, the Physical Therapists and hospitals. We've had no opposition to this. It's something that they felt was needed and would certainly appreciate 89 votes on that board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Coming from a university town where we have probably a higher percentage of involvement in this particular profession or skill than other areas of the state, I would urge that we get more green votes on the board. Particularly in the area of application of heat treatment and other emergency care operations with respect to this general area. It's absolutely a specialized area. It's a crucial area. It's comparable to ambulance service in it's own way and it's the kind of thing that really needs to be regulated in order to prevent these emergency treatments from being cared for by people who simply aren't qualified to do it. And I would urge as much as Mr. Schlickman, Representative Schlickman that regulations are excessive in some cases. But in this particular case, it's something in the name of good health and safety for the State of Illinois that's really crucial and I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

E. Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you notice, my light is on 'present'. The reason why is that I'm echoing the remarks of the Chairman of Appropriations II. It has been the policy of this House that when we have a Companion Bill with a Substantive Bill that that Substantive Bill is rereferred to the Appropriations Committee so we will know what we are doing. I'm surprised that our Leadership on this side of the aisle is pushing this Bill through when he knows the policy is for this Bill to be in Appropriations II. So I wish everyone who is voting green would change their switches to yellow so that this Bill can be rereferred to the Appropriations Committee."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "As usual, Representative Jones speaks a good deal of truth.

In fact, complete truth. There's no reason this Bill should be passed now. There's no reason it should be any different from Representative Younge's Bill or my Bill or anybody else that has a Companion Bill. But to speak to the substance of the Bill, why it should be defeated on it's demerits. This is much more than just certifying that the people are qualified. What we are doing when we give it... when we create another licensed profession and we're closing hard on two hundred which is about ten times more than the average state licenses. What we do is give an implicit guarantee that the people we license are qualified to do what we say they are qualified to do. Now, you know where the corrupt people in the State of Illinois end up, they end up in places where they can take payoffs. And licensing R & E is one of the historically corrupt Departments in this state. And while I don't think that that will occur right now, giving them another opportunity is just not the way to do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise as you see with a green light there. I'm strongly in support of this Bill. The technicalities we'll leave to someone else to argue. I want to speak to the merits of the Bill. I think that I have seen, I know that I have seen many young fellows and recently, of course, girls also in the field of athletics who have been maimed and actually crippled for life because they either did not go to a doctor or had no access to a doctor in a small community and a good competent first-aid trainer can be of invaluable service. The Krammer First-aid Company provides free a training course for trainers. And in all of my years of coaching experience, I never had a manager who was not... had not gone through the Krammer First-aid service. And even as a youngster, they were very, very invaluable in emergencies."

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

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel there is the support for this piece of legislation, but I also have the feeling that they'd like to



wait until we bring the Appropriation Bill along at the same time.

So I would ask that we take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 809. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill belongs on Postponed Consideration. I'd certainly consent to a motion to put it on Postponed Consideration but not to take it out of the record. There had been a Roll Call and we have spent twenty minutes debating this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I think that you ought to differentiate this Bill from others. We're not talking about a Bill going to Roll Call and then the Sponsor allows it go to a final Roll Call and wishes to have it taken out of the record. He has proposed to take this out of the record because there's a Companion Bill in the Appropriations Committee. He did not know until I told him now that this Bill was exempt from the deadline requirement and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that it ought to simply be taken out of the record despite the fact that Mr. Walsh will not allow me to address the Membership."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 809. 809."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 809. A Bill for an Act to vacate an easement in Sangamon County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very noncontroversial Bill and I'm glad that it comes up at this particular moment. It does two things. House Bill 809 vacates an easement that presently is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation. It vacates it in favor of the City of Springfield. The city owned the land before the Department of Transportation had it. The other part of the Bill corrects a typographical error in an easement Bill that we passed out of here last year and was signed by the Governor. And I'd ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 809."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 135 'aye' and some 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority... Chalkie inadvertently dumped that. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 813."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 813. A Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Regional Port District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that has been brought before the 79th General Assembly and passed the House and the Senate. It is basically the same Bill, was passed out of Committee with a 14 and 0 on it. And what it does is turn over the Directorship of the Chicago Regional Port District, over to the City of Chicago by reversing a number of members of the board from four to the city, now to five for the state, just reversing that five and four. And I'd like to ask for a favorable vote on this please."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, we can't. Representative Schuneman and Representative Ewing reminded that that's improper procedure. You want to speak in opposition?"

Schlickman: "I don't know whether or not I'm opposed."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there's nothing in the rules as Representative Schuneman and Representative Ewing pointed out to me. There's nothing in the rules that permits interrogation of the Sponsor. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's unfortunate that this Bill is being called when Representative Collins is off the floor because I know he had a great interest in this matter. I wonder if the Gentleman would consent to taking it out and going back to the..."



Speaker Redmond: "I thought you objected to that before? Representative Taylor."

Walsh: "I did not object to that before."

Speaker Redmond: "Then my memory is... yours. is shorter, mine is long."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: Have all voted... Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm certain that Representative Collins would be in favor of this Bill. Last year, year before last when the Bill in the Cities and Villages Committee, he came in and he testified in favor of this same proposal. We've had Subcommittee meetings and a number of meetings over the last couple of years and I'm certain that this is a good Bill and should be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Take the record. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise? This question, 110 'aye' and 14 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 825. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I got here too late to explain my vote and so I must rise on a point of personal privilege. I would like to say in answer to the use of my name on the floor that I am very much in favor of the concept in this Bill. However, the Bill makes one change that I did not favor and I had hoped to see changed in it and I hope we will see changed. And that is the appointive powers as the Mayor vis-a-vis the Governor. Governor Walker's amendatory veto changed it last year and that's the reason why we didn't effectuate the law last year. So while it is correct that I very much do favor this concept, I would like to see the Bill beaten in its present form and changed into the form in which it came back to us from Governor Walker and then I'd think we had a Bill with which we could all live."

Speaker Redmond: "825."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 825. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Promotion Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet."

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



for this Bill came out of the Tourism Commission. It was passed from the Executive Committee by a unanimous vote. It will help out tourism in the State of Illinois. And simply what it does is ask for part of the money that we should have been getting all along. In 1963, there was a Hotel-Motel tax passed in the State of Illinois. This was to be used for tourism. It has gone into the State Treasury all of these years and we're not asking for all of this back. We're just asking for a 10%... of what this brings in each year under the theory that what we're doing in tourism, we're increasing this tax and we feel that we should have a part of it. I'm sure all of you people are familiar with tourism and how much money it brings in. It's big business in our state. It's estimated that in 1975, it brought into our state one billion, two hundred and twenty-two million, nine hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars. Tourism pays, it does not cost. About 60% of the tourists in this country that go east to west or west to east, cross through the State of Illinois. We'd like to stop them here for a day or two or a week in order to help out our tourism dollars here within this state. I would ask for your approval of this Bill and I might tell you that the Governor has said that he will sign it into law when it is passed through the House and the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 9 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 865. Representative Von Boeckman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to be recorded as voting 'yes' on House Bill 2. It wouldn't change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman... what number?"

Von Boeckman: "2."

Speaker Redmond: "We didn't do that today."

Von Boeckman: "It was yesterday though."

Speaker Redmond: "That was a verified Roll Call, 2 was. Can he or can



he not, Mr. Parliamentarian? No, not on a verified Roll Call.
265, Representative Dunn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 868, Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 868. A Bill for an Act creating the Law---
Revision Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich. Timer is on."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 868 is an extension of the Law
Revision Commission and this is a newly-formed Commission that
had a budget of twenty-three thousand dollars. Last year we sub-
mitted thirteen Bills. This year we submitted fifty-five. The
last time the laws were revised was after the 1870 Constitution.
We're putting approximately four or five thousand Bills in a Ses-
sion. The Legislative Reference Bureau has commended the Commis-
sion on the fine work that they have done since they were over-
burdened by the substantial number of Bills submitted. And I'd
urge approval of House Bill 868."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? The question is, shall this
Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have
all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take
the record. On this question there's 131 'aye' and 13 'no' and
the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby de-
clared passed. 886."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 886. A Bill for an Act increasing the
salary of Judges. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 886 does exactly what
the Clerk indicated it did. It's the third leg of the program
which was set in motion when this House adopted a Resolution some
time earlier in the Session calling on the Governor to appoint a
cross-section of the community to examine judicial, legislative
and executive pay levels and recommend appropriate levels to com-
mence January 1, 1979. Yesterday, we voted out the legislative
and executive vehicles. The one dollar pay raises. This is the
judicial one. It in as much... and I would like to point out,
we're not talking about July 1, 1977. We're talking January 1, 1979,



which means that they would be waiting the same length of time as the Legislators would be waiting for a pay raise. This is the appropriate time to handle it prior to any election strains and so forth, so I would urge that the Membership give the same vote that it gave to the legislative and executive pay Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, in opposition."

Skinner: "How on earth can anybody justify a pay raise for Judges. Do you remember what the schedule was last time after we just took the Associate Judges up from something like twenty-four thousand to thirty-five thousand? A year later they came in wanted forty-five thousand dollars. I don't know what Representative Leinenweber's trying to do. Maybe he wants to get a job as an appointed Associate Judge because he'll be end up getting paid twice as much as he is where he is. And I really think we ought to defeat this Bill in order to take that temptation away from him."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Totten."

Totten: "It's not a Constitutional Amendment, is it?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's a Joint Constitutional Amendment. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I was not aware that the Judges were being underpaid or overworked now."

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

Stearney: "Take the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'aye' and 55 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 898."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 898. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 898 amends the Municipal Code and decreases the amount the Department of Revenue may retain for the administration of the municipal use tax from 4% to 2%. Municipalities may impose a use tax on personal property purchased outside of Illinois at



retail from a retailer which is titled or registered with the state. This is, in essence, a sales tax on cars, boats, airplanes and motorcycles purchased out of the state which is imposed by the municipalities. This tax is collected and administered by the Department of Revenue and this Bill would seek to reduce the amount they retain towards collection of these funds from 4% to 2%. I might point out that their cost is only 1% and we did pass legislation in 1975 to reduce the amount kept by the state for collecting municipal sales tax, retailers occupational tax and municipal service occupation tax from 4 to 2%. This Bill would put the fund retention in the same posture. It costs 1% for them to perform this service they're charging for. I think the municipalities are entitled to this... to the benefit of this Bill. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, in opposition."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ryan: "Representative Richmond, how much money... Oh, can't do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing and Representative Schuneman reminded me that we can't do that."

Ryan: "That's right, I forgot, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, I apologize. Well, I can speak I guess, can't I? Thank you. As I understand the cost of this Bill is somewhere around six million dollars. It's not in the Governor's budget. And I would certainly hope that it would not pass. I would ask that you don't go green on this one, that you stay red."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Macdonald. Representative Leinenweber, your seatmate is... Macdonald, she wants to vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Richmond, to explain his vote."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explanation, this Bill in presenting it before the Cities and Villages Committee, I did request impact statement and was unable to get one because they said it would be very difficult to put a handle on this particular



on these particular funds, but they said it would be minimal. I'm sure that minimal would not be six million dollars. It passed out of Cities and Villages 13 to nothing. It's fully endorsed by Illinois Municipal League."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye, Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "May I ask for a poll of the absentees, Sir?"

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Bowman, Deavers, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Friedrich, Kent, Kornowicz, Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino, Madison, Mann."

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

Chapman: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Lady as 'aye'. Proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madison, Mann, McBroom, Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison, for what purpose do you rise? Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Mann, for what purpose..."

Mann: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye'. Representative Mautino, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mautino: "I'd like to change my 'no' to an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman's 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom, Meyer, Molloy, Pullen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, change me to 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Is everybody in their place now? Maybe the best way is to dump this one and do it again. Everybody in their place. Sit in your own seat and only vote your own switch. Wheel in the State Police to enforce the statutes. Dump the Roll Call. The question is, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'."



Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'aye' and 48 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 901. Representative C.M. Stiehl."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 901. A Bill for an Act in relation to Fire Protection Districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative C.M. Stiehl. Representative Reilly."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 901 provides for the cost of an election to organize a Fire Protection District will be borne by that Fire Protection District should the referendum succeed. If the referendum would fail, the cost of that election will be borne by the county. This is the procedure that is presently in effect, but it is not in the statutes. The statutes provide for the combination of fire districts but it does not provide for the formation of the fire district. And I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted... Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 131, 35 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 911."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 911. A Bill for an Act in relation to the designation of an emergency telephone number throughout the state. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Two years ago, the General Assembly passed legislation establishing an Illinois 911 as the emergency telephone number. This is a program that will be implemented over a ten year period. There has been every effort to try to encourage local units of government to provide 911 service to upgrade their emergency service. What this Bill does, House Bill 911 at this Session is to set up a Good Samaritan Law with regard to 911. One of the problems has been that local units of government have not been able to obtain insurance. House Bill 911 like all of the Good Samaritan Laws provides that there will be liability in the event of willful or



wanton activity or misconduct. Otherwise, the public agency that is responding a call or a hospital that is monitoring an emergency call, for example, a person may call in in the middle of a coronary and the 911 operator gets a position on the phone and is relaying instructions to the individual from the position. That position also under this situation would not be liable unless he is engaged in willful or wanton misconduct. This Bill was unanimously recommended by the Executive Committee of the House and has been recommended by the various state agencies that are dealing with this problem. I would urge its enactment as a positive step forward in getting us a 911 emergency system in operation throughout Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Does anyone rise in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 927."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 927. A Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Youngue."

Youngue: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill will require that a person in charge of a train when having received notice that there's an emergency vehicle proceeding towards a railroad crossing that is being blocked by that train to move the train. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Locomotives Union and the Railroad Association which comprises all the railroads in Illinois. And it affects the Chicago and East St. Louis switching districts. And I ask for your favorable support of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Who rises in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? It's even money that Ebbesen doesn't make it back in time. Have all voted who wished? Like the long walk from the bull pen. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 6 'no'



and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 939."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 939. A Bill for an Act to amend the Credit Union Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Molloy."

Molloy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Gentlemen standing between Representative Molloy and the Chair please be seated?"

Molloy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 939 would allow credit unions whose assets are in excess of one million dollars and who now make real estate loans to be able to discount and sell these notes in... at times when they're short of money. There's a secondary mortgage market with banks, savings and loans and other credit unions. This would just aid these credit unions in being able to properly service their members in this area. As you know, two years ago we passed this Bill allowing credit unions the right to make mortgage loans to their members if their assets were in excess of one million dollars. I would like your favorable consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 940."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 940. A Bill for an Act to amend the Credit Union Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Molloy: "House Bill 940 would permit an Illinois chartered credit union who would have... to merge with a credit union of another state if that credit union has the same common bond to membership. For instance, if a company and this is a particular case that I'd like to refer to, Caterpillar Company has a small credit in Iowa. They also have a large credit union in Peoria. The credit union in Iowa would like to be able to merge with the Illinois credit union and can under Iowa law, but the law is silent in the State of Illinois. This would give the people who are just over the



border in Iowa the opportunity to be serviced by a large progressive credit union. I would ask your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk... the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 948."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 948. A Bill for an Act restricting lie detector tests and similar tests for public and private employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 948 is a Bill that would require, would prohibit the requiring of a lie detector test or submission of a lie detector test against the will of an employee or against their voluntary taking in the case of employment. The Bill has been amended to exempt financial institutions in the State of Illinois and in the municipal corporation or political subdivision. In another Amendment by Representative Simms that would exempt companies that have by rule or by law such as security companies at airports and things like that, the right to continue to demand the use of a lie detector in the cases of employment. What this Bill actually gets to the heart of is the involuntary mandating of the use of lie detector against the will of an employee. The concept is that in a free society, just the fact that you refuse to take a lie detector test should not be enough to fire or have discharged or demoted or any other punishment of an employee just in that one individual's desire not to take a lie detector. This in no way affects crime or prohibits the use in the enforcement of law and order in the criminal aspects. It's strictly that if an individual wants to refuse to take it, he can't be fired. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Is there anybody in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill... Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think here



the system breaks down, the Short Debate Calendar. This Bill as I recall in Labor and Commerce Committee got barely enough votes for passage and had about 8 'no' votes. So it seems to me this Bill should have been on the Calendar that would permit somewhat extensive debate because it's a very controversial and in my opinion, bad measure. Now there's no reason on earth..."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, if the Gentleman would read the Digest, he would know that it came out of Labor and Commerce 13 to 0."

Speaker Redmond: "That was the 78th Session, Representative Walsh. Proceed."

Walsh: "Well, it didn't come out with my vote. I'm on that Committee, Mr. Speaker, and my recollection is that that's what happened. So irrespective of that, it is a bad Bill and I'll attempt to tell you why. The Gentleman in his explanation of vote could very well have made the point that he interrupted me to make that I don't think is relevant. In any case, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that to exempt financial institutions is an indication that it is a bad Bill. Why are on earth are financial institutions any different than any other position of trust. And almost any position of employment, Mr. Speaker, is one of trust. Certainly, an employer who is having someone operate a cash register all day long is in the same position as a banker who might employ someone to make change all day long. The temptations are the same, the opportunities are substantially the same. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing obnoxious it seems to me, in taking a lie detector test. If someone doesn't want to take a lie detector test, then they don't have to work for the employer who wants him to take a lie detector test. This is a bad Bill. It's restrictive on business and we don't need any more restrictions on business. I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Hanahan, to close. No, wait a minute. You can explain your vote for one minute. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "That's another thing, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that this



procedure on Short Debate should be that there's an opening by the Sponsor, an opponent and the Sponsor should have an opportunity to close."

Speaker Redmond: "He has the opportunity to close. I'm giving him one minute. For what purpose do you rise, Mr. Simms?"

Simms: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "When the time comes. I recognize Representative Hanahan to explain his vote. When the time comes, I will recognize you."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in Committee even the Chamber of Commerce and Representative Simms worked together and we agreed to this kind of Amendment to the Bill and the concept of the Bill. I might point out that the Gentleman was totally in error because he did not vote negative and he was in Committee when this Bill was brought before the Committee. That's number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a person in a free society should have the right to refuse to take a lie detector test in his course of employment and not be punished over it. That's the only aspect of this Bill. It does not say anything else except that you cannot fire a person just for the refusal. You're suspecting somebody of stealing or somebody of absconding funds, you have many other recourses to determine the validity and honesty of that individual employee. But just to fire a person just because... it's almost against... it's almost unconstitutional against the Bill of Rights to do, to take away an economic freedom..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill. Representative Hanahan is right. We did work out an agreement, an Amendment with the Chamber and with the I.M.A. which does allow that before an employee is hired by a firm, if the employer so designates, it allows them to contractually give, to agree to a lie detector test before employment. And it did satisfy those objections that were raised in the Labor Committee by those that had questions about it. And the Bill as amended was satisfactory to the Illinois Chamber and the Illinois Manufacturers as amended."



And I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my 'no' vote:

While in sympathy with the concept, I happened to be in Labor and Commerce the morning that this Bill was heard. I don't think the Bill went far enough so I'm voting 'no' on it. A strange position to be in, Representative Hanahan, but you're going to open the door to scopolamine, hypnosis. Take the removal of ineffective lie detector tests away from people and they're liable to replace it with something much worse - sodium pentothal. I just might call that to your attention. So consequently, I'm voting 'no' rather than open that particular door."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. And aside from the questions of privacy, I doubt and I do not place credibility in the reliance of the polygraph. Now, let me give you one reason and that is an example. Some two years, a young lady came into our law office who was fired from her job on the basis of pilfering. She failed a lie detector exam with her own company. She came to us, we sent her to a private polygraph examiner and low and behold, she failed again. But in the meantime, she went back and petitioned her company. They sent her back to the very same individual that gave her the first lie detector exam in which she had failed. She passed it now on that third time and the company hired her. Now, that be the case, if the guilty can now then come back and be rehired on the basis of passing an exam, I would think that an innocent individual may very well under apprehension and worry, fail the exam. And for that very specific reason, I say we should pass this Bill because there is not that much great reliability to be placed in the inherent trustworthiness of the polygraph. And need I remind you that in the courts, the polygraph, the results of a polygraph examination are not ad... (microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in



support of this Bill also. The polygraph reminds me of the gestapo tactics that were used in Germany in the 1930's. There's no reason that we have to put up with lie detector tests in this day and age. They're not admissible in court and they affect different people in different ways. Nervous people could be telling 100% truth, still take this test and fail it. Be strapped in a chair and have this thing put on your arm, cause a lot of apprehension among certain people and there's absolutely no reason in the world that people should be submitted to this kind of treatment. As you know, I'm not a member of the American Civil Liberties Union and I'm not a very liberal person, but I'm 100% opposed to these lie detector tests. It's an infringement on their rights."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Point of information. Will the Clerk... Mr... Representative Simms mentioned there was an Amendment on this Bill. I haven't seen it and I wonder if the Clerk would check the Bill and see if that Amendment is on relative to a prior contractual service for polygraph tests by the intended employee."

Speaker Redmond: "Calendar says Amendments 2 and 3."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I'd like to ask the Clerk to check..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Enrolling and Engrossing, we don't have the Bill here."

Geo-Karis: "I think the Clerk is looking for it now, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He won't find it. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Were these two Amendments... point of information, put on the Bill then?"

Speaker Redmond: "In Committee, the record and the Calendar so shows that."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Hanahan, he didn't take them off did he? That's what I'm asking. They're on the Bill? All right, in that case, I'll change my vote."

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

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'no' vote, I would point out that this Bill attempts to ban and attempts to outlaw in certain practices what has otherwise been accepted as an acceptable tool of our modern society. So I'd urge a 'no' vote



because if we outlaw what is otherwise a bona fide tool of our modern society, we're taking a step backwards and I think that we should vote 'no' on this."

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

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's obvious that the do-gooders are going to try this Bill to victory at least here today. But I want you to know that most of the people that object to a lie detector test..."

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead, turn him on again."

Cunningham: "That wasn't sixty seconds, Speaker. Those that perspire the most when they're hooked up to a lie detector test are the ones that are guilty. Why deprive law enforcement of a mechanical means of pursuing the thing? If you're for law and order, vote for this particular Bill. Notice the number of policemen when they're called in... put lie detector tests, holler about civil rights."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye' and 53 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 975. Representative Giglio, out of the record. 989."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 989. A Bill for an Act in relation to county zoning. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what House Bill 989 purports to do is change the procedure for amending county zoning regulations where a protest is made. Right now, the law provides that three-fourths of all members of the County Board must approve and what this Bill proposes to do is change that procedure to three-fourths of those voting. Never less than the majority of the Board. There was one Amendment attached to the Bill in Committee which said where counties under Commission form would be two out of three of the members. I would urge your support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's in opposition to this Bill? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, having taken my cuts at the Municipal League Bills



earlier I would like to suggest that anyone who values the role that cities have, the preeminent value that cities have in zoning should be against this proposal. What it does is allow County Boards to have more influence over zoning and to allow the representatives from one part of the county who maybe absolutely convinced that something this wrong to be overridden by the rest of the county if they can just get somebody not to vote. I just think this is... gives much more power to county government than they should give. In our case, I think it's Representative Hanahan's house is fairly near the gravel pits that would or that would be a gaping gravel pit near his house."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I think we... echo what Representative Skinner pointed out here. You're taking away powers of people who oppose rezoning to influence their government by decreasing the vote drastically that's required to overrule a contrary or objection or a contrary point of view taken by the local Zoning Board. So I think we ought to seriously consider whether we want to give or take away from people, the present power that they have - the level of power that they have to influence local zoning."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Tuerk, to explain his vote."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, some Members may take the view that it's going to take away the power. In this day and age where you hear the term conflict of interest and I know on the Peoria County Board there's been areas that and times when people feel sincerely that they have a conflict of interest and yet their vote is nullified by the fact that they abstain. What this Bill is attempting to do, in the area of those people who feel that they have a conflict and that duly is a sincere feeling that it would not require three-fourths of the entire Board, but those voting on the issue which means that never will there be less than a majority of the Board needed to approve it. But it may reduce the number in terms of, say, four or five people abstaining from



a vote because they do have a feeling of a conflict. And I think it's a good concept and I don't think it takes away all that much power."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 61 'aye' and 59 'no'. The Bill having received, failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. We'll go now to House Bills, Third Reading, Supplemental Consent Calendar, Second Day. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to call to the attention of the House that there's a young lady behind me who has a toasted cheese sandwich and she doesn't know who ordered it."

Speaker Redmond: "Has to be Deavers. Mr. Clerk, Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bills, Third Reading, Supplemental Consent Calendar, Second Day. I'll read the Bills which have been taken off of the printed Calendar. Removed were: House Bill 859. I'm on page 32 of the Calendar. 880 was removed. 890, 893, 902, 905, 956, and 957. The remainder of the Bills have been read a third time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Does this apply only to Group 2? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "This is Group 2. House Bills, Third Reading, Supplemental Consent Calendar, Group 2. Read the numbers of the Bills that were removed."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bills that were removed from Group 2 start on page 32 on your Calendar. They are: 859, 880, 890, 893, 902, 905; and on page 33 - 956 and 957."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 151 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bills having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. 993. What's that motion, Representative Winchester? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, there is a Companion Appropriation Bill with



993. Take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this out of the record. 995."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 995."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act in relation to the operation of service stations selling motor fuel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was originally placed on the Consent Calendar and it was inadvertently moved to the Short Debate Calendar. We heard this Bill once before and working with Representative Leinenweber and Representative Bartulis, we amended it to clarify the original intent. And what it calls for now is simply more or less the truth in advertising Bill for motorists and it says, 'During any period of time when the owner or operator of a service station advertises less or a mini-service consisting of the sale of gasoline only with a different price for that product, the service station shall provide the service during those hours of operation.' I think it's a good Bill. It provides for as I said, truth in advertising for motorists and would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone standing in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 5 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1007."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1007. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill allows the Regional School Superintendent to close schools for... under an act of God for bad weather such as we had this last winter and gives him the authority to declare acts of God. And it would give him the authority. There was no opposition to this in Committee and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether we ought to be a little leary about this or not. But I remember school strikes that the lawyers for the Chicago School District described as an act of God in a court brief. And indeed, this could be considered an act of God under this Bill and we're going to let the Chicago schools off the hook, I'm a little leary."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass?"

Skinner: "The real question is not whether the Mayor of Chicago is God."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "I think we ought to be careful what we're doing. I think what we're doing is eliminating snow days for the local schools which means that you can be absolutely guaranteed that your children or your constituents children are going to receive less days in school than they currently do. Every school now prepares for inclement weather and acts of God by providing for extra days of study. I don't think we should do that."

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

Friedrich: "Well, my only question and that's one of the problems with this Short Debate Calendar is..."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that? Will you repeat that please?"

Friedrich: "I say one of the problems of the Short Debate Calendar is that you don't have time to ask questions, but my question is, what is an act of God? An inch of rain or six inches or an inch of snow or a foot of snow? Who decides whether it's an act of God and whether the act of God is so severe he can't have school?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't. Take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye' and 36 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Friedrich, I think the act of God is language that's in the statute in many other cases, but I don't know whether it's defined anyplace except... 1012."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1012. A Bill for an Act in relation to the



creation, maintenance, operation and improvement of the Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This Bill would authorize the Chicago Park District to make supplemental appropriations of any and all monies received after the adoption of the annual appropriation ordinance. However, this legislation would be limited to appropriations not to exceed the amount of monies actually received. The necessity of the adoption of this Bill is based on the anticipation of Federal, state and local legislation whereby the Commissioners could procure additional revenue in the year in which the annual appropriation is adopted. I think the thing to emphasize is that this supplemental appropriation ordinance can affect only revenue which becomes available after the annual appropriation ordinance is adopted.

I ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Anybody in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'."

Marovitz: "Nobody even opposes my Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to say to you that Representative Marovitz was very cooperative in taking out a Section involving ordinances, financial ordinances without notice of hearing and I think the Bill is in good shape and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1014, Representative Sandquist."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1014. A Bill for an Act relating to the deductions from salaries of wages of state employees, the amounts of money designated by them for payments to the United Fund or other similar organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Sandquist: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is really a very simple Bill that will give the state employees the right to make a voluntary deduction for what they



want. Under the present time, the United Way has a monopoly. This is no way a Bill to do anything against the United Way, but there are other national health organizations such as the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Fund, sickle-cell anemia, muscular dystrophy. These are all great things and all I am trying to do is to let the state employee make that decision and not have a monopoly by one organization. It's a good organization and we're not trying to take it away, but these other organizations are great, too. And I think that the state employee should make that decision as to who he wants to contribute to."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane, in opposition."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 1014. The Sponsor of the Bill says that this gives... that without this Bill, the United Way has a monopoly. I would like to point out a few things. First of all, United Way is a cooperative venture with an awful lot of charitable local community organizations that have banded together and have a very low percentage of administrative costs. Most of the money that goes to United Way goes directly into social service agencies. The state employee has an option, a choice. He can give his money to any agency that he wants. What we're giving to United Way under present statutes because of the cooperative nature of United Way and their low administrative expenses, is saying that they can have a salary check-off. There is no need to give this to other agencies. They can get in on this if they would join United Way and be cooperative. The other thing is, is that most of these agencies that would be added to this check-off system are agencies that have a large percentage of the funds that they raise in administrative costs. Under the Attorney General's Consumer Division, Fraud Division, last year, Easter Seals was shown to have something like 55% of the money that they raised go to administrative costs. I don't think that the state should be using its administrative structure to be collecting money for these kinds of agencies and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. And



Representative Jones, to explain his vote."

D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having been a board member of a national health agency for a number of years and not speaking in that capacity, but I do have an observation. Those health agencies who decide to stay out of United Way do so on their own decisions believing this to be in their best interest and that their appeal to the public provides more funds to them, for them than it would being a part of United Way. So I think that this same appeal would follow in... if they were included in the mass appeal that they would not get as much money as they would of their own direct appeal. And I believe that this would be in their best interest not to join in this organization."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gaines, to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hate to see all those red lights up there because you're depriving citizens of an opportunity of free expression. In many state agencies, they have all kind of pressure to have record contributions and many of the low-paying people cannot afford under the pressure to contribute to the United Fund and then contribute to their favorite charity at the same time. And they're accused of not being charitable. When in fact, all they want to do is an opportunity to contribute to their own favorite charity. And I do not think that this is... the state should be in the charity business. We have a welfare department for that. But what we're doing is making people contribute when they don't want to and I think this is the type of coercion that many of you complain about. But because the United Way is a so-called luxury and aristocratic group, you want to be associated with them. Well, a lot of poor people who are workers should have an opportunity to contribute to where they want."

Speaker Giorgi: "This Bill having... Have all voted who wished? This Bill having not received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Voting 'aye' is 41 and voting 'no' is 96. Representative Pierce, for what reason do you rise?"

Pierce: "Who said no other Bill would get less votes than the bottle Bill? I got 42."



Speaker Giorgi: "Next Bill, Mr. Clerk. Take the record. Mr. Conti, for what reason do you rise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave, I was called out of the room. Before the Session's over with I would like to vote for one of Bill Marovitz' Bill and I wasn't here when he called his Bill and I'd like to be recorded as 'aye' on 1012."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave has been granted. Representative Smith, Peggy Martin Smith, for what reason do you rise?"

P. Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. On yesterday, House Bill 730, since we were just on that subject, was called and I was out of the room and I'd like leave please to be recorded voting 'no' on House Bill 730."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the woman have leave? Leave has been granted. Representative Flinn, for what reason do you rise?"

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. I hate to see this Bill get less than the bottle Bill,"

Speaker Giorgi: "Change his vote 'nay' to 'aye'. Mr. McBroom, for what reason do you rise?"

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, may I be recorded 'no'? I was distracted on this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Record the Gentleman 'no'. House Bill 1041. House Bill 1041."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1041."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hart."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill provides for a first come, first served zoning rights in the mile and a half around a municipality. Presently the present law provides that a municipality may zone in one and a half miles around it, but in the event that the county zones the county and desires to overzone or take jurisdiction of the mile and a half that they have that right. I think after all of this time that if cities do zone the mile and a half as



many have done in our area that they should have the right to keep the jurisdiction of the mile and a half zone. This Bill passed out of the House with a substantial majority two years ago but died in the Senate for some reason. It came out of Cities and Villages with a good vote. I can't find the Digest. 13, unanimously out of Cities and Villages and I would urge the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Who is the registered opponent to House Bill 1041? Representative Houlihan, Dan from Cook County."

D. Houlihan: "What happened to the Bill two years ago?"

Hart: "It died on Third Reading in the Senate."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Houlihan, are you the opponent? Are there any other opponents? The question is, shall House Bill 1041 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 3 'nays' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1046."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1046. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Meyer on 1046."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would permit the Illinois Housing Authority to make grants to not-for-profit corporations who are rehabilitating residential housing. I urge its approval."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any opponents to 1046? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Is there an appropriation matter with this Bill, Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Meyer, is there an appropriation measure to this Bill?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Lechowicz: "Well, in all fairness you want to hold this until it comes out of the Appropriation... measure comes with the Bill?"

Meyer: "Fine."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Speaker is... take it out of the record. House



Bill 1072, Mr. Clerk. I apologize. House Bill 1060."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1060. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was a Bill that we passed out of the House last year but failed in the Senate. It failed in the crunch over in the Senate. It would permit the Capital, it would authorize the Capital Development Board to include seven Chicago museums, the Art Institute, the Planetarium and the two zoos in the Capital Development Authority. The reason... the majority of these institutions are supported by the Chicago real estate taxpayer. They're regions of cultural and regional institutions of cultural and recreational interest. Three of them have over two million in attendance in a year and quite frankly, they need to broaden their support to the entire state. I urge its approval."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any opponents? Then the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 12 'nays' and 10 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1072."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1072. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan Civic Center Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen, on House Bill 1072."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1072 amends the Civic Center Act. It reduces from the now six hundred million to three hundred million on the minimum assessed valuation for a county to form an authority. And I'd just like to make the point clear that all that it's doing is giving anyone who would comply with this minimum of three hundred million, it gives that at the local level, a local decision for that County Board to authorize or create a Metropolitan Exposition Authority. And this Bill passed out of the House and Senate last time without a dissenting vote. The Governor did veto it and the... we had



an override in the House. It failed by two in the Senate, but I would encourage everyone to give it his support."

Speaker Giorgi: "In opposition, Representative Skinner, are you in opposition? Representative Skinner, are you in opposition?"

Skinner: "Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I thought we beat this Bill once this year already. I certainly remember speaking on it. Isn't it supposed to be on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I don't... I see on the Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar."

Skinner: "I'll be happy to argue against it. The Gentleman, the Sponsor says it's a local Bill, it's a local decision. I suggest we vote 'no' and make it local money instead of state money. We have a choice. This money comes out of the Agricultural Premium Fund which if not, that goes in the General Fund and... from the General Fund, it can go to the Common School Fund and then out to educate kids. If you'd rather go build monuments than educate kids, you ought to vote for it. My county would be qualified under this Bill and I have yet even since speaking last time received no interest whatsoever from my county. I, as a matter of fact, have received no interest from DeKalb County and I represent part of DeKalb County. Why don't we let the school kids have the money instead of the contractors?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay' and I have a few people that want to explain their vote. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1972 is identical to House Bill 3924 of the last General Assembly that the Governor vetoed. And the reason he vetoed it, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is that as the law now stands, every county in the state is eligible to form an authority, either alone or in combination with other counties. However, the reason for the threshold of six hundred million dollars and not the three hundred suggested here is to insure that an authority will have a sufficient economic base to finance the construction and support the operation of such a center. The Governor felt and I think



rightfully so that reducing the threshold will substantially increase the risk of unsuccessful projects which would be a continuing burden on taxpayers and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "I wonder if the Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, realizes this Bill has less than the bottle Bill. You've still got time to get on it though, Monroe."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in response to the one who spoke negatively about this legislation said he represents DeKalb County or part of DeKalb County and he knows of no interest. Well, there was a very important meeting held in which he was invited that included university representation and the City of DeKalb and the Farm Bureau and actually this civic center that we're talking about is basically, virtually all local money. But we have to have the authority, the statutory authority to move ahead on it. And as far as I'm concerned, Representative Skinner, I think it's about time you pay attention to your mail and show up at those meetings if you'd demonstrate any interest. And I certainly would encourage some of those who are a little bit hesitant about voting for it, that it is bond money and as far as that bond money going into General Revenue for children, I have no opposition to that. But we're not talking about bond money for the state. We're talking about a local input with very little state money."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schuneman, to explain his vote."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this concept is a concept which we have accepted here in the State of Illinois. The civic center concept was accepted in Chicago. It seemed to be a good idea there. It was accepted in Rockford. It seemed to be a good idea there. It seemed to be a good idea in Peoria, but for some reason, it isn't a good idea for the rest of the state. And I think this Bill deserves some votes and if it's good for the rest of the State of Illinois, I think it's good for DeKalb and other counties throughout this state which could make good use of a civic center for expositions and particularly in the area of a community like



DeKalb where they have an agricultural community, they have an education community and it would be a very worthwhile addition to that entire area and I urge support of this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is another one of those good Bills that came out of the Cities and Villages Committee. Representative Ebbesen has worked very hard with me on that Committee in the past years in order to make certain that we give the authority to other areas throughout the state and I don't see any reason why we shouldn't help Bill for his own area and I solicit your support for House Bill 1072."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "I agree with the speaker that pointed out that all of these other areas that have these civic centers, the Representatives that come from those and vote 'no', do so in exceedingly poor grace. We note that Sangamon County has been the beneficiary of tons of state tax money. Their Legislators are all voting 'no' on this particular proposition and Cook County has been a beneficiary since time began. It's foolish to think that the money would ever end up the General Fund. You and I know that whenever there's a balance there, it'll be... there'll be a new project in Cook County to take it away. Give Joe a chance to raid the till and there's nothing sacred about the six hundred million dollar assessed valuation. Let's lower it down to three hundred million. You get it down to a hundred million, I have some areas that'll need civic centers."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mautino, to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Cunningham is exactly correct on that situation. I happen to agree with him on this particular point. The money comes from the Agricultural Premium Fund set up originally for the replenishing and rebuilding of the McCormick Place. What is fair to the northern part of the State of Illinois and Cook County is fair also to downstate. That's what it's all about. I think that it's important for the rest of the State of Illinois to have a crack at having additional construction and individual places for an exposition.



And when you have a county like DeKalb where agriculture, industry and labor are all in favor of basically setting up their own tax structure to come up with their portion of the dollars, I think it's a credit to those people and I hope to see at least three more green lights on that board. It's good for downstate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lauer, to explain his vote."

Lauer: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and especially those of you from downstate, I would suggest that since, because the money comes out of the Agricultural Premium Fund this is all the more reason to vote 'no' on this measure."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if this should reach the necessary amount, I will ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Younge, do you want to explain your vote?"

Younge: "Yes, I think that one of the points that should be pointed out about this Bill is there are two means by which an authority can be set up. One by act of the General Assembly and the other by vote of a County Board. And as I understand this piece of legislation, it merely cuts in half the assessed valuation for a county that is necessary for them to have the authority to set up an Authority. And I think for that reason that everybody ought to be voting for that. It simply gives equal justice and equal opportunity for the smaller counties to be able to vote to set up an Authority if they want one. And for that reason, I think that this legislation ought to pass."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Mudd, to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in listening to Roscoe over there on the other side of the aisle and it's very seldom that him and I disagree too much on these kind of things. I'm really surprised that there's some downstate people who are benefiting from the Civic Center Fund or Metropolitan Exposition Fund who's not supporting this particular issue. And I would hope that they'd get on the board before a verification because I've heard this Bill twice. Last year and this year. It's a good piece of



legislation. It has the necessary support from the local authority that wants to build this thing, the money is there and I think we should support it. I think that Representative Ebbesen has a good Bill and I think the people from downstate should support this particular measure."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. In the meantime, Representative Davis, do you have an announcement?"

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have here to the right of me, a hundred and fifty-one young Americans who are students at the McCosh Elementary School in Chicago. The school is located in the great 29th district. Representative Charlie Gaines, Ray Ewell and Eugene Barnes. Their teachers are with them, Mr. Monroe Bound, Betty Jones, Clarence Tagell, Ralph Grimm, Vernon McGee and Ray Neterlouis. Will the McCosh School please stand?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "That's right. Let's hear it for them. It's not too often we get to introduce the tour guide that is leading that group and let's hear for Babette McMacon up there, the tour guide."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms, you persist in your verification?"

Simms: "No, I'll withdraw the verification."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, on this question there are 98 'ayes', 58 'nays', 10 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Hanahan, for what reason do you rise?"

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we should introduce a colleague of ours that's up visiting and watching us. It's Representative Van Duyne sitting up there."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 1074. In the meantime, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's one person who has been here for some time and I think he's deserving of recognition. Andrew A. Faringa, Head Assistant Attorney, Metropolitan Sanitary District, who only wants an increase in taxes



without referendum. Andy."

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

Robinson: "As long as we're introducing people, my Aunt Harriet Johnston, from Representative Greiman, Peters and Laurino's district is sitting up there."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 1074."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1074. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1074 amends the Chicago Teachers' Article of the Pension Code to allow contributors, retirees, or annuitants who are contributors to the Teachers' Pension Fund on the days immediately preceeding the economic lay-off in Chicago in 1976, to pay their contributions for the time of the lay-off in to the Teachers' Pension Fund. Requires that the contributions be made prior to July 1, 1978. This Bill is similar to House Bill 3987, Representative Telcser's Bill and Senate Bill 1999, Committee Bill by Senator Egan. The language in House Bill 1074 was included by Amendment in the Senate Bill and was adopted in the Conference Committee Report and passed the House but failed in the Senate by two votes. And I ask a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 1074."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any opponents? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 1 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 1078."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1078. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1078 amends the School Code and provides that school boards shall be required to mandate that employees who teach in the State of



Illinois must live in the State of Illinois. That is, they must have residence in the State of Illinois after their employment. And one thing should be made clear on this particular Bill. This does not include the people already on boards. Anybody that's working for a school board right now or for a school district right now may continue no matter where they may be living. It also does not, it also allows school boards to go anyplace they want to hire the personnel. They can go to East Left Overshoe, Nebraska if they want to to hire a particular teacher. But the point is, after that particular teacher is hired, they shall live in the State of Illinois. Another reason for this, I come from a border area and each year, I find that there's hundreds of thousands of dollars that are going out of the State of Illinois into our border states. And this is a loss as far as real estate taxes are concerned, gasoline tax, sales tax, to the tune of millions of dollars over a period of time. I have also found that oftentimes these faculty people who do not live within a state are less concerned about community activities, they're less concerned about the affairs of the State of Illinois, and I urge your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any opponent? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I don't know why in the world we should enter into what is usually a local decision. It seems that local school boards are very capable of deciding the conditions that they wish to require their employees meet. Now, we had some Bills that sought to prevent the local school boards from making these decisions, but I don't see why in the world that we should sit down here in Springfield and decide what the school board in Moline or Joliet or perhaps some of the communities that reside right next to the county line. So, I don't see why we should do this. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1078 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Mulcahey, to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "Well, I can appreciate and understand how people who live



in the central part of the state cannot grasp this idea; but if you live in the border areas, you can understand what I'm talking about. As I indicated, there's hundreds of thousands of dollars each year that are going out of the State of Illinois into our neighboring states. And all this does is state that indeed if you work in a school district in the State of Illinois, you should live in the State of Illinois. It does not preclude the hiring from any other state. And the purpose of it, of course, in these hard fiscal times right now is to maintain some sort of fiscal responsibility as far as these salaries are concerned. This money doesn't... the income to local taxpayers. It should stay in the local communities, I believe, in these border areas. Of course, it will not affect the central part of the state. Somebody living in Decatur is not going to live in Iowa or Wisconsin, but there are a lot of school districts around the border states where this is happening."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Deuster, to explain your vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I represent a border district and I haven't had one word from one constituent complaining about any of our people crossing the state line up into the State of Wisconsin. You go into Antioch or any of the communities and you will find people working in factories that live in Illinois, work... live in Wisconsin. Who cares where they live? Now, if the school board thought it was a problem, I'd hear from them. I haven't heard any complaints. I'd urge you to take a second look at this and give the schoolteachers the same right any other worker has and that is the right to live where they want to or give the local unit of government that power to make that determination rather than dictate from Springfield. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, have problems with this Bill and I like Representative Deuster am from Lake County. We're a border county, bordering Wisconsin. But you've got to understand what this Bill could do to people who live in Illinois because Wisconsin surely will pass



similar legislation. We'd have people in Illinois working in Wisconsin and they'd be out of a job. This is a precedent when we pass this type of Bill. It can hurt people in Illinois, so I would urge Members to get off of this Bill and vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pierce, to explain your vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, this is the opposition of the freedom of a teacher to live where they want. You're making a teacher teaching in a border community like up our way and they find it hard to find a place to live. And so they find an apartment or a house to rent right across the state border at Winthrop Harbor over in Kenosha County, Wisconsin. It's a decent place to live and maybe it's the only place you can find. What's so wrong with them renting or buying that house there as long as they're in time to work and do their job? Why impose by state statute this hardship on the teacher. If the school boards want to do it, my Bill that passed over in the Senate, 113, would allow them to do it for future teachers they hire, but that's their decision, the school board's decision. Let's not mandate it from Springfield, just put another hardship on teachers who find it hard enough to find a place to live and maybe they'll find a decent place to live right over the state line and so what if they do? Why prohibit it?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 71 'ayes', 77 'nays', 12 voting 'present' and this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1079."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1079. A Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of public accounting. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jacobs on 1079."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1079 does exactly what the synopsis states. It serves the C.P.A.s and at the same time, takes care of the thousands of what are known as public accountants by registering and licensing public accountants. Now, in House Bill 1979 it establishes two categories of licensed accountants - the certified public accountant and, number two, the licensed accountant. The I.R.S. currently license nonC.P.A.s or the public accountants for the



purpose of taxing accounting, known as federally enrolled agents. This Bill does not alter the current examination for a certified public accountant but creates another examination for the licensure of the licensed accountant. The Department of Registration and Education will have the power to suspend and refuse a license or a certification for unethical conduct of both the C.P.A. and the licensed accountant. Now, in the Committee only one C.P.A. was there to oppose this Bill and then it was only in appearance only. And one other thing about the Bill that I think you should know, there would be no monopoly on the tax - tax preparation and bookkeeping service markets by either public accountant or C.P.A.s. The state is simply regulating the practice of public accounting giving adequate protection to the public and providing licensure and certification. And I think, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, our guiding principle has to be with the people's interest in mind. And therefore, I ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 1079."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms, in opposition."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. This is similar to the legislation introduced in 1971 which caused so much controversy when Representative Hood had 89 Sponsors and wound up with only 12. What this Bill very frankly does is it sets up a separate classification of accountant, identical in powers, authorities and responsibilities, but not identical in requirements of education and experience. For example, the profession of certified public accountant is one which requires a college degree, years of experience and passing of a comprehensive and highly difficult examination. On the other hand, this legislation would set up a class of licensed accountants which would not even require a high school diploma or any experience or any comprehensive testing procedures whatsoever. In addition to that, it is estimated because of the grandfather of the provisions of this legislation, almost fifteen thousand people could seek licensure under the grandfather provisions. And lastly in opposition, the cost to the State of Illinois to set up this program to the Department of Registration and Education will be a



quarter of a million dollars. Frankly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we don't need two classifications for accountants in Illinois. The present system is adequate and I would suggest that this legislation should receive the same type of vote that it received in 1971 and that's an overwhelming defeat."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1079 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Jacobs, to explain his vote."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After listening to the last Gentleman's remarks, I just want to tell you what happened in 1943 when the State of Illinois permitted the public or the C.P.A.s to pass a Bill that said that no new applicant could be examined for public accountants. Today, it is estimated that there are now four to six nonC.P.A. or licensed public accountants licensing in the State of Illinois. Another thing is that I would like to have you know in a letter from the F.T.C., the Federal Trade Commission from Washington, D.C., dated on April the 5th. And the caption is, 'F.T.C. to investigate possible restrictions on competition on accounting industry. The Federal Trade Commission has by unanimous vote authorized the Chicago Regional office to conduct an investigation into whether activities by the State accountancy licensing boards and private accounting associations restrain entry into the profession or restrict the competitive behavior of accounting.' And I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, if this is an anti-trust suit being prepared in Washington, then why are we continuing with the 1943 anti-accountant legislation? These men and women who are accountants today are doing their bookkeeping work in little restaurants, little businesses, and they're doing your income taxes for you. And if this Bill doesn't pass, you're going to have twelve thousand accountants out of work. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Birchler, to explain his vote."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Accountancy Act Study Committee worked for two years listening to the C.P.A.s, the enrolled accountants, also to the independent accountants. This Bill comes as near as anything we've ever had to giving the control that we



need of accounting in the State of Illinois. It provides the wishes of the C.P.A.s by giving them what they asked for. It also provides the wishes of the enrolled accountants. The Farm Bureau organization in the state that sets up much accounting work through the extension division supports this concept. I urge that we get more 'aye' votes on that board. Today, we need to also control those persons who are providing service to the public. They do about 80% of the people's work. The C.P.A.s do everything that we do. In addition, the C.P.A.s attest. We're not asking to attest. All we're asking is that you give us the right to control the other group of people who are doing accounting work in the State of Illinois. I surely want to see more 'ayes' on the board."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there are 65 'ayes', 77 'nays', 10 voting 'present' and this Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is declared lost. House Bill 1083. Representative Madison, for what reason, do you rise? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker... am I on? Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. For those of you that are engaging in whistling, you know, it's an ultrahigh frequency sound and there are a few of us that are suffering from hangovers from last night. I wish you'd cease and desist if you would please."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 1083."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1083. A Bill for an Act in relation to county zoning. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1003 is a, basically a clean-up proposition as far as the cities and villages and county zoning situation is concerned. What it does is change the or allows cities to protest the change of a text when the land lies within a mile and a half of the limits of a zoned municipality as well as presently being able to protest a change in the map. And it also makes... changes the word, 'city county and present board of trustees in the corporate authorities whereby it does not have to be individually signed.' Can



be done by Resolution. I'd ask for affirmative vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any opponent? The question is, shall House Bill 1083 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and House Bill 1083 receiving the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1071."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill..."

Speaker Giorgi: "I apologize, 1091."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1091. A Bill for an Act to provide for the Metropolitan Exhibition and Auditorium Authority in East St. Louis. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to go ahead with this Bill although there is a small feasibility study Bill in one of the Appropriations Committees, But whether or not it's successful, the authority which will be operated if funding should be set up. I'd like to concede. This Bill sets up the East St. Louis Exposition Authority and providing that nine members of the governing board to be appointed by the Mayor. And it is a first step in the implementation of a small assembly facility that we need in East St. Louis that would seat between two and five thousand people. This legislation is set up in such a way that the authority if set up then has to apply to the Department of Business and Economic Development for approval to participate in the state-wide fund. The Authority has to show that the project has economic feasibility, that there is a master building plan and there is a financial plan. And I ask for your support of this matter."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand there's a Companion Appropriation Bill. I think this should wait till that catches up."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Younge, the practice has been if there's an Appropriation Bill that we pull the Bill out of the record until the Appropriation Bill arrives with it."

Younge: "Yes, I explained that that was a feasibility study and not an



appropriation to set up the Authority."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, if that's only a feasibility study, that's not an appropriation. Mr. Leinenweber, are you an opponent? Same question. Representative Schlickman, are you an opponent?"

Schlickman: "Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a Bill that has come to us many times and it's rather difficult to come up with new reasons as to why we should be against the Bill. I would like to summarize them as follows: This Bill covers only East St. Louis instead of the broader area of Madison and St. Clair counties. A broader area would provide more of a tax base to support it. In addition, considering the depressed nature of East St. Louis, it's open to serious question as to whether it could accurately support a civic center. No authority is given to levy any local taxes or support the authority or to pay principal and interest on G.O. bonds. It allows some general obligation bonds to be issued without a front-door referendum. The backdoor referendum provision only gives ten days after publication of the ordinance for a petition to be presented. It allows the interest rate on revenue bonds to be at 8%. All other authorities are limited to 7%. Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it does not provide for a negotiated sale as well as bidding of revenue bonds as do Springfield's act. Negotiated sales of bonds can be done at less expense than bidding. I urge a 'no' vote on 1091."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1091 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Younge, to explain her vote."

Younge: "Yes, in reference to the negotiated sales for the bonds, an Amendment will be placed in the Senate that will take care of that problem. And it was indicated that this Bill had come up before. This is the first time that this Bill has ever come up. And because the assessed valuation of East St. Louis is a hundred and seventy-eight million dollars, I feel that the one and one-half percent which is the threshold for a referendum is a threshold that the people of East St. Louis will agree with and will pass the referendum necessary to bring this authority



in existence. The nature of this kind of legislation is to help with the economic conditions of the local area and any adjustments that have to be made in the legislation will be made in the Senate and I ask your support of this matter."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Younge, for what reason do you rise?"

Younge: "A poll of the absentees, please."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Representative asks for the poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, would you poll the absentees? Representative Sharp, for what reason do you rise?"

Sharp: "Yeah, just if it hits 89, I'm going to request a verification."

Speaker Giorgi: "Standby."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, Bennett, Bradley, Byers."

Speaker Giorgi: "Byers votes 'aye'. Hold it, Mr. Clerk. John Dunn votes 'aye'. Gene Chapman votes 'aye'. You got those, Mr. Clerk? Representative Gaines 'aye'. Gaines, Charlie Gaines. Sandquist, you want to be recorded voting 'aye'?"

Sandquist: "Yes, would you change me to 'aye'?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Sandquist 'aye'. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett, Bradley, Conti, Cunningham, Deavers, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Ewing, Friedrich, Huskey, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Kane, Katz, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Laurino, Macdonald, Mautino, McGrew, Meyer, Molloy, Mugalián, Mulcahey, Schneider, Schoeberlein."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mulcahey 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sevcik, Stanley, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Telcser, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "On this question there are 88 'ayes'. Representative Anderson, for what reason do you rise?"

Anderson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Anderson: "Vote me 'no' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Anderson 'no'. Representative Klosak."

Klosak: "Record me 'aye' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Klosak votes 'aye'. That's 89."



Representative McClain 'aye'. Representative Bradley 'aye'.
Representative Sharp, do you persist in your verification?"

Sharp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, you know, you took the vote before anyone had an opportunity to explain their vote and I live in Madison County and it seems to me until the people down there can decide amongst themselves whether they want an exposition center, whether they want to work together for a center for the Madison-St. Clair County area, I don't think we here in the General Assembly should be passing this for either county and I live in Madison County. They want it all to themselves, and so I am going to request a verification on this and I wish that we could get some people to drop off and let the area solve their own problems first."

Speaker Giorgi: "For what purpose does Representative Madison rise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if Representative Sharp persists in his verification, I wonder if I might be verified. I have to leave the floor."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be verified so he can leave the floor? Hearing no objection, Representative Madison's verified. Representative Mautino, for what reason... Representative Mautino 'aye'. How many does that make, Mr. Clerk? 92. Representative Epton, for what reason do you rise?"

Epton: "I inadvertently pushed the wrong button. Record me as 'no' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Epton 'no'. Representative Houlihan, Jim, for what reason do you rise? Representative James Houlihan. Representative Stiehl, for what reason do you rise? Cissy."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as not voting."

Stiehl: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote Mrs. Stiehl 'no'. Representative Winchester, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Winchester: "Vote me 'present' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote Mr. Winchester from 'aye' to 'present'. There are now 88 votes. Representative Youngue."



Younge: "Put it on Postponed Consideration please."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Lady asks that it be placed on Postponed Consideration. Any objections? Put it on Postponed Consideration.

House Bill 1098, Representative McMaster. Representative McMaster, I'm asked to ask you is there a Companion Bill? Out of the record. Take 1098 out of the record. House Bill 1113."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1113. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Construction Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mudd, on 1113."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was filed to correct a discriminatory practice as being practiced by our Capital Development Board through no fault of their own. It corrects the legislation to allow every school district within the State of Illinois to participate in debt service or construction grants. It allows... it is supported by the Illinois Office of Education, the Illinois Association of School Boards and I don't think that it has any opposition. It came out of Committee unanimously. It's on the Consent Calendar and we left it on Short Debate just in case there was. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any opponent? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1113 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 17 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1188."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1188. A Bill for an Act to amend the River Conservancy District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kent, on 1188."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This provides that where a river conservancy district is located in more than one county, the trustees representing that area which are located outside any municipality with a population of five thousand or more and trustees at large shall be appointed by a majority vote of the county board of the county which encompass the districts. It permits those trustees already in office to continue until their time is finished. I



urge you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any opponents? The question is, shall House Bill 1188?

All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', no 'nays', at least six voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1202."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1202. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to plats. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kempiners, on 1202."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1202 was recommended to me by Frank Olsen, who's the Director of Planning and Zoning Division of Kane County government. And the problem they're having is that people are getting around local county ordinances due to the existing state law. And what we're doing here is amending the Platting Act by inserting wording under an exemption that would indicate that the law, that this exemption that we're amending does not invalidate any local requirement applicable to the subdivision of land. And basically what we're doing is saying to the people in local counties that if you have a law that is more stringent than what's provided here, that the person who is subdividing would have to follow that law and not use this as an exemption around that particular ordinance."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any opponents? Is there an opponent? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 1202 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 128, 9 'ayes', 11 'nays', 6 voting 'present' or 7 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1209."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1209. A Bill for an Act concerning fees and salaries. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1209 simply raises the fee for a marriage license from ten dollars to



fifteen dollars. I feel everyone in this room should vote 'yes' for three reasons. One, the raise is justified. The last increase was made in 1963 from three dollars to ten dollars. With inflation and increased overhead, any County Clerk you want to ask will assure you that the increase is justified. Second, you'll strengthen the family and make your County Clerk happy at the same time. Third, it will affirm the value that our society places on the institution of marriage. Those 103 people who voted 'yes' to increase the hunting and fishing licenses should vote 'yes' on this Bill to increase the marriage license fee on the grounds that those who participated in activities should be willing to pay a reasonable fee. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "The opponent, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we heard a lot of debate on this on Second Reading. Let me tell you it's only a two dollar fee for the issuance of a fire permit. I realize there's more fireworks in marriages. Five dollars for the issuance of liquor licenses and I realize that sometimes a marriage gets to drinking. And only a dollar for the issuance of filing of swearing of affidavits and I realize there's a lot of swearing in marriages. But seriously, this isn't a fee. It's a tax. There's nobody on the floor of this House can tell me that it costs fifteen dollars to administer the marriage license. The Sponsor of this Bill told the truth on Second Reading, why she introduced that Bill to discourage marriages. You don't do it by a fee. That's no way to do it. It's dishonest by placing a tax on people who are going to get married. That was the purpose for increasing it to ten dollars. It didn't work. It's not going to work for an extra fin. Believe me, it won't do it. If you want to, put it up to a thousand. There's a lot of young people are realizing now they can live together without getting a license. That's what it's going to lead to and I know Representative Dyer, you're not for that. So I plead with the Ladies and Gentlemen on the floor of the House, vote 'no' to this bad Bill 1209."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1209 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting



'no'. And we have three or four that want to explain their vote.
Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a bachelor I just wish to announce a conflict of interest so I vote 'present'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Well, I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill was heard by the Counties and Townships Committee of which I am Vice-chairman. It received a sizeable vote in this Committee. I certainly think that it would make marriages more of a serious matter and therefore, would have a tendency to help family life in which I've got a strong interest. I also feel that it will bring in income to counties that need this type of help and will add some income in a reasonable fashion. I think raising it from ten to fifteen is very reasonable. I ask for your support."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keats, to explain his vote."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As is true of my friend, Representative Bowman, I'm a bachelor, too, so I have a conflict of interest. But I'm not going to vote 'present'. I'm going to vote 'yes'. We ought to make it difficult to get married. In fact, I was going to amend this Bill to say it costs five thousand dollars to get that fee and that money is put into escrow and collects interest. At the end of ten years if you're still married, you get your five thousand back with interest. If you aren't married, we'll use the five thousand in interest to pay for all your stupid court costs. So I'm voting 'yes'. We ought to make it a little more difficult to get married."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that this Bill only keeps the cost of marriages licenses up with inflation. Hopefully, the five dollars will have some deterrent effect on anybody who's entering into a hasty marriage. I think the Bill is timely. I think it's in good order and I would hope that this House would see it as our Counties and Townships Committee did and pass it out with an overwhelming vote. Thank you very much."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Dyer says that this Bill will make your County Clerk happy and that's why I'm voting for it. I want to make my County Clerk happy."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if there are any married men up there that are voting red and don't think their wife is worth fifteen dollars, you should be ashamed of yourself. I think you ought to think about the value of the, of what you get for the investment. And so I can be happy when I go home and tell my wife I think she's worth far more..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "...I urge the raising it substantially."

Speaker Giorgi: "I've been asked, please all unauthorized persons clear the floor. It's creating a little congestion. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I disagree with Representative Keats. I think it should be easy to get married but I don't think a five dollar increase is that much problem so I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I checked with our County Clerk and I find that in almost every instance, she indicates the man pays the amount so I called this to the attention of the Sponsor of this Bill that this is obviously in violation of the Equal Rights Amendment and the Illinois Constitution. Secondly, since my Bill was referred to the Fishing License Bill, I would also call to her attention that she rejected two suggestions that I had in my Fishing License Bill that could be applied to her Bill and, therefore, I don't know whether I can support it. For instance, she rejected the concept of a twenty-four hour marriage license and she also rejected the idea of creating a special marriage license fund which could be used for disgruntled husbands. So in each case, I think she ought to consider these Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."



Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I know you're up on the rostrum and can't talk on this Bill so I'll give your speech for you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Nevermind."

Pierce: "I understand... in order to make sure that people are... know what they're doing when they get married, I believe you have a case that each party must get an attorney and make an application in court for the finding that they're qualified to get married, that they know what they're doing and they're qualified to be parents. And so therefore, with you serving as Speaker, unable to speak, I know it's too late to offer that Amendment, but I think if Representative Dyer would offer to bring this back to Second Reading, Representative Giorgi would offer the Amendment that before any couple could get married, each party must hire an attorney and get a petition court... for an order finding them qualified and knowledgeable to get married."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think I need to speak anymore, but sometimes I think they need more attorneys. They need a psychiatrist. But fifteen dollars shouldn't be too much."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Matijevidch, for what reason do you rise?"

Matijevidch: "Please for a short explanation. I want Don Deuster to know it's not what your wife is worth, it's what you're worth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "How do we deal with the problem of guilty by reason of temporary insanity, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "No answer. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I know that we've taken a long time but I just wanted to, in explanation of my vote, I wanted to say to Representative Deuster, I was talking to his wife the other day and she said that there was no inflation at their house because he's still only worth two cents."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti, quickly."

Conti: "I just wanted to say that I got married, it cost me two dollars."

It was the best bargain I ever had and I don't want to deprive



the youngsters of this same thing."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Lauer, while we take the Roll. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Lauer. Take the record."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I would agree with those people who want the fee considerably higher. I can't help but recall a Bio. Prof. in college that made the remark, 'Gentlemen, when you see that cute, young thing wig-waggin across the campus, just remember, it isn't love, it's those damn potassium ions again!'"

Speaker Giorgi: "On this question there are 103 'ayes', 41 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1224."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1224. A Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1224 provides that when an Illinois employer has had three successive years without claims against his workmen's compensation insurance policy, that the insuring agent must not cancel his policy for at least one year after the renewal date except for lack of payment of his premium. This Bill is an attempt to end the huge number of claims, policy cancellations which are forcing the employers into the assigned risk pool. And in 1974 there were only 500 Illinois employers assigned to the pool. And by 1976, we had almost six thousand employers assigned to that pool. I think this is good legislation and I would ask for a green light."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? Being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1224 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1231."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1231. A Bill for an Act in relation to the insurance of contracts and depositing of..."



Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, out of the record. 1237."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1237. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1237 merely permits towns to consolidate precincts in town elections. And there are very few people that vote in these elections. It would simply save some of the taxpayers money and I know of no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponents, the question is, shall House Bill 1237 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Conti, for what reason do you rise?"

Conti: "I'd just like to a question. Is this permissive or is this mandatory?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Porter. Permissive, he says."

Conti: "All right."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 141 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1241."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1241. A Bill for an Act to enlarge the corporate limits of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Macdonald on 1241."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1241 provides for a number of single-family homes that are currently in Hoffman Estates that are in the process of being annexed into the Village of Hoffman Estates to be annexed into the Metropolitan Sanitary District. Currently, many of the residents are under contractual services to M.S.D. and are required to pay 140% of the normal tax rate until they can be officially annexed into the district. There is more than sufficient sewer capacity available from the Metropolitan Sanitary District's



John Egan plant to serve the residents and I ask for your favorable vote on this much-needed service."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland, are you the opponent?"

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would call your attention to House Bill 1241. I don't suggest to you that there's anything kinky about this measure, but it's supported and introduced in the House by colleagues from another district. Now what... the opponents of this measure are numerous small villages in the Barrington Township and Palatine Township of this area of the Second Legislative District. And here's an example of legislation being introduced by colleagues in another district in an... a slap in the face to those who are representing the other district. Now under this measure, the M.S.D. would utilize the legislative process to encroach upon existing and well-established programs and land-use policies in the Second District area. And I'd urge your rejection of this measure."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall this Bill, House Bill 1241, pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Macdonald, to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to clarify the statement of the last Representative that spoke. Hoffman Estates, the Village of Hoffman Estates is in the Third District and I was asked by the President of that village to introduce this Bill. I certainly meant no offense. I do not think it is a violation of protocol of this House. The land that we are talking about is unincorporated land and these people are going to be in the Village of Hoffman Estates and they have asked to be annexed into the Metropolitan Sanitary District. And I see no reason for them to have to pay 140% of normal tax rate just because the surrounding village oppose their getting service from M.S.D."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What's involved here is a land-use planning by B.A.C.O.G., Barrington Area Council of Governments which has about eight or nine municipalities which have taken, which have studied this area and has made plans for orderly



development. Disorderly development does not call for the kind of intensive use that would be generated by an extension of this Metropolitan Sanitary District in this area. The Villages of Barrington, South Barrington, North Barrington, Tower Lakes, Inverness and so forth are very much opposed to this. And since the area in question and this Council of Government is entirely within the Second District, I'm communicating to you the wishes of those communities to allow their planning to be unaffected by expansionist moves of a municipality which has encouraged and developed high density land use and zoning."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "I'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration please. Poll the absentees. I guess we can't put it on Postponed on Short Debate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, let's... The Clerk suggests we dump this and we'll put it on again. Dump this Roll Call. The question is, shall House Bill 1241 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' or those opposed vote 'no'. Get on your switches so that it may not be necessary to... Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Totten, for what reason do you rise?"

Totten: "Well, I wanted to explain my vote. I had my light on."

Speaker Giorgi: "Explain your vote."

Totten: "You opened the voting switch and now you've closed it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, those that want to vote can vote orally. We can hear them."

Totten: "Okay, then let me explain my vote. The Mayor of the Village of Hoffman Estates for which I live in the Village of Hoffman Estates came to Representative Macdonald and I and asked us to introduce the legislation. Representative Macdonald has been handling the legislation which pertains to the Village of Hoffman Estates and it has the sanitary district annexing some additional land into the sanitary district to serve people in the Village of Hoffman Estates. That portion happens to be in the Second Legislative District. The Barrington Area Council of Governments is opposed to the annexation as indicated by Representative Friedland.



But in no way is there any poaching by any Representatives. I happen to live in the Village of Hoffman Estates and Representative Macdonald represents the area and that Mayor came to us for the proposal. The sanitary district wants to do it. The people are paying more money because they're not in the district and they should be allowed to be serviced."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "I just want to change my vote from 'yes' to 'present' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Change Friedrich from 'yes' to 'present'. Representative Hoxsey, for what reason do you rise?"

Hoxsey: "Change my vote to 'aye' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Hoxsey from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Kane, for what reason do you rise?"

Kane: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane, how is he recorded?"

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

Kane: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote Representative Kane 'aye'. Representative Reed, for what reason do you rise?"

Reed: "In Short Debate, am I allowed to ask Representative Macdonald a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "We haven't up till now, Mrs. Reed."

Reed: "Okay, then may I explain my vote?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes, you may, go ahead, continue."

Reed: "I live adjacent to the Second Legislative District and am immediately familiar with the organization called B.A.C.O.G. I simply would like to point out that B.A.C.O.G., the municipalities within B.A.C.O.G. are by and large paper villages. They have by all means set up some strict zoning standards. I'm sure that they don't want a new subdivision next to them that's within sight of the Egan Plant of M.S.D. However, the rate increases that the people are being forced to pay in this unincorporated area when they are within sight of the largest sanitary plant in the entire world is incredible. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Edgar, to explain his vote."



Edgar: "No, I'd just like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Edgar votes 'aye'. Representative Conti, for what reason do you rise?"

Conti: "I'd like to change my vote to 'aye'. I was a little concerned about the stipulations of this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti votes 'aye'. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm not recorded. Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen 'aye'. Representative Wolf 'aye'. Should we dump this and take another quick Roll Call? No, no? Okay, Representative Marovitz 'aye'. The Clerk would rather not. Representative Robinson 'aye'. Peggy Smith Martin 'aye'. Representative McPike 'aye'. Representative Bradley 'aye' and 'no'? Oh, from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Anderson, for what reason do you rise? Anderson 'aye'. Byers from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Christensen 'aye'. Christensen. There are now 94 'ayes'. There are... on this question there are now 94 'ayes', 20 'nays', 21 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1266."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1266. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Northeastern Illinois Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matejek."

Matejek: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1266 amends the Northeastern Illinois Planning Act. It requires the advice and consent of the Senate for the Governor's appointees to the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. It has been the general policy of the Illinois General Assembly to require the approval by the Senate for as many of the Governor's appointments as possible. I would ask for an affirmative vote please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there... Representative Ryan."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, Mahar."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mahar, to speak in opposition."

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



rise reluctantly to oppose my good friend, Mr. Matejek's Bill. I don't see any real need for the Governor appointees being confirmed. Bear in mind, we have twenty-five commissioners. Some of them are elected by their, by the Council of Mayors in the metropolitan area. The Mayor of Chicago appoints five commissioners and there is no need for their confirmation and they're not confirmed. You have the M.S.D. appointing a member, the C.T.A, the Cook County Board of Trustees, the suburban area appoint commissioners. It just seems to me that in the operation of the... of NIPC that there isn't any real need for the Governor to approve these and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1266 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. And Representative Hanahan, to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I encourage your favorable vote on this Bill and I'll tell you why. NIPC in northeastern Illinois is that organization that affects an awful lot of the planning of our villages and our cities, our counties, our hopes and aspirations. And unless we have some input on what members are going to serve on NIPC that the Governor appoints, we know the City of Chicago and the County of Cook are going to be well taken care of by their appointees representing your interests. But the Governor's appointees and I don't care who the Governor is, Republican or Democrat or where he's from, those appointees affect our lives very, very much. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, as we grow in this metro-government kind of concept, I'd like to have any kind of question on an appointment process by any Governor for northeastern Illinois. And I urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, I must admit I'm fairly confused at this point. I have not noticed that the Illinois has done much to help the outlying areas on R.T.A. and I can't imagine their attitude toward any Governor's appointment would be any more helpful to my county than it has been on R.T.A. Perhaps somebody can convince me, otherwise."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well briefly, I hope Senator... I mean, Representative Skinner will see the light. Anything with respect to NIPC just about will be an improvement. The latest thing that has happened to us up in Lake County is they cut our water off pretty much. NIPC suggested that we can't get anymore Lake County water. I certainly think that it would be helpful to have the Legislature look over, even if it's the other Body, it would be better if we had the House looking them over, too, but if we have the Senate look over these appointments, that'll be helpful and help us make these people responsive to the needs of the surrounding counties. I'd urge many, many more 'aye' votes. Anything like this would be a step forward and I hope that Skinner will help us, too."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matejek, to explain his vote."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we all have a moral responsibility as elected officials to see to it that our system continues to be one of checks and balances. Therefore, I think the Senate should confirm the appointments of the Governor to the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative, Majority Leader Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, do you know if this is Mr. Matejek's first Bill?"

Speaker Giorgi: "No, I didn't know it till now, Mr. Madigan. Matejek, this is your first Bill?"

Matejek: "That's right, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, let's take the record first. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. He requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Brummet, for what reason do you rise?" Mr. Clerk, Representative Brummet wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Huff voting 'aye'. And Representative Schisler voting 'aye'. There are 89 votes now. Do you still persist in a poll of the absentees? No, he doesn't. Is there... How many votes? On this question there are 89 'ayes'. Representative Mulcahey, for what reason do you rise? Mulcahey votes 'aye'. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 62 'nos', 3 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.



House Bill 1268."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1268. A Bill for an Act requiring certain types of Bills introduced in the General Assembly have provided a note indicating the fiscal affects upon the state finances.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McCourt, on 1268."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this proposed legislation expands the Fiscal Note Act of 1965. As you know, a Sponsor of legislation that has a fiscal impact in state finances where it expends state funds or increases or decreases the revenues of the state, either directly or indirectly, must present a brief explanatory statement or note which must include a reliable estimate of the anticipated change in state revenues or expenditures. This Bill would require the same type of fiscal note if the finances of some other unit of government was affected by the proposed legislation. The fiscal note would be prepared by the Department of Local Government for municipalities by the Office of Education for school districts and by the community college districts and for the community colleges by the Illinois Community College Board. Wherever taxpayers are affected by legislation, the full impact should be known at the time the legislation is considered. I'd recommend your favorable approval. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, are you an opponent?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really don't think the Fiscal Note Act has really worked. It's created some chaos here. We know there's ways to get around it which have been done. It's kind of blocked a lot of things and now to expand it to units of local governments, school districts and community college districts, I think we'll just create more chaos and if we're going to have the Fiscal Note Act, let's leave it be where it's at. And I think we're better off not expanding it at this time. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1268 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. There are a number that want to explain their votes.



Representative Lechowicz."

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

I stand in support of House Bill 1268. In fact, the meetings of the Illinois Municipal Problems Commission, the Mayors from throughout this state vividly expressed their concern as far as being mandated by programs coming and passed by the General Assembly and signed into law and at no time was there a fiscal impact statement on that legislation that was passed, how it affected local government. This Bill addresses that problem quite specifically in stating that if there is a Bill introduced in the General Assembly affecting local government, there should be an impact statement prepared so if it is signed into law, we know who's paying for what. I strongly recommend an 'aye' vote.

Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 126 'ayes', 6 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1269."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1269. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McCourt, on House Bill 1269."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Bill. It corrects certain abuses that some school districts have been guilty as pertains to the use of their life safety taxing authority. This General Assembly in 1961 authorized a five cent tax authorization for the purpose of improving fire safety conditions of our schools after the disastrous Queen of Angels fire. This is a tax without a referendum. This money has been used for such projects as tennis courts, outdoor tracks, sidewalks, fences, normal maintenance for removed from any relationship to fire safety by some school districts. The purpose of this Bill is to tighten up these abuses so as to assure that this taxing authority is used to improve fire prevention and safety features of schools. It's supported by the Office of Education and I strongly urge your support. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? Being no opponents, the question



is, shall House Bill 1269 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 156 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1275."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1275. A Bill for an Act to create Sanitary Districts and remove obstructions from the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1275 exempts the Assistant Purchasing Agent from civil service examination. Last Session we passed a Bill that would exempt various Deputy Chief Engineer, Assistant Chief Engineer and Assistant Director under the code. This has been supported by the Civic Federation and it is important to note that the Bill does not take the position out of the classified civil service. It merely removes the requirement of an examination. It also further provides for certification as a civil service employee after satisfactory completion of a probationary period not exceeding two years. And I would urge your support."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there an opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1275 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Yes, I would like to oppose this Bill and I'd urge a 'no' vote. You realize what this does? This takes the Purchasing Agent for the Chicago Sanitary District out from under civil service examination. This is an office with tremendous power. If you've read the metropolitan newspapers, the greatest scandals in the state have occurred in the Metropolitan Sanitary District in the City of Chicago. And we're going to let this Assistant Purchasing Agent be a patronage person who can let contracts and do the purchasing for that body. I would certainly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote in support of this

piece of legislation. During the last Session of the General Assembly we passed on to the Governor who signed a Bill which exempted the second level person for every department at the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District from the civil service requirements. The absence of the Assistant Purchasing Agent was an error on the part of the drafters of the Bill. So that all this Bill does is to bring this one position into conformance with all of these similar positions at the sanitary district. I might add that the person who is in charge of the department also is not subject to the civil service requirement. However, if that person who is in charge of the department is to be removed, then charges must be filed by the General Superintendent and a public hearing held before all of the trustees. There is nothing inherently wrong with this legislation. It's corrective in nature and I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 33 'nays', 19 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 1277."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1277. A Bill for an Act to amend the matching grants for University Scholarship Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Chapman, on 1277."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill expands the very excellent student to student program that our colleges and universities have, public colleges and universities, to include private colleges and our community colleges. I urge you to support this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1277 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 126 'ayes', 13 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1307."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1307. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lechowicz, on House Bill 1307."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1307 provides that a local liquor control commissioner may petition the Circuit Court for the purpose of obtaining an order from the court for the immediate closing of any premises licensed under the Act when such a premise poses an imminent danger to the public health, welfare, safety or morals. This Bill in conjunction with two other Bills, 1308 and 9, are the byproduct of the Southwest Mayors Conference and in turn, are supported by the Illinois Municipal League. And they were introduced for that specific reason to take in some of the objections that the mayors had at the mayors conference in reference to the control of alcoholic establishments within their community. A significant problem in the present law is a long period of time between the commencements of a proceeding to revoke the license of an establishment and in the case of an appeal, the final, the case of the appeal and the final determination. This may take over a year



or longer. In the interim period, the establishment may continue to operate and continue the same violations as were charged in the original proceedings. House Bill 1307 addresses that situation in a rather direct manner and that Mayor has asked that this Bill be introduced, be brought before the General Assembly for its consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1307... Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill because I happen to sit on the Illinois Liquor Commission and I got, had to consider appeals from local commissioners. And what the problem is, is you have local commissioners who are the prosecutor, the judge and the jury on liquor licensees. And I think you've got to remember that liquor licensees are entitled to due process just like everyone else. And what this series of Bills does is to take away part of this due process. And I think there are constitutional problems in this Bill because it says... it's vague, the description of what is imminent danger. And I think that the process we have now if it's properly carried out, gives everybody the protections they're entitled to by our State Constitution or our Federal Constitution. And I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1307 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "I'll yield to Representative Bluthardt, for the time being."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If there's any one agency that's failed to function properly in the last few years, it's the Illinois Liquor Control Agency. You know, when we have problems with taverns and have to take action to close a tavern up, they merely... the owner of that tavern merely calls the agency up and they're allowed to open again instantly. We've had cases where young men, a young man was murdered in a Schiller Park tavern. I closed them up. The next day



up there instead of waiting for some Liquor Commissioner in the Capitol City to make up their mind what's happening in the local community."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lucco, to explain his vote."

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

Just briefly reiterating what has been said, I think that the Mayor as a duly elected official of the community knows best what is best for his community."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mayor Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, I didn't know this light was on, Mr. Speaker. But

I, too, as a former Mayor of DeKalb would concur with everything that's been said and I would encourage a lot more green lights up there. There's 48 people that are not voting. I encourage them to get over on the green side."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijeich, to explain his vote."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like

to show the other side of the coin. We've heard from all the Mayors and they don't always know what's best because sometimes you've got to look at the politics of it. I know what happened a few years back in the City of Waukegan where right after election, the Mayor of Waukegan at that time closed down the best eating place we've got in Lake County. They had a little bowling banquet and they played a little game of chance and he knew there were other places that he could have closed, but he picked that one. And I'll tell you you can find a friendly... a Mayor can find a friendly Judge. They'll close a place down strictly for politics. Believe me, this can be used for politics and it can be very dangerous. So I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sandquist, to explain his vote."

Sandquist: "No, I rise on a point of personal privilege because there's been some remarks here about the Illinois Liquor Commission. Well, I was a commissioner and I want to tell you. It's easy for you people sitting out here that are talking about a Mayor running things because he's got the local people just as Representative Matijeich just said. They play politics with this. And when matters come to the Liquor Commission, we've got to look at due



process and our things were appealed to the Circuit Court. And you've got to take these things into account. You cannot just satisfy the mob and run out to close a place. And I resent these remarks that we did not operate in the correct way."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 101 'ayes', 37 'nays', 11 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Cunningham, for what reason do you rise?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I hope you counted the number of Mayors that spoke on this and recognize that the Mayors constitute more of a threat to this House than do the lawyers. And you should change your position and antagonism that you've expressed in the past."

Speaker Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Cunningham. House Bill 1309."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1309. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1309 is again a by-product of the Municipal Conference and it was introduced at the request of the Mayors from throughout the State of Illinois. It provides that in the event of an appeal from an order of a local Liquor Control Commissioner revoking a license or refusing to suspend a license, relief from such action may be conditioned upon a court order. The Bill as it was originally introduced required a bond. That has been eliminated by Amendment #1 which was adopted. And in turn, now it's up to the Judge to indemnify the state against all injuries, loss or costs sustained as it is occasioned by the proceedings. This is totally modified as far as with Amendment #1 that it's up to the Judge now to determine the true cost and profits that the establishment had in its period that it was open, during its... period of relief. As you know, a tavern is closed and in turn with 1307 just being passed, there is process of having to reopen. But what we're trying to do is to eliminate the tremendous amount of time between a decision and the appeal process. And in turn, we've found cases where the establishment was open for a year or



two providing the same type of violations but in turn, making a tremendous profit. 1309 addresses itself in the situation where the Judge can determine the profits and losses and also determine the fact that the necessary amount of dollars that it costs in doing business and providing that person a fair return on his money. That's the purpose of 1309 as amended. Be more than happy to have any debate on the matter."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sandquist, in opposition."

Sandquist: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Really, not so much in opposition now that 1307 has passed. There's no question that this Bill is probably needed because there will be instances where someone's going to be closed down and they're going to sue the local Liquor Commissioner for the damages lost because they were improperly shut. And whether or not you can get a bond, I don't know. I kind of doubt it, but that's one of the problems you've got with this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1309 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. And Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote. Representative Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you can distinguish from the last Bill which is on the same subject as being a good Bill. Where there's an imminent threat of danger to the public health, welfare or safety or morals, as some of the Mayors pointed out, there you need fast action. And a 'yes' vote on that last Bill, I think, would be justified. But on this one where you're talking about just the appeal process, there's no reason that we have to tear that jurisdiction away from the State Liquor Control Commission. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Skinner, for what reason do you rise?"

Skinner: "I'm just curious to know whether these take 107 votes because they don't exempt home rule units."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just one moment while I peruse the Bill. I've been asked will the unauthorized personnel please leave the Assembly floor? Will all unauthorized personnel please leave the Assembly



floor? Mr. Lechowicz, for what reason do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "Doesn't affect home rule."

Speaker Giorgi: "It does not affect home rule? Then it would take 89 votes. In any event, on this question there are 97 'ayes' or... Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 101 'ayes', 30 'nays', 9 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1336. Representative Totten."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1336. A Bill for an Act concerning costs of litigation in civil cases where the state's allegations are untrue and unreasonable. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1336, I had requested come off the Short Debate and go on the regular Calendar and I think it appears on there now."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 1348."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1348. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Shumpert, on House Bill 1348."

Shumpert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1348 amends the Cook County Article of the Pension Code. Adds one trustee to the Pension Board to be named by the Cook County Board. Now, this Bill passed out of the Committee 13 to zero. I would certainly ask for an affirmative vote on this Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1348 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 'ayes', 12 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1405."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1405. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1405 deletes the provision that under the State Minimum Wage Act, we allow the



exemption from the provisions of the two dollars and thirty cents an hour students employed that are over the age of eighteen that are employed in motion picture theaters from receiving the salary of two dollars and thirty cents an hour. All this Bill does is remove that exemption. I might point out that presently as part of the exemptions of the State Minimum Wage Act on overtime pay, is the exemption of movie theater employees up to forty-five hours. So in effect, right now, a twenty, twenty-one year old student of a university working in a motion picture theater is receiving or may receive a dollar, ninety-five cents an hour for the period of up to forty-five hours. I think this is ridiculous in an area when we talk about raises in pay for Judges, we talk about raises in pay for Legislators, we talk about raises in pay for all sorts of other employees of the state and we talk about raising salaries around here very simply, we're talking about people making a dollar, ninety-five cents an hour going to the grand total of two dollars and thirty cents an hour. And if you hear the old argument about movie theaters are going out of business, let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it isn't because they're paying any super wages. It's because of the crap they're showing on the movie screens that people don't go to see. And any young college kid that has to put up with the crap that's put on the movie screen should possibly at least earn two dollars and thirty cents an hour. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Giorgi: "In opposition, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Bill. Last Session of the Legislature, Representative Hanahan in his wisdom did exempt these individuals. And every time that you make... increase the minimum wage, you are going to put some people out of work. And basically, these jobs are filled by high school students who serve as ushers in a movie theater and other type of working in the popcorn concession stand. And basically, what you're going to do is you're just going to eliminate those young people from having gainful employment. Now, if this is the attitude of the Illinois House, so be it. But every time that we do this, we are creating more of an unemployment problem



in the State of Illinois and it's especially true of the young people that are of eighteen years of age or younger that have worked in the movie theaters and doing these menial tasks. And I would urge that the House vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1405 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. And Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "I would hope it wouldn't be necessary to explain a 'no' vote for this very, very bad Bill. Representative Simms, of course, stated pretty accurately that if you want... when you buy a ticket now all you're going to find that the manager will be selling you the ticket and he'll tear right in the booth and you'll have to go find your seat yourself. If we want to have some opportunities for young people to have some sort of employment, we're going to have to make it possible for an employer to be able to afford to employ them. That isn't the only problem the movie theaters have that... if we move this, but I certainly would hope that we would not pass this Bill and needlessly create unemployment among our young people who right now suffer a higher degree of unemployment than any other group."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Hanahan, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 67 'ayes', 51 'nays', 6 voting 'present' and this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Lost, lost, lost. I'm sorry, I apologize to the Transcriptions. Representative Collins votes 'no'. Representative Dyer votes 'no'. Anybody else? Representative Luft votes 'aye'. House Bill 1424."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1424. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, House Bill 1424 amends the Chicago Park District Article of the Pension Code. Adds one trustee to the Pension Board to be named by the Board of Park Commissioners. Because of the heavy workload, we're looking for more participation from the public and it's been difficult in the past to get



all the Members present at a meeting. I'll accept a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1424 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative McClain, do you... Have all voted who wished? Will someone push Mautino's button? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 2 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'; And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1456. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Is anyone here going to handle Kucharski's 1447? That's out of the record. 1447 also out of the record. 1456."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1456. A Bill for an Act in relation to the creation, maintenance, operation and improvements of Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Farley, on 1440... 56."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, House Bill 1456, does exactly what the synopsis says. It raises or increases by ten cents tax levy for the Chicago Park District just in the City of Chicago. This Bill will generate approximately twenty million dollars for the Chicago Park District. The money is needed, of course, for the ordinary operation of the park district's many facilities, personnel and planned programs from senior citizen's programs to small children's activities and programs. As we all know, the Chicago Park District serves all the citizens of the State of Illinois and I think the passage of this Bill will certainly assure our citizens of continued progress and service. The five or .05% of assessed valuation or five mills for the workmen's compensation part of the Bill will provide approximately eleven, six hundred and eleven thousand dollars. This is needed because the experience for the first part of 1977 indicates an increase of approximately 60% which will mean the amount of benefits will be paid by about three hundred and seventy thousand to a total of nine hundred and eighty-six thousand. The requested tax authority in this Section will generate about a six



hundred and eleven thousand dollars. The Bill was reported out of Cities and Villages by a vote of 16 'aye' votes, no negative votes and one 'present' vote. And I would solicit passage of this Bill at this time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber is an opponent."

Leinenweber: "Well, I would just point out I think this is a tax increase without a referendum for the City of Chicago people which I suppose is all right with me. However, it seems to me it would make more sense to amend the Workmen's Compensation Law to get rid of the insane benefits that are creating the crisis that communities have to come down here and ask to increase their tax rate without a referendum so they can pay these claims."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1456 pass? All those in favor will vote, will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Farley, to explain his vote."

Farley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that's just a portion of the Bill. What we're requesting is the ten cent increase which as I said earlier, is going to generate badly needed monies which the park district will have to have for this year and next year. We all know that the park district has expanded facilities through its field houses, programs and are working at a bare-bones personnel situation now. I think that, you know, we should pass this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Collins, to explain his vote."

Collins: "Yes well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Representative Farley said that the workmen's compensation is just part of it and it's a very small part of it. I've been down here six terms now and I can't remember a Session where we didn't give the store away to the Chicago Park District. And here we are now taxing the citizens of Cook County without referendum again. The park district has been expanding, they sure have. I don't know what they do with the money we've given them already and now they want all this additional. All I can figure out is it means just that many more patronage jobs in the City of Chicago. The facilities are falling down, they're not caring for the parks and golf courses that they have now and now they want additional



money to waste on God knows what. I say, let's turn this Bill down and send it back where it belongs."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've heard enough about that workmen's comp. Tom Hanahan gave me some figures that in 1974, the premiums earned jumped from two hundred and fifty-nine million to five hundred and thirteen million. Losses paid from a hundred and seventy-six to only two hundred and fifty-six million. The insurance companies are ripping us off. That's the whole issue right there on workmen's comp. and they're taking benefit of that act to just get more."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mann, to explain your vote."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, we all know as users of park district land that inflation has taken place with regard to their expenditures as involves any other expenditures and we have repeatedly recognized that fact throughout this Session. This is a good Bill. It supports the park district and is needed and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McAuliffe, do you want to explain your vote?"

McAuliffe: "Yes, just briefly. I rise in support of this Bill. I have a park that's about a block away from my house and they have a lot of facilities, does a lot of good for the neighborhood children. It gives them a place to go and play baseball. They have a fine program. They have dramatics, they have tumbling, they have acrobatics, they have floor hockey, they have baseball and football. I think it's a very good Bill to keep the kids off the streets. They need the money."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 36 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. - House Bill 1457. Representative Madison, for what reason do you rise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, my light has been on since debate started on 1456. Is the board working up there?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I'm apologizing. I didn't see your light. Take your time."



Madison: "Thank you."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1457. A Bill for an Act in relation to the creation, maintenance, operation, improvement of the Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Majority Leader, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave that House Bill 1457 and 1458 be considered together."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no opposition, leave is granted. Read 1458."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1458. A Bill for an Act concerning aquariums and museums in public parks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "These Bills taken together would have the same financial impact as the last Bill that we just passed. The proceeds from these Bills would go for the various museums in the City of Chicago and I'd like to point out to the Membership that the revenue from this tax, not just this tax increase, but this tax in general provides only between 9 and 25% of the budget for these various facilities. The remainder comes from donations from private sources. I request a favorable Roll Call."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner, in opposition."

Skinner: "Oh heavens no, I'm in favor of this one."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, you can't have the floor if you're not going to speak on it. Is there any opposition? Be in opposition? Representative Collins, in opposition."

Collins: "Well, no, Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say that Representative Madigan has another Bill that lets the Arts Council distribute money to the museums. I would think they'd be more at home in the aquarium."

Speaker Giorgi: "On this... the question is, shall House Bill 1457 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no' and 1458. 1457 and 1458. Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Yeah, I think everybody ought to vote for this. This is the only regional service of the City of Chicago that's paid for by the people of the City of Chicago that we can all enjoy. And after all, if we don't pass it so they can raise the taxes in Chicago, they'll probably come out and raise the taxes in Will County or McHenry County."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 1457 and 1458, there are 119 'ayes', 20 'nays' and 6 voting 'present', and these two Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. House Bill 1468."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1468. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Local Governmental and Governmental Employees Tort Immunity Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Yourell, on 1468."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1468 amends the Local Governmental and Governmental Tort Immunity Act to expand the permissible purposes for which the insurance levy may be used. The Bill is necessary because liability insurance is becoming increasingly unavailable. Currently, the insurance levy can be used only to purchase liability insurance or pay judgments. With many local governments involuntarily becoming uninsured, statutory authority is needed to enable the



local governments to use the levy for things that insurance companies normally do. Such things would include the settlement and judgments before a lawsuit is filed and the undertaking of rich management problems. Such activities in the long run are expected to reduce insurance costs. In addition, local governments will be specifically authorized to use the insurance levy to self-insure and to pay for workmen's compensation. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1468 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, this is another unfortunate example of the limitations of the Short Debate Calendar because I don't think this Bill is getting the proper discussion and debate. One of the provisions in this Bill seems to say that the public entity which now, as I understand it, can levy a tax to pay a tort judgment can now levy a tax to pay claims on their workmen's compensation. I think this is an end run around the provision which some of them have been seeking to get to be able to raise their taxes without a referendum in order to pay for workmen's compensation insurance. But again, I'm not sure because this is a rather complicated Bill and this is Short Debate Calendar is not the proper form."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 7 'nays', 25 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1471."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1471. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewell, on House Bill 1471. Take it out of the record. 1489."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1489. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Epton, on House Bill 1489."

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



many occasions, I have been proud of this chamber. In 1971 I was particularly proud when we passed a guarantee fund for casualty insurance companies despite the opposition from the entire insurance industry. Since 1971, we have been trying to do the very same thing for the health and life insurance companies. That industry has steadfastly refused to concede that such a possibility could occur. Then we found equity funding came to pass and if ever we could see a situation where the possibility existed of the need for this legislation, equity funding proved it. Certainly it's true that all of the policy holders came out whole on equity funding, but that was just fortuitous sheer chance. Now this is identical to the 1971 Bill. It covers the remaining insurance companies with the exception of fraternal in the State of Illinois. It does not set up any fund whatsoever unless or until there is an actual insolvency. If no insolvency should occur, then this fund hopefully, not hopefully, will never come into operation. I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1489 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 146 'ayes', 2 'nays' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1499."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1499. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Beatty, on House Bill 1499."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a simple Bill that indicates that if you are charged with a violation of the Ethics Act, you shall be tried in the county of your residence. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any opponent? There being no opponent, the question is, shall House Bill 1499 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson: "In explaining my vote, I would hope that the Members of the



House who are voting green would realize that this changes one of the sacred concepts in American law and that is the right to be free from local prejudice with respect to this or any other potential criminal charges. I think the whole reason that we have changes of venue provisions in our law and the whole reason we have built into our system the protections we have is to guard against the kind of individual and local prejudice that can affect individuals in cases such as these. And I think that's the reason we have the protections we have and that's the reason I vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "More of a question. I don't think that's the purpose of the Bill and I have a feeling that one could still ask for a change of venue. If that is the case, I wish the Sponsor would so indicate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill unless the Sponsor wants to correct me has been heard before in Judiciary II where it was defeated. What it does is to say that people, for example, who violate the law in Sangamon County can go home to Cook County to be tried. And that creates some problems which are kind of obvious, I think, to anybody who gives it any thought. And I say, the Judiciary Committees are the correct place for this to be heard and I'm not sure how it managed to slither through and get into Executive instead this time. I think a 'no' vote is the correct vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Beatty, to explain his vote."

Betty: "First place, you can still get a change of venue. This is to make it more convenient for defendants. I believe now, you have to come to Springfield if you get charged with a violation of the law of ethics. You can always ask for a change of venue. Now, with regard to the alleged change of Committee, I'm not aware of that. I've got the book here. It was assigned to the Executive Committee and it passed out of there and to my knowledge, it never was anywhere else. I am not aware that there was ever any problem with this Bill except what you're making right now."



But I don't think that's accurate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there are 91 'ayes' 40 'nays' 27 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1504. Representative McAuliffe, for what reason do you rise?"

McAuliffe: "I would like to be recorded voting 'no' on House Bill 1489 if I could have unanimous consent. It won't change the results."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Record him as 'aye' on 1489."

McAuliffe: "No, no. Recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "'No' on 1489."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1504. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Johnson: "I just wondered if I could have unanimous leave of the House to be recorded as voting 'yes' on House Bill 869. I won't change the result."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave has been granted. Representative Cunningham, for what reason do you rise?"

Cunningham: "Request consent to be added as an 'aye' vote on 1224, will not change the results."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any objection? Leave. 1264, 1224, Cunningham wants to vote 'aye'. House Bill 1504. The Bill has been read a third time. Antonovych on House Bill 1504."

Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been introduced at the request of United Neighbors. It's a community group which is representing the northwest side of Chicago. There was a series of Bills introduced that passed through the Committee. It would eliminate some redlining in the inner-city area and I believe my Cosponsors on the Bill may wish to have something further to say."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any objectors? Is there an objection?

There being no objection, the question is, shall House Bill 1504 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Holewinski, to explain his vote."



Holewinski: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we're going to be able to pass this Bill so I'll be very brief. It is an attempt to curb discriminatory practices in the underwriting of insurance. There was no strenuous objection that I know of and I think it's a good measure to protect those who are trying to obtain insurance in our inner-cities and I urge everyone to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 108 'ayes', 3 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1507." Representative Marovitz, for what reason do you rise?"

Marovitz: "I'd like leave to be recorded 'aye' on that last Bill. What was that, 15... 1504."

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote Representative Marovitz 'aye' on 1504."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1507. A Bill for an Act to establish a Joint Legislative Reference Bureau and to define the powers and duties thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matejek on House Bill 1507."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1507 would require the Legislative Reference Bureau to review all reported decisions of Federal courts, the Illinois Supreme Court and the Illinois Appellate Court which affect the interpretation of the Illinois Constitution and statutes and report the results of its research to the General Assembly by the first of each year, by March 1st of each year. The research required by the Bill is something the Reference Bureau is already doing to some extent. However, the chief effect of the Bill would be to require the Reference Bureau to do the research on a more regular and systematic basis and to incorporate the results of their research in an annual report. A fiscal note has been filed and a very minimal expense would be incurred. I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there an objector? There being... Representative Ebbesen, in objection."

Ebbesen: "I don't know as it's any objection, but perhaps in explanation



of vote before I cast my vote, I'd like to know the definition of a minimal expense."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Matejek will explain his vote and tell you what that is. There being no objectors, the question... does House Bill 1507 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'. And Mr. Matejek might answer that question for Mr. Ebbesen."

Matejek: "The fiscal note signed by George Nichols says, 'In short, while House Bill 1507 would impose additional duties on the Legislative Reference Bureau, any measurable, additional expenses would be directly charged to the Bill... would be minimal.' And that's what's stated in the fiscal note."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who.... Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "I am acting Chairman of the Legislative Reference Bureau and I just checked with George Nichols and he says that it creates no particular problems for them or any extra expense."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 120 'ayes', 24 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1509."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1509. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Walsh, on House Bill 1509."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill changes the number of hours from six hundred to one thousand and forty that an employee may become a member of the I.M.R.F. It further provides that an employee who works may voluntarily participate if he works between six hundred and one thousand and forty hours. This Bill is supported by the Taxpayers Federation and by the Municipal League and I solicit your support."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any objector? This Bill having no objector, the question is, shall House Bill 1509 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Reed, to explain her vote."



Reed: "Mr. Chairman, I don't want to explain my vote. I simply want to be recorded 'no' on House Bill 1504."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Lady have leave? No on 1504. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 6 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. An announcement from the Speaker. We are on page 26 and we'll continue on the Short Debate until the bottom of page 26 or 6:30, whichever arrives first. There'll be no break for dinner and we plan to stay till 10:30 or eleven. And tonight we will return to Third Reading, Regular Calendar. But we are now on page 26 and we'll continue until the bottom of page 26. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 1512."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1512. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to recorders. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Geo-Karis, are you taking the place of Ralph Dunn?"

Geo-Karis: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Dunn asked me to take this Bill for him cause he's in the hospital. It's a simple Bill. It provides flexible requirements for the recordation of solar easements of real estate by local recorders. And with the increasingly interesting uses of solar systems there's a need to anticipate the legal questions which may arise concerning easements and to stipulate procedures and remedies to protect property owners. And furthermore, it says easements must have... must remain a matter of local jurisdiction and I ask for a favorable Roll Call for Representative Dunn's Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there an objector? There being no objector, the question is, shall House Bill 1512 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "What in the world is a solar easement?"

Speaker Giorgi: "In explaining your vote, Ms. Geo-Karis, can you tell what a solar easement is? Representative Geo-Karis, in explaining your vote, can you tell me what a solar easement is? She doesn't



know. Have all voted who wished?"

Geo-Karis: "Did you want me to explain that really?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk."

Geo-Karis: "Take my vote first and I'll tell you what it is."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 1 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1537. Representative Younge in the room? Is Wyvetter Younge in the room? Take that out of the record. House Bill 1563."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1563. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Terzich, for Representative Kornowicz."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1563 amends the Chicago Teachers Article of the Pension Code. It adds an additional trustee to the Pension Board to be named by the Board of Education. The Board of Education would appoint four Members which is now at three and I would urge your favorable support."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner, are you an objector?"

Skinner: "I certainly don't want to stand up and take that position if anybody else has anything serious to say."

Speaker Giorgi: "You are the objector."

Skinner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the third Pension Board to which we are adding another trustee and I'm just curious as to why. Do they get paid or what? Is it for participatory democracy purposes?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall House Bill 1563 pass? All those in favor will vote, will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. And Representative Terzich can probably explain his vote and explain what you was askin'."

Terzich: "Well no, the reason for this is that this would add one more Member from the Board of Education and also there is a problem under the Arissa which is the Federal Act. And we also passed a Bill here just recently to indemnify these people. It's simply a further expansion of the Board."

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



Representative Ryan, did you want to explain your vote?"

Ryan: "Not yet."

Speaker Giorgi: "I saw your light flashing. Have all voted who wished?"

Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I need seven more votes so would you poll the absentees please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman requests that the Clerk poll the absentees. Representative Shumpert would like to be recorded voting 'aye'. Representative Terzich. I'm sorry. Representative Peggy Smith Martin 'aye'. Just a moment for the Clerk. Representative Lucco 'aye'. Are you getting those, John? Representative Satterthwaite 'aye'. Just a moment for the Clerk. Representative Capparelli 'aye'. Representative Caldwell 'aye'. Representative Huskey 'aye'. Representative Klosak 'aye'. How many does that make? George has got them. Representative Chapman 'aye'. Representative Corneal Davis 'aye'. Should we dump the Roll and... Who else wants to be recorded? We have them all. Representative Madison 'aye'. Representative Reed 'aye'. I'm not going to dump the Roll Call, so... Representative... we have more than we need. Representative Mulcahey 'aye'. Representative Adams 'aye'. How many is that, John? On this question there are 97 'ayes', 18 'nay', 23 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 1587."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1587. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Illinois Housing Development Act and an Act to revise the law in relation to the State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. 1600."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1600. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the construction, operation and regulation and maintenance of a system of toll highways and to create the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Katz: "When the toll highway system was enacted in Illinois a number of years ago, a promise was made by the Governor of this state to the people in northern Illinois that ultimately when all the bonds had been retired, that the toll road would be part of the free highway system. The people of Illinois enacted the law. What has happened has been that it has not come to pass that the toll road has become a free road and we have gotten into extensions of the toll road. For example, the current one, the East-West Extension is the only toll road in the United States to have as many toll collectors as users. Well, the time has come for the General Assembly to stand behind its promise when the day ultimately comes when the bonds are retired. It ought to be part of the free highway system and this Bill would make it possible for that ultimately to take place. It includes an Amendment that was added at the suggestion of the State Toll Highway Authority with regard to making available in the Toll Road Authority the list of users who have passes that they can use lawfully on the Toll Highway Authority. Finally, it contains one other provision of importance to the Members of the General Assembly. It would require if any additional toll roads are constructed, using the northern Illinois toll road as the mortgage basis for doing it, that this General Assembly would have to authorize that. It could not be done by the Governor without the authority of the General Assembly. This Bill was unanimously recommended for passage by the Executive Committee and I would urge its adoption by the General Assembly."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, to speak in opposition. Is there anybody to speak in opposition? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're all conscious of the fact that we're running out of money for our roads. That's one of the big political questions facing everybody. Where are we going to get the money to fix up our roads and our bridges and patch our roads? As it happens, the toll road system is based on the user-fee concept that people who use a facility that is a good facility and is in excellent shape like the Tri-State running through my district are not too unhappy about paying thirty cents. There is



no need. There is no need for us to restrict or hamstring the Illinois toll road system at this time. It happens to be probably the only mass transit system in Illinois that is self-sustaining and doesn't have to come down here to the General Assembly begging for money or begging for subsidies. This is no time to hit it over the back of the head with a club. I would urge a 'no' vote for those of you who do believe in the user-fee concept and who do not want to place impediments or restrictions on our Illinois toll road system which is working very well. The bonds are being paid off. Actually, the fares have been reduced. I would urge a 'no' vote and for you to really think twice. There is no such thing as a free road, but a self-sustaining toll road is a good thing. It's a responsible thing and as one Representative who has a toll road and a normal road running through my district and I find many of my constituents prefer the toll road because it's safe and it's in good shape, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa, to explain his vote."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if there is any time in the history of the road industry or the road building in the State of Illinois, this is one time when the restriction of road building should not be enacted into law. This is a bad Bill. When you go ahead and you cut down our chances for putting highways anywhere in Illinois, be they toll roads or any other kind of highway, you're doing irreparable damage to a road program that needs the versatility at some time or other in the near future. And any restriction at this time, we do have enough restrictions already in the present law. You should not add any more on. This is a bad Bill. I would appreciate a red light up there."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Ho hum, maybe we'll get to the microphone eventually. Toll free in '73 was a slogan when we started out with the Toll Way Commission. Now if you've read the Illinois Highway Commission's



report, what they want to do is build more tollways in the Chicago area right up and down DuPage County, right through the other end of Representative Deuster's district. But fortunately not in the Fox River Valley as Representative Deuster wanted to build last time, to build four-lane highways in southern Illinois from nowhere to nowhere. Now, Representative Whats-his-face from Lawrenceville may get a jail and events that are tropic to Lawrenceville may justify the building of a highway, but I be... I don't think that he wants a tollway. Now if the Representatives vote 'yes' want tollways, I'm sure that we can arrange for them to have it through their districts or that is if the Representatives voting 'no' want a tollway, we can arrange for it. I suspect that one of the opponents of this Bill is really against it because it'll take away his free pass to use the tollway though."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, my district, of course, intersects the tollway and I've been concerned even before I became a Member of this General Assembly about the tollway and not so much about what it did, but by these bonding authorities and why we couldn't seem to pay off our debts. Now, I know since I have had some second thoughts on the subject since I became involved because I have found out that for one thing, the tollways, certainly most that use the tollways are not Illinois residents and certainly, in some respects, maybe we're not paying for it. But the fact remains, the general public feels that they have been betrayed because one of the reasons why we have the Toll Way Authority in the first place, the general public was told as soon as these bonds were paid, the tollway would become a freeway. I'm very much in favor of this proposal."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I beg you to listen to Chairman Garmisa. He's the one that has his head screwed on correctly as compared with the comments made from Crystal Lake. Nothing is worse than the ingratitude of those



that have so many highways that their choice is such they don't use the tollway. I want to publicly state that the people in my area would welcome a tollway. Grant us one tomorrow. We won't be chintzy about it. We won't stand up and whine that we've got so many of those we don't want to carry our share. And I would remind all of you who do not have a tollway in your road, the funds that you would lose by granting this ill-humored request to make them ride free are funds that'll be available for your need in your community. Vote yourself interest and vote for good government. Vote for roads. Give us a chance. Vote 'no'. Thanks for the money, Skinner."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill ordinarily got a great number of votes because it is a Bill that is fair. I would say Representative Cunningham, as usual, is just screwed up. I don't know how his head's screwed on or not; but if a tollway could sell itself in his area, then create your own Toll Authority. You know it won't sell. You know the bond holders won't go for it. What you want is to take the money from a tollway that is making its way, the Tri-State, and extending tollways to nowhere and building roads in areas that the user-fee cannot work. If it were a true user-fee and users in that area were paying for roads, I'd say go ahead. But you know that you're building roads that cannot pay for themselves out of the user-fee system and this is a fair Bill. And let's make the promises come true that the tollway one day will become a freeway."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My memory goes back to the years of 1953 or '54 when the people were urged to go out and to vote for the beginning of the Tri-State Tollway. They did so and they approved it, but they approved it with the understanding that when that system, when that roadway or tollway was completed, the bonds eventually would be paid off and that system would revert to a toll free system. Now,



this was a solemn contract between the voters of the State of Illinois at that time and those that were responsible for issuing the referendum. I feel that we have a moral obligation to do what we said we would do back when this whole thing began. And I think that's the key point. I have no argument with the user-fee idea, but I feel that when we enter into an agreement with the people and the taxpayers of this state ought to be observed. And if we don't observe these things, it is little wonder that the people of the State of Illinois begin to lose confidence in some of the things that we do in government. So I would say that a green light here would be indicated so that our people can have some faith in what we tell them. And I would urge more green lights on this."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman, fair is fair. The people in the tri-state area have paid for this road over and over again. They have carried their burden, they have paid their share. They pay a larger share of the motor fuel taxes and I think that they are entitled to it simply because it's right. And you can't sit up and ask the people from one area to pay for all the roads in the rest of the state. And I would agree that anybody who wants a tollway and wants to pay for it is fine, but the one thing that happens is they make all these promises about being able to pay for it and then the next year, they come in for exemption for everything starting with farm vehicles, station wagons, cars with less than 50 horsepower, et cetera. And by the time they finish, the only thing that's going to end up paying in their district would be cars that are on for-profit missions and they say that nothing's for profit. I think it's only fair that the people in the collar counties get their just due in this situation. I don't think you ought to saddle them for paying for this, paying for the R.T.A. and doing things unfairly. Fair is fair and they're entitled to some relief in those counties. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."



Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just briefly, I'd like to make two points and reiterate a couple points that have been made. Number one, everyone who's sitting here who knows anything about the history of the Toll Road Commission and the whole program knows that the only honest vote is a green vote on this if we're going to keep our word with the public from the point in time when we started. Number two, there's no question in anyone's mind who understands the bonding authority and the use of those bonds by the Toll Road Authority that the bonds that have been extended for the additional toll roads have been extended on the basis of the tolls that are collected on the system that was supposed to be paid off. There's only one legitimate vote on this for the people, the taxpayers... for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois as well as the users over the years of the toll road and that's a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, to explain his vote."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's rather amusing to watch that board. Number one, did you ever stop to think of where the toll booths stop? They stop prior to the time that you get into the City of Chicago and yet you extend it on the very same road. Number two, if you take a look at that board, we have Members who are travelling on passes when everybody else has to pay their way. And I think those two things should be taken into consideration, too."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, all that one has to really do when you look at the tollways situation compared to the freeway, look at an Illinois map and you'll find that anything from Interstate 80 south, they're all freeways. And the concentration of the people are up in the northern section of the State of Illinois. And when you've got the concentration of the people, that means that most of the automobiles and that means those people are the ones that are paying most of the motor fuel taxes. And when you pay those motor fuel taxes and then you still have tollways, in the days



that we had the Tollway Authority established in that expansion that was either tollways or no ways. And as far as I'm concerned, I know that... I think the bonding, I think I speak accurately, those bonds go out based on the present issue retirement based on the... to the year 2020 or something like this. And to me, I think that there really is no reason to get overly excited about this at this point in time because we've got something like perhaps forty years before we get to that point in time. So there's a lot of time to think about this legislation. However, I do think an affirmative vote is the proper vote at this point in time."

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

The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster. Have all voted who wished? On this question there are 102 'ayes', 53 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1601."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1601. A Bill for an Act creating the Commission on the Status of Minorities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Barnes on the floor? Take it out of the record. 1603."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1603. A Bill for an Act in relation to the creation and management of Forest Preserve Districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1603 as amended was recommended to me by the forest preserve district of Cook County. Essentially, it would restructure the law relating to forest preserve districts where the population... in a county where the population of three million or more. There are no substantive changes and this Bill would clarify legislative intent and avoid the inadvertent action which from time to time has affected the Cook County Forest Preserve District by Amendments to that previous Act. I would point out to the Membership that this Bill had been presented to... the effects of this Bill as amended have been presented to the Legislative Committee of the Cook County Forest Preserve District and passed



without dissent. Subsequently was submitted, presented and approved by the entire Cook County Board. I would solicit your favorable vote on behalf of House Bill 1603 as amended. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Anybody to speak in opposition? If not, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 'ayes', 2 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1606."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1606. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1606 as amended is supported by the Health Facilities Planning Board. There was no testimony in Committee in opposition to it. It would require a staff summary of testimony at a prior public hearing. A staff summary to be made to the Health Facilities Planning Board to determine whether to grant or deny a hospital permit for expansion to be made available to those testifying and to the applicants for written comment prior to admission to the Board. And such written comments would be submitted along with the staff summaries of the testimony. Under existing law at meetings of the Health Facilities Planning Board, there is no opportunity for participation by other than the petitioning hospital. This legislation was introduced in response to a situation in Chicago where a number of community groups were opposed to a hospital expansion and at the public hearing, there were witnesses representing the groups to testify against it. This is the culmination of a two-year fight. When the staff summary was presented to the Board, it simply stated that there were three opponents who testified, failing to state that those three opponents represented approximately two thousand residents. This is meant to correct that situation."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to speak in opposition. D. Houlihan."



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

I rise in opposition to the Bill as amended. I think it creates an unfortunate precedent or what we will come to regret as a precedent if we do adopt this Bill. The fact is that there is no real necessity of supplying to every witness who would testify at a public hearing a copy of the staff comments. Not only is there no real necessity for doing that, but further to provide that the staff must almost... must also include in its report a comment on that own witnesses testimony is making a very cumbersome situation. These staff reports are intended for use by the Board. The staff persons work for the Board. They do not work for the witnesses who testify no matter what interest those witnesses represent. They do not represent or work for those witnesses. I think this is an unfortunate precedent that we would be setting here and I ask for a negative vote on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'no', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to explain his vote."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, there is a precedent in most administrative agencies in the hearing officer's report and the opportunity to see that and comment on that. The situation we have with the Health Facilities Planning Board is they're unique in that the only party to a proceeding is the hospital. There is no opportunity in the formal proceeding for community input. If they're going to expand a hospital, in order to... which may significantly change the composition of a community, you know, there should be some opportunity for community input. This is a very, very small step in that direction. And I would urge a few more green lights on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to explain his vote."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly respect the Sponsor's intentions on this Bill. It certainly, there is a need for this type of activity in the health care field, but I would remind the Members of the Assembly that we have at least five Bills presently now in the Interim Study



Calendar, all of which address this problem. This is not an isolated situation. This is a tremendous problem which is being at the present, screwed up, Federal Government. Hopefully, that Interim Study will come out with something which will meet the problem on an entire face. And for that reason, I agree with my colleague, Representative Houlihan, and vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think in its original form, House Bill 1606 would have been cumbersome and would have created problems for the Health Facilities Board. However, the Amendment drastically changes the Bill and requires that a staff report made to the State Board prior to its decision whether to render a negative decision will be available, that this information will be available to the Board itself. And in the Human Resources Committee, there were 13 voting 'aye', 3 'no' and zero 'present'. I think that it's not the kind of Bill that is earthshaking in any respect. It is not going to be that much of a help quite frankly or that much of a hinderance to the operation of the law. And in talking with the staff of the Health Facilities Board, they assured me that the Board in its... that the Bill in its amended form did not present a problem to them. So I am voting 'yes'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a legitimate concern here in that many third party payers such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield are going to refuse to pay and claims for a patient in a facility which has not been approved by this Board. And if the Board denies a permit and then it is appealed and a court reverses that, will we have people standing in facilities for which third party payers will deny payment? I think that creates an even more severe problem than the lack of appeal and, therefore, I am voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 56 'ayes', 55 'nays', 26 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House



Bill 1607."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1607. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Section of the School Code which pertains only to the City of Chicago. There is presently language on the statute books which provides for the scheduling of budget hearings. The problem with the statute as it now stands is that it does not provide a very meaningful basis for citizen input into the budget-making process. The way it now stands is that copies of the tentative budget must be made available to the public ten days or no less than ten days before the budget is to be adopted by the board. And in practice, they would hear only that minimum. They rarely have the budget available longer time than that. Then the budget hearing must be held no later than one week before final adoption. And in practice again, they rarely have the budget hearing earlier than that. That really isn't a very good basis for citizen input. Furthermore, these hearings are held at a time when parent associations are in a state of disarray prior to the beginning of the school year. So what this Bill does is to provide for a needs hearing, a program needs hearing occurring roughly in the month of May where parents could attend to tell what they think the needs are for the coming year. That information then presumably would be used by the budget planners in the school board. And finally, there would be one final hearing no less than two weeks prior to the adoption of the final budget. I think this is needed legislation. The Chicago School Board budget is roughly a billion dollars and you just can't get a handle on that in a... under the present statute and I think this will provide the better basis for citizen input in getting a handle on that budget. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, Daniel."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Bill which is applicable only to the Chicago Board of Education. I agree that lengthening the time for



public inspection of the budget in its tentative form is a good idea. I suggest that this Bill goes far beyond this. First of all, the fiscal year of the Chicago Board of Education starts on September 1 of each year. The effect of this Bill would be to mandate public meetings at each attendance center 90 days prior to September the 1st. That means sometime around June the 1st at a time really when the Board of Education does not have a solid foundation of what revenues it can reasonably expect for the next fiscal year. This will also provide or mandate an added cost in administrative... in administration of budget hearings if you wanted to hold these at every attendance center in the city. Frankly, I don't know how many attendance centers there are, but if it is a term which is... which includes every school or even a region of schools, this will impose a tremendous administrative burden on the board. There is no money for such increase in administrative costs. Who's going to pay for it? The Bill is well intentioned, but practically it will have a very negative effect on the Chicago Board of Education. And in consequence, I would ask for a negative Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Representative apparently did not read the Bill. The Bill does not mandate budget hearings at every attendance center. It simply requires that the form of the budget be sent out, in addition, by attendance center. And I point out that's exactly how the school board handles it right now. I simply wrote that into the statute to guarantee they'll continue doing that. Furthermore, all the program... all that the hearings are supposed to do in the first place is simply to provide the opportunity for parents to come to, before the school board and tell them what's on their mind, what they think their program needs are for the coming year. During the summer, of course, the school board then takes this information, merges that information with their estimates of revenue for the coming year and then the tentative budget is presented in the fall or before September 1.



The hearing that is to be held in May is not in the usual sense of the word, a budget hearing. There is no document which the parents and other citizens are required to comment on or that the school board is obliged to file or to supply to the public. The only thing that the preliminary hearing does is to provide a form for parents to say what they think the program needs in their own schools are. And there is only supposed to be a, there's only provisions for a central hearing. There is no provision in this Bill for hearings in each attendance center. I recommend to Mr. Houlihan that he read the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explanation of my 'no' vote, I would strongly recommend to the Sponsor of this Bill that he take an active part in the P.T.A. programs in local schools in his area. In my area, the P.T.A. is a working, viable group that works with the principal in coming up with a respective budget. And in turn, they supply it to the Board of Education. If they have any problems over there, they normally contact the representative from the district. And in turn, he works along with them. We don't have any tremendous problems that we can't overcome on an individual basis. If you just take a little more active part in the P.T.A. program, you'll probably accomplish your mission."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 1607. I can understand what the prior speaker has said about involvement of the P.T.A. members in with the principal in terms of the school's budget. But the fact of the matter is, once the funds are appropriated, there is no way that his P.T.A. or my P.T.A. or anybody else's P.T.A. is going to know that those funds are being spent at the schools in the way that they were requested. One of the problems that we have on the west side of Chicago is that fact that it becomes very, very evident that those



schools in my district are not receiving a proportionate share of the dollars that are spent by the Chicago Board of Education. And I have constantly been and will continue to be a strong critic of the way the Chicago Board of Education spends their money. In terms of the allocation of funds for the schools, it is not on an equitable basis. What this Bill seeks to do is to make them specify in their budget the appropriations by attendance center. Let the people see how they're going to spend the money and let us have an opportunity to measure what they actually spent by what they propose to do. We had a situation in Chicago where all kinds of promises were made in terms of capital improvements in schools. Some of those schools that they vehemently said they were going to rehabilitate, they ended up deciding they'd tear those schools down. No parental input into that kind of decision, no even ability to measure or to gauge what the board was going to do in advance. This is a good Bill. It makes sense. And I think we ought to support it and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think you ought to listen to... be sure and listen closely to Representative Madison. I believe when you're opposing a proposal like this in a city the size of Chicago with a school district as massive as it is, it has enough trouble trying to centralize it's functions to the point where it does exclude and keep to a great extent the budget in the dark, that we ought to take a good look at how the community can participate. It's nice to know that Representative Lechowicz' community does have involvement. But we're talking about a massive district and there are individuals who do not have the chance to understand the kinds of programs that are offered and the cost that is involved and how the monies are being distributed. There was no opposition from the Spokesperson for the Chicago School Board when this Bill was heard in Committee. It struck me as an amazingly good proposal because it does involve more people. It does give the communities a chance



to participate. It does, in effect, really create districts without creating them by allowing people to get involved. That's the way we relieve the tensions in schools and that's the way you get a good education and I think this is a fine proposal and we should get it to 89."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 52 'nos' and the Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman now wishes to have it placed on Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objection, it will be so placed. House Bill 1608."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1608. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Telcser, 1608. 1608, Mr. Telcser. It's been read a third time."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1608 is the same Bill that we passed last Session but lost in the Senate. It allows the Chicago teachers to pay in their own money, their contribution to the pension fund for the economic lay-off they suffer when the school is closed early. I appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there an opponent? Seeing none or hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, I wanted to tell Representative Telcser that explanation was a hell of a lot better than Representative Yourell's."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 120 'ayes', 8 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1608. Kozubowski wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 1608. All right, 1630."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1630. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to construction of the statutes. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1630 is brought about at a request of both employers and employees unions requesting a definition of employer and employee. In many legal suits outside of the areas of the statutes such as workmen's comp. and unemployment comp and various other statutes, there are definite explanations to who is an employee and who is an employer. But in the area of general law when there are various wage claims and other kinds of litigation, there is no definition in the statute books for the definition of employee or employer. Presently today, lawyers who practice in this field have to rely upon the twenty common law principles on the defining of the words employee and employer in the state courts. It has been suggested by employer representatives and employee representatives that we enact by a construction of statute Amendments the definition of employer and employee. This Bill came out of Executive after a thorough hearing, 25 to nothing. It is supported by every employer and employee organization. It is not doing anything more than explaining a simple definition that is used under law, under common law presently today and putting it under the construction of statutes in those areas where those definitions are not explained, the definitions used right now under common law. And I know of no opposition to the Bill. The Realtors Association did ask me to put an Amendment on which I concur and it will be put on in the Senate because the definition of some sort of salesman for the realtors and they concur with the rest of the Bill. They wanted a little explanation on that construction of statutes and they'll be added. But they presented the Amendment too late for me to have it offered and adopted here. So in the Senate, that Amendment will be offered on the Bill. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I know it's an important, worthwhile project and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, this is... points up the shortcoming of the Short Debate Calendar because it appears to me that House Bill 1630 is probably the sleeper of the



Session. And under the present common law, as Representative Hanahan, pointed out, there aren't twenty tests, but I believe there's five or six tests to distinguish an employer and employee relationship from many other different types of relationships including independent contractor relationships. This House Bill 1630 seeks to replace the common law tests with some language which does not appear to me to be particularly clear. But if it's clear at all, it seems to eliminate any distinction between contractor, independent contractor from the term employer-employee. This could have grave and I would like to emphasize that, grave consequences in many fields, including the problem of social security, the problem of the workmen's compensation, creation of agency relationships where none now exist whether it's an independent contractor relationship. So I would suggest you very seriously consider this. I don't see any reason at all to disturb what has long been rather clear in the law the specific tests to define an employer and employee. So I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish that Representative Leinenweber had informed me that he had any problem with it or opposition. I could assure him there's no sleeper and you don't have to have a knee-jerk reaction to this kind of legislation. There's nothing going through on a construction of statute as a matter of definition. And there is twenty common law definitions of employer and employee because the I.R.S. is who they use as the basis of judgment. I can say to you this, that this was put in at the request of the employers and employees and in no way does it affect those laws that specifically right now allude to or suggest what the definitions are. This is in the other areas of law that has been researched by the Reference Bureau. This is their language worked out with the construction of statutes type of approach to defining. There's nothing hidden. It doesn't do anything else



except remove the error in the common law tests of definition. It will not change or do anything else to any other statute and I suggest to the Gentleman, I'm sorry he made a big issue out of a good Bill because this is not a bad Bill. If I want to sneak something through, Representative, I'll do it in many other ways except this way."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, that was an interesting concluding statement by my colleague that he'll find some other way to sneak it through. I would wonder if this is similar to the Executive Overtime Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 71 'ayes', 59 'nays', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1633."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1633. A Bill for an Act creating the Commission to study Illinois laws relating to public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McLendon: "Mr. Speaker, that Bill has been assigned to Representative Caldwell."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Caldwell. Out of the record? Take that Bill out of the record. 1636."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1636. A Bill for an Act creating a Commission to recommend plans for and determine the location of the Pioneer Memorial Plaza. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

DiPrima: "I'd like, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to hold this up. I have a Companion Bill coming with this when it gets out of Appropriations."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. 1644."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1644. A Bill for an Act in relation to the definition, licensing and regulation of community currency exchanges. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1644 is a Bill



that allows currency exchanges to engage in the distribution of food stamps. At the present time, currency exchanges are involved in the distribution. It is by agreement with the Department of Public Aid. This Bill simply seeks to codify what is presently practiced on the part of the Department and I solicit your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Any opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 131 'ayes', 3 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Consent Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar. House Bills, Third Reading, Supplementary Consent Calendar, Second Day, Group Three, on page 33 on your Calendar. The Bills removed from the Consent Calendar are: House Bill 1179 and House Bill 1228. These Bills, all the Bills have been read a third time previously. The Bills removed were House Bill 1179 which appears on page 34 of your Calendar and House Bill 1228 which appears on page 35 of your Calendar. These Bills have been read a third time previously."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall these Bills pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Sandquist is on there. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On these questions we have 147 'ayes', no 'nays', 10 voting 'present'. And these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. House Bills, Third Reading, Regular Calendar, on page 5 appears House Bill 27. Mr. Ebbesen. I'm sorry. We have to start where we last left off. The next Bill to be called is on page 7, House Bill 876."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 876. A Bill for an Act to require access to certain information. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a freedom of information Bill which has been before this Body since

1974. It had extensive public hearings in the 79th General Assembly in the Executive Committee. These were engendered by Representative Matijevich and the specific hearings were conducted by Representative Kozubowski and other Members of the Subcommittee. As a result of those extensive hearings, we have adopted Amendments to meet the objections that were raised by the Secretary of State's office. For example, the Secretary of State, of course, is the office in the State of Illinois which does make a business of providing records to the general public. We have adopted, as I said, the Secretary of State's Amendment and we've also adopted an Amendment to provide secrecy for architects' plans. I would like to just take a little bit of time to explain to you what the Bill does cause I'm sure there are questions about that. It would require that records which show policy statements and provisions of rules and regulations and general statements be available to the public that a list or index of such records be available from each agency and that in each office, the agency host its own organization chart so that someone coming in, any member of the general public would be able to see just how that agency is organized. In other words, who is in charge of providing what and they would have to also post a budget statement, just good business practices really. The local governments have been amended out as have the school districts so that this Bill now affects only state agencies. The Secretary of State has, as I said, offered an Amendment which we did adopt in Committee. He has since said that he would like to change one provision in that Amendment and we would like to do that in the Senate if we could so that we can expedite proceedings of the House. That provision is the one that engendered some opposition from the Public Broadcasters and one of the journalism societies. It was a provision that said that the agencies would have thirty days to comply with requests for information. They feel that it should be returned to the original ten days which were given and the Secretary of State feels that this is a reasonable request. So he has now agreed to that request. And as I say, we will be complying with that in the Senate. The Bill is supported by... oh, I wanted



to say one other thing before I finish talking about what the Bill does. It has very carefully and finally drawn protections of privacy so that it does protect those people, for instance, who have mental health records with the State of Illinois, people who have records in the Department of Children and Family Services, employees personal information and that kind of thing. So there is no invasion of privacy and it has, in fact, been pointed out by the Field Newspapers that it's a very careful balance between the right to information by the public and protection of private records. It is supported by the Illinois Association for the Mentally Retarded, the Field Newspapers, Standard Publications and numerous other groups and I ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

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

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates that she will."

Darrow: "Is the Illinois News Broadcasters Association still opposed to this Bill?"

Catania: "Representative Darrow, I mentioned that the reason they took a position against the Bill last weekend at their convention was that we had amended it to say that agencies would have thirty days to comply with the request for information and the News Broadcasters felt that that was too long as did the Sigma Delta Chi Journalism Society. The Secretary of State has, therefore, said that he will go back to the original ten days to comply with the request and that is what we will do in the Senate. It's filed here, but as I said, to expedite proceedings, I thought we should move it and do that in the Senate."

Darrow: "But with that Amendment, are they in favor of this Bill?"

Catania: "Yes, that was the only objection that they cited to the Bill. They are in favor of the concept of freedom of information as is the Press Association and as I said, Field Newspapers, Gannett Publications and so forth."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Ms. Catania, to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for your support of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see a light flashing. The



Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

Friedland: "Under this measure to receive the information, is there a fee charge? And if so, how much and could you elaborate briefly how the schedule of fees might be in effect in this measure please?"

Catania: "Yes, certainly. That's one of the reasons why I worked very closely with the Secretary of State because they have established fees for providing records and nobody complains about their fees, so obviously they have found the right way to assess them. Originally the Bill provided only for the cost of copying. But with the Secretary of State's Amendment, it does say that they can charge for the cost of search and producing the records and we have adopted that Amendment and we're going to try it and see if that works well with other agencies. This was the Secretary of State's Amendment and it is part of the Bill now."

Friedland: "Well, for example, how much would a ten page, a copy of a ten page document cost?"

Catania: "It would depend on the document. It would include the cost of producing the document plus the copying it and if it took a couple of hours for search, the agency could also charge for the search."

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

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Susan, does this Bill affect all levels of government down to the townships or did... is this just the state government that we're talking about?"

Catania: "The Bill in its original form affected all government agencies in the State of Illinois except the courts. But it was amended last Friday afternoon to take out all local governments and the school districts."

J. Davis: "Thank you. I didn't hear you say that."

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

Giorgi: "Representative Catania, this includes the Legislature, does it not?"

Catania: "Yes, it does."

Giorgi: "How will this affect me now. You know, if we're convicted



of a felony, we... our seats are vacated. In that event, do I have to keep my correspondence and my records so that whoever wants the availability of them, would they have to be available to them and am I going to be penalized? Who's going to pay for my storage costs and..."

Catania: "No, Representative Giorgi, what you have to keep is policy statements which I assume, you know, your correspondence don't express, they don't express official records. The official records are kept by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House. Furthermore, our Bill analysis that we used in Committee would not have to be revealed because they are documents that are used in development policy and those are specifically excluded under this Bill. So it's policy statements that must be provided to the general public."

Giorgi: "Well, in the event we did develop a policy in caucus, am I liable for court action if I don't produce that policy or that worksheet or whatever we worked on?"

Catania: "No, you're not liable for court action and whatever comes... I'm not aware that written policy statements come out of conferences. They don't come out of the Republican Conferences. I don't expect they come out of the Democratic conferences. If they came out, it's written policy statements. They probably would be available for public dissemination anyway."

Giorgi: "But in the event this develops into, say a felonious charge, does that mean that a Legislator if he didn't have records to please the court, would lose his seat because of a conviction?"

Catania: "Absolutely not."

Giorgi: "You sure?"

Catania: "What this Bill does is to provide a way that the public can request these things and the only way that the court becomes involved is if there is some sort of denial of access to records and there is a process of appeal and the court can then decide, you know, that the record has to be provided. But they don't become involved in any other way under this Bill."

Giorgi: "Now, you have exempted home rule units, is that correct?"

Catania: "Local governments are exempted as are the school districts."



That was not my Amendment but it was adopted."

Giorgi: "Okay, what documents then are exempt for me as a Legislator?

What documents are exempt?"

Catania: "I would expect that everything in your office is exempt unless you have some sort of policy statement posted about how you're going to serve your constituents in your local district office, something like that."

Giorgi: "In other words, everything's exempt in my office. Okay, cost.

What's the cost going to be like? That's the last question."

Catania: "The fiscal notes that were filed and I have copies of them here include a statement from the State Treasurer saying that it's not going to require anything more than what they're now doing. They are providing public records. The Secretary of State says that with the Amendment they think that there will not be additional costs. That was the purpose of what they did in their Amendment. I have one here from Michael Bakalis saying that they don't expect any additional costs. And you come and look at any of these that you're interested in. I have them here on my desk and they're on file also with the Clerk."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry. Did I understand, did I hear right last night when everything, a motion made that everything would go on the Short Debate Calendar? It was passed through here last night. The motion was made and accepted."

Speaker Bradley: "That was... understand Matijevich's motion. It was not serious."

Taylor: "I think it was serious. The Speaker never said it was not."

Speaker Bradley: "This Bill doesn't appear to be on Short Debate. So we'll have to go along with the regular rules that apply to regular Bills on Third Reading."

Taylor: "Then, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Ms. Catania, to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As I said,

this Bill did go through two years of public hearings. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady or the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well, in briefly explaining my 'yes' vote, I think this is a Bill that is a result of a lot of work and has reached a reasonable condition. What it simply does is says that every citizen has a right to this basic information, but the citizen who comes in and demands a document has to pay the cost of preparing it. And that's reasonable. We have instances around the state, and we had one out in McHenry County and one out in Lake County just recently where there was an annexation document. Of course, this Bill has been amended so it doesn't include local government this time but where citizens go to get something and they're absolutely refused and denied. This establishes a basic right to the information and again, is reasonable. Places no financial burden on the government because the citizen who wants this information has to pay for it. I would urge more 'yes' votes. This is a good Bill and you can go back and tell your constituents you're doing everything possible to make government open so if they want to know what's going on and they want to exert themselves and they want to pay the cost of the document, they can find out."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, all of the documents that this Bill requires the local government or the governmental units to disclose are presently disclosable pursuant to a subpoena in court. But it seems to me to be wrong in principle to require a person to have to file a lawsuit in order to be able to obtain information which has been gathered or put together at the expense of taxpayers. This Bill if the local governmental body or the governmental body uses their head, will not cost anything because it's up to the citizen to make a copy if he wants to see it. All he's entitled



to be able to look at it. And it's very easy to hire a copying service and there are hoards of them throughout the state to go in and make copies. But it seems to me wrong in principle to require a person to have to file a lawsuit in order to be able to find information which has been gathered and stored at his expense. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevec, to explain his vote."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is true that this Bill had extensive hearings in the Executive Committee last Session. In fact, we had a full hearing here in Springfield. We had a hearing in Chicago. And the reason we had those hearings is that... we got 92 votes and I can stop."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "I think that the people in the House have explained their votes satisfactorily. Thank you."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 125 'ayes', 9 'nays', 11 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 881. For what purpose the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, rise?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a point of personal privilege I guess. I'd just like to make an observation. This Bill has 125 votes which is about a hundred more votes than the minutes we spent discussing it. Secondly, the other point I want to make is that there are a lot of people who aren't here on the floor of the House. And we're in a position now where you're getting to the types of Bills where you'd better be sure that if you're going to vote, that that party is here to vote. Otherwise, it's going to be challenged and we're taking much more time. I'm not sure that Mr. Taylor's point made earlier doesn't make a lot of sense. And that is that maybe if we're ever going to get to some of these Bills during this Session that we'd better get, give serious thought to putting everything on the Short Debate Calendar, get



an opponent, a proponent, and close that switch... close that thing fast and don't allow people to get on Roll Calls if they've missed them. Now, Mr. Matijevich took the bit in the mouth and objected to anyone who got up and got on the Roll Call. And he was chastised by someone and the Speaker turns around and lets somebody else get on. Can't do that. We are going to be here until the end of time or half of the people aren't going to have their votes, have their Bills heard or get a chance to vote on them. Now, we've either got to agree to do this collectively or we're not going to get it done at all because we're surely going to all hang together or we're going to hang separately as Ben Franklin said. Let's get on with the work of the House. Let's get some of these people to close their mouth and push their button."

Speaker Bradley: "I think your point's well taken. I think the Speaker has done everything he possibly can to impress upon the Members that we've got to move along and he's working as hard as he can to see that that happens. Now, Mr. Yourell would like to have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 881. Are there objections?"

Yourell: "Only with the permission of Representative Hoffman. This is the first time that I've done it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman, does Mr. Yourell have your permission? Hearing no objection, he'll be... on the last Bill we were just on which was House Bill 876. I'm sorry, 876. The... he shall be so recorded. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Matijevich: "Speaker, to show you how serious I am, I'll put that in the form of a motion that everything on Third Reading be in Short Debate. I don't think it would hurt anything one bit."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there objections? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, for what purpose do you rise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to second that motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "In connection with what Representative Hoffman, the Speaker said the other day that come July the 1st, if they wanted to see



him, they'd have to send the state police. So you'd better get your Bills up and out."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I object to that. I agree that we're going to be here forever, but there are Bills flying out of this House before we get a chance to turn a page and read the analysis on it, the Bill is voted and passed on. I've been voting 'present' on quite a few Bills just like I'm voting on the Consent Calendars. I would certainly like to go home after serving my district..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Hold everything. I don't want this to take time. I'll withdraw the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you. On the Calendar on Third Reading appears House Bill 881. Mr. Taylor, the Gentleman from Cook, for what purpose do you rise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I make the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Taylor renews that motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "I have a parliamentary inquiry. We have a rule where we have put certain Bills on a Short Debate Calendar and a certain process. I'm not necessarily against Mr. Taylor's concept but I'm not sure we can do it this way. We have a rule, we put some Bills on the Short Debate Calendar, we have put some Bills on Consent Calendar in a particular procedure and I'm not sure we can do this. Am I correct? I really don't know."

Speaker Bradley: "The... if we would do this, it would be tantamount to suspending the rule on debate and limiting and it would take 89 votes to do that. And we're not at that order of business right now. We're on House Bills, Third Reading. And I would hope that Mr. Taylor would withdraw that motion for a few minutes and talk with the Leadership on both sides before and if you persist, at that time we will call the motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that you recognize me every



time goes on because I will be moving the previous questions."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Bradley: "Okay, we'll recognize you on every occasion. Now, House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 881. Mr. Totten."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 881. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten will speak from Mr. Pechous' chair and I understand he has some slides or charts here down in front, so we draw the attention of the Members to the charts in front of the Clerk's desk. We recognize Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And I appreciate the Speaker giving me leave to speak from Representative Pechous' seat. But I thought it would be..."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, rise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Gentlemen to clear the center aisle so we can see the charts?"

Speaker Bradley: "Would they please clear the center aisle? Clear the center aisle. Remove yourself from the center aisle. We're trying to see the charts down there. I think maybe if everybody would be in their seats..."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to the Members. The chart may not be big enough to see, but the concept is very interesting which is proposed in House Bill 881. What it does is it indexes the personal exemption by the rate of inflation. And what's happened since 1969 in Illinois is that we have because we have not indexed the personal exemption, actually had an increase in the tax rate for every taxpayer in this state without ever legislating it. What the chart shows that for a person in 1976 earning fourteen thousand dollars with exemptions... with four exemptions assuming the 7% inflation rate, paid two hundred and fifty dollars in taxes in 1976. And his effective tax rate was 1.79. In 1977, assuming a 7% inflation rate, the same taxpayer if we go over to the last side without indexing, paid two hundred and seventy-four dollars and fifty cents in taxes and his wages just went up with inflation. He had a 9.8% increase in his taxes without us legislating it and his tax rate went up to 1.83. That's an increase in his tax rate without us ever having



legislated it. Since 1969, a person earning ten thousand dollars if he had an increase in his exemptions or his salary by 65% which is what the inflation rate has been, his taxes went up 91% and his tax rate went up 17% since that time. In fact, that one thousand dollars exemption which we gave people as a tax advantage in 1969 is worth six hundred and four dollars today. What House Bill 881 does is for the future, it indexes the income, the personal exemption, thousand dollar personal exemption for each dependent, by the rate of inflation as determined by the consumer price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Seven foreign countries are now doing this and in U.S. News and World Report today, they said or this week, they said that probably that'll be the one tax reform that the Federal Congress does at the Federal level. If Illinois does it and I think in this instance we have taxation without representation, we will be the first state to do it. The fiscal impact on the state could be as much as fifteen million dollars the first year, but you must remember that this is not money this is a tax cut. It is money that we would not get because of inflation and it's not money you're not necessarily taking away from state government. I think it's an important concept and I think, one, that we should adjust our tax rate and protect our taxpayers and leave that tax rate the same. If we want to raise taxes in this state, we should do it by raising the income tax and that two and a half percent rate we have on individuals rather than hide the fact of what we're actually doing by increasing it without indexing by taking advantage of inflation. And I would try to answer any questions and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

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

Kelly: "Yes, I would like to ask the Sponsor, is the administration, the Governor, in favor of this proposal?"

Totten: "I would... at this moment, I think the Governor's position on the Bill would be that we can't afford it."

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

Ewell: "Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."



Ewell: "By the same token, what about the costs of the state? Do they rise by inflation?"

Totten: "Well, those purchases of goods and so on that we make would rise by inflation."

Ewell: "In other words, next year it's going to cost the state more for the same goods. Is that correct?"

Totten: "Right."

Ewell: "If we indexed it according to your theory, we would, in effect, then be legislating a cut in the taxes that the state receives in terms of relative dollars?"

Totten: "Yeah, but you're forgetting what we do to the individual. The individual's having a higher rate increase without indexing and he has to make the same purchases for all his means of living as the state may have to do. The state does get an increase because the persons' salary usually goes up. As you can see on that chart, even with indexing, there's an increase of taxes from two fifty to two sixty-seven. I would think that's getting additional revenues."

Ewell: "I would like to speak to the Bill very briefly."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Ewell: "I think although what you're doing sounds very popular, it may have a widespread appeal, but the effect upon state government is going to be devastating. You're going to strap the government between rising costs by things which we mandate every year, talking about pension increase, additional persons added to the rolls. We have an inflationary rise in the Medicaid budget, the Medicaid section that we can do absolutely nothing about. You want to spend money for the highways and there are increases in wages every year that go on and on. What you're doing in net effect is hindering the state's ability to pay these inflated costs. You are, in effect, cutting the state revenue. And I think if you're not willing to step up and say in what sections you want to cut the revenue and in what sections you don't think we ought to appropriate money, it's utterly ridiculous for us to sit here and vote for this Resolution no matter what the appeal might be. The net effect would be that in twenty years, the state would not



have enough revenue to pay anything and it would only increase the day in which we are ultimately going to be forced to raise the income tax or raise another tax in order to pay for it. Gentlemen, I think we are deceiving ourselves. We could put pressure on everyone, we can put pressure on the Governor. But by the same token, it's going to come back to haunt us. We put pressure on Governors before, we put pressure on Governor Ogilvie. He did what had to be done. He was a man about it. He stood up for what had to be done and he suffered the consequences. You saw the results of tax philandering by the, our past Governor and you saw him waste away the entire fund that Ogilvie paid blood for. I'm saying whether we have a Democratic Governor or a Republican Governor, it's going to come right back to us to do the same thing. I suggest that the Gentlemen, no matter which side of the aisle they're on who want to appropriate all the money, give all the tax relief, give everything to everyone, are the last ones to sit up and put on a green light in any form of tax increase. If you want the votes on the particular thing, we've got to be somewhat fiscally responsible and I'm suggesting what this Bill would do would be suicidal in terms of state revenue."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've already spent more time on this Bill than it deserves and I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The... Mr. Totten, to close, down at Mr. Pechous' desk."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Although the impact in revenue may be great, I think that the impact on future taxpayers and what we're actually doing as Legislators is even greater. The fact that what we do without indexing, and because of inflation is effectively increase tax rates as they're so well depicted in this chart is that fact that I think we, as Legislators, ought to think seriously about. Those tax rates have been an increase say for a person with a ten thousand dollar income in 1969 by 17%. The state still gets the benefit of



increased taxes because of inflation. But the state should not get the effect of an increased tax rate, one that we haven't legislated, one that we have the responsibility of protecting. This proposal, although not new, has been endorsed by a rather different group of individuals. The Nobel lawyer Milton Friedman has endorsed it; Leonard Woodcock from the... President of the United Auto Workers; the Wall Street Journal; and recently the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Responsibilities. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this proposal is as worthy today and important that we enact and I'm hopeful I can solicit your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller, to explain his vote."

Miller: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise to speak in favor of House Bill 881 for three reasons. I think this Bill addresses itself to the plight of the middle-income taxpayer today who back in 1969 was allowed a one thousand dollar deduction for every individual in his family. Today, that one thousand dollars because of inflation is now about sixteen hundred and fifty dollars. And I think we ought to begin to match that deduction to today's dollar values. The inflation that Representative Ewell addressed himself to earlier is covered by the fact that more money is coming to the state via increased income to the state. As a matter of fact, the State of Illinois is expected to garner about three hundred and eleven additional, three hundred and eleven million additional dollars this year. What we're doing here is merely saying instead of attracting three hundred and eleven million new dollars, we're going to attract two hundred and ninety-six million new dollars. And I think we're doing our constituents a favor by giving them the privilege of being able to claim for a deduction what it ought to be worth by today's market value. And I encourage your 'yes' vote on this Bill on behalf of your constituents."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to explain his vote."



Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had the opportunity of listening to this Bill when it appeared before the Revenue Committee and I complimented the Sponsor as far as the unique approach. And really the basic understanding of this reflects to every taxpayer in the State of Illinois. It's true that we're caught in an inflationary process, but in turn, when the original tax law was enacted, it was based on a premise. And as you know, the State of Illinois is one of the few states that doesn't have any exemptions whatsoever. This is a basic understanding as far as in the area of inflation. The present standard exemption is a thousand dollars for each taxpayer and dependents. House Bill 881 sets up a form whereby these one thousand dollar exemptions are multiplied by the inflation factor. This factor, in turn, is arrived by dividing the consumer price index for the taxable year ending June 30, by the same index for the base year. The base year means the twelve-month period ending June 30, 1976. I just want to point out to the Sponsor, though, on page 1, line 24, it says the consumer price index is not prepared by the United States Department of Commerce, prepared by the Department of Labor and that item should be changed in your Bill. I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist, to explain his vote."

Sandquist: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I'd just like to say I think we're wasting too much time here. We're going to encourage people that they're going to get something that each and every one of you know the state cannot afford. I think we should get the 'no' votes up there and let's get on to things."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Just briefly, I'm amazed, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at some of those green votes up there. I intend to vote green on it, but all I heard in Executive Committee on any Bill that came in is how much, is this in the Governor's budget? And I see the same people that used to make that remark



now getting on this bandwagon to the tune of fifteen million dollars that the Governor hasn't okayed. I'm delighted to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats, to explain his vote for one minute."

Keats: "If you're about to close the record, I'll shut up. Otherwise, I have something to say."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I'm trying to."

Keats: "If you're going to take the record, I won't say anything."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I think this ought to be verified. There's a lot of people who aren't here."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you requesting a verification?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, I am."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a verification. The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Keats, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I've been having trouble with my switch on and off all day and it's not working again. Could you mark me as 'aye'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I'd like to amend my request and ask for electronic verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Oral verification?"

Leinenweber: "Oral verification."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Mr. Jaffe, for what purpose do you rise?"

Well, it looks like we're going to have a verification. We'll have a verified oral Roll Call. Everybody will be in their seats and the staff will and those not entitled to the floor will get off, please remove themselves from the floor. And the Clerk will, the Members will be in their seats. The Clerk will call your name and stand up, he can hear an 'aye' or a 'nay' and press your button so you'll be recorded. We're going to dump this Roll Call. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Poll the absentees please."



Speaker Bradley: "Well, a verified oral Roll Call will give everybody an opportunity to get on and it will save that time. And we'll go as rapidly as possible, as rapid as the Members will let us. So please be in your seats and let's begin with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson."

Speaker Bradley: "Abramson records 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'No'. Adams, 'no'. Anderson, 'yes'. Antonovych, 'no'.-- E.M. Barnes, 'aye'. Jane Barnes, 'present'. Bartulis, 'aye'. Beatty, Beatty, pass. Bennett, 'aye'. Birchler, 'aye'. Bluthardt, Bluthardt, pass. Bluthardt, 'no'. Boucek, Boucek, 'present'. Bowman, 'aye'. Bradley, 'aye'. Brady, 'aye'. Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Not here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt, pass. Breslin, 'present'. Rich Brummer, 'aye'. Don Brummet, 'aye'. Byers, 'aye'. Caldwell, 'no'. Campbell, 'aye'. Capparelli, pass. Catania, 'aye'. Chapman, 'no'. Christensen, 'aye'. Collins, 'aye'. Conti, 'no'. Cunningham, pass. Daniels, pass. Darrow, 'aye'. Corneal Davis, 'aye'. Jack Davis, 'aye'. Dawson, 'aye'. Deavers, pass. Deuster, 'no'. DiPrima, pass. Domico, pass. Doyle, pass. John Dunn, pass. Ralph Dunn, pass. Dyer, 'no'. Ebbesen, Ebbesen, 'aye'. Edgar, 'aye'. Epton, 'no'. Ewell, 'no'. Ewing, pass. Farley, pass. Flinn, pass."

Speaker Bradley: "Who just voted 'aye'?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Flinn."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass on Flinn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pass. Friedland, 'aye'. Friedrich, Friedrich, 'aye'. Gaines, pass. Garmisa, 'aye'. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. Getty, pass. Giglio, 'aye'. Giorgi, 'aye'. Greiman, pass. Griesheimer, pass. Hanahan, pass. Harris, 'aye'. Hart, 'no'. Hoffman, 'no'. Holewinski, 'no'. Dan Houlihan, 'aye'. Jim Houlihan, 'no'. Hoxsey, 'aye'. Hudson, 'aye'. Huff, 'aye'. Huskey, pass. Jacobs, 'aye'. Jaffe, 'no'. Johnson, pass. Dave Jones, 'aye'. Emil Jones, Emil Jones, pass. Kane, 'aye'. Katz, 'no'. Keats, 'aye'. Kelly, 'aye'. Kempiners, 'aye'. Kent."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Kent, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye'. Klosak, 'no'. Kornowicz, pass. Kosinski, 'aye'."



Kozubowski, 'aye'. Kucharski, pass. Lauer, pass. Laurino, pass. Lechowicz, 'aye'. Leinenweber, 'no'. Leverenz, 'aye'. Levin, pass. Lucco, 'aye'. Luft, 'aye'. Macdonald, 'aye'. Madigan, 'aye'. Madison, pass. Mahar."

Speaker Bradley: "How do you... How? No? Record the Gentleman as 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mahar, 'no'. Mann, 'no'. Marovitz, pass. Lynn Martin, pass. Peggy Smith Martin, pass. Matejek, 'aye'. Matijevich, 'aye'. Mautino, 'aye'. McAuliffe, pass. McAvoy, pass. McBroom, 'aye'. McClain, 'aye'. McCourt, 'no'. McGrew, pass. McLendon, 'aye'. McMaster, 'aye'. McPike, 'aye'. Meyer, pass. Miller. Meyer votes 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "No, just a minute. Mr. Meyer, how do you want to be recorded? He wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Now, the Members will have to stay in their seats in order... and keep the noise volume down so that the Clerk can hear and the Members can hear themselves, their names being called. Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you rise, Sir? We'll get back... let's finish the Roll Call. We'll pick up Mr. Miller now, I think. Mr. Miller wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Meyer votes 'no'. Miller, 'aye'. Molloy, pass. Mudd, pass. Mugalian, 'no'. Mulcahey, 'aye'. Murphy, 'aye'. Nardulli, 'aye'. Neff, 'aye'. O'Brien, 'aye'. O'Daniel, 'present'. Pechous, 'aye'. Peters, 'no'. Pierce, 'aye'. Polk, 'aye'. Porter, 'aye'. Pouncey, 'aye'. Pullen, 'aye'. Reed, 'no'. Reilly, 'aye'. Richmond, 'aye'. Rigney, 'aye'. Robinson, 'aye'. Ryan, pass. Sandquist, 'no'. Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Schisler, 'aye'. Schlickman, 'no'. Schneider, 'no'. Schoeberlein, pass. Schuneman, pass. Sevcik."

Speaker Bradley: "Wait a minute. Mr. Schuneman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schuneman votes 'aye'. Sevcik, pass. Sharp, 'aye'. Shumpert, 'aye'. Simms, 'no'. Skinner, 'aye'. Stanley, 'aye'. Stearney, 'aye'. Steczo, 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll take Mr. Stearney off. It's getting a little noisy and we can't hear up here real good is the problem. Now if we can hold the noise down, the Clerk can go ahead rapidly with



this. Would those Members please be in their seats?"

Clerk O'Brien: "E.G. Steele, 'aye'. C.M. Stiehl, pass. Stuffle, 'aye'.

Summer, 'aye'. Taylor, 'aye'. Telcser, 'no'. Terzich, 'aye'.

Tipsword, 'aye'. Totten, 'aye'. Tuerk, 'aye'. Van Duyne, 'aye'.

Vitek, 'aye'. Von Boeckman, 'aye'. Waddell, Waddell."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, to explain his vote."

Waddell: "Members of the House, I think that you're witnessing probably the worst vote that you have ever made. And if you want to see in five years us go down to three hundred million and in ten years, no tax base, you've just done it. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, arise?"

Walsh: "I'd like to be recorded as voting 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we're not... we'll be there very shortly, I think. Continue with the... Mr. Wall is next, I believe."

Clerk O'Brien: "Waddell votes 'no'. Wall, 'no'. Walsh, 'no'. Wikoff, pass. Willer, 'no'. Williams, 'aye'. Winchester, pass. Wolf, 'no'. Younge, pass. Yourell, 'aye'. Mr. Speaker, pass."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any additions? Mr. Hanahan. Hanahan 'aye'.

Mr. Marovitz, 'aye'. Capparelli, 'aye'. Greiman, 'aye'. Levin,

'aye'. Farley, 'aye'. McGrew, 'aye'. John Dunn, 'aye'.

Madison, 'aye'. Brandt, 'aye'. Mudd, 'aye'. Peg Martin, 'aye'.

Emil Jones, 'aye'. Daniels, 'aye'. So we have anybody that

wishes to change their vote? Mr. Byers, do you wish to be re-

corded from 'aye' to 'no'? Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'.

Mr. Hart. The Gentleman... Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Is my light working?"

Speaker Bradley: "Your light is green?"

Ewing: "Vote me 'aye'. I just wondered if my speaking light was on."

Speaker Bradley: "It was then. Mr. Mudd, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to change my vote to 'no'. For some

reason or another, I'm just getting goosier than hell messing

with an Income Tax Bill. It might come back to us in another form."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope all the people on our side of the



aisle now start watching while all the Democrats end up changing to 'no' where any sensible vote ought to be."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Please change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Lady as voting 'aye'. Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I'd like to briefly explain my vote. This is really a shell Bill and it's going to come back in a 3% income tax."

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

Huskey: "Would you vote me 'no' please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. McAvoy."

McAvoy: "Record me as voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Winchester.

Record Mr. Winchester as voting 'no'. Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Barnes.

Mr. Stuffle. Record Mr. Stuffle as voting 'no'. Jane Barnes.

Record the Lady as voting 'no'. Mr. Harris. Record Mr. Harris as voting 'no'. Push your button, Mr. Harris. Mrs. Stiehl."

C. Stiehl: "Mr. Chairman, vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Lady as voting 'no'. On this question there are a hundred... take the record. On this question there are 102 'ayes', 45 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Well, thank you. I believe in innovation, but this is the second time we've adopted this kind of a verification Roll Call. I think it takes more time to do it this way than the other and I suggest we abandon this practice."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar appears House Bill 904. For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, arise?"

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry and since the Parliamentarian is there, in somewhat concurrence with Representative Hart, I don't think that it would take longer, but I would like to ask of the Chair on an oral verification of a Roll Call, is there allowance for explaining a vote? Normally, on the verification, we do not explain votes and I was just wondering.



I think that that was one of the things that lessen that Oral Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think there's anything in the rules that prohibits somebody from explaining their vote even on verification. So at that time, we're going to verify that way, I think the Gentleman when he casts his vote has the opportunity to explain that vote."

E. Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 904."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 904. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schneider. From DuPage, I'm sorry."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 904 is a Bill that provides for a hearing officer to deal with tenure teachers who are reduced if the district experiences a reduction in forces for economic reasons. One of the problems with that concept, of course, has been that some teachers are being released and being told that it's for economic reasons and then are being... there's selective rehiring and leaving some teachers out of a position that they're entitled to, but are really being dismissed for reasons that are not aboveboard. What I'm asking then is in the event that an individual feels as though his position has been arbitrarily removed, that he have a hearing and that he be given the opportunity to explore whether or not the necessity for the economic reduction is legitimate. I'll be glad to answer questions and I would, of course, solicit an 'aye' vote."

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

Deuster: "Question of the Sponsor. Who pays for the hearing?"

Schneider: "The hearing officer as it presently stands is a state expenditure. Last year, the Jaffe Bill or two years ago, allowed for that to be done through the state and the cost was somewhere around twenty-three thousand dollars. The estimates I have on the present proposal before you are less than that."

Deuster: "Do you know how many teachers are being dismissed throughout



the entire State of Illinois this year because the General Assembly and the state has not been able to really fund the schools and that they've had cutbacks because..."

Schneider: "I don't have those figures."

Deuster: "You have no figures, so you have no idea how much this will cost?"

Schneider: "Well I don't think, as I said, a second ago, the figures as best they can be arrived at through I.O.E and B.O.B., in my informal discussions with in pursuing that indicated that on the figures that they have available, they saw that the cost would be less than what the present hearing officer Bill provides and they told me around fifteen grand."

Deuster: "Is the fiscal note filed on this?"

Schneider: "There was no request for a fiscal note. There's none filed."

Deuster: "Thank you."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to rise in support of this Bill. I think it's important to realize that there was one place in the law which said that the board can dismiss a teacher when it's due to a reduction in force. If this is left in the way it stands right now, a board can dismiss a teacher and say it's due to a reduction in force and turn around next December and hire new teachers without any consideration being given to the teacher they presently have. This plugs the loophole in that, it gives the person an opportunity to appeal in a fair hearing on it. I think it's an important Bill and I urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, two years ago you probably all received voluminous mail on the so-called infamous Jaffe Bill. Since that time, we've found out that the costs were somewhat less than twenty-three thousand dollars for the teachers to have an opportunity to have a hearing. This, Mr. Deuster pointed out, he asked what the fiscal note was. Apparently, somewhat less than fifteen thousand. It was so minimal in this instance, that it wasn't even considered necessary to have one. I received a lot of correspondence from some of the school boards who are



concerned again. However, they have come back and told me that they feared they were wrong in their concerns two years ago when they were concerned about the original dismissal Bill. I think it's time, this Bill is timely and I hope it gets 89 votes."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to close the debate."

Schneider: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. I think the points made by Representative Brady are especially pertinent and again I'd ask for an 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. McCourt, to explain his vote."

Mc court: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, gee, thanks. Before this Roll Call gets any higher, I think I ought to call to your attention a few things. House Bill 904 deals with a reduction of force or discontinuance of teaching service. The Bill amends certain current law to require the boards to prepare, "Written findings of necessity in the event they must reduce their teaching staff. After receiving notice of honorable dismissal, the teacher, tenure or nontenure, may request a hearing before a hearing officer." The hearing officer would then either uphold or rescind the dismissal. This is a blatant intrusion into the local, decision-making authority of boards of education. Decisions to reduce the staff are not made lightly. If a Bill should be defeated, this should be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 102 'ayes', 35 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 907."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 907. A Bill for an Act to create the Alcoholism Treatment Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson,



arise?"

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be voted 'no' on that last Bill, 904?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave to be recorded? Mr. Ewing, you requesting the same thing? Mr. Ewing wants to be recorded as voting 'no' 904. Are there any objections? Hearing no objection, you'll be so recorded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave of the House to be recorded as 'aye' on 904?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye'? Hearing no objections, he will be so recorded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, on 907."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 907 amends Chapter 43 of the code, statutes. Increases the tax on beer, wine and alcohol and places those funds in the Division of Alcoholism of the Department of Mental Health for use in the prevention and education in the field of alcoholism. In 1976, approximately fifteen thousand people died from drug-related causes and approximately a hundred and forty-three thousand died from alcohol-related causes. Today in May, 1977, there's a total absence in the State of Illinois of a good, sound, mandatory educational program for our children in public schools in this area. There's a total absence to those who have a serious alcohol problem. The only funds that we have now that we're using are those who are the casualties of the disease. Presently, we're spending about twenty-one million dollars for the four thousand casualties in mental institutions. There's a tremendous number of people in the treatable area. Industry says that 65 to 80% recovery rate is evidenced for those people in private industry who are a victim of this particular problem. The economic cost to society based upon a poll that came out last week is about thirty-five billion dollars. This is in lost production, health and medical costs, motor vehicle accidents and other things. Alcoholism abuse is a major cause of the disruption of family life, poor job performance, 50% of all our fatal accidents, 64% of all our murders, 30% of our suicides and I could go on and on. The 78th General



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Assembly passed the Alcohol Treatment Act. It was later amended in 1979 and became effective July 1. Mr. Speaker, could I have some order? Mr. Speaker, could I have some order?"

Speaker Bradley: "It's pretty quiet right now."

Mahar: "Okay, it is. Briefly, what the new Act says that alcoholism is no longer a crime and must be treated as such. The new Act provides the Department of Alcoholism shall provide adequate and appropriate treatment for all intoxicated persons which includes detoxification facilities for emergency medical service, facilities and services to render emergency medical care shall be open 24 hours a day and they shall provide immediate physical and social needs of the people. I could go on and on. I know the hour is late, you've heard a lot of debate on this matter, but I wanted to say to you very sincerely. This is a program that is very much needed. We have these funds in sixteen states. It certainly isn't appropriate that we get them from real estate tax or income tax or sales tax and what are we talking about in cost? The industry, it seems to be very much concerned. We're talking about a penny on a twelve pack of beer. We're talking about a fifth of a cent for a glass of wine. We're talking about a half a cent on a cocktail. I think it's important to begin serious consideration to this particular measure and get this program started. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I think first of all, it should be pointed out that almost everyone in the House that drinks probably has a conflict of interest and so, therefore, I hope that everyone using their highest form of ethics, those of you who drink, abstain from voting today because this would be a definite conflict according to some interpretations of the Ethics Act. But besides that, I'd like everyone on the floor of the House to know why God invented whiskey. He invented it to keep us Irish from ruling the world. And to put a tax on it, and to put another tax on it no matter how lofty an ideal, seems that at this time, you know, a wrong approach to solve a very crucial problem. All of us are



for motherhood and apple pie and treatment of alcoholism. There's nobody going to stand up on the floor of the House and say that we do not want to attack the problems of the sickness called alcoholism. In the trade union movement, we spend untold millions of dollars and untold hours in helping solve the problems in the workplace by our workers who happen to have the sickness of alcoholism. But to put a tax on the very product that may contribute to the sickness is not the method, especially in view of the fact that the Federal government offers to the state three hundred million dollars, three hundred million dollars to be allocated for alcoholic prevention. What does Illinois get out of that three hundred million? At best, a paltry one million dollars. Now, if we want to do something about alcoholism prevention in Illinois, I suggest to the Sponsor that when the budget for the Department of Mental Health comes through this General Assembly, that we insist that the Director of Mental Health attach to it all the provisions that he needs and this is necessary to attract the money that the Federal government was willing to give to this state to help cure alcoholism and not put a tax on the people that happen to enjoy an occasional nip with a fine glass of wine or a glass of beer or a shot of booze. So to protect all of us from ourselves, I suggest to those of you who have a conflict of ethics by voting for this Bill, I think that you should abstain."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this kind of a tax is a luxury tax. I don't want to vote for any raise in the income tax or in the sales tax. And incidentally, we should try and help people who are very unfortunate because of a bad habit like alcoholism. I think this is a very necessary tax and it isn't going to hurt us. It's five cents per gallon and forty cents a gallon for alcohol and spirits and five cents a gallon wine and one cent per gallon on beer. My goodness, I'm sure the prior speaker wastes more money than that in just going out and having dinner. I know I do, too, and I think it's necessary and I don't think we should penalize the middle class by raising



income tax and sales tax and let's get on with the show and support this Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Mahar, since your Bill has the philosophy that the use pay for the alcoholism treatment, would you be amenable that all of the tax money now going for alcohol and wine be put into this fund?"

Mahar: "No, it would not simply because the money that's now being used is needed for many, many other purposes. The Alcohol Treatment Fund as far as the twenty-one million dollars now goes for the casualties. There's all kinds of law enforcement that's needed. Because of the effects of this, there's accidents on the highway every day. It's only logical as far as the State Police's funding should come from the problems that are caused by alcoholism, investigations that go on for suicide, the teenage problems, the probation problems, they're all part of the whole act because of the alcohol problem. Therefore, you cannot divert all the funds to this treatment program."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak to the issue."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Matijevich: "The issue really is that there are enormous amounts of funds presently being paid by the industry, if you want to call it that, by those who use alcohol and wine. And we're always looking to tax the sins, you might say, of people. There are many people who have many worries in the world. You may call it a sin, if you will, but there's some people it's the only enjoyment they get. And I don't think you ought to put a tax on it. Now, you know what happens, you put that tax and what'll happen then will be that the beer wholesalers will increase the price and then the retailer will get that increase. So then there'll be another increase to the consumer. So don't just look at it from that minor, small tax as you want to call it. It



becomes a great increase to the consumer. I remember when we passed the tax in 1968 and that resulted in the six pack being raised a quarter. And I think that what you're going to do is you're going to just make beer and wine cost more. The Federal government in excise taxes sends plenty of money. If we just got all of that money and put it to alcoholism treatment, we'd have enough. I'm concerned. I'm the one who originally introduced the Alcoholism Treatment Act. I'm concerned, but this is a sickness that all of the people have got to pay for. And even if you said that the users ought to pay for it, they're paying enough right now. And I would recommend a 'no' vote on 907."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Mahar, to close the debate."

Mahar: "Well, I think we've heard several comments here that reflect the industry. Four years ago I had this Bill and it didn't get out of Committee. It got one vote in Committee. The industry, of course, is a very strong force in this matter. The industry agrees that we ought to have some kind of a program but they really don't fund it and I'd like to tell you that I received and you probably received on your desk some facts. And one of the facts that they tell you, they're spending an awful lot of money. Now, if you'll just listen to this. The sum total of all the liquor industry contributions to the National Council of Alcoholism for 1976 was seventeen thousand dollars. They tell you the millions of dollars they spend. They spend three hundred million dollars a year on advertising. I don't think they're really hurting. One member of the industry belongs on this board, so they have good liaison with the board. They know what's going on, but they talk out of both sides of their mouth when it comes to doing something for the alcohol treatment people. This is a very important piece of legislation that I've said now is going on in sixteen states and is going to go on one day in Illinois. Maybe not today, but it's going to go on one day in

Illinois in which we're going to have some money going directly into the treatment fund for alcoholism. I would urge you at this particular point to consider this measure. It's something that's very much needed, very appropriate and give me an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. And the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis, to explain his vote."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to point out to the House that when Representative Mahar was checking off the disadvantages of alcohol, he left out an obvious one. That it's probably responsible for a lot of bad legislation passing out of this chamber. So consequently, I urge you to pass out this good Bill while you're not under the influence."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote."

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

I rise in support of House Bill 907 and when this Bill was heard in Executive Committee, it was a shameful thing to see a Member, a Chairman of another Committee, lobbying this Bill very openly against this Bill in the Executive Committee. The liquor industry killed the twenty-one-year-old drinking age Bill and I have no quarrel with that except that they used the arguments it'll certainly defeat that industry if they keep up with the same old arguments. The highest casualty rate of any commercial business to day in the United States is the bar and the restaurant business. All you have to do is pick up the Tribune each day and you'll find that there's more of those establishments for sale than any other category of businesses in the State of Illinois. And yet the argument they use that if you increase, if you increase the tax on a six pack of beer by one cent which this Bill calls for, that many, many businesses will go out of business and cease to exist. One of the other arguments they used was that if you live on a borderline of another state, the people are going to spend sixty-nine cents to use a gallon of gas to go to another state to buy a six pack of beer or two six packs or ten six packs to



save a penny on each one. I think it's absolutely ridiculous. I think this is a good Bill. The money's going to go for a good cause and I would hope that we would get at least 89 votes."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting concept. I think the concept here is that you make the culprit pay the cost of rehabilitation, so I'm going to vote for this Bill and I'm going out and have a drink."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yeah, I would like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Anderson: "Yes, alcoholism is something that creeps up on you. It doesn't come on right away. You may be able to drink for a few years and all of a sudden you may not be able to drink anymore. And there are those unfortunates out there that need help, but I think this problem is something like an iceberg. That it may bring our nation down eventually. You know that one out of four drivers that you meet on the road day or night has alcohol in his blood. 70% of the divorces in the United States, alcohol is there. 70% of the people on public aid, alcohol is involved. 75% of the police calls, alcohol is involved in them. So I certainly urge you to reconsider and to put some green lights up there."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from White-side, Mr. Schuneman, to explain his vote."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we're all familiar with the problems of alcoholism and I think we ought to weigh the cost of this Bill with the possible benefits to be derived from the Bill. If I heard the Sponsor correctly, this tax would amount to a penny on a twelve pack of beer. This Bill would cost about a half a cent of a dollar cocktail that we buy somewhere. Now, that's certainly not an unusual increase in the tax to pay and I think we should get some more green lights up there on this matter and pass this Bill out of here."



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

The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "The way to shut me up is to get 70 votes up there."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished?"

Skinner: "I would like to suggest that those of you who knew or who know Representative Fary and who may have talked to him about this subject that he would probably be voting for this Bill here today. I suggest those of you who don't think he would be voting for it, haven't heard him say that he believes the industry should pay for problems which it creates. And although he was a tavern owner, he was a very respectable and, I think, reasonable tavern owner in that attitude. The industry certainly does create problems and this Bill will help the industry or at least the users of the industry help... help solve the problems that that industry creates."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes' and 62 'nos', 13 voting 'present'. Mr. Cunningham, you wish to change your vote to... from 'present' to 'aye'. On this question there are 70 'ayes', 62 'nays'. This Bill... the Gentleman's requesting it be placed on Postponed Consideration and we will place it on Postponed Consideration. In an hour and fifteen minutes, Ladies and Gentlemen, we've passed three Bills and one on Postponed. House Bill 909."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 909. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act of 1975. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Hart, who's a principal Sponsor, will open. I will close."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr.... Mr. Franklin... or... the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we have a little order?"

Speaker Bradley: "Give the Gentleman some order please."

Hart: "This is the Independent Probate Bill, sponsored by Representative Porter and myself. This Bill is designed to simplify the probate procedures by eliminating red tape and cutting expenses



of probate. The Bill contains procedures that would implement a basic reform known as the independent administration of decedent's estate. The measure eliminates the current requirement that a court of law must supervise the administrator throughout the process of the settlement of the estate. The extent of this often needless, lengthy and expensive probate court supervision, the Executor of an Estate would simply file the will with the court and the court would notify the heirs and other innocent parties without the necessity of a court proceeding to validate the will. If no will exists, the settlement of the estate would essentially be a private family matter with minimal court supervision. However, if at any time an interested party to an estate requests the court protection, the court would be available to step in and supervise the administration of the estate. For the majority of cases not requiring court supervision, probate would involve less red tape and less expense. Independent probate administration would allow citizens to use the probate courts only when they deem it necessary. This proposed reform of the Illinois Probate Act was drafted by a Joint Committee appointed by the President of the Illinois State Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. When the completed, the proposal received unanimous approval of the governing bodies of both Associations. If approved by this Session of the Legislature, the comprehensive reform of Illinois probate procedures would become effective January 1, 1978. Amendments have been placed on the Bill to take care of concerns voiced during Subcommittees and full Committee hearings. This is strictly an optional procedure and would, if nobody... if no interested party objects, leave to... those people in interest who are most concerned, the administration of the estate. It's a very good Bill. It's a needed Bill and it would expedite the handling of estates, would make it quicker, less expensive and create a closer relationship between the client and the attorneys. I urge the Members of this Body to approve this legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

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



Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

J. Dunn: "In the event an independent administration is begun and later terminated and court supervised administration begins at that point, how can one go back to the beginning of the probate and reconstruct the accounting of expenditures and receipts?"

Hart: "Well, Representative Dunn, this does not eliminate the necessity of keeping an accounting because at the end of the administration period, the accounting would be... although it wouldn't be filed in court, it would be available to all other interested parties. So there would be no diminishing of the keeping of accounts. It just wouldn't be made a public record and available to people who really don't have any interest in the matter."

J. Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

J. Dunn: "I am generally in support of the concept of this Bill and it's intent and purpose because I think we should do what we can to streamline probate procedures. But I have a very serious concern about the accounting aspect of this Bill because once there is an independent administration by a layman without supervision of any kind, that permits any kind of record keeping. And unless there is some professional advice in the background somewhere, either from a lawyer or an accountant, it's entirely possible that records that are kept will defy reproduction and will not be capable of corroboration. So I think we can expect if this becomes law that while we attempt to solve one problem, we will create another and that is that we will find cases cropping up from time to time where it's impossible to reconstruct what happened during the probate and the heirs will find themselves squabbling about what happened and they will be less satisfied than if they had followed the procedure - that is, the law at the present time. So I think the intent of the Bill is good, but it has some shortcomings and it's a little bit ahead of its time."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"



Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "Do I understand this Bill correctly that the intent of the Bill is to simplify the procedures of the Probate Act and in turn, make less work? But what does Amendment #3 do there?"

Hart: "Amendment #3 requires that when the accounting is made to the heirs and a report... the file report would be filed but there wouldn't be the accounting in it and the amount of the attorney's fees and administrator's fees would have to be in the public part of the final report."

Lechowicz: "Now, how do you base your fees on that because it supposedly be less work? Will the fees remain the same?"

Hart: "It would be a matter of contract between the administrator or Executor or attorney."

Lechowicz: "Okay, thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly, the Bill might need a few changes which I'm sure can be taken care of in the Senate. But I think it's a necessary Bill and would save a lot of money for a lot of people who don't have too much money to spend on probate and you do have safeguards in here in case of fraud. So I speak for the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, to close the debate."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not as some of you might think the Uniform Probate Code. This really adds a new section to the existing Probate Code. And it provides for simplified administration of estates and it should save time, it should eliminate red tape and it should save expenses. I think that it's a reasonable approach to the problems that people have had with our sometimes cumbersome probate system in years past. I think that there are adequate protections for all the rights of interested parties that are made in the Bill. And it also has provisions in the Bill that simplify the proof of will, the administration of claims and the issuance of appraisals and also in reference to will contest procedures. This, to me, is true consumer legislation without any cost to the



state, without any additional bureaucracy being established. That's a rare bird these days in government and I certainly urge the Members to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Ms. Macdonald. Would somebody push her 'aye' switch there, Mr. Skinner? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 135 'aye', 6 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 917."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 917. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 917 is an Amendment to the Public Aid Code. What it does, it requires recipients of lump-sum benefits such as lottery receipts or workmen's comp. or any other windfall receipt, to report their receipt to the Department of Public Aid. Then secondly, the Department may say to the public aid recipient, if you irresponsibly spend that money, then you are no longer on aid for the amount of money that you had received. Let me give you an example to explain that. Say a person was receiving a hundred dollars a month in welfare and they received a thousand dollar windfall profit. If they... today they could go and spend that thousand dollars and go back on public aid the next day. What we are putting into the law is that the Department for irresponsible use of the money may prorate the dollar amount over the length of time that that aid would have been received. If it's a hundred dollars, it would have been ten months and they would be ineligible for aid during that period. Apparently, the Department of Public Aid has this loophole. A person can spend the thousand dollars in one day and be back on public aid the next day. This would close up that loophole. It is a much-needed reform in our welfare. The Assistant State's Attorney down in St. Clair County told me there was someone with a thirty-eight



thousand dollar receipt on a windfall profit and they spent the money in less than a month and were back on welfare. What we're trying to do in this Bill is to prevent that from happening. It in no way affects anybody but the person receiving the aid. It does not affect the children. And I solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

D. Jones: "Recorded 'aye' on 909."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests leave of the House to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 909. Hearing no objections, he will be so recorded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, meaning no disrespect, we know that the Sponsor of this Bill is a great protege of Ronald Reagan and that this particular Bill is part of the Ronald Reagan welfare program in California. Unfortunately, it is not applicable in the State of Illinois. It penalizes people and it is in conflict with the Federal law. You know, Federal law would preclude recovery of prior assistance particularly if this meant depleting current resources which the recipient would need to meet needs. I would tell you that the Department of Public Aid is against this Bill. It really is not necessary because the Department has already power to assess current financial needs. I would call to your attention that this is not a new Bill by the good Representative from Cook County. He has introduced it beforehand in prior Sessions. It's always gone into interim study there and it's always died a quiet death. I think at this time, we ought to give it another death, but perhaps not so quiet."

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

Mann: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there are only five hundred and fifty-six thousand children on public assistance in the State of Illinois. I think when these windfalls come around and the money's depleted, let them all starve. It's only a half a million kids. Great Bill, Mr. Totten, one of your greatest."

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



Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there is a reference to half a million children who are public aid and we all agree that we have some need to help them and we're doing the best we can. What you're forgetting is the millions who don't happen to be on public aid. You know, their parents are the ones paying these taxes and they have a right to demand a certain level of accountability. You and I are held to certain standards and I see no reason why a welfare recipient could not be held to the same standards that you and I are held to. Now, concerning a California welfare program, it is to be remembered that the California welfare program is one of the few in America that is actually still working. And it is to be remembered in the California welfare program, they raise benefits for the people at the bottom end of the spectrum. The people in the bottom end of the spectrum in California are in better shape than they are in Illinois or any other major state in America today. And as you remember that Jerry Brown, the present Governor of California, a man I have some respect for, ran for President espousing those very ideals that you're talking about in California and he is the only man in America never to be defeated by our incumbent President or I should say the only man within his own party. He never lost a primary running on the principles you're discussing and that was a Democrat primary, don't forget. So with that, I remind you, please think also of those people who are paying for the half million people on aid who we are trying to help and remember that the California program does work, something we can't say for our own program."

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

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, here again we go, but I want to suggest to every Member of the House who are voting on this particular measure to keep this one thing in mind. This Bill runs contrary to the Federal law in this area. And if there's anyplace where the Federal law will prevail, it's in this area. Illinois has been wrestling and involved in the past year with the Federal government, saying that they will not reimburse the cost of such certain questionable



administrative actions. If we take this action again, we're putting Illinois in that same posture. And when we do not receive those Federal reimbursement funds necessary to run the public aid program here in Illinois, I hope the people that are proposing these sanctions that they know definitely are contrary to Federal law, are prepared to put in the General Revenue Fund the funds that you would lose in Federal monies for trying to put forth this kind of program. This is a bad program. It has been proven bad. It is common knowledge that it is contrary to the Federal law, the Federal law in this area would not allow, would not allow a state government to use sanctions of this type. And in doing so, in doing so, would not... this state would not be eligible to receive certain Federal reimbursements in this area. I'd tell you, weigh your vote very carefully. This is a bad Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, apparently Representative Taylor's off the floor. I'll move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's... Mr. Taylor is here."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "It do appear that you do not see my light. I had it on since the start of this debate and I would appreciate it if you do recognize me, would appreciate renewing the motion that we go to Short Debate."

Speaker Bradley: "There are still four other lights still flashing. The Gentleman's moved the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to close the debate."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Let me point out to some of the adversaries of this type of legislation that there are two provisions in here. One, apparently Mr. Mann did not read and I'd address his attention to line 37 and to my previous remarks. There shall be no denial of financial



assistance to or on behalf of any child under this paragraph. And two, paragraph C of the Bill also addresses itself to any conflict there may be with Federal statutes in this area. And it says that if there are any conflicts, this section only applies in the areas of which there are no conflicts. But, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me tell you. Our welfare program has run amuck. There have been some states who have been willing to address the program like fighting Federal regulations and doing something about it. This in no way impairs the ability for those who truly need aid to get it. But it does say for those who take big windfalls and squander them recklessly in a few days, that the aid is denied to you for the rest of the benefit. And I believe that's only fair and it's something that we should do in order to correct this welfare system run amuck and I solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. And the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I would... I didn't mind helping Representative Totten when he was trying to dismantle the income tax that Ogilvie put on the state, but I take exception to his remark about the lottery because California doesn't have a lottery. But I think the House ought to realize that we spend two billion dollars for public aid and one billion of it goes to medical purveyors. And I don't see Totten introducing any Bills penalizing the doctors that have ripped us off and the pharmacists and the clinics and everybody else... and the pharmacists. One billion dollars in medical purveyors are working this for it. The other billion is going to your friends- Illinois Bell Telephone, Niagas, Commonwealth Edison, 'Jewel-ox' and some other people and the poor half a million kids you're talking about might end up with some food. I think that's the reason why the Republicans lose these elections - they forget the sight of the people and their needs."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."



Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this Bill ought to go down to a resounding defeat for one basic reason. The Sponsor of the Bill purports to solve the welfare problem with this Bill and let me tell you, there is not one person of you in this House who would want your children to be responsible for your irresponsible acts. This Bill purports to penalize people who irresponsibly use windfall profits. The program that it is being amended is the aid to dependent children program and if this Bill passes and if it were effective, it would be the children that would be... that would be punished and not the person who was irresponsible. Now, this Bill is a farce in that it has a smoke screen in it. He goes on to put in a provision that nothing in this Bill is intended to deny children's benefits that they want. And yet, the Bill is designed to affect the aid to dependent children. That being the case, it's a basic contradiction and we ought to just defeat it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if this Bill were to go on the books, possibly it would stop some of the irresponsibility. Instead of having to cut off the benefits, they wouldn't be spending the money that they receive in windfall profits so that they would not have money left. The taxpayers of this state are paying for public aid. Surely they must expect some kind of accountability from the Public Aid Department and from our state government and this House. The Human Resources Committee approved this Bill. You might note that thirteen Members of the Human Resources Committee of this House agreed that this was a good measure. I urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, really not to explain my vote, to make a correction to Representative Giorgi. I'm glad to see you on your feet, Representative Giorgi, but just to prove that one time that you perhaps are wrong that you said that the State of California does not have a lottery. And I would like to advise



you that in order to buy a home in the State of California in many locations, they do conduct that by lottery in which if your name is drawn, you get the option or the first refusal rights and I just want to clear that point up."

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

E. Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Had the Sponsor did his research, he would have known that this is already in the Public Aid Code. It is redundant legislation. We in the Appropriations Committee just passed out an appropriation for the Department of Public Aid, deficiency appropriation in excess of a hundred and twenty-five million dollars. I think every Member in this House should know that that deficiency, a hundred and nineteen million dollars, goes to the medical providers, not to the aid to dependent children. Your aid to dependent children line item was reduced for F.Y.'77. If the staff on the other side of the aisle was doing their job, they would have told the Sponsor that this language is already in the Public Aid Code and is not needed. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to tell you that the Department, and I'm sure you know it, the Department of Public Aid currently requires that recipients properly report any changes in their circumstances which may affect eligibility. If assistance is given without knowledge of the change, receipt of lump-sum benefits, for example, the Department is currently authorized to seek a refunding of the appropriate amount. That is the law and that is what they do. Now, a few minutes ago, I witnessed how many of us rush to the defense of the liquor industry and here... I watched it... I... rushed to the defense of the liquor industry and here you're going to condemn young children. God help us."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 56 'aye' and 81 'no'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 921."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 921."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, out of the record. 932."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 932. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 932 is following up... just speaking about children, I'm speaking about the elderly. 932 is the Homestead Exemption Act. And in return, when I was running for office and being around..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sharp, sit down. 932, Mr. Clerk. We've got the wrong number up."

Murphy: "Most of the complaints that I was getting was from the elderly people that they couldn't meet their obligations as they were. These are the people that have built our schools, built our great heritage that we have and now we are putting them out into a field where they can't even own their own home. They can't pay the taxes and I thought if I was fortunate enough to be elected, that I would do something for them. The Homestead Exemption Act right now gives them a fifteen hundred dollar deduction and that's just one... I'm not asking the state to pick it up. I'm willing to take it back to the counties and let them fight it out back there. The County Board Officers, they think nothing of raising their salaries and squandering money. There's too much government all the way. In the local townships, they go behind closed doors and raise salaries. You guys are afraid to take those guys on back there in the counties, well just... get on this one and just wake them up. It's about time after having a bad year last year with the inflated costs of all the utilities, these people are having a rough time trying to meet their obligations. Now, we took care of the farmers in the Land Bill Bradley had here and there's no reason that we can't take care of the elderly folks back home. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Jones."

E. Jones: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all



voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109 'aye' and 24 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 933, Representative DiPrima. Was that your last Bill, Representative Murphy? Representative DiPrima."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 933. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 937, Representative McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 937."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 937. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

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

House Bill 937 is another attempt to do something for the senior citizens in Illinois. House Bill 937 would exempt senior citizens with incomes under ten thousand dollars from property tax increases that are attributable to an increase in the value of their property. It would not exempt them from increases that arise from an improvement to the property or for an increase in the tax rates. Year after year the assessed value of their property will continue to increase. The taxes on the increased amount would not be paid by the senior citizen, but would be reimbursed to the local units of government by the states. I feel that this Bill is important for three reasons. First of all, there's four hundred thousand senior citizens in Illinois with incomes below ten thousand dollars that need tax relief. When the Legislature passed the Homestead Exemption in 1972, it did so in order to help these people. The Homestead Exemption allows seniors to deduct fifteen hundred dollars in assessed value of their property. At an average tax rate of \$6.70, this saves each household approximately one hundred dollars. However, since the Homestead Exemption went into effect in 1972, the medium price of a house has increased by sixteen thousand dollars. Assessing property at one-third the market value, this represents a tax increase of three hundred and seventy dollars. So the hundred dollars we saved them in 1972, has



disappeared three times over. The medium price for a new house in 1978 is expected to be fifty-one thousand and in 1983, ninety-two thousand. Obviously, anyone on a fixed income will not be able to afford property taxes on an increase... increase of approximately one thousand dollars. Secondly, I think this is important because it's a step away regressive taxation. We all know that the most regressive taxes in this state are those on food and medicine and the property tax. Although this is not a comprehensive tax program, what we are saying that increased costs of local government will not come out of increasing property taxes to senior citizens, but will come out of state taxes which are the least regressive of all the taxes we have. And finally, I think this is important because when everyone is talking about fiscal responsibility, this Bill is just that. The law would go into effect January 1, of 1978. That means that property taxes that year would be frozen. In 1979, the assessed value will go up and the state will be responsible for the taxes on this increased portion. These taxes for 1979 are payable in the spring of 1980. Therefore, there will be no cost to the State of Illinois for two years. In summary, I think that this legislation would help four hundred thousand people that need help. It's a move away from regressive taxation and I believe it's fiscally responsible. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it's hard to say anything against a Bill that is designed to help senior citizens. But let's remember now that 10% of our people in this state and in this country over 65, they are not all indigent, believe me. We're sending kids to school longer. They're in school until age 20 to 25. We've got a number of people on public aid and the load on the working man, the guy who finally has to pay the bill, is getting heavier and heavier and heavier. And a lot of senior citizens I know are a heck of a lot better prepared to pay their local taxes than some of the guys that are working, trying to buy their home and raise their families. This has got



to shut off somewhere. There is some merit to doing something for the indigent senior citizens, but I know people now who are driving up in a Cadillac to eat a sixty-cent lunch and I resent it because they're just as able to pay as the guy that's out working trying to raise his family and somewhere, even though it isn't popular, we've got to shut this off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

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

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to that... to the last speaker, this Bill does not apply to all senior citizens. It only applies to those senior citizens with incomes below ten thousand dollars. Those are the ones that need the assistance. I think it's a very good Bill and I would urge your support."

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

Kane: "I was going to ask the Sponsor a question but since that's precluded, what I would like to make is the statement that under our present circuit breaker system, the property taxes persons over 65 with incomes with less than ten thousand dollars, their property taxes are already frozen at 4.2% of their income. And this Bill would have no affect whatsoever."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the last Gentleman made one of the points I was going to make. I really don't believe this Bill does much of anything. But if it does, it's going to have a tremendous impact on the state in the amount of perhaps ten to fifteen million dollars if it does what he says it does. I don't know how he's going to get the money or where he thinks it's going to come from. The Bill really ought not be supported. Local government does the assessing, they can collect the taxes, the relief ought to be locally, if local governments want to give



it and they ought to pay for it. It may look good to pass the buck over to the state, but the Gentleman knows full well that someone's going to have to pay the Bill and that this legislation really and truly won't save anyone anything. And I urge everyone to vote 'no' on House Bill 937."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we need to take a look at here what we are doing for senior citizens. We do a lot for our senior citizens and they deserve it. But we just passed out a Bill here that will double the Homestead Exemption with hardly a negative vote. Now, do we need to pass out another vote that will freeze the property tax? Earlier this Session we have discussed Bills in this same area and there wasn't enough support in this House to even make the Homestead Exemption available at..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Give the Gentleman order. Proceed."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that we all must take a responsible attitude. I think if we talk to our senior citizens, they don't want to burden future generations for benefits that they can live without. I think we've done enough for one Session and I think we should turn down this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see this Bill, this fine Bill has 90 votes which is enough to pass. This is a mere ten million dollars from local government. The Bill we just... preceded it was only twenty-four to twenty-eight million loss to local governments which is only a total of about forty million. We just cut the state income tax by fifteen million. That makes a total of fifty-five million we've cut off. Now, the next Bill I suppose is going to be called is the Public Aid Bill to add forty-two million to the state's budget. I think that... we should give that a resounding vote, too."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know why we're so concerned about a piddly fifteen million dollars. Earlier in the evening, we just voted



out three hundred million dollars worth of tax relief to people.

I don't know why fifteen million should bother us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if this... if this gets only 89-90 votes, I'm going to ask for a verification."

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

Ewing: "We want the verification."

Speaker Redmond: "I would suggest that we dump this Roll Call. Dump the Roll Call and we'll vote again. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Dump it, yeah. There are some votes on here that the Members are not sitting in their seat. May I caution you, please vote your switch only. All... the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Only your own switch please. Have all voted who wished? Your own switch only. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Don Brummet, Byers, Campbell, Collins, Jack Davis, Deavers, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Ewell, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Griesheimer, Hoffman, Huskey, Johnson, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kucharski, Laurino, McAuliffe, McBroom, Molloy, Mudd, Polk, Ryan, Schlickman, Schuneman, Stanley, Stearney, Wall, Wikoff, and Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Please change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's requested be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Kosinski desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Garmisa as 'aye'. 91 'aye'. How many 'no'? 41 'no'. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I heard 88 plus, I think, 3 is 92 and if... 91. I would like a verification and I'd like it with using the procedure of the voting unit."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. What was the further request?"



Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've been using the procedure of staying at your desk and standing up and punching the button..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have an oral..."

Ebbesen: "An oral verification, yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Oral verification. Members please be in your seats. Representative Skinner, please be in your seat. I don't see that there's any exception in the rule that you voted for, Sir. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Representative Luft."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters, why are you standing?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, you had just ordered that the Members in accordance with the rules be in their seats and that Senator Schaffer remove himself to the rear."

Speaker Redmond: "You tell Representative Schaffer. I'm not going to. He treats my Bills kindly over on the other side. Representative Lauer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No one's recorded right now."

Speaker Redmond: "We're all off. You'll have a chance when we call your name. Please sit down. Let's go ahead and call the roll, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, 'no'. Adams, 'present'. Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote, Sir? No?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, pass. E.M. Barnes, 'aye'. Jane Barnes, 'no'. Bartulis, pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Bartulis 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Aye. Beatty, 'aye'. Bennett, 'aye'. Birchler, 'aye'. Bluthardt, pass. Boucek, 'no'. Bowman, 'aye'. Bradley, 'aye'. Brady, 'aye'. Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Please depress your key when you vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Aye. Breslin, 'aye'. Rich Brummer, 'aye'. Don Brummet, pass. Byers, pass. Caldwell, pass. Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "Caldwell, how do you vote?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, 'aye'. Campbell, pass. Capparelli, 'aye'. Catania, 'present'. Chapman, 'aye'. Christensen, 'aye'. Collins,



pass. Conti, 'no'. Cunningham, 'no'. Daniels, 'aye'. Darrow, 'aye'. Corneal Davis, 'aye'. Jack Davis, pass. Dawson, 'aye'. Deavers, pass. Deuster, pass. DiPrima, pass. Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you stand and... DiPrima 'aye'. Depress your key please."

Clerk O'Brien: "DiPrima, 'aye'. Domico, pass. Doyle, 'aye'. John Dunn, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, pass. Dyer, 'present'. Ebbesen, 'no'. Edgar, 'no'. Epton, 'no'. Ewell, pass. Ewing, 'no'. Farley, 'aye'. Flinn, pass. Friedland, 'aye'. Friedrich, 'no'. Gaines, 'present'. Garmisa, 'aye'. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. Getty, pass. Giglio, 'aye'. Giorgi, 'aye'. Greiman, 'aye'. Griesheimer, pass. Hanahan, 'aye'. Harris, 'aye'. Hart, 'aye'. Hoffman, pass. Holewinski, 'aye'. Dan Houlihan, 'aye'. Jim Houlihan, 'aye'. Hoxsey, 'no'. Hudson, 'no'. Huff, 'aye'. Huskey, pass. Jacobs, 'aye'. Jaffe, 'aye'. Johnson, pass. Dave Jones, 'aye'. Emil Jones, 'aye'. Kane, pass. Katz. Kane, 'no'. Katz, pass. Keats, 'no'. Kelly, 'aye'. Kempiners, 'no'. Kent."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Present. Klosak, 'no'. Kornowicz, pass. Kosinski, 'aye'. Kozubowski, 'aye'. Kucharski, pass. Lauer, pass. Laurino, pass. Lechowicz, 'aye'. Leinenweber, 'aye'. Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Where's Leinenweber?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Leinenweber, pass. Leverenz, 'aye'. Levin, 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Supposed to be... stand and depress the button, Representative Levin."

Clerk O'Brien: "Lucco, 'aye'. Luft, 'aye'. Macdonald, 'present'. Madigan, 'aye'. Madison, 'aye'. Mahar, Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote, Sir?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Pass. Mann, 'aye'. Marovitz, 'aye'. Lynn Martin, 'no'. Peggy Martin, 'aye'. Matejek, 'aye'. Matijeovich, 'aye'. Mautino, 'aye'. McAuliffe, pass. McAvoy, pass. McBroom, 'present'. McClain, 'aye'. McCourt, 'no'. McGrew, 'aye'. McLendon, 'aye'. McMaster, 'no'. McPike, 'aye'. Meyer, pass. Miller, 'present'. Molloy, pass. Mudd, 'aye'. Mugalian, 'no'. Mulcahey."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Mugalian here?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Mugalian."



Speaker Redmond: "He's not here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pass. Mulcahey, 'aye'. Murphy, 'aye'. Nardulli, 'aye'. Neff, 'no'. O'Brien, 'aye'. O'Daniel, 'aye'. Pechous, 'aye'. Peters, 'no'. Pierce, 'aye'. Polk, pass. Porter, 'no'. Pouncey, 'aye'. Pullen, 'no'. Reed, 'no'. Reilly, 'present'. Richmond, 'aye'. Rigney, 'no'. Robinson, 'aye'. Ryan, pass. Sandquist. Ryan, 'no'. Sandquist, 'present'. Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Schisler, 'aye'. Schlickman, pass. Schneider, pass. Schoeberlein, 'aye'. Schuneman, 'no'. Sevcik, pass. Sharp, 'aye'. Shumpert, 'aye'. Simms, 'no'. Skinner, 'present'. Stanley, pass. Stearney, pass. Steczo, 'aye'. E.G. Steele, 'aye'. C.M. Stiehl, 'no'. Stuffle, 'aye'. Sumner, Summer, 'present'. Taylor, 'aye'. Telcser. Terzich, 'aye'. Tipsword, Tipsword, 'aye'. Totten, 'no'. Tuerk, 'no'. Van Duynne, 'aye'. Vitek, 'aye'. Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Von Boeckman?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Pass. Waddell, 'no'. Wall, pass. Walsh, 'no'. Wikoff, pass. Willer, 'aye'. Williams, 'aye'. Winchester, 'no'. Wolf, pass. Young, pass. Yourell, pass. Yourell, 'aye'. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other Members desire to vote? Representative Von Boeckman. Any other Member desire to vote? Representative Katz."

Katz: "Record me as 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Lauer. Representative Katz, depress your button. Representative Katz."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, record me as 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'. Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Mr. Speaker, record me as 'present' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Bennett 'present'. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Record me as 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett is from 'aye' to 'present'."



Speaker Redmond: "Present. Daniels."

Daniels: "Present."

Speaker Redmond: "Present."

Daniels: "From 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Schoeberlein 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Wait a minute, wait a minute."

Speaker Redmond: "Press your button when you... then the button will correspond."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein from 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, record me 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Aye to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "No to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "McAvoy."

Clerk O'Brien: "Porter 'no' to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAvoy."

McAvoy: "Present."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'. Representative Antonovych."

Antonovych: "Record me as 'present', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'. Representative Katz desires to be recorded as 'present'. Katz. Representative Wolf. Somebody has to depress the button. I think the rule says you're supposed to be in your seat, Representative Wolf. Representative Willer. Wolf hasn't... The rules... Representative Willer, do you seek recognition?"

Willer: "Yes, I ask to be recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Lady as 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "From 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar. Representative Mahar, 'no'. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 941."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 941. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections



of an Act creating a Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis. Out of the record. 942."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 942. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be in your right seats."

Clerk O'Brien: "Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be in your seats. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, House Bill 942 is a revision to the University Retirement System. It would require that the annual employer's contribution be made in order to meet the annual accruing liability of the system. It would create an irreversible and continuing appropriation to cover that amount of contributions on an annual basis. I think that most of you are aware that our retirement systems are funded on the basis of the employer and the employee contributions both being made into the system. They're what we call actuarially funded and they call for these contributions to be set aside during the employees working lifetime to fund the pension benefits that will be earned at the time of retirement. While we have accepted that in theory and have indeed put that into our statutes, we have not been allotting the necessary contributions to operate at the level of full funding of these systems. The employer's share has been obtained through arbitrary appropriations rather than through what the statutory requirement is. In most cases, we've been providing only the amount needed to meet the current pay-out costs. The procedure provides nothing towards funding benefits being credited to the account of the current numbers. And thus, the method we're currently using fails to recognize the increasing costs resulting from rising membership and salaries, et cetera. And as a result, the unfunded accrued liability of the university systems exceeds six hundred and fifty-eight million dollars."

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



Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I simply can't hear what the Lady is saying."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Lady order, please. Will the Members please be in their seats? Have you completed your bed check, Mr. Telcser? Proceed."

Satterthwaite: "Most pension authorities agree that the funding rate for systems of this sort have to be funded at least at a level equal to 60% and preferably of a level of at least 80%. In the case of this particular system, it is funded only at 46%. The state is really on a very dangerous course and we are going to find ourselves faced with very serious funding problems in the future. A report by the House Republican Staff on the comparison of the pension system funding in 1976 indicated that we were on this precarious path and that we needed to do something to properly fund them. They say that the pension costs should be properly budgeted as a percentage of payroll and should be adequate to level fund the plan. The cost should include the payment of interest on the unfunded accrued liability and thus, would stabilize the systems at their current level. I recommend to you this Bill as a method of following through on the recommendation of that Republican Staff study so that we do not allow this system to continually fall behind in its funding and will provide for us an insurmountable problem in the future. I solicit your vote."

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

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, if I'm interrupting, but I would like to respond."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, well, we'll get to you."

Ebbesen: "I'm sorry, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "No, I had just completed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would invite your very close scrutiny and attention to this particular piece of legislation as it relates to the state's University Retirement System. Now, if you'll all open up your Digest and Synopsis there, you will see that it... this creates



an irrevocable and continuing appropriation. I'll say this on a nonpartisan basis just looking at this in terms of I'm sure the objectives of what Representative Satterthwaite has said of sound funding to the pension systems is very well taken. But I would invite whether we have a Republican or a Democratic administration, as I understand this legislation, an irrevocable and continuing appropriation that locks this government and the State of Illinois in this particular case on normal costs plus interest based on 100% funding, a tab of about seventy-five million dollars which we do not have. Now, I will say this that under the previous administration, as far as all systems where the State of Illinois was involved with the pensions that never where we appropriated the total amount that we paid out to equal what we've paid in in appropriations. Now, it's my understanding and I stand corrected, but as I read this, we're talking about the interest on the unfunded accrued liability in the state university's systems which we would be locked in in approving this legislation which is absolutely a fiscal and financial impossibility. And I want to call everybody's attention to the fact that if they vote 'aye' on this, they're voting for something that is impossible to achieve. The objectives are fine, no question about this. And if we do it for this system, we can do it for every system or should do it for every system and we are in total state's responsibility, unfunded accrued liability not counting interest, about three to four billion dollars. And I would encourage a 'no' vote and I cannot understand the rationale and the same Sponsor who yesterday said something about service credits which were erroneously interpreted, erroneously interpreted to put in a hundred and ten or fifteen or twenty thousand dollars and now to take care of a few people, now here we are talking about seventy-five million dollars. A 'no' vote is an absolute necessity on this particular piece of legislation."

Satterthwaite: "If you will kindly let me explain, Mr. Ebbesen is quite right in what he says. And it seems to me that his indications of the growth under funding of the systems as he indicated now has us in several billion dollars worth of debts to



those systems. It is precisely for that reason that I introduced this Bill. My Bill would not pay back any of that unfunded liability. That would still be there. It would still be a problem for the state at some future time how we took care of that. All my Bill will do is to make sure that that unfunded liability does not increase. As we are going now, this current year, we've increased that deficit by sixty-four million dollars. Next year, with the appropriation as it is now listed, we will increase that deficit by seventy-four million dollars more. I am only asking that we fund this year's payment on the basis in which the statutes say that that system should be funded in order to keep the unfunded liability from growing."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. This Bill is blatantly unconstitutional because it creates and mandates that the General Assembly... to provide appropriations for continuing General Assemblies which is unconstitutional. It creates an irrevokable and a continuing appropriation of such an amount as the General Assembly does not appropriate enough. Thus, the appropriation would be created without the General Assembly approval. In essence, this General Assembly would be mandating future appropriations to future Sessions of the General Assembly and this is totally unconstitutional besides the arguments that Representative Ebbesen so clearly illustrated, the seventy-five million dollar cost. Now, this legislation is going to continue on a pattern in the areas of pensions and causing a great financial strain on the State of Illinois. So these reasons combined enough should give sufficient votes to defeat this proposal and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Satterthwaite should be commended for submitting this Bill. Whether or not it be constitutional or not, she is pointing out a fact that our funds are underfunded. And one of the reasons for this is because of the lack of attention that's given by our Legislative Body and our governmental agency paying



their fair share into the pension fund. Now, I will admit that the General Assembly is also concerned in this since they did pass all of these benefits, but this is a step in the right direction. It will show that the government of the State of Illinois wants to live up to their obligations by funding and paying their fair share into the pension program that we enacted pension benefits on and I would urge support of this Bill, 942."

Speaker Redmond: "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', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Representative Satterthwaite, to close."

Satterthwaite: "In response to one of the previous speakers who indicated that this might be an unconstitutional move, may I reiterate that all the Bill does is say that the state will make the payments as the statutes already say that payment will be made. It does not add any additional money beyond that. Also, I would bring to your attention that the very same language that I have inserted into this Pension Code is already a part of our state statutes. It is now included in the portion of our statutes dealing with student loans and the guarantee of the state to repay those loans. So it is not new, it was simply lifted from another section of the statutes. I believe that it is equally valid in this situation and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, in explaining my vote, this Bill is simply doing what this Legislature promised years and years ago would be done. I would say before any of the Members of this Body were here, there was a statute passed setting up this retirement system and promising and guaranteeing that it would be funded in the years to come. What do we propose to do? Do we propose to wait until the Federal government in its continuing action to make pensions in this country sound



and continuing, that they come along and say to the State of Illinois, you pay up now totally, totally right now and you can forget your other appropriations in this state until you do because that's what we're going to face. They've been saying the same thing to business now and business pensions and the next thing is going to be governmental pensions. We can no longer continue to live in this dream world that we're in, of not funding these obligations that we have made for ourselves. This Bill does not provide for picking up all that past Legislatures have failed to do. It simply provides that now and in the future, we're going to do what we promised to do years and years and years ago before any of us ever got to this Legislature. We're going to make good on this promise to the people of the University Retirement System and we're going to be forced to do it in all of the other retirement systems. We'd better start now or else be geared to have a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars overnight to fund all of these pensions systems in the State of Illinois because otherwise, that's what we face."

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

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'aye' and 66 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 945."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 945. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt. Will you please break up the conference? Mr. Simms. Representative... can't see Representative McCourt. Will the Gentleman standing between the Chair and Representative McCourt please sit down? And we'll get smaller after shaves, Mr. Ryan."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was introduced to correct an inequity as to the application by the Illinois State Scholarship Commission in the distribution of scholarship funds for those students attending school in May, June, July and/or August. Traditionally, this period of the



year for most students is considered summer school where a student can accelerate a study program or catch up by taking certain extra courses. However, there are certain courses of study that have a required attendance for a full twelve-month period and have this required attendance prior to July 1st of 1947 for a successful completion. And in particular, certain schools of nursing are on a twelve-month class schedule. The Illinois State Scholarship Commission by not allowing tuition payments for "summer school enrollment" has, in effect, reduced the entitlement of nursing students enrolled in a twelve-month institution of higher learning to two-thirds to three-quarters percent of a student's entitlement. House Bill 945 attempts to correct this inequity wherever a school has a twelve-month study requirement and has had such a requirement before July 1, '75. This Bill is supported by the Cook County Hospital School of Nursing, Lutheran Hospital in Moline, Illinois, St. Francis Hospital in Evanston, and a score of other hospitals and I urge your approval."

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

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

I rise in support of House Bill 945. We find ourselves caught with those students who because of their programs and because of the academic wisdom of those who set up those programs are caught in the situation of falling through the cracks of the rules of the Illinois State Scholarship and Grant Commission. Because of the way the rules are drawn right now, part of their education for which they would otherwise be eligible are not funded. Now, I don't think it is for me, I don't think it's for anybody on this floor unless you chance to be expert in the field of nursing or if you chance to be expert in the field of medicine or expert in the field of dentistry to know whether or not a twelve-month basis of continuing education is necessary. But that is neither here nor there. If in the wisdom of the faculty of that school in setting up its academic programs, they deem it to be necessary that there be a twelve-month program, then it seems to me that those students should not be penalized when they would otherwise qualify for Illinois State Scholarship funds



for their education simply because they do not fall within the regular norm of going to school nine months and then being off for three months. It seems to me whether the education of the student goes over four nine-month periods each of which is interrupted between the freshman-sophomore, the sophomore-junior and the junior-senior years by a three-month interim or whether they go straight through on a twelve-month basis. For this, they are eligible for aid by the State Scholarship and Grant Commission. Then, they should be eligible for that aid, the interim periods notwithstanding. I strongly recommend an 'aye' vote on this excellent Bill to extend the coverage to some of those students who by their own fault and by their own devices have fallen through the cracks, the intent of the legislation of the state notwithstanding."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 137 'aye' and 11 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 947, Representative Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 947."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 953. Put it back in the record. Sit in your seat the way the rules say, the Hanahan's rules. Why you won't get shut off like that."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 947. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 947 permits the manufacturers and distributors that furnish a retain sign, outside sign, costing not more than five hundred dollars. It eliminates the sign size limitation. The present law limits that manufacturer and distributor to a hundred and twenty-five dollars and that law has been on the books for thirty-some years. What has really happened is that the outside sign contributions have been, you know, skated around. As far as the size of the sign,



local ordinances both county and city limit the size of the signs and the necessity of having that kind of limitation the state statute is no longer needed. This Bill is supported not only by the various liquor license dealer's associations but also by the manufacturers and distributors and the sign painters and the sign painter's union, the electricians and the sheet metal workers who depend upon their living in helping install this kind of signs in the retail liquor establishment. There was an Amendment put on the Bill to comply with the Federal prohibition on this size, but what has really happened is that we had an unworkable limitation on the amount of money a sign could be worth and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mahar: "Are there any Federal funds available for these signs?"

Hanahan: "Not that I know of."

Mahar: "Are there any restrictions as far as local government are concerned. Do they have to comply with local ordinances?"

Hanahan: "No, no, this is a state Act. The local ordinances could supercede."

Mahar: "What is the need for this type of..."

Hanahan: "Just to remove that limitation of the hundred and twenty-five dollars that would... under law, under state law that a manufacturer could contribute toward the cost of an outside sign. That's all this does. It really just brings it from a hundred and twenty-five which was set up in 1933 to the present-day standards of five hundred dollars seeing that the average sign may cost that much money and contributed by the distributor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "May I speak on this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mahar: "I don't really see the need for them to increase the size of the sign. I think they're doing pretty good business now as they indicate. And to allow them to increase the size of the sign will



only cause more problems and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mautino: "Tom, I don't have your Bill in front of me, but if I remember that statute correctly, the preceding paragraph of the dram shop I think addresses counties of population two hundred thousand or more and I think... Am I correct in assuming this Amendment would affect those counties two hundred thousand or more? I don't happen to have the Bill in front of me but if you'd check it..."

Hanahan: "Maybe Mr. Sandquist, Representative Sandquist could enlighten that. I really don't know."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is uniform throughout the state. It's not limited to any county, this provision."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

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

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's just, you know, this isn't a real biggy. This is a Bill to allow, to encourage the reasonable share of the costs of the outside to be contributed by the distributors and manufacturers and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. This is something as Representative Hanahan says, goes back to the 1930's. You cannot have a reasonable sign now at a hundred and twenty-five dollars and there have been ways of getting around it which I think are wrong and this is a Bill that everybody agrees will make it better. Urge you all vote."

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

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'aye'



and 27 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 953."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 953. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 953 is a copy of an Act that's already on the books in the State of California and a copy of the Bill introduced in the Congress of the United States that where what has happened in many of our collective bargaining agreements is that employers who enter into that agreement find an ability under a ruling of the National Labor Relations Board on the Howard Johnsons case where they find that if they sell their business, that the new employees that were employed previously by the employer that signed the agreement, is... are... the new employer is not bound by the contract that he had entered into with the representatives of those employees. So what in essence has happened as a general practice that only recently in the last six months is the fact that some employers will sign a contract and then sell the business. In the meantime, the carpenter, the hotel, motel or the janitor or whoever is working under that contract for that employer finds that he has a new employer and no contract. And what has happened is that there's a disruption in the manner in which a continuity of a contract takes place for the average working man who is under union contract when his employer sells his business. All this Bill does is cover the loophole that was opened up under a court decision called the Howard Johnson Decision. And it is not... it's a matter of fair play that if your employer agrees to a contract, that you as an employee should have the right, knowing full well that your contract is for a specific period of time, that that contract would be held valid for that specific period of time and all purchasers of an employment with a union contract would be, therefore, made known to them that they would be obligated to continue the contract that the previous owner had agreed to. It's a good Bill, it's a fair concept. There are both proponents and opponents among unions on this issue. I think the Fair Employment



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Practices Commission should be empowered to at least have continuity continued in collective bargaining. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson. Abramson."

Abramson: "Will the Sponsor yield."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Abramson: "Mr. Hanahan, does this contract... this provision apply to contracts with building apartment owners and janitors? If you sold your building, does the new... does the janitor you came with have to stay under the union agreement?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "If you as the owner of the business or, you know, the provider of the contract... no, it would be with the employer or the janitor. If you were the direct employer like some service employees work directly for the owner of businesses, you sold your building, yes, you would be bound by continuity for the term of contract. But you as an owner would be protected that you would be at least knowledgeable. What has happened is too many new purchasers of businesses or of... a new purchaser of an apartment building finds themselves with a labor problem only because he wasn't aware of the previous owners commitment to his employees under a written contract. But this is... all this would be is to provide the continuity of that contract to the expiration date."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser. Representative Lauer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lauer: "Mr. Hanahan, am I to believe that the new owner then is bound by the previous contract to the extent of that contract whether it be three years, five years, ten years, whatever?"

Hanahan: "Contracts have... generally three years maximum, generally one year termination and generally you don't sell it in the first..."

Lauer: "He is bound..."

Hanahan: "He would be bound to the termination point of the contract.

But the safeguard would be the purchaser of the business would be forewarned. He would not find out that that was the case after



he bought a business. He would have the prewarning under the law that he would not end up like owning a business with an existing contract that he wasn't aware of."

Lauer: "Is there provision in the Bill that would require a seller to awar... to give warning to the purchaser of the provisions of the contract and the fact that he would be bound by that contract?"

Hanahan: "That's the intent of the legislation, that everyone be aware of it."

Lauer: "Is it stated in the Bill?"

Hanahan: "I'll be honest with you. I don't know."

Lauer: "I think it is not. If the synopsis..."

Hanahan: "That would be the intent of the legislation and if it weren't specifically spelled out, would be amended in because that is the intent of the legislation. I just took the Federal Act and put it in the state statute here."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, if I may address the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, strikes me that this is another one of those imperfect Bills that because of the fact there is no provisions for warning of the purchaser, because of the fact that you are binding one individual by the actions of another individual who is completely independent of that individual, that we have a situation that this Bill should not be passed. The point that I am trying to make, Ladies and Gentlemen, and particularly those on this side of the aisle is the missing word in your analysis. And that word is 'not'. It says no party in the synopsis in... and Digest, I think you could be led down a primrose path thinking that this might be harmless. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I submit that there's a great deal of harm in this Bill because it leaves the freedom or it closes the door on the freedom of action to someone who picks up an ailing business and that business may very well be ailing, Ladies and Gentlemen, because of the terms, the unrealistic terms, uneconomic terms of a union contract. I think that the individual ought to be forewarned, I think he ought to be aware of the fact that he's running a terrible risk and until such time as that is amended into this Bill,



I could not possibly vote for the Bill. I'm not sure that I would want to vote for the Bill if that were amended in. But at this point at least in my mind the red flags are about a hundred and eight feet long and seven hundred... a hundred and eighty feet long and seventy feet wide indicating that this Bill should not pass and I strongly solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanahan's Bill amends the Fair Employment Practice Act and I'm concerned about what affect this would have on the operation of F.E.P.C. Now, they're behind... maybe Mr. Hanahan can provide some information on this. Tom, do they have the money to implement this? They are behind what? About one year in processing their complaints right now. Are they... three years, someone said. This additional responsibility which does not relate to discrimination that is based on sex or color or nationality or religion, but is a labor matter. I wonder if they're prepared to take this on and if this belongs in F.E.P.C. or if it would rightfully belong in some other statute."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, in answer to the direct question. The Fair Employment Practices Act just as the words call for would be the proper place for this type of legislation because we're talking about a fair employment practice. We're talking about a continuity of a fair employment or fair employer's agreement having a continuity over a change of ownership. Where else could you amend the statutes to insure fair employment treatment to employees of an employer who decides to sell his business? And I'd just like to point out that there probably would be very little necessity in the law were on the books because what is now happening... what... right now according to what the Bill is purporting to be, is to give notice in a sixty-day, to Representative Lauer, that if he read the Bill, he would understand that it does say that they have to be notified and there is a sixty-day clause in there that has to take place. And they could enter into a mandamus action under the law action if a contract or company did not comply with the provisions of continuity."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

going to cost any money which is incredible because he then went on to talk about mandamuses and serving of notices and all those kinds of things. And we know that all costs a lot of money and he didn't indicate that he's going to appropriate any more money for the F.E.P.C. which is now underfunded and overburdened.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I could not possibly vote for the Bill. I'm not sure that I would want to vote for the Bill if that were amended in. But at this point at least in my mind the red flags are about a hundred and eight feet long and seven hundred... a hundred and eighty feet long and seventy feet wide indicating that this Bill should not pass and I strongly solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanahan's Bill amends the Fair Employment Practice Act and I'm concerned about what affect this would have on the operation of F.E.P.C. Now, they're behind... maybe Mr. Hanahan can provide some information on this. Tom, do they have the money to implement this? They are behind what? About one year in processing their complaints right now. Are they... three years, someone said. This additional responsibility which does not relate to discrimination that is based on sex or color or nationality or religion, but is a labor matter. I wonder if they're prepared to take this on and if this belongs in F.E.P.C. or if it would rightfully belong in some other statute."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, in answer to the direct question. The Fair Employment Practices Act just as the words call for would be the proper place for this type of legislation because we're talking about a fair employment practice. We're talking about a continuity of a fair employment or fair employer's agreement having a continuity over a change of ownership. Where else could you amend the statutes to insure fair employment treatment to employees of an employer who decides to sell his business? And I'd just like to point out that there probably would be very little necessity in the law were on the books because what is now happening... what... right now according to what the Bill is purporting to be, is to give notice in a sixty-day, to Representative Lauer, that if he read the Bill, he would understand that it does say that they have to be notified and there is a sixty-day clause in there that has to take place. And they could enter into a mandamus action under the law action if a contract or company did not comply with the provisions of continuity."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put?

Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Representative Hanahan, to close."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to relieve anyone of any confusion on the written notice that this Bill would call for written notice upon the other party to the contract of the proposed termination or modification, sixty days prior to the expiration date thereof or in the event such contract contains no expiration date, sixty days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification. In other words, what we're doing here is we're making it a fair employment practice in Illinois that an employer cannot easily escape or put off his obligation... negate his obligation that he freely entered into by contract onto... and hoodwink a prospective buyer into purchasing a business that he would not know that he had... he had a compulsion to comply with the contract that was entered into prior... by the prior owner. This Bill is a good Bill. It, like I say, it's introduced in the United States Congress. It is the law in a few states, California being the latest one to adopt it. It is a fair employment practice and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I had my light on but debate was closed off before I was recognized. I think that Representative Chapman was asking how much money this is going to cost and the Sponsor seemed to imply that it wasn't going to cost any money which is incredible because he then went on to talk about mandamus and serving of notices and all those kinds of things. And we know that all costs a lot of money and he didn't indicate that he's going to appropriate any more money for the F.E.P.C. which is now underfunded and overburdened.



Furthermore, I find it extremely odd that the Sponsor of this Bill who only twenty-four hours ago rose and said that this General Assembly has no right to interfere in the sacred relationship between the employer and the unions, is now introducing legislation which he wants us to vote for, interfering in that sacred relationship. I see no reason why the unions can't inform people who are buying the business that this is a company which has collective bargaining. And I expect that they're very likely to do that, so I don't see any reason why we ought to vote for this Bill for those two reasons if we want to behave responsibly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to yield to Corneal Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

C. Davis: "It seems to me that we're loading certain responsibilities upon the Fair Employment Practices Commission before we really know whether or not the appropriations are going to be increased or decreased. I don't want to certainly be against labor. I'm not against labor, but I... we have added on to the Fair Employment Practice Commission the job of enforcing nondiscrimination because of age. Now, we're going to add something else on. Where are we going... are they going to give us any money for F.E.P.C.? We have so many cases now that they can't handle 'em. We're almost a year behind. I could wish that we'd hold some of these Bills until such a time as we know what the appropriations are going to be and I think that makes sense to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 50 'aye' and 54 'no' and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have unanimous consent to be listed as having voted 'no' on House Bill 1279."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave?"

Simms: "...change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on the Consent Calendar, they tell me."



Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I'd like leave to be recorded as 'yes' on House Bill 909."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I'd like consent to be recorded as 'no' on 1279."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. Hearing no objection, Representative Walsh, leave is granted. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded 'yes' on 945."

Speaker Redmond: "She have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Leave to be voted 'yes' on 947."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Sir, may I have leave to be voted 'yes' on 932?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? According to Representative Hanahan's rules, this is the last week we're going to let people change their vote. 963, Representative Houlihan, Daniel. Asks leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted and it's returned. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."
Representative Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Is the Clerk ready?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "My first request, I would ask leave to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 1277 as well as 730."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 886."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, I'd like to have leave to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 869 please."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Leave is granted. I can't see Representative Lucco. Representative Skinner is standing between Representative Lucco and the Chair. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "I'd like to introduce myself. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be



recorded as voting 'no' on House Bill 1563."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave?"

Lucco: "Does not change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 963 on page 3 by deleting 3 and 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to House Bill 963 was an Amendment suggested by Representative Wolf in the Pension Committee hearing of the Bill and simply makes explicit what was intended by the Sponsors of the Bill, Representative Giorgi and myself, that the Assistant State's Attorney, Public Defender and the Assistant Public Defender who would be eligible for participation in this pension fund must be full-time Assistant State's Attorney's, Public Defender and Assistant Public Defender. That's all that the Amendment does is clarify the Bill to the effect that these have to be full-time positions and I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 970. Representative Bennett, 970."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 970. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Fire Protection Personnel Standards and Education Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is one of the appropriation Bills and this Bill would appropriate one million, ninty thousand, seven hundred dollars for fiscal year '78 for the expenses of the Illinois Fire Protection Personnel Standards and Education Committee or Commission. The request broken down is one hundred and ninety-nine thousand, six hundred



dollars for operations and eight hundred and ninety-one hundred for grants. I'd ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Houlihan, J.M., are you seeking recognition? You were doing this."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I was merely trying to establish that meeting we've been trying to have for the last two weeks."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I heard the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous, ask leave to vote 'aye' on House Bill 730 and I make a parliamentary inquiry. Does that change the result?"

Speaker Redmond: "He advised that it didn't."

Pierce: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "I hope he's right. 971."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 971. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please sit down."

Taylor: "I'd like to take House Bill 971 out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor, what was the..."

Taylor: "I'd like to have 971 taken out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 972."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 972. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 972 amends the Election Code. This proposition... gives outside employment powers only to the Election Commission in Chicago and there are only three. The restriction causes problems if the commissioners have outside income since the term 'employment' is capable of being misinterpreted. The Amendment provides that this provision does



not prohibit an election commissioner from receiving income from other sources or from continuing to engage in a professional practice or a business of which he or she is engaged in or on.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit your support for House Bill 972."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Taylor, can you tell me how much a commissioner on the Board of Election Commissioners in Chicago makes?"

Taylor: "The Chairman makes thirty-five thousand dollars and the other two commissioners make twenty-five thousand dollars."

Madison: "Representative Taylor, can you tell me how many of the commissioners presently this Bill would affect?"

Taylor: "Three."

Madison: "If the... are you saying then that there are three commissioners who have outside employment in deference to the present code?"

Taylor: "No, I'm saying that the three would be entitled to have outside... or own business in this provision here."

Madison: "Do any of the commissioners at the present time have outside..."

Taylor: "One owns a business that I know of."

Madison: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the answer."

Taylor: "One owns a business that I know of."

Madison: "Is that... under the present statutes, is that individual in violation?"

Taylor: "I don't understand the question."

Madison: "Is that individual in violation of the statutes as it presently stands?"

Taylor: "No, because he has changed his name and should not be listed as the owner."

Madison: "He has changed his name?"

Taylor: "No, the name his... the owner who runs the business for him."

Madison: "I see, thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Sir, I move the previous question."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is to move the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed?
Previous question is moved. Representative Taylor, to close."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, this is a simple Bill and I simply solicit your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 972 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Explaining his vote, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, I really wanted to ask a question. Maybe the Sponsor can nod if I can get out from behind the post. Would this allow the... one of these commissioners to have another public job such as the City of Chicago or the Sanitary District or... the Parliamentarian says 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Taylor. He indicates it would not."

Taylor: "It says that a person that owned a business, would not be another public job. It would be a person and I know of one individual that happens to be in the moving business services and he is a Board of Commissioners in Chicago and he has the problem right now. That's what this Bill... the record that is trying to correct, that one problem."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in looking at the Bill in the analysis we have, it's inconceivable to me that someone could want to make the kind of money that's involved here, not want to, but our statutes permit them to make that kind of money, that kind of requirement and that kind of specificity with respect to the job of election commissioner and still expect to have outside employment. And I can't see how we can go to the people of Illinois in the year of fiscal crunch and say that we're going to permit that kind of thing to go on. And I would urge very strongly a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, this particular Gentleman does not work for the city or the state. He does own a private business and he is a very capable public servant. And having been in that area and was the one that we sought that could run the



office and he is there and he should be there and there shouldn't be any reason why he should not be able to maintain his own business. He's not trying to siphon anything off of the public payroll at all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, so far as I know there's three commissioners. One, a Republican who served in this House with distinction. I don't know whether she holds any other job or not. And there are two Democrats. But I do know this, if we sought to appoint a lawyer, we'd certainly want the best lawyer. Do you mean to tell me that that lawyer would have to give up all of his law practice before he would be eligible to serve on that job? Do you mean to tell me you want to select men or women who have no job who were probably on relief and we say we're going to give you one now, we're going to put you on the Election Commission? You want the very best. This is what you want on that and show me now how you can, how you can go out and select the very best when they don't even have a job and the very best would certainly have some kind of job. This man is a distinguished leader. He has a job."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."

C. Davis: "Now what do you want him to do? He has a business."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Davis."

C. Davis: "You want him to discard his business and throw it away?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly bring your remarks to a close."

C. Davis: "It's unreasonable."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jones, to explain his vote. The timer is on. Representative Gaines, to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I arise in support of this legislation. The personality being involved is a distinguished businessman in my community who has spent his lifetime building up a business and to ask a man to jettison a lifetime's work for a couple of years appointment because on all these appointed jobs, you never know from one day to the next when you're going to be unappointed. And therefore, I think it's unfair to require anyone to give up their business and profession and their property



in order to be a public servant. So therefore, I'd like to ask, particularly those of you from downstate, to make it possible for this distinguished gentleman to continue to act as a member of the Board of Election Commissioners in Chicago where he is serving with distinction."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and all I have to go by is what I'm reading here in the Digest and, you know, I kind of look at this and it kind of relates to myself here serving in the General Assembly. . . And I certainly would hate to see something that prohibited me from conducting my private practice, whatever limited time there is available. But I am voting 'aye' for that reason and I support what Representative Taylor is trying to do in this particular Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Emil Jones, to explain his vote."

E. Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there is a misconception concerning this piece of legislation. Under the current statute, even an attorney could not practice law if he is appointed commissioner of the City of Chicago Board of Elections. And you and I know, I don't know of any attorney in here who will work for the... for twenty-five or thirty-five thousand dollars per year. Most of the lawyers here practice law. Most of the lawyers here practice law at the same time we pass legislation dealing with those laws. So all this Bill does is permit a person who happens to own a private business, to own his own private business. I would like to see some more green lights up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "After Emil Jones' explanation, I change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Taylor. Representative Matijevec, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevec: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote because I think initially the red votes went on there because many thought this was a double dipping Bill and now slowly, we're beginning to realize that it's not. And I don't see how you can tie anybody



up from making a legitimate living. You can't really do it. I would urge those who initially got on red thinking this is a double dipping, changing and voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Kosinski, to explain his vote."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'aye' because he may be a jeweler."

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

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Taylor's been to my desk, Representative Gaines has been here, they have some strong feelings about this Bill and I'm certainly not going to vote against them if they feel this strong and they can live with what... with their people making thirty-five thousand dollars a year and getting another job, so can I."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 101 'ayes', 38 'nays', 16 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 922, Representative Stanley. 922. I'm sorry. 992."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 992. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Liquor Control Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you. This is the Liquor Control appropriation. It amounts to four hundred and three thousand, five hundred dollars. It is less than last year's budget. It's definitely a tight budget. Last year was four hundred and eight thousand and the year before that, it was four hundred and twenty-one thousand. Now, the Liquor Commission itself takes in over one million dollars in revenue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. There's a point of order being raised. Representative Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "Well, last week when Dwight Friedrich made the point that we shouldn't be passing out Appropriation Bills when we've got this time problem on other Bills, why don't... we just passed one out and I thought, well, we slipped through. But if we're



going to do it to every one of them, it's just going to take too much time and I'd suggest we pass over them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I asked that specific question when I got up here, John, and they said they passed a few others out. What's the will of the Sponsor?"

Stanley: "I would just as soon do this right now. It's a Bill that's been reduced, it's appropriation's been reduced and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's really the Sponsor's right to call it. Are there any questions on House Bill 992? The Sponsor, to close."

Stanley: "Yeah, I just request a favorable Roll Call. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 992 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 4 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill receiving the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 1016, Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1016. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Building Commission Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill has been introduced before and I think we had some problems with it because it wasn't in proper form and had many objections. But I think this year we've got it back. It is in proper form, it's been amended and accepted by the Committee that reviewed it. It amends the Public Buildings Commission Act, provides that the total amount of outstanding bonds issued by any Public Buildings Commission of any municipality or county with a population of less than one million shall not exceed 5% of the total assessed value of taxable property within that municipality or county, except as authorized by referendum. If they exceed 5% of the total assessed valuation within that authority, it does not close the door on them, but it does require that a referendum be held before after exceeding



that amount. This is the only public body within the State of Illinois to my knowledge that has no limitations to its bonding authority. I believe it is one that is beginning to be used more and more every year and one that should have some type of restrictions so that it may consider priorities within that municipality so that the tax burden of that municipality isn't extended beyond the ability of the taxpayers to pay at any one given year. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 1016 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill receiving the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Would you... Does Representative Collins have leave to be recorded from 'no' to 'aye' on House Bill 1016? Hearing no objections, so recorded. House Bill 1021, Representative Chapman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1021. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, often a handicapped voter, a voter confined to a wheelchair is not able to vote at the polls on election day simply because he cannot ascend or descend the stairs to reach the polling place. This Bill permits two of the election officers, officers of different parties, to deliver the ballot or vote-o-matic device to the voter at the entrance to the polling place, enabling him to vote in the same... at the same time and in the same location as other voters do. I hope that you will support this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't doubt for one minute the sincerity of Representative Chapman's idea for introducing this Bill, but there's only one question I ask. Who or how can we determine whether we're going to start a chain voting ballot like we used to have years ago?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Knowing the Sponsor, I'm sure that's not her intention. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she'll yield."

Polk: "Representative Chapman, how are you going to determine whether a person is actually handicapped?"

Chapman: "The voter must declare upon oath properly witnessed that by reason of any physical disability it is difficult for him to ascend or descend stairs. And there would need to be a... two election officers of different parties that would be present to assist him."

Polk: "Then the election officers would leave the polling place and go out to the automobile and front?"

Chapman: "At the entrance to or the driveway of the polling place."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If I might speak to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Madison: "I can certainly appreciate what the Sponsor is trying to do..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for one second. Can we have your attention for a moment please? Thank you. Please proceed."

Madison: "I can certainly appreciate what the Sponsor is trying to do in this regard. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have sympathy and empathy for the physically handicapped. The problem that I have is that the day this Bill's signed into law, half of my precinct is going to become physically handicapped. And that reason, I can't support the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The previous question has been moved. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed? Better hold up for a minute. Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to say that my seatmate introduces some of the best Bills I've ever seen. This is not her specialty, however. I would just like to point out that,



it may not have been mentioned in debate that the persons that would be covered by this Bill can also vote by absentee ballot."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Representative Collins.

No, no, it was..."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very well-intentioned but I would submit equally unmanageable. I can just imagine someone who is incapacitated being brought to the polling place, into a busy polling place where the judges already have their hands full, sending up for two judges to come down with all the voting materials, including the vote-o-matic, using the back of one of the judges to fill out the application and sign it and then attempting to vote on the sidewalk or maybe in the lobby of the building or maybe in someone's car. Even putting aside any suggestion of any fraud, it's just... is unmanageable. There are procedures for incapacitated voters to vote. I would like to see what the Sponsor is attempting to be accomplished, but I think it is impractical. I think this is a bad Bill. It certainly is bad legislation and I would suggest that we turn it down."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Chapman, to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the point that many of you are missing is that handicapped voters do not wish to vote by absentee ballot if they can avoid it. Handicapped voters want to be as much like other citizens as they can. This Bill comes from the United Cerebral Palsy of Illinois Incorporated and it's one of their requests of this Legislature in order to help handicapped people to be as much like other citizens as possible. They would like to vote on election day the way the rest of us would. I believe this is a practical proposal, I believe there are sufficient protections and I hope that you support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1021 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 42 'ayes', 92 'nos', 11 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the



Constitutional Majority is declared lost. House Bill 1025, Mrs. Younge."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1025. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 1026, Representative Abramson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1026. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you wish to call that appropriation Bill this evening? Proceed."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this appropriation Bill appropriating five million, six hundred and fifty-two thousand, nine hundred dollars for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Commerce Commission for fiscal year beginning 19... July 1, 1977. This appropriates one million, seven hundred and sixty-nine thousand, two hundred dollars from the Motor Vehicle Fund and three million, eight hundred and eighty-three thousand, seven hundred dollars from the Public Utilities Fund. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be voting 'no' on this particular Bill. I think that this Bill is symbolic of our Governor's priorities. Budgets like Children and Family Services are literally starved to death, foster parent care is cut back, we're short teachers at the Institute of the Visually Handicapped to teach blind on subjects such as mobility, on subjects such as family living. And yet what do we do with the Commerce Commission? We increase their budget by close to a million dollars which equals 25% increase on the Commerce Commission budget. We include in their budget five new political plumb jobs that are created by the Governor for the Commerce Commission, but we don't have teachers to teach the blind. I think it's time that the Governor stopped playing with his dog and start thinking about people."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Brummer."



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

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

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, I can answer Mr. Jaffe's questions and if you'll let me take this out of the record, I'll show him where the money comes from."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, taken out of the record. House Bill 1029, Representative Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1029. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1029 and the following Bills..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Dan. Representative Ewing, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we get started on these Bills, there are two motions pending on this and the next Bill. And I think that the procedure we followed before was to consider the motions before we went into the Bill. The motions are on the Calendar to recommit to the Committee on Revenue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Clerk read the motion? Would you read the motion please?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Have you... will this next two measures take 107 votes to pass?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll look into it. Clerk will read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to commit House Bill 1029 to the House Revenue Committee. Filed May 3, 1977. Signed, Representative Ewing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll check into that question for you presently and let you know, Mr. Ewing. Representative Friedland, on the motion."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Perhaps because I sit in the back, I don't get involved with the



communication and the huddles out there in the middle of the aisle, but I'm not quite sure what Representative Ewing's trying to do, you know. As a Minority Member of the Committee on Assignment of Bills, I want to report to you that we do work hard and you know sometimes working with Representative Madigan, he smiles a lot. It's a difficult job. We try to get the job done and Representative Bradley is a Member there, too. Is it the contention here that the Bills were assigned to the wrong Committee? It's been the practice since the Session began that measures dealing with tax revenues were assigned to the Revenue Committee and those dealing with bonding authorities were assigned to the Executive Committee. And we meet often and it's a difficult job. As a matter of fact, Zale Glauberman has interrupted several of our meetings back in Representative Madigan's office. He can attest to the fact we do meet often. And so, the requests that I receive from Members, I do relay those to the Members of the Assignment Committee and I'm probably batting about 70-80% and the Sponsor of this motion, on March 29th, asked to have House Bill 772 recalled from the Committee on Cities and Villages and put to the Agriculture Committee and that was... we did accomplish that. So I'm not quite sure what is happening here. Maybe the Sponsor could enlighten us?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ewing, in answer to your question, House Bill 1029 requires 89 votes. House Bill 1030 requires 107 votes. Representative, what's your pleasure on the motion? Representative Mugalian, do you have any questions on the motions? Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We were, last year it was decided that we would have a statement of jurisdiction in our rules. For some reason, we abandoned that, so our rules do not now require a statement of jurisdiction as I understand it. The last two years that I sat on the Revenue Committee, as far as I know, we had all the Bills pertaining to the Capital Development Board. It would seem very logical that those Bills would go to the Revenue Committee whether or not we had a statement of jurisdiction. Just as criminal justice Bills would go to the Judiciary II



and Bills on insurance would go to Insurance, surely it would seem that such Bills would be assigned to the Revenue Committee without any question. I just can't understand why we invite these kinds of situations and I would urge that the Speaker and the Leadership consider a statement of jurisdiction and any statement that will be written would not send these kinds of Bills to the Executive Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question when we get to the... Have we settled this matter of jurisdiction? May I ask the Sponsor a question or are we through... are we still discussing..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, ma'am, we're on the motion, ma'am. And we'll get to the Bill after we get through with the motion."

Willer: "I'm sorry about that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is that satisfactory, Mrs. Willer?"

Willer: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the motion to commit."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's all right. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that motion lay on the table."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Darrow moves that motion lie on the table. I don't believe there's any debate. All those in favor will... of Representative Darrow's motion to lie on the table will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Representative Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, and also to expand a bit on what Representative Mugalian said: It seems to me that there is no need for this motion, that the rule explicitly states, I believe Rule 31(e), that anything pertaining to revenue must be either referred initially or referred to the Revenue Committee. So regardless of the outcome of Representative Ewing's motion or the outcome of this motion to table Representative Ewing's motion, it seems to me that the Chair must order this Bill and the following Bill respectively to Revenue and to Appropriations. There is simply no alternative unless, of course, the Bill following this has already been to the Appropriations Committee. But the rules permit no latitude in this matter. This Bill must go to the Revenue Committee



and is exempt from the May 21st last day for House Bills in the House. I urge you to vote 'no' on this motion to table."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Byers. Your light's on. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not trying to be dilatory, nor am I trying to hold up Representative Houlihan's Bill. I just believe that the rules are very clear that everything dealing revenue or affecting the revenue of this state should go to the Revenue Committee of this House. That has not been followed. That was the reason the motion was filed. I will accept the vote of the people in this House on the disposition of these motions. I would ask to see more red votes up there if we want to uphold our rules and have a true means to keep a handle on how we're spending the money of this state. That's the reason for this motion. It's very simple, it's very clear, and I think it should... we should defeat this motion to lay it on the table. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chair under Rule 31(e) to refer this Bill to the Revenue Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, under 31(e) I just want to point out to you that this Bill is not exempt from the deadline and you would actually kill the Bill if you did that."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, that's not accurate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...rule out of order. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that everyone in this House knew as Representative Friedland pointed out earlier that there was a good many of these Bills that were assigned and heard in Executive Committee. Now if we're going to set a precedent here and start sending these Bills and rerefer them to Committee, we're going to have a ton of Bills. So I think it's better that we go ahead. They've been reviewed by a Committee and take action on them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. Mr. Walsh's motion is out of



order. It's superfluous. The House has spoken on this issue as reflected in that Roll Call and I suggest we proceed with the business of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the conduct of the Chair and of the Majority leaves me as a Member of the Minority no alternative but to appeal the ruling of the Chair. Now, there... the rule could not be more clear and I invite anyone who voted opposite from me on this question to consult Rule 31(e) and if they agree that this Bill affects state revenue, then the Bill must go to that Committee. Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Chair is being arbitrary in ruling as it is and I hereby appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "Point of order. Representative Walsh has no motion before you. There was really no ruling, the Chair can't commit a Bill. So there's nothing to appeal and he's entirely out of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 80 'ayes', 70 'nays', 1 'present'. Representative Darrow's motion prevails. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Are you going to entertain my appeal to the... from the ruling of the Chair?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your ruling?"

Walsh: "The Chair has ruled that this Bill will not go to the Revenue Committee as I suggested under Rule 31(e). I appeal that ruling."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "Point of order. The Chair didn't rule anything. The House just acted on a motion and tabled it. That's why that Bill hasn't been committed and you can't appeal nothing."

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

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion for the Majority Party to get out of this tangle. I think we all want to respect the rules. The rules are clear. The rules provide that this sort of a Bill should be referred as provided specifically in the rules. Obviously, we want to... the Majority wants to get around the rules. I would simply suggest that some Member of the Majority



Party move to suspend this rule so that action on the Bill can take place. You've got the votes, do it properly; but just don't throw the rule book into the trash can. Let's have some respect for the rules that were developed and debated and adopted by all of us. That would be the proper procedure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me just point out to you that we don't throw any rules into the trash can. I think that the House spoke quite vividly on the motion and in turn... Rereferral of the Bill after the deadline is untimely. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have the solution to our dilemma. I move to adjourn till 9:30 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The motion is to adjourn till 9:30 tomorrow morning. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed? We're adjourned. Good night."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	10:00	Speaker Redmond	Come to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond	House Bills, 3rd reading	
2-3-4-5		Clerk O'Brien	Supplemental Consent Calendar	
6		Speaker Redmond	Messages from Senate	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Sumner		
7		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Excused absence	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Redmond	Agreed Resolutions	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi		
8		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McGrew	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond	Committee Reports	
		Clerk O'Brien		



2.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 651
		Speaker Redmond	Back to 2nd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	#1
		Beatty	Table #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Beatty	#2
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1699
		Speaker Redmond	Return to 2nd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	#1
10		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1784
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion
11		Neff	
		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
	10:35	Clerk O'Brien	HB 477
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	#1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Beatty	
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	3.
12		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1978, 2nd, #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Yourell		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker REDmond		
		Barnes, E.M.	Leave of House #718 etc.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hart	Leave to return HB 2322 to 2nd	
13		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#5	
		Hart		
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading	
		Hart	HB 2325 return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
		Hart		
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading	
	10:42	Speaker Redmond	HB 1915 return to 2nd	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	Already on 2nd	
14		Mann	Yield	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1915, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
		Mann		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading
15		Brummer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1958, 2nd, no CA
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	#1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brummer	Not support
		Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew	#1
16		Speaker Redmond	
	10:50	Brummer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	
17		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
18		Stuffle	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Point personal privilege



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
19.		Speaker Redmond	#1	
		Polk		
		Speaker Redmond	Fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	#2	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kane		
20		Speaker Redmond		
		Hoffman	Yield	
		Kane		
21	11:01	Speaker Redmond		
		Schneider		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Polk	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kane		
22		Speaker Redmond	Fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	#3	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kane		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brummer	'no' vote	
23		Speaker Redmond		
		Kane	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McGrew		
		Speaker Redmond		



6.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Waddell	Announcement
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	Fails
		Waddell	
24		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	#4
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	
	11:11	Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
25		Speaker Redmond	
		Brummer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Anderson	
26		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	Question
27		Brady	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	
28		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	To close
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
29		Ewell		
		Speaker Redmond	#4 fails -	
		Clerk O'Brien	#5	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Richmond		
30		Speaker Redmond		
	11:25	Brummer		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hoffman		
31		Speaker Redmond		
		Birchler		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Leinenweber	Yield	
		Richmond		
32		Speaker Redmond		
		Richmond	To close	
		Speaker Redmond	#5 fails, 3rd reading	
		Harris	HB 1119, leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
33		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Harris	Yield	
		Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading HB 1206 to 2nd	
		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
		McClain		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
34		Walsh	Yield
	11:35	McClain	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
35		Speaker Redmond	Fials
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Luft	Leave to table #2
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted #1 adopted, 3rd
		Mahar	Republican Conference
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	Leave to return HB 1650 to 2nd
36		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	#2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
		Marovitz	
		Madigan	Motion recess till 1:00
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
37		Peters	
	11:42	Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted, 3rd reading
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
38		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	House recess
		Doorkeeper	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	HB 1973 (joke)
39		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
40		Giorgi	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	



10.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion
		Greiman	
41		Birchler	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 368 to 2nd
		Clerk O'Brien	#2
		Griesheimer	Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading PPC
42		Stanley	Leave to change vote
		Speaker Redmond	HB 1110
		Griesheimer	Leave to take to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	#1
		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	
		Griesheimer	Table #1
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	#2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Griesheimer	Explains #2
43		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted, 3rd reading
		Sanquist	'aye' on Bill
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 501, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	Explains HB 501
44		Speaker Redmond	
		Mann	Vote 'aye'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Speaker Redmond	Passes	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 674	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Deuster	Explains	
		Houlihan, D.	Opposes	
45		Speaker Redmond		
		Deuster	Expalins vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Griesheimer	Explains vote	
46		Speaker Redmond		
		Kosinski	Explains 'aye' vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Darrow	Explains 'no' vote	
47		Speaker Redmond		
		Steele	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Deuster	Asks for a poll	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Katz	Explains vote	
48		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Caldwell	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 674 passed	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 758	
		Hart	Bill passed yesterday	
49		Clerk O'Brien	HB 766	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mugalian	Explains HB 766	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
50		Clerk O'Brien	HB 769	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kempiners	Explains	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain	Yield?	
51		Kempiners	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 769 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 796	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Pullen	Explains	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Katz	Yield?	
		Pullen	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Inquiry	
52		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Pullen		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Schunaman	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 796 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 797
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	Explains
53		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Raise a point
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
54		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schneider	Explain vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
55		Speaker Redmond	
	1:40	Johnson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, E.	
56		Speaker Redmond	
	1:42	Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	TOOR



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
57		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh	Object	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 809, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kane		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
58		Clerk O'Brien	HB 813, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Dawson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh		
59		Speaker Redmond		
		Taylor		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Collins	Point personal privilege	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 825, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
	1:50	Brummet		
60		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Von Boeckman	Leave to vote 'aye	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
61		Speaker Redmond	Can't	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 868, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Terzich		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
62		Clerk O'Brien	HB 886, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Leinenweber	Sponsor	
63		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner	Against	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 898, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Richmond		
69		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:00	Richmond	Explain vote	
65		Speaker Redmond		
		Richmond	Poll the absentees	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Chapman	'aye'	
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
		Mann	'aye'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mautino	Change to 'aye'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Collins	Change to 'aye'	
66		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 901, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Stiehl, C.M.		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 911, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Katz		
67		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 927, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:07	Young		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
68		Clerk O'Brien	HB 939, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Molloy		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 940, 3rd reading	
		Molloy		
69		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 948, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
		Hanahan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh		
70		Speaker Redmond		
		Hanahan		
		Walsh		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Walsh		
71		Speaker Redmond		
		Simms		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hanahan	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:20	Simms	Support	
72		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, J.	No vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Stearney	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McAulliffe	Support	
73		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis	Point of information	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Steele, E.G.	Urge 'no' vote	
74		Speaker Redmond		
		Cunningham		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 989, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tuerk	--- Sponsor	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner		
75		Speaker Redmond		
		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tuerk	Explain vote	
76		Speaker Redmond	Lost	
		Schlickman		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3rd reading Supplemental Calendar. Remove HB 859, 880, 890, 893, 902, 905, 956, 957	
	2:30	Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan	Inquiry of chair	
		Speaker Redmond	Bills passed	
		Winchester		
77		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 995, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Steczo		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1007, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Byers		
		Speaker Redmond		
78		Skinner	Oppose	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	19.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Leinenweber	Explain	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich		
	2:35	Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1012, 3rd reading	
79		Speaker Redmond		
		Marovitz		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mann	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1014, 3rd reading	
		Spekaer Redmond		
		Sandquist		
80		Giorgi		
		Kane		
		Giorgi	In Chair	
81		Jones, J.D.	Explain vote	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Gaines	Explain vote	
		Speaker Giorgi	Lost	
		Pierce		
82		Speaker Giorgi		
		Conti		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Martin, P.		
		Speaker Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20.
		Flinn	Change 'aye'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		McBroom	Recorded as 'no'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1041, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
	2:45	Hart		
83		Speaker Giorgi	"	
		Houlihan, D.	Question	
		Hart		
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1046, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Meyer		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Lechowicz	Question	
		Meyer		
		Speaker Giorgi	TOOR	
84		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1060, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Meyer		
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1072, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Ebbesen		
85		Speaker Giorgi		
	2:53	Skinner	Question	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Schlickman	Explain vote	
86		Speaker Giorgi		
		Pierce		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Ebbesen	Explain vote	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Schuneman		
87		Speaker Giorgi		
		Taylor		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Cunningham		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Mautino		
88		Speaker Giorgi		
		Lauer		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Simms		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Younge		
		Speaker Giorgi		
89		Mudd		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Davis, C.		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Matijeovich		
		Speaker Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Simms	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Hanahan	Introduction
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Schlickman	
90		Speaker Giorgi	
		Robinson	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1074, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:05	Yourell	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1078, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mulcahey	
91		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mulcahey	Explain vote
92		Speaker Giorgi	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Matijevich	Explain vote
93		Speaker Giorgi	
		Pierce	
		Speaker Giorgi	HB 1078 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1079, 3rd reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:12	Jacobs	
94		Speaker Giorgi	
		Simms	
95		Speaker Giorgi	
		Jacobs	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Birchler	
96		Speaker Giorgi	Lost
		Madison	Point of personal privilege
		Spekaer Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1083, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Wikoff	
97		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1091, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Younge	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Younge	
98		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:25	Schlickman	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Younge	
99		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
		Younge	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Giorgi	-----	
		Shapr	Verify	
		Clerk O'Brien	--Polls absentees	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Sandquist	'aye'	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Anderson	'no'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Klosak	'aye'	
	3:30	Speaker Giorgi		
100		Sharp		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Madison	Leave to be verified	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Epton		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Stiehl, C.M.	Vote 'no'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Winchester	'present;	
	3:31	Clerk O'Brien		
101		Speaker Giorgi		
		Younge	PPC	
		Speaker Giorgi	1098 TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1113, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Mudd	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1188, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kent	
102		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1202, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1209, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Dyer	
103		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:40	Matijevich	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
104		Bowman	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kelly	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Keats	Explain vote, opposed
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Ewing	Explain vote
105		Speaker Giorgi	
		Collins	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Deuster	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Pullen	'aye'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Greisheimer		
		Speaker Giorgi		
106		Pierce		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Katz		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Campbell		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Conti		
107		Speaker Giorgi		
		Lauer		
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1224, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed	
108		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1237, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Porter		
		Speaker Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	27.
		Conti		
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1241, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Macdonald		
109		Speaker Giorgi		
		Friedland	Opposed	
		Speaker Giorgi		
	3:52	Macdonald	Explain vote	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Mugalian	Explain vote	
110		Speaker Giorgi		
		Macdonald	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Giorgi	Dump roll call	
		Totten	Explain vote	
111		Speaker Giorgi		
		Freidrich	Change to 'present'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Hoxsey	Change to 'aye'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Kane	Vote me 'aye'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Reed	Explain vote	
		Speaker Giorgi	Record as 'aye'	
112		Edgar	'aye'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Conti	Change to 'aye'	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	28.
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Ebbesen	'aye'	
		Speaker Giorgi		
	4:07	Clerk O'Brien	HB 1266, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Matejek		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Mahar	Oppose	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Hanahan		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Skinner		
114		Speaker Giorgi		
		Deuster		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Matejek		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Matejek	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Brummet		
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed	
115		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1268, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		McCourt		
		Speaker Giorgi		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Matijeovich	
	4:09	Speaker Giorgi	
116		Lechowicz	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1269, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		McCourt	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
117		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1275, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Dyer	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Madigan	Support
118		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
119		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1277, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1307, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
	4:16	Lechowicz	Sponsor
120		Speaker Giorgi	
		Sandquist	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Lechowicz	Yield
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Bluthardt	Support
121		Speaker Giorgi	
		Wikoff	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Conti	Support
122		Speaker Giorgi	
		Lucco	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Ebbesen	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Matijevich	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Sandquist	Oppose
123		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Cunningham	HB 1309, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Lechowicz	
124		Speaker Giorgi	
	4:30	Sandquist	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
125		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB -1336
		Totten	Sponsor
		Speaker Giorgi	TOOR
		Clerk Hall	HB 1348
		Shumpert	Sponsor
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 1405
		Hanahan	Sponsor
126		Speaker Giorgi	
		Simms	Oppose
127		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leinenweber	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	Fails
		Clerk Hall	HB 1424
		O'Brien	Sponsor
128		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 1456
		Farley	Sponsor
129		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leinenweber	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Farley	Explain vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Collins	
130		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mann	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	
		McAuliffe	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
131		Madison	
		Siorgi	
		Clerk Hall	HB 1456
		Madigan	HB 1456 & 1458 together
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk Hall	HB 1448
		Madigan	Sponsor
132		Speaker Giorgi	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Collins	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 1468
		Yourell	Sponsor
133		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 1471



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	Out of record
		Clerk Hall	HB 1489
		Epton	Sponsor
134		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 1499
		Beatty	Sponsor
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Johnson	Oppose
135		Speaker Giorgi	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Cantania	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Beatty	
136		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		McAuliffe	HB 1489
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk Hall	HB 1504
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Johnson	Yes on HB 869
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Cunningham	'aye' on HB 1224
		Speaker Giorgi	HB 1504
		Antonovych	
		Speaker Giorgi	
137		Holewinski	'aye'
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Marovitz	'aye' on HB 1504
		Clerk Hall	HB 1507, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
	5:00	Matejek	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Ebbesen	
138		Speaker Giorgi	
		Matejek	Responds to Ebbesen
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 1509, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Giorgi	
139		Reed	Record me 'no' on 1504
		Matejek	Passed
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk Hall	HB 1512, 3rd reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Leinenweber	Question
		Speaker Giorgi	
140		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
	5:07	Clerk Hall	HB 1563, 3rd reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Giorgi	
141		Ryan	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Terzich	Poll the absentees
		Speaker Giorgi	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 1587, 3rd reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	TOOR
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk Hall	HB 1600, 3rd reading
		Speaker Bradley	
142		Katz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Deuster	
143		Speaker Bradley	
	5:16	Garmisa	Explain vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
144		Speaker Bradley	
		Kelly	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Cunningham	
145		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hudson	
146		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewell	
		Speaker Bradley	
147		Hoffman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Waddell	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	Explain vote
148		Speaker Bradley	HB 1600 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1603, 3rd reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Pechous	
149	5:20	Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1606, 3rd reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	
150		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Epton	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
151		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	Explain vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners	Explain vote
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
152		Clerk Hall	HB 1607, 3rd reading
		Bowman	Sponsor
153		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	
		Bowman	
154		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	
155		Speaker Bradley	
		Schneider	
156	5:51	Speaker Bradley	Poll absentees, PPC
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1608, 3rd reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Celrk O'Brien	HB 1630, 3rd reading
157		Speaker Bradley	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	38.
		Leinenweber	Urge 'no'	
158		Speaker Bradley		
		Hanahan	Explain vote	
159		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley	Lost	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1633	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McLendon	Out of record -	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1636	
		Speaker Bradley		
		DiPrima	Out of record	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1644	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison		
160		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	Consent Calendar	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 876	
		Speaker Bradley		
161		Catania		
162		Speaker Bradley		
		Darrow	Yield	
		Cantania	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
--	--	Catania	To close
		Speaker Bradley	
163		Friedland	Question
		Catania	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Davis, J.	Yield
		Catania	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Giorgi	Yield
164		Catania	
165		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	Parliamentary inquiry, MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Catania	To close
166		Speaker Bradley	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Leinenweber	
167		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mann	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Hoffman	Point of personal privilege
168		Speaker Bradley	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	40.
		Matijeovich	Puts motion	
		peaker Bradley		
		Taylor	Seconds motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Friedrich		
169		Speaker Bradley		
		Conti		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijeovich	Withdraws motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Taylor	Renews motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Greiman	Inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		
170		Taylor		
171		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 881	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison		
		Totten		
172		Speaker Bradley		
		Kelly	Yield	
		Totten	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ewell	Yield	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	41.
173		Totten	Discussion	
174		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten	To close	
175		Speaker Bradley		
		Miller		
		Speaker Bradley		
176		Lechowicz		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Sandquist		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell		
177		Speaker Bradley		
		Keats		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leinenweber	Requests verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Keats	Vote me 'aye'	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leinenweber	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Poll absentees	
178		Speaker Bradley		
179		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Absentees & roll call	
180		Speaker Bradley		
		Waddell	Explain vote	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Walsh	Vote me 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mudd	'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	'no'
181		Speaker Bradley	
		Dyer	'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Huskey	'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		McAvoy	'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Robinson	'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Stiehl	'no'
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Hart	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Barnes, E.	Inquiry
182		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk Hall	HB 904
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schneider	Explain
		Speaker Bradley	
		Deuster	
183		Schneider	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brady	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Polk	
184		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schneider	To close
		Speaker Bradley	
		McCourt	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 907
		Speaker Bradley	
185		Hudson	Motion on 904
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	'aye' on 904
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mahar	Sponsor explains 907
186		Speaker Bradley	Order
		Mahar	Continues
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Hanahan	
187		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
188		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijeovich	Yield
		Marhar	Answeres
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijeovich	Speaks to Bill
189		Speaker Bradley	
		bramson	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mahar	To close
190		Speaker Bradley	
		Davis, J.	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Yourell	
191		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	
		Anderson	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schuneman	
192		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	PPC
		Clerk Hall	HB 909
		Speaker Bradley	
		Porter	Yield to Hart



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hart	Explains Bill
193		Speaker Bradley	
		Dunn, J.	Yield
194		Hart	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
195		Lechowicz	Yield
		Hart	iscussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Porter	To close
196		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 917
		Speaker Bradley	
		Totten	Sponsor
197		Speaker Bradley	
		Jones, D.	Recorded 'aye' on 909
		Speaker Bradley	Leave
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mann	
		Speaker Bradley	
198		Keats	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Barnes, E.	
199		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			46.
		McBroom	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Totten	To close
200		Speaker Bradley	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Bradley	
201		Madison	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	
202		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, E.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Redmond	Lost
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 921
203		Speaker Redmond	T00R
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 932
		Speaker Redmond	
		Murphy	Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, E.	Previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
204		Clerk O'Brien	HB 933



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 937
		Speaker Redmond	
		McPike	Sponsor
205		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	Oppose
206		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	Previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
		McPike	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	Oppose
207		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
208		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	Verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	Verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		McPike	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schneider	'no' to 'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	
209		Ebbesen	Verification
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lauer	
210-211		Speaker Redmond	Oral verification
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lauer	'present.'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bennett	'present'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	'present'
		Clerk O'Brien	
212		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedland	'present'
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	49.
		Porter	'present'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		McAvoy	'present'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Antonovych	'present'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Willer	'present'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McPike	PPC	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 941	
213		Speaker Redmond	Out of record	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 942	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Satterthwaite	Sponsor	
		Speaker Redmond		
214		Madison		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Satterthwaite	Continues	
		Speaker Redmond		
	8:25	Ebbesen		
215		Satterthwaite		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	50.
216		Simms	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Terzich		
217		Speaker Redmond		
		Taylor	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Satterthwaite		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipsword		
218		Speaker Redmond	Lost	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 945, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McCourt		
219		Speaker Redmond		
		Lauer		
220		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 947, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hanahan		
221		Speaker Redmond		
		Mahar	Yield	
		Hanahan		
222		Speaker Redmond		
		Mautino	Discussion	
		Hanahan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Sandquist		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	51.
		Speaker Redmond	HB 947 passed	
223		Clerk O'Brien	HB 953, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hanahan		
224		Speaker Redmond		
		Abramson	Yield	
		Hanahan	Discussion	
		Lauer	Yield	
225		Hanahan		
226		Speaker Redmond		
		Chapman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hanahan		
227		Speaker Redmond		
		Darrow	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hanahan		
		Catania		
228		Speaker Redmond		
		Madison		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis		
		Speaker Redmond	Lost	
		Simms	Motion on HB 1279	
		Speaker Redmond		
229		Robinson		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	52.
		Walsh		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Macdonald	'yes; on HB 945	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Sumner	'yes' on HB 947	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Polk	'yes' on HB 932	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Pechous	'yes' on HB 1277 & 730	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mann		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond		
	9:02	Lucco		
230		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 963, #1, 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 970, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bennett		
231	9:05	Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, J.		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Pierce	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 971, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Taylor	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 972, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Taylor	
		Speaker Redmond	
232		Lechowicz	In chair
		Madison	
		Taylor	
233		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Taylor	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Taylor	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Taylor	
234		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	9:14	Gaines	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
235		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jones, E.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Conti	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matijevid	
236		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kosinski	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 992, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stanley	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matijevid	
237		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stanley	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stanley	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Mudd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1016, 3rd reading
		Mudd	
238	9:23	Speaker Lechowicz	Passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	55.
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1021, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Chapman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Conti		
239		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Polk	Yield	
		Chapman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Madison		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Darrow	MPQ	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mugalian		
240		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Collins		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Chapman		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost	
241		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1026, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Abramson		
		Jaffe		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
242		Brummer	MPQ	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Abramson	TOOR	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1029, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads motion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedland	
243		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mugalian	
244		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Willer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Darrow	Move motion lie on table
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Walsh	
245		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	
246		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	57.
		Walsh		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Matijevich	Out of order	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Walsh		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Matijevich		
247		Duester		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Walsh		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Madigan	Move to adjourn	
		Speaekr Lechowicz	Adjourn	

