

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery. The Speaker wishes to inform the Membership that the order of business will be Third Reading.

Could I have your attention, please? The Speaker wishes to inform the Membership that the order of business will be Third Reading."

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. It is written in the Talmud: Why did God create only one Man? So that thereafter no one could say, 'My ancestors were nobler than yours,' or that virtue and vice are inherited, or that some races are better than others... And to teach us that whosoever destroys a single life is as guilty as though he had destroyed the entire world; and that whosoever saves one life earns as much merit as if he had saved the whole world. Let us pray. Almighty God, the Author and Finisher of all life, we thank Thee for our creation and preservation in this life and in the life to come. We come to Thee this day with our humble prayer that our knowledge and love of Thee and of all that is Thine, may never be tarnished or diminished. Direct us, O Lord, into the paths of trust in Thy divine plan for the world in which we have our being. As we serve Thee and Thy people as Representatives in the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, grant that we may hold precious that life which is Thine alone to give and to take. Enable us to perfect the society in which we dwell, not for the privilege and selfish desires of a few, but for the universal benefit of all. This we ask in the Name of Him Who gave His Life that we may know life, Thy Son, Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. We're honored by the former Parliamentarian of the House, who presently is the Blair Professor of Law at John Marshall Law School, Ann Lousin. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Journal for the 125th Legislative Day..."



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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journals #125 of May 9th and Journal #126 of May 10, 1978, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion on the Gentleman's motion? It's been moved by Representative Lechowicz that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with and that the Journals be approved. All those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries, the reading of the Journal is dispensed with and they are approved. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 16, 1978, reported the same back with the following recommendations: Do pass as amended, House Bill 2857 and 2986."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 1274."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1274. A Bill for an Act creating the Chicago Community School Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff. Out of the record. 1357."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1357. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney. Out of the record. 1533. Representative Younge. Out of the record. 1710. Representative Younge. Out of the record. 1764. Representative Kane or Lechowicz, you ready on 1764? Kane - Lechowicz. Out of the record. 1788. Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. 1803. Representative Robinson. Out of the record. Representative Robinson, did you want 1803 called? 2073. Representative Bowman. 2073. Out of the record. 2075. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. The senior class of Mother of God School in Waukegan and they have...with their teacher, Maureen Donnegger and they are represented by Representatives Geo-Karis, Matijevich and Griesheimer...and you can have your notes."



Speaker Redmond: "2084. Representative Chapman. Out of the record.
2106. Representative Von Boeckman. Out of the record. 2295.
Representative Geo-Karis, which Bill do you want called?"

Geo-Karis: "All I want to say is that Mrs. Jo Ann Persich is also with
the instructor with the Mother of God students."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you please note that in the record? House
Bill 3153."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3153. Representative Sharp."

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

Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring House Bill 3153...I guess...
Do we have to bring it back to Second..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring it back to Second. He asks leave to return
3153 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing
no objections, leave is granted and 3153 is returned to the Order
of Second Reading."

Sharp: "Reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted for the
purpose of tabling Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sharp, having voted on the prevailing
side, moves that the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted be
reconsidered. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "I move to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Sharp moves to table
Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Amendment #1 is tabled.
Anything further? Return that to the Order of Third Reading.
Representative Pierce, 2418. 2529. Representative Mulcahey, 2529.
Out of the record. 2575. Representative Lechowicz. 2575 out
of the record. 2591. Representative Flinn. Out of the record.
Representative Ryan, are there any excused absences on the Republican
side?"

Ryan: "None that I know of, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want any excused tomorrow evening?"

Ryan: "No, that won't be necessary."

Speaker Redmond: "Keep them all here, it works better that way. 2619."



Emil Jones. Out of the record. 2626. Representative Ebbesen.
Out of the record. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the record indicate that Representative Emil Jones is excused because of returning back to his wife who is in the process of delivering a baby. And also that Representative Bill Marovitz is excused on official business."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Let the record so show.
Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to point out that after a couple weeks illness we have Representative Hudson back among our ranks...welcome Ray back."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson, welcome. You know...you know why he came back so fast? I offered to vote his switch for him and give him a good voting record and he...scared him, scared him back here."

Ryan: "My other question is, what does Representative Jones know about delivering babies?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know, maybe you better ask him. Representative Polk."

Polk: "You going to take 2652?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well...yeah, yeah... Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have up in the gallery to my right, students from the Jane Adams Elementary School in Chicago, the 30th District. They have with them their principal, Bill McKenzie. This group is represented by Representatives Giglio, Collins and Dawson. Glad to have you here."

Speaker Redmond: "2652. Representative Polk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2652. A Bill for an Act permitting raffles or drawings from prizes to be conducted by non-for-profit organization.
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Schlickman, this Bill we discussed at great length when we asked to have it discharged from Committee. I think it has been...received a



considerable amount of correspondence on it. It's in relation to raffles. It's what we're presently doing. The Bill simply states that any non-for-profit charitable organization that is presently selling the dollar raffle tickets may now do legally what they are doing illegally today. I have a letter in my file from a young...elderly lady and...I could just see her in her rocking chair, she was knitting an afghan for Our Lady of Guadalupe Church. And her question to me was, 'Am I in fact... Will I be guilty if I donate this?' I contacted our State's Attorney and he said, indeed she would be. I think all we're doing is clarifying the law and saying what's going on now can continue to go on. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote and be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Brady. Please sit down."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Domico..."

Brady: "Will this legislation, as drawn, allow for a group to go into a statewide lottery in competition with the state?"

Polk: "No, that is not the intent. The intent, if you read, it says: 'A non-for-profit organization, charitable organization, may have a local raffle.' And again, what we're intending to do is to make sure that the churches and the veteran's organizations continue to have an opportunity to do what they're doing every day."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Sponsor's intent and I appreciate what he's saying but in...nowhere do I see it says, 'Hold a local raffle.' I think it's very...much does go to the extent that it would allow for statewide participation by a non-for-profit group and I think that's in direct competition with the state lottery. And as it's worded I think I'd oppose it at this time. Maybe if he'd take it out we could work on an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "The only reason for the urgency of this now is to get it in the Senate in time to do something for this year. I would concur in relation... There are some national organizations, such as some



Catholic Charitable Organizations, that are doing this now and this would prohibit them from doing it and... All organizations that have contacted me have been on the very positive side. If that is a problem with you, I'll be more than glad to have Senator Wooten, who is going to Sponsor it in the Senate, to do that...to modify it or amend it as you see fit."

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

Brady: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I think we can take it out here though and amend it here and send it in its proper form and have something we can all agree on. There is time, we've got a week and a half left and if the Sponsor would do that I could support it, if not I'd have to oppose it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Polk asks leave to take the Bill out of the record for a few minutes with the intention of getting back to it today?"

Polk: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, fine. House Bill 2656. Representative Mahar. Take it out of the record. House Bill 2661. Representative Chapman. Mrs. Chapman. Is the Lady on the floor? Take it out of the record. House Bill 2662. Representative Bradley. Out of the record. 2663; out of the record. House Bill 2666. Representative Jack Davis. Do you want to hear it? The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2666. A Bill for an Act in relation to township's police protection. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis, House Bill 2666."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2666 is a Bill that would provide that in downstate counties, it excludes Cook County, that by referendum townships may choose to tax themselves for the creation of a township police force and/or for purchasing or contracting police services from counties or municipalities that are close to them. The problem has developed in primarily counties that surround metropolitan areas where Sheriff's budgets are lagging behind the population



influx; where townships like mine are remote from the Sheriff's police 40 miles away, the county seat; where there are not enough officers on patrol, there's not enough money to hire more officers to put on patrol. And where the rate of rural crime is increasing at a rate that's much higher than the crime rate in metropolitan areas. Thank goodness for our good road system which is exporting that crime, unfortunately. The Bill is designed and brought to the attention of this Body - and I hope for its passage - at the urging of many of my township supervisors and by virtue of the fact that, next to my little farm in Will County, we've had two home invasions and four burglaries within the last six months. So I would simply stand here and answer any questions for you. I think it's a very good Bill. I think that it is permissive, obviously, and requires a front door referendum and will allow townships to do it only if they so choose to tax their own people. I urgently solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I would like to just rise and speak in favor of this good Bill. This is a much needed piece of legislation, particularly in some of the more populated townships where they do have problems of crime. Many of the criminal element are going right outside the city limits and finding that there's not adequate police protection in some of these heavily populated townships and that's where the crime rate is increasing. And this merely gives to the townships the opportunity to provide the necessary police protection. I think it's a good Bill, it's much needed and I would urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, under your Bill, do I understand correctly that it...there has to be a referendum approval?"

Davis: "That's correct."



Geo-Karis: "All right. Now, under your Bill; for instance we have areas in my city and outside of my city that's supposed to be covered by the Sheriff's office, under your Bill, does the township have the right to contract with the City of Zion, for example, to cover the unincorporated areas next to Zion, rather than being forcibly mandated to contract with the Lake County...with the Sheriff's Office?"

Davis: "They have that right now, Representative Geo-Karis, but they're extracting from funds out of revenue sharing and other sources. This will allow, by referendum, a tax source to provide for funding for that contract."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favor of this Bill. There's been such a tremendous outpouring of crime and not enough protection. I know one area in my county where they called the Sheriff's office on a burglary and the Sheriff supplied them one five (sic) days later. I think this would probably be a great deterrent and a great help to stem the tide of crime and I certainly speak in favor of this Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not sure we're all up to what's happening right here but I think we all ought to stand at attention because what we're going to do by the passage of this Bill is put up for referendum more policemen all over the State of Illinois that I don't think we need. What we have right now... Under the Cooperative Agreement Act we have the availability of townships, if they so desire, and we've done it in Lake County and it's worked out all right, we've worked with 'Aiken Contract' with the Sheriff's department for added police protection. They can do it right now with the Cooperative Agreement Act. I don't think we have to go to referendum to have the townships in the police business. The...the Sheriff's department has that authority, that's their statutory...authority right now. I think we ought to kill this Bill right here and now and let them use the Cooperative Agreement Act that we've given them, not only in the State Constitution, but in



statutes. I would plead with you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this piece of legislation. In many rural areas in..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'am. Could we give the Lady a little order please? Please continue, Ma'am."

Hoxsey: "In many rural areas in unincorporated villages in the State of Illinois and I speak well of those in my district, there are many cases that the Sheriff department does not have adequate patrol members to patrol the county's rural areas. I have had requests from villages and from many areas asking for this type of protection. They want to do it themselves. Now, I think that any time local governments want to do something for themselves rather than have it state supported, this is where it should be. So I suggest you support this piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, to close."

Davis: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. In refutation of the Gentleman from Lake on the opposite side of the aisle, I would only agree with the speakers who have supported the Bill. It's obviously needed by those of us who live in the burgeoning unincorporated areas of...of the surrounding metropolitan counties and townships. And it's very nice for a township just to the north of me to be...to have the wherewithal to contract for that police service but my particular township does not and cannot at this particular point in time. The Bill is permissive, it would provide for either/or the establishment of a police force if the funding source is large enough or contract work. And I emphasize to you again that this is a front door referendum possibility. The township officials...association are solidly behind this Bill and I think all downstate legislators, particularly those in communities that surround urban areas, in counties that surround urban areas, must and will support this Bill. I urgently solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 2666 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from



Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to urge you to vote 'aye' on this question. I think it's absurd that a town of 300 people can have a police department and a township of 100,000 people cannot if they so will and are willing to pay the taxes for it. We've got areas in Madison County, large areas and it's no reflection on the Madison County Sheriff's Office, but they just plain can't get to all these places. And as far as I'm concerned, if one of those townships is willing to vote this in and pay the tax to support a police department, I think they should be allowed to do it because some of these rural areas certainly need this kind of protection. Incidentally, 'Clay Hardback', who's with the Sheriff's Association, said they no longer oppose this. A year ago they did but now that this is put in by referendum of the people living in the township..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, is my speaking light working up there on the main counsel? I had it on before you called the initial..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "With these bright lights up here, Ron, it's very difficult to see the flashing lights, now with leave of the House to bring them down...I'll be more than happy to do so."

Griesheimer: "Well, you have leave as far as I'm concerned. Mr. Speaker, I think basically this may be a good concept but I think there was one question that I was cut off from asking that should be asked, in this situation of the Sponsor. If the referendum is merely for the tax increase this may not be a good idea because the townships right now have more money than they've ever had before in their history. They're obtaining that money from revenue sharing funds. The problem we face is that a good many township people may not want another police force but if they can create a police force, using revenue sharing funds and if the referendum is only to the issue of the tax levy, then we'll have multiple additional police all over this state when we don't need it, merely because some township



officials are trying to build their own little gestapo. And if that question can't be answered by the Sponsor I'm going to urge a 'no' vote on this because we'll be creating, not only police where we need them, but a lot of places where we don't need them to satisfy a supervisor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, I would move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109 'aye', 19 'nays', 8 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2670. Representative Wolf. 2670. Jake."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2670. A Bill for an Act in relation to the abolishment of the Illinois Naval Militia."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman requests leave of the House to bring that Bill back to Second Reading. Is there any objections?(sic) Hearing none, the Bill is back on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Wolf. Amends House Bill 2670 on page 23, by deleting lines 15 thru 17 and so forth."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Reference Bureau just handed me this Amendment. It is a technical Amendment which is needed to clarify the Bill and I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Any discussion? The Gentleman asks leave to have the Amendment adopted. Amendment #2, a technical Amendment. The Amendment has not been distributed... Would you explain the Amendment? There's some question on the Amendment."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, in my haste I just handed them all up. Do you want to take that out of the record? I haven't even got a copy of it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill, momentarily, out of the record and I'd like to have the Membership's attention to Representative Birchler. Representative Birchler, for the purpose of making an



introduction. Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the south has risen again. We have with us here today the Class A Championship Basketball Team of the State of Illinois, Nashville. 58th District. Represented by Representative Dunn, Representative Richmond, Representative Birchler and of course we have to mention Senator Buzbee. At this time I'm going to introduce to you the superintendent of the Nashville School, Dave McClintock, who serves on the State Athletic Board. I think you, if you were watching television, saw him present a trophy to his own team. First, before I introduce him, I want to ask Representative Richmond or Representative Dunn if the...either have a word they want to say. Good. Okay, Superintendent McClintock."

McClintock: "Thank you, Mr. Birchler. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives and of course to our Representatives in our area; Representatives Birchler, Richmond and Dunn, most certainly it's a pleasure for us from Nashville and from the south to be up here today. We would like to thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to honor our basketball team. Most certainly, we're proud of them but I know you're here to see the basketball team and the coach. It's my pleasure, at this time, to present our head varsity basketball coach, Mr. Bob Vogel. Thank you very much."

Bob Vogel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the House of Representatives. I'd like to introduce the rest of our squad members and the assistant basketball coach, John Hawkins, along with our twelve varsity members - and I'll introduce these individually. Fella's ...if you'll just raise your hand so they can see it and down here on the floor. Jim Dallman, raise your hand, Jim. Randy Ruggel; our manager, Matt Swinford. Keith Mashaw. Roger Boucek. Mike Free. Brad Rollamin. Rich Deering. Barry Morris. Mike Brodeock; and then the two 6'6 bookcases, John Kankowski and Roger Stigg. One squad member, Paul Patton, was unable to attend. He has the honor of making an all-star team down south and they have to practice this afternoon about 2:30. Again, we'd like to thank



you for the Resolution and we appreciate you extending the invitation to come. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Keep up the good work, men. Good luck in school.

Back to the item on Second Reading. Representative Wolf, are you ready to go with 2670? It has not been distributed? Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, on House Bill 2418.

It's on Third Reading.. The Gentleman asks leave of the House to bring that item back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the item is on Second Reading. 2418. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2418 is a Revenue Committee Bill that would comply with the mandate of the Constitution to abolish the personal property tax and to replace it. Amendment #5 does a few things; first of all, it states in a preamble that was absent before that this is the Bill to comply with the constitutional mandate. Secondly, it more sharply defines the way in which we determine the personal property tax base for distribution in the future and limits those collections to a one year period. And the third, most important thing it does, it takes care of the problem that was raised by some of the school districts and other local units of government. It provides that if two or more units should merge there would be no problem insofar as the tax bases of those two units. And it also covers the reverse of that situation where, for example if a school district should separate into two there would be a way of distributing the future...replacement revenues to those two units of government."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor...I'm sorry, the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, do you want to speak on the Amendment? Adeline? Do you want to speak on this Amendment? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed? Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6. Ewing. Amends House Bill 2418 as amended in Section 3 of the Bill and so forth."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #6. Mr. Ewing. I don't see the Gentleman on the floor. Mr. Mugalian, are you familiar with Amendment #6? Mike... Do you make a motion to table Amendment #6?"

Mugalian: "Yes, if it's meritorious Amendment we could bring it back later and I so move."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's Mr. Ewing now. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, on Amendment #6."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, this is a substitute Amendment for Amendment #4, which was adopted by this House when this Bill was on Second Reading the other day. It merely includes the railroads back in as payers of the replacement tax. There was some question about the technical wording of Amendment #4 and I would move this adoption of this corrective Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Wouldn't it be more appropriate for the Sponsor to table #4 prior to adoption or reconsider the vote by which 4 was adopted? Wouldn't that be procedurally...the way to proceed here?"

Ewing: "Well, I would...I would prefer to leave 4 on and if this is adopted then I'll take 4 off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can't have it both ways."

Houlihan: "I think you can accomplish what you're attempting to do, Representative, by moving to reconsider the vote by which 4 was adopted."

Ewing: "Well...I can't understand that... Many times we have duplicated Amendments and all I would like to do is put this one on and then I'll return...remove 4, ask to have 4 removed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan, moves that...to reconsider the vote that Amendment...by which Amendment #4 was adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. Amendment #4 has been reconsidered and now he moves to table Amendment #4. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', all opposed. Amendment #4 is tabled. Now, Amendment #6. Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's one way to get there whether you want there or not. This is... As I explained, Amendment #6 is



a replacement for Amendment #4, which merely includes the railroads into the Replacement Bill for the personal property tax. For some unknown reason to me, they were left out and they were not being required to pay any tax in replacement of the personal property tax and I would move for the adoption of this Amendment."

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

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 was adopted by this House and I have no desire to frustrate the will of the House. I'd like to...if the Sponsor of the Amendment would yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Representative Ewing, is it your statement that this Amendment merely does what Amendment #4 did but there was a technical defect in Amendment #4?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Mugalian: "And the purpose of it is merely to include railroad corporations among those that would be relieved of the personal property tax and then be required to pay the income taxes levied as a replacement? Is that correct?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Mugalian: "And if upon reading this Amendment later, it...it turns out that it does more than that and there's another technical defect, would you be willing to reconsider this Amendment?"

Ewing: "Of course."

Mugalian: "Thank you. I have no objections."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall... The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "What personal property tax do the railroads pay?"

Ewing: "Well they pay it on their rolling stock. It's not called exactly personal property, Cal, but it's on their rolling stock in the State of Illinois."

Skinner: "How much is paid through this unit tax on railroads?"

Ewing: "I cannot tell you."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the Amendment and...

It's quite obvious to me that if the railroads are attempting to end up paying no tax to the State of Illinois, because virtually all of them are losing money. In fact, the northwest industries was created through the taking of federal tax losses for the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad. And as a result there was tremendous pre-tax income which...on which no Federal Income Tax whatsoever was paid. The Rock Island Railroad, a major railroad in the Sponsor's district, I believe, will end up paying no tax in the foreseeable future because it is now in bankruptcy court. And if it ever gets out of bankruptcy court they will be laying off the losses of the Rock Island against profits other companies that will be brought into the conglomerate that is now being formed by the receiver. This is a fairly good example of a special interest; that is the railroad industry, attempting to get out of paying any taxes to the State of Illinois... any taxes of any appreciable manner to the State of Illinois. I think it would be a medium size disaster, if this Amendment were adopted, to local school districts because there will be no replacement income. There cannot be replacement income from the railroads if they pay no income tax, if that's the replacement tax you're levying. At the present time, railroads pay significant combination real estate-personal property tax and I just do not believe that we want to let them off the hook completely and I think that's what this Amendment does and I would urge its defeat for that reason."

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

Mugalian: "Well, I...I didn't ask to be recognized but I may...I may state that it's the intention of this Amendment not to relieve the railroads of the real estate tax that they pay. Now, there are some railroads, quite a few railroads in this state that aren't making any money and therefore would not be paying any corporate income taxes as long as they're not. I understand there are two railroads in the state which are quite profitable, including the Sante Fe. Just for the enlightenment of the major...of the House..



and I don't take any special position on this Amendment... As you know, I voted against Amendment #4 but I may add that as far as I know, the railroads as a group have up to now been opposed to 2418 and wanted to be left out of it. But... You have to judge for yourself as to how this operates. But this will not eliminate the taxes paid on real estate by railroads in Illinois. Is that correct, Mr. Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a question, in the bottom of Amendment #4, which I understand he's trying to clarify, it says, 'Provides for the assessment of property of any railroad company shall be based upon the value determined as provided, less that percentage of the total cash...total value, which consists of operating or non-operating personalities'. Can you explain that? ... And does your local assessor make this determination?..And what I'm alluding to is, for example, if you had a railroad car that was maybe 20 years old but it was in fairly good condition, is there some technicality whereby the company may say, 'Well, after 20 years it's totally depreciated and so therefore it's worthless.'?"

Ewing: "Depreciation doesn't...that's not the basis of how your property is assessed. We have a unitary assessment of real and personal property for railroads. The unitary part, on personal property, is what they would be carried over into the income tax and they would be included under this Bill. If we don't put them in Mr. Skinner's fears will come true, because they won't have to pay the unitary tax on their personal property and they won't have to pay any income tax, regardless of whether they're making money. If we put them in and they make money, they're going to contribute to the replacement tax."

Van Duynes: "But what if they don't make any money?"

Ewing: "It's just like any other company that isn't making money. Why is U.S. Steel so hot for this Bill? They don't make any money."

Van Duynes: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask a parliamentary inquiry? If we defeat this Amendment what's the status then? Would we be allowed



to reconsider our...our motion to table Amendment #4, to reinstate?
Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's always in order."

Van Duyn: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Can I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I can't hear you."

Geo-Karis: "May I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he indicates he'll yield."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, the Bill as amended thus far and including
your Amendment, if it would pass, I believe it replaces the personal
property tax with another. Is that correct?"

Ewing: "That's the intent of the Bill, is to replace the personal
property tax with an income tax."

Geo-Karis: "And what your Amendment does is guarantee that there
will be a payment for personal property tax by the railroads, is
that right?"

Ewing: "No. It guaran... You see, right now, Representative, the
railroads are left out of the Bill. If we passed this Bill
they would pay no personal property tax, nor would they pay
any income tax to replace the personal property tax they're
presently paying. I'm saying, the railroad should take part
in the replacement tax and that's what this Amendment does, is
put them back in. If we defeat this Amendment, they
won't be paying any replacement tax, nor will they be paying
personal property tax."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

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

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I think... I hope that the House understands
that this Bill merely requires the railroads to continue to carry
their share of the tax burden, which they were paying under the old



personal property tax. And if we adopt 2418 they will be paying part of the replacement tax, just like all the corporations and partnerships and trusts in the State of Illinois. I think they owe that to the taxing districts of this state and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #6 to House Bill 2418. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 96 'aye' and 6 'no' and the motion carries and Amendment #6 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. In the gallery, in the right rear is the Homewood Christian Academy. They're represented by Representatives Kelly, Mahar and Steczo. Would you welcome them please?"

Speaker Redmond: "2702. Representative Kempiners."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2702. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill doesn't make any changes in existing statutes, but makes explicit what is implied in the statutes with regard to allowing township's highway commissioners to prohibit or limit...place weight limitations on truck traffic on township roads. It was introduced after an opinion by the State's Attorney of DuPage County saying that township highway commissioners are not included in the definition of local highway official. And as a result of the past winter a number of townships in the State of Illinois have lost township roads because they have not been able to put on these weight restrictions and I would ask your support for passage of this Bill."

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



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The 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. 2707."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2707. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizen's and Disabled Person's Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz. Out of the record. 2714. Representative Peters."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2714. A Bill for an Act to abolish certain special funds. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bennett: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed that 2708 preceded 2714. I was wondering if you just missed it."

Speaker Redmond: "I have not called Bills that have been taken out of the record previously and 2708 had been taken out. I'd hoped that we would be able to move along and not waste time on those Bills that have been taken out before but I'll be back. 2714. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Madigan is the principal Cosponsor on this Bill and unless he has objection, I will proceed."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Peters: "House Bill 2714 is a...a clean-up Act, really. What it does, in effect, is to abolish certain funds which we have set up; the court of claims fund, the local government of law enforcement offices fund and the local fire protection personnel fund. This has absolutely nothing to do with abolishing the functions of this operation. What we do now is appropriate from the general fund into these funds and then we have to appropriate out of these funds to whatever the purpose we've designated. What this Amendment will do...or this Bill will do is to abolish these three funds and cut down on a lot of paper work and a lot of transfer work for both the General Assembly and the Comptroller and I would solicit the approval of the Assembly."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'aye', no 'nay' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2722. Representative Vinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2722. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the compensation to Members of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very simple Bill. Right now the statute says that if a Member of the House resigns and there's a replacement, the people have to double pay for that month, both Members get compensated fully for the month. The Bill would simply pro-rate that compensation so that each Member got the pay for the number of days he was actually in the General Assembly. I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? How often does that arise, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Frequently, in modern years."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question of the Sponsor but I see that's too late. I just wondered if this was retroactive."

Speaker Redmond: "Ex post facto. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question... Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer the question from Mr. Ewing. Representative Vinson did just exactly what the Bill said should be done, so in retrospect it was...retroactive. He refused to take the money for some 29 days."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2736, Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2736. Ryan."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan. Out of the record. 2754, Representative Porter. Out of the record. 2766, Representative Bowman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2766. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Crime Victim's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this indeed is one of the simplest Bills that we will consider this term. It adds two Section numbers to the Crime Victim's Compensation Act, to account for the fact that in the last...that in the Spring Session of the General Assembly we created two new felonies; one was heinous battery and one was aggravated arson. In doing so we neglected to amend the Crime Victim's Compensation Act to guarantee that any person who is injured by a felon, in either of these two categories, would be able to claim compensation. At the present time, it is not true that someone who is injured in the course of heinous battery could claim compensation under simple battery, that is not true. Nor is it true that a person that is injured in an arson attempt could claim...in an aggravated arson, could claim compensation under simple arson. This will, in my opinion, provide the protection that the Citizens of Illinois need and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Do you have any indication of what the fiscal impact this would be on the compensation?(sic)."

Bowman: "Well, I think it's probably safe to say that there would be no fiscal impact in the current fiscal year, even the coming fiscal year, simply because at the present time it takes so long to process these claims that...if we could speed it up a little bit maybe there would be a fiscal impact. I don't...I don't see one in the near term; however, we have to make it possible for people to be able to be able to trial their intent so that they



will ultimately be able to claim."

Totten: "I realize that, Representative Bowman, but... I realize they could probably bring into conformance the intent of the Class X Bill. but there must be figures available to you on the...the number of crimes that would fall within this and an estimate of the dollar costs."

Bowman: "Well, you know, it's a...no one really knows, however let me assure you that the entire Crime Victim's Compensation Program, over the last fiscal year, cost the State of Illinois 750 thousand dollars. That's for over 20 different felony offenses. We're adding two additional ones here and so I would anticipate that the...the incremental costs, the additional costs would be many times less than that."

Totten: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Van Dwyne: "You are adding two more crimes to the Crime Victim's Compensation Act and I'm wondering if you have, or if you've even thought of it even where it's limitedly possible, where these people who commit the crimes, or if they're under age maybe their parents might be the people who have to pay out this money. I have nothing against giving the victims of these crimes some kind of compensation but sometimes I always think we're looking toward our government as a catch-all to pay back. And sometimes... I know the feeling is that most people who commit these crimes are indigents anyway but I don't believe it's true in all cases. And I think sometimes these people ought to be responsible, financially, for their own misdeeds."

Bowman: "I think there's other legislation on that point, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill, having



received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
2767, Representative Riley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2767. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections
of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.
Last year, when we enacted into a statute the funding formula
for community colleges, we made an omission that deals with
new or relatively new community colleges. Previously, the...
all new community colleges had received 100% funding for new...
credit hours for each of the first four years of their existence.
The funding formula which we passed last year, we had in our minds
the fact that most community colleges in the state were established
institutions which had lower costs for additional or marginal
credit hours so we only gave them 70% credit. This Bill, with
unanimous support of the Community College Board, rectifies
that omission and gives 100% funding to community colleges for
the first four years of their existence. I would ask for a
favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Gentleman could tell us whether this means...
how many junior colleges will not receive full funding, if this
passes?"

Reilly: "None will not. The Community College Board is going to
lapse about 4 million dollars this year. This Bill will cost
about 52 thousand dollars, so it will have no effect on other
community...on other community colleges that would not otherwise
be with the formula they have."

Skinner: "Why are they going to lapse 4 million dollars?"

Reilly: "Because the projected growth in credit hours, on a state-wide
basis, just didn't occur. In other words, enrollment's not
up as much as they thought it would be."

Skinner: "I must admit confusion to the General Assembly because my
incoming junior college board chairman is complaining vociferously
that the state is not living up to its...its promise. And it looks



to me, from the fiscal note, that they're not paying 100% of the statutorily authorized grant."

Reilly: "No, they are. They are to all...all community colleges.

The problem this Bill deals with is the fact that in the formula, to the extent that your hours go up each year, to the extent that you have growth in credit hours, by law you're only supposed to get 70%. The problem is that new community colleges have additional costs that established ones don't have."

Skinner: "I understand. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor will yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Brady: "It's my understanding, Representative Reilly, that the John Wood Community College is the only community college that fits under this provision at this time. and that it not only is it 52 thousand this year but it's 69 thousand in the next year. My question is, regardless of the fact of possibility of lapse this year, if there was no lapse would it not just come out pro-rate across the board against all community colleges? Even though it's a small amount?"

Reilly: "If there were no lapse, that's right. But assuming the Bill passes, I would assume that we would build into the community college budget, for next year, the funds to fund this Bill. I would also say, looking down the road one year, that already it appears that the projections, on which the community college appropriations were based, are again going to be too optimistic from the community colleges point of view. So, I really don't think there's any realistic chance of what you're saying happening."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, with the comments that Representative Reilly is going to work for full funding for the community college systems in Illinois, I'd certainly support him in the position to get the 52 thousand to his community college."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've explained the Bill adequately, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative McGrew. Representative McGrew. Will the Gentleman standing between Representative McGrew and the Chair please be seated? Representative Bradley..."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise somewhat reluctantly to oppose this Bill whose intentions are certainly with a great deal of merit and their need is very real. However, I would like the General Assembly to realize that we are deleting a provision of the funding for junior college systems; that is the 80% of enrollment growth. What we're saying is then, in fact, if you're starting a junior college system that you would be plugged in immediately to the overall rate pattern. Consider what happens if a class enrollment is jumping from 10 to 30. Obviously the 30 will still be in that class, so that you're now receiving three times the amount that you would in the original situation. In other words, there would be a windfall for those first embryo years for a junior college that is trying to get itself established and on the books. The...the overall intent of this Bill is somewhat good, I don't deny that, but it seems to me that we're putting a precedent on the statutes that really was well studied, was well thought out...and it's a change from that and I oppose House Bill 2767."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 13 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2770. The Gentleman from Will."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2770. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber. Out of the record. 2772. Is Representative Hart on the floor? Out of the record. 2778. Representative Giglio on the floor? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2778. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Printing Contracts Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."



Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is the companion Bill for the appropriation setting up the machinery at the Logan County Correctional Institution. This is also part of a package whereby the correction institutes, hopefully will get into the operation of manufacturing the license plates of the State of Illinois. I think after the...we've witnessed what California, Texas, Arkansas, New York and other states are doing to manufacture their own license plates, we...through the Motor Vehicle Law Commission and the Illinois Corrections Department, had public hearing pertaining to what we could do to manufacture our own. Now only will it be a savings in money to the manufacturing of these plates and stickers but it would also be a benefit to the inmates in these institutions, whereby we would be giving them something to do and hopefully training them to make something of themselves once their sentence is over. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer; if not, I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90...100 'aye', 29 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2775, Representative Jane Barnes. Out of the record? Take that one out of the record. 2787."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2787. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, I promised to take this back to Second for an Amendment, it's a technical Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading?"

Brummet: "It hasn't been distributed yet, so just pass me up, if you will, until tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record."



Brummet: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "2793, Representative Tipword."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2793. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Downstate Public Transportation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, all that this does is to put Illinois in the same position that the Federal Government has done for transit districts...and the money that is provided to them. This allows transit districts grants to be advanced on the basis of their estimated expenditure for the coming quarter; that is for the next three months...Upon filing their application and their statements of estimates with the department... And also there are safeguards in it that it cannot exceed what they would be entitled to during the entire year. This would help these downstate transit districts very much with their working cash problem, because there are a lot of special rates that they provide to students, elderly... And they don't have money enough to keep themselves operating, in each instance, for the full three months without having that money coming in sometime before the end of that quarter. I would urge that we pass this Bill. This is merely a means of keeping those transit districts able to pay their bills without going into the red during this three month period."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye' and 14 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2818. Representative Dunn. Representative John Dunn, the Gentleman from Macon."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 2728. I inadvertently pushed the 'no' switch."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative ..."

Dunn: "...I want to go 'no', is what I want to do."



Speaker Redmond: "You want to be recorded as 'no'? Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'no' on 2778? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Mulcahey, the same request. Is leave granted? Leave is granted to Representative Mulcahey. Representative Harris, same request? Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Richmond, same request? Does he have leave? No objection, leave is granted. Representative Lucco, same request? Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a matter of introduction, we have students from the Armstrong School in Chicago, with their teacher, Mrs. Thompson. This group of students is represented by Representatives Bowman, Brady and McCourt. Glad to have you here."

Speaker Redmond: "2818, Representative Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2818. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady, the Gentleman from Cook."

Brady: "Yes, thank you, Speaker, fellow Members. This amends the Public Community College Act. It deletes reference to full fair cash value and inserts equalized assessed value. The reason this was brought about is, taxes are levied on equalized assessed value rather than full cash value and Mr. Dale Yung, of the Department of Local Government Affairs, advised this Amendment is necessary...the statute to conform with the practice. The Community College Board of Trustees recommended that this legislation be introduced to clean this Act up. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 156 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2833."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2833. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Motor Fuel Tax Laws. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell,"



Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, throughout my tours of the State of Illinois and the districts, I have found one group of people who are so oppressed they are almost in slavery. This group of people are the Illinois' motorists. The Illinois' motorists, some six million seven hundred thousand of them, have been subjugated to one of the most unfair tax systems that this country has ever found. I would like to point out that the income tax is only two and a half for individuals, four percent for corporations; and there are deductions making it possible for people to have some form of equity and relief. The sales tax in the State of Illinois is only five cents and some things are excluded. The inheritance tax starts off at a pittance of two percent, after you get to a forty-thousand exemption; and if you happen to be a stranger it starts at ten percent. But if you are an Illinois motorist the rate is in excess of ten percent. Even the liquor tax is seven cents a gallon. The hotel tax is only five percent of ninety-five percent of the gross. Only the gambling games receive, possibly, an equal rate of taxation. But an automobile is a necessity to the American way of life. This overburdened, oppressed taxpayer has borne us long enough and now is the time for a little simple relief. On behalf of these motorists, we are asking your help, your mercy, your understanding and your justice above all. We ask for this on behalf of the motorists because their rate is in excess of ten cents or ten percent per dollar. We're talking about a rate of seven and one-half cent a gallon. Truly an oppressive rate. The real estate tax is only one-half of one percent and the amusement tax is some fraction on the gross. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you are honest, if you have compassion, if you have understanding of the problems of the working man and woman you will then at least grant this equity, equity to the motorist. And remember, before a man can be generous he must be just. We owe this small measure of justice to the motorists and on their behalf, I plead with you to help grant some equitable relief."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."



Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Mr. Ewell, could you tell me how much the tax is in Chicago?"

Ewell: "How much the what?"

Kent: "The gasoline tax is in Chicago?"

Ewell: "Seven and a half cents a gallon."

Kent: "Plus five cents?"

Ewell: "For the R.T.A."

Kent: "Would that be cut?"

Ewell: "No, you can't... You're cutting the two percent...comes of the MFT..."

Kent: "So who you're relieving are the people downstate, right?"

Ewell: "No. We're trying to relieve everyone who pays the gas tax. It's a straight, simple, flat cut, an equitable cut, of two cents per gallon."

Kent: "How much...who receives some of these motor fuel tax funds? What are they expended for when they receive it?"

Ewell: "There is a very complicated formula on the motor fuel tax fund and it is so pro-rated, that various units of government receive various pieces of money. They receive these monies according to a formula, which we have set out. Now, if you would like me to go into the formula, I would be very glad to do so. But suffice it to say that the local governments get a little, the counties get a little, the state gets some and..."

Kent: "The reason that I called it... I just wanted to be sure that you knew where the counties and townships get their road fund. And if we begin to cut back they do not have enough money at this time to pay for all of the many repairs, just from this last winter, out of those motor fuel tax funds. And I really wonder what Mr. Bakalis will do with his pothole fund if he doesn't have this motor fuel tax fund. I urge you all to listen to this and defeat this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "I have an estimate here that the reduction by two cents per



gallon will result in a revenue loss to the state of between 110 and 120 million dollars. Is that correct?"

Ewell: "No."

Schlickman: "What is the correct figure?"

Ewell: "Well, if I am to believe the Department of Transportation, who attached a fiscal note, which I tried to send over, I'm sure you have over there, it will cost about 45 million to the road fund."

Schlickman: "Is this state-wide?"

Ewell: "Well, 45 million to the road fund, yeah...Wherever they build build roads and I'm sure that we, in the current administration, tried to build roads throughout the state and thru every hill and valley and community."

Schlickman: "All right, what is the total revenue loss, then?"

Ewell: "To who?"

Schlickman: "To the state, to the county...to the townships and to the municipalities."

Ewell: "Well, the state has an approximate loss of 45 million dollars. Now, the local units of government, with which there are many, collectively have a loss of approximately 70."

Schlickman: "Did you say 70?"

Ewell: "7.0."

Schlickman: "So we have an approximate revenue loss, for all units of government, state and units of local government, of approximately 110 to 120 million dollars, is that correct?"

Ewell: "That's a very good estimate."

Schlickman: "Thank you. Now, under Amendment #1 to this Bill the total revenue loss of 110...120 million dollars would be taken from the R.T.A. Is that correct?"

Ewell: "That was not my Amendment. It's not exactly the way I understand it. As I understand it, it's more or less a hold harmless agreement, so that we don't hurt the R.T.A."

Schlickman: "Amendment #1, as I read it, provides that the revenue loss of approximately 110 to 120 million dollars would be replaced from the R.T.A. gas tax collection. Is that correct?"

Ewell: "No."



Schlickman: "What is correct?"

Ewell: "Now, the Sponsor of the Amendment, Mr. Skinner, could really fill you in on the details of that. I consider it just a slight Amendment that the House decided that would help the Bill and therefore I'm going with it."

Schlickman: "Well isn't it true that the 110, 120 million dollars loss will be replaced by a transfer monthly from the R.T.A.-M.F.T. fund? It's own gas tax... And that this 110, 120 million dollars, collected by the state from the R.T.A., will then be earmarked for improvements within the six county R.T.A. area?"

Ewell: "Now, again I'd like to point out to the Sponsor. I think there are several different interpretations of the Amendment. But I think we ought to go to the Sponsor of the Amendment, who in his wisdom, when he had it drafted and had the approval of the House could surely elucidate on the point and make it clear as to where it sits in the total scheme. So, I would like to yield to Mr. Skinner at this time, to explain his side of his portion of the Bill."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I arise to oppose this Bill. Number one, if it is going to reduce in the downstate area, significantly, funds necessary for road improvement by the state and by units of local government. Number 2, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it will bring about a diversion of funds from the R.T.A. for public transportation. And to the improvement of roads within the six county area. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you will recall, I was a very active opponent to the R.T.A., however, it does exist. I have never opposed a transportation system and I've always felt that the use of road funds or M.F.T. funds was appropriate in the support of public transportation, which will benefit our roads by alleviating the use on them. I think it is a bad Bill. I think it will adversely affect the citizens of this state, state-wide, both downstate and within the six county area and I urge a 'no' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor... Representative Ewell, the monies that we've cut here in this reduction, are any of those monies used to capture federal funds for projects, road projects, within the state?"

Ewell: "There is a system of cooperation between the Federal Government and state government known as matching grants. To a certain degree, there has to be some type of matches. The same process is true for the road fund, as might be true for the welfare system, as might be true for several other system^s."

Mudd: "So the fiscal note, although it outlines the direct reduction of facets for local government, it would be hard to calculate exactly how much road monies and projects would actually not be funded, because of the matching funds, on the federal level. It would not reflect the true loss of monies for these projects. Isn't that true? There would be much more..."

Ewell: "In part."

Mudd: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Johnson. The Gentleman from Champaign, are you seeking recognition?"

Johnson: "I was just going to call for the previous question."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, what we're talking about is simple justice. We're saying that one system should not force... be forced to become the beast of burden for the entire tax structure. There are six million, seven hundred and forty-one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five people who pay this unjust tax. Now, if you are for tax relief, you give circuit breakers to the elderly, you try to grant exemptions to other people and other groups. You hear the re...pleas of the children. You allow the children increases in tuition, exemptions and grants from the state. I'm simply saying that the motorist, the backbone of the state, is being used as a beast of burden and its back is



about to break. If you are for tax relief, if you believe in an equal form of taxation, then you will allow them this meager two cents per gallon. That's all it is. A simple tax relief measure and I, for one, am certain that you shall incur the wrath of the entire electorate of the state when you vote against this Bill. This is simple justice and I plead with you, in the name of tax relief, that which all of you have stood for; each and every one has stood on the podium and promised the people throughout the state that you were going to give them relief. Now you have a chance. Now you have a vehicle. And let us now test the ^{mettle} ~~metal~~ of your courage and let us check your vote against your promises. Thank you."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'm going to vote 'no' now because I know it's going to come back as an increase and I'd like to have the same vote both times."

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

Skinner: "Who says the interests of Chicago and the suburbs can't converge?"

Nobody loses on this Bill in the six county area but the R.T.A. and that agency, of course, is made up of losers. Eighty million dollars will be transferred from the R.T.A.'s public transportation fund to replace any funds lost from the two cents per gallon tax cut. The effect it would be, the repeal of that most illogical tax, the R.T.A. gas tax...nobody in the six county area is going to lose because any money lost is going to go from the R.T.A. to the local municipalities or to the townships or to the counties. Now, if your downstate you might end up losing, because there's no replacement for you. And if you think the highways downstate are not good enough and maybe you need a tax increase instead of a tax decrease you certainly should be voting 'no'. But if you prefer the six county area a 'yes' vote can be defended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm



voting 'no' out of a habit but without any deep conviction or any enthusiasm for it and I think the Sponsor is to be congratulated for having the nerve to bring this matter to the attention of the House floor. It's true that the people of the State of Illinois are paying through the nose in the gas tax and not getting very much for it. But we have to recognize that in reality the direction of this Bill is about 180 degrees out of phase. The need is for an increase in gasoline tax in Illinois that we might have roads that are commensurate with the twentieth century. Many times I've criticized this administration for its failure to build roads, particularly in the 54th District. I've pointed out to you that my town of Lawrenceville is the mud road capital of Illinois and no one can dispute that if they've been there to see. But you really can't, in the last analysis, though it be true that the administration's road building policy for the 54th District for this year is a joke, in the last analysis you can't really complain or criticize them too strongly because we haven't the nerve to come before the people and say, 'More money is needed to build roads.' And if we do not have the nerve we can not assume that the administration will bring more nerve to that problem than we. So, I would urge the Sponsor, that though his good Bill is going ^{down} to defeat, maybe at a later day we can combine together to have a new Bill that raises gasoline to the point that we can have roads in Illinois that are equal to that of other states."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 66 'aye' and 71 'no'.
Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, so that the absentees could speak, I'd like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees.
Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, I believe you probably inadvertently overlooked my light. I just wanted to indicate that I had a conflict of interest but nevertheless would vote my conscience."



Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Brady. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima.
Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Farley. Garmisa. Giglio. Hanahan.
Hart. Hoffman. Dan Houlihan. Emil Jones. Klosak. Laurino.
Lechowicz. Madigan. Marovitz. McAuliffe. McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McBroom desires to be recorded
as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McCourt. McGrew. Nardulli. Peters. Pierce.
Schneider. Stearney. E.G. Steele. Tuerk. Winchester. Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. What's the score?
On this question there's 68 'aye' and 72 'no'... Representative
McCourt 'no'. Representative Peters 'aye'. That's 69 'aye',
72 'no'. Representative Nardulli 'aye'. Representative DiPrima
'aye'. Representative Ewell. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Postponed Consideration, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 2834. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce a group of
students from Harrison High in Chicago. They are represented by
Representatives Domico, Huff, Stearney, Terzich, Kornowicz and
Bianco. Glad to have you here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I looked in the gallery just a minute ago and I saw the
good news that Ray Hudson's back, because I saw his wife up there,
Mrs. Ray Hudson. Let's have a hand for her."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, didn't 'Andy Pupils' go
to Harrison High? That's what I thought. 2834. Representative
O'Brien. O'Brien. Out of the record. 2835. Out of the record.
2839."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2839. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an
Act creating a Commission to recommend plans for and to determine
location of the Pioneer Memorial Plaza. Third Reading of the
Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill I passed in the last...last Session which created a Commission to make a study for a...Pioneer Memorial Plaza. And due to the inclement weather that we had this last winter we didn't have too many meetings and I would ask for an extension for another year and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

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

Matijeich: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matijeich: "Representative DiPrima, I've noticed that the naming of the plaza is the Pioneer Memorial Plaza. Who's responsible for naming that the Pioneer Memorial Plaza?"

DiPrima: "That was me."

Matijeich: "Oh. Well, what pioneer was it named after?"

DiPrima: "Well, all the pioneers that ventured into this land at the outset, you know."

Matijeich: "People like whom, Representative?"

DiPrima: "Well, Father Marquette and de La Salle and all the rest of the pioneers, you know."

Matijeich: "Continued. You haven't named an Italian yet, keep going."

DiPrima: "DiPrima, when they came here."

Matijeich: "Could you give us the fiscal impact of this Bill?"

DiPrima: "That's an error there. There is no money involved with this particular Bill. This is just to extend the Commission for an additional year. I have a separate Bill for two thousand dollars."

Matijeich: "You mean you're extending a Commission for which we gave you no money yet for last year's work? Is that what you're telling us?"

DiPrima: "Right. Well, we have some dedicated people on the Committee...the Commission that made a couple of the meetings."

Matijeich: "Like whom?"

DiPrima: "The civilian members, Robinson here, Dave Jones, Bob Mitchler and



I made one of the meetings myself."

Matijevich: "Well, you mentioned the plans and the location, do you have either plans or a location yet?"

DiPrima: "Yeah, the Space Needs Commission is working on that."

Matijevich: "Oh, then we don't need your Commission then. Space Needs is going to handle it, is that true?"

DiPrima: "Well they were looking to see where a good site for the thing is, you know. But I would like to continue to..."

Matijevich: "Well, I think it's not too bad, Representative DiPrima. I would have liked a different name but as long as you say it's good, I'll go along with it."

DiPrima: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative James Houlihan. Anyone else? Anyone else? The question is... Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

DiPrima: "Yes."

Catania: "Representative DiPrima, I know that you want to be sure the pioneer women are honored...pioneer men."

DiPrima: "Oh...I've got them included in the statute, you better believe it. You don't think I was going to blow that, did you?"

Catania: "I wanted to be sure that you were still as dedicated to the cause of women this year as you were last year, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Oh...Right, sweetheart."

Catania: "Thank you, Larry baby."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to take it out of the record? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye', 14 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The plans are to work quite late tonight. We have 242 Bills total on the Calendar. 160 on Third,



82 on Second. And we have a very important reception tomorrow so we won't be able to work late tomorrow. 2842, Representative Flinn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2842. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2842 comes about because of a ruling that the Attorney General made last year in regard to state liquor license. Previously, the criteria for issuing a state liquor license was that all you had to do was to obtain a local license and the state automatically issued the state's 50 dollar license. But the Attorney General made a ruling that those establishments... establishments within 100 feet of a church could not have a license, even though it may be a church. Now there are a number of churches and private schools that have had, for a good many years, a license on their premises and they use them for various men's clubs and so forth. And some of them use them for bingo games and one in particular I'm familiar with has a bowling alley and they serve beer at the bowling alley. And what this does is circumvent the Attorney General's ruling and state that there can be a license issued within 100 feet of a church providing the church is notified and does not object. If there are no questions I would like to ask for your approval."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to have one question from the Sponsor. I know of two or three incidents, Monroe, where the school district has maybe 50 or 60 acres and the school may be 100 or maybe two blocks away from a shopping center but the school land is contiguous to that shopping center and people were denied liquor license because it was contiguous to the property. Are you talking about the building itself or the property?"

Flinn: "The law right now speaks of the property lines. And it really



makes it unfair, because very often the church is nowhere near the property line and so it's much more than 100 feet in many cases."

Conti: "Is this going to correct that?"

Flinn: "This will correct that."

Conti: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 26 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2865."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2865. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Mental Health Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Out of the record. John Dunn. 2893."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2893. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the law in relation to recorders. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matejek."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2893 is a very simple Bill. The Bill amends an Act governing the Office of the County Recorder. It provides for an increase in the fees involved for the recording of maps or plats in additions or subdivisions. The changes are intended, and only intended, to make the fees represent the actual cost incurred by the county in providing these services. This Bill is supported by the Illinois State Organization of County Clerk and County Recorders and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 16 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2894."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2894. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to mechanic's liens. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matejek."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2894 is another very simple Bill.

It increases the Recorder of Deeds fee for filing a satisfaction or a release of a mechanic's lien from 3 dollars to 5 dollars. This is also supported by the Illinois Organization of State County Clerks and County Recorders. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'aye' and 22 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2899, Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2899. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Transfer Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2899 is a result of a law suit that has presently been filed addressing itself to the net receipts from the sale of revenue stamps by the recorder of deeds and registrar of titles. And because of the 1970 Constitution that treats the collections of fees as something that had been eliminated, we're trying to delete the provision with this Act that such proceeds are to be treated as a fee of the recorder's or registrar's office. And that language is contained in the Act. All of the county recorders and clerks in the State of Illinois, to my knowledge, are in favor of the legislation. And if this legislation does not pass and the lawsuit is successful the County of Cook will lose 2 million 800 and 44 thousand dollars this year. And also, the other counties in the state will likewise suffer similar loses. I move for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2899."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "I don't quite follow your explanation, I wonder if you can tell me. At the present time, are you saying then, from your Bill... if I understand you and I'm not sure I do, that... Perhaps you could explain it a little better because..."

Yourell: "Yes, well in Article VII of Section 9 of the 1970 Illinois Constitution, it provides in pertinent part that fees shall not be based upon funds dispersed or collected, nor upon the levy or extension of taxes. What we're doing with the Bill is, so the State of Illinois will retain 50 cents on the hundred dollars and also the county in which the transfer is made will retain 50 cents for the total of 1 dollar per hundred dollars for the Transfer Stamp Act, that you buy to attach to the document. We're changing the language to read: 'The net proceeds of such sale by the recorder or registrar of titles shall be treated as the distribution of the tax which is herein authorized to be charged and collected.' We're clarifying the language so the counties will not lose this tremendous amount of revenue."

Geo-Karis: "Well, at the present time, will you tell me how much of that amount goes to the counties? Before your Bill?"

Yourell: "Well, 50 cents goes to the county and 50 cents goes to the state. We want to retain that exact distribution. This does not take away any money from the county nor does it take away any money from the state nor does it change."

Geo-Karis: "Are you just making a Bill then to clarify it?"

Yourell: "To clarify the language that the Constitution describes because of a lawsuit pending in Cook County."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

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

Conti: "Can I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Conti: "That last statement that you made, did you say that this is going to take care of pending litigation in Cook County?"



Yorell: "I didn't hear you, Sir."

Conti: "That last statement you made, did you say that this is going to take care of pending litigation?"

Conti

Yorell: "No"

Yorell: "What did you say, that last statement?"

Yorell

Conti: "There has been a lawsuit filed that has not been brought to fruit yet. It's been threatened and this is what we want to do to prevent that from happening."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye', no 'nay' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2926. Representative Capparelli."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2926, A Bill for an Act to amend an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record."



Speaker Redmond: "2927, Representative Richmond."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2927...."

Speaker Redmond: "Former House Member in the chambers. Former House Member Savickas. Representative Richmond."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2927. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill appropriates a total of 7,580,000 dollars from the Capital Development Fund to be....to the Capital Development Board for the completion of the planning and construction of the permanent facilities for the School of Law at Southern Illinois University. Now in the....1972, this Legislature appropriated money to start a school of law and it has done just that since then. And we did it last year, appropriate the funds for the planning which the Governor recently released. And the...we are now in danger of losing the accreditation for the school as a result of not having any funds appropriated for the building itself. When the ABA came to inspect the school with the thought in mind of giving it accreditation, it did recommend temporary ~~accreditation and permanent~~ accreditation being predicated upon the starting of a new one building facility that would house ...house the school entirely within five years. So therefore it is very imperative that we take this step, a step which incidentally, publicly has been supported by the Governor in his trip to southern Illinois. I would hope that you could recognize the seriousness of the situation inasmuch as the ABA Accreditation Committee did visit the school just a month or so ago with the thought in mind of...of removing the accreditation since we have made no progress in the actual building itself. They have agreed to delay it pending action by this Legislature. And I might point out some of the things that would happen if this accreditation is withdrawn. It would...it would totally wreck the school because, as you can imagine, the...anyone that graduates



would not be permitted to take the bar exam. So, therefore, it is very critical that we act with favor upon this Bill and I move for its favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would like the Sponsor...."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Skinner: "I would like the Sponsor of the Bill to tell me when they're going to open a law school in Springfield so that Representative Kempiners and I may go to law school and earn....and find a way to make a living after we lose an election?"

Richmond: "I thought you had already been to law school, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Heavens, no!"

Richmond: "You fooled me. But to answer your question, I don't know when."

Skinner: "Well, would you convey to your...to your university officials the possibility that they may be able to follow the example of their med.school with a law school here. Think of all the state employees that you could keep for a little longer time while it took them five or six years to go through law school. We could underpay our staff people for a couple more years and not have to retrain them every two years."

Richmond: "Well, of course, what you say may be right but it's needed in southern Illinois and it's started. We have an excellent school and they're turning out some excellent students but they're in danger of losing the accreditation so...."

Skinner: "Well, you wouldn't even have to build a law library here because the Supreme Court already has one. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Richmond, are you aware of the surveys nationwide in the State of Illinois that show the terrifically high percentage of law school graduates for whom there is simply no jobs available; that we're graduating approximately 50 or 60 percent more people from law schools than there are jobs available in law firms?"

Richmond: "I am not aware of the survey, no. Apparently, in southern



Illinois where these students are graduating, they're finding not too much of a problem, or too much trouble becoming employed in that area which was the actual intent of...of locating this school in that area."

Johnson: "Well, just speaking to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I...because of the immediacy of the problem, and the past promises made, I'm going to vote in favor of this but I hope the state would look in the future to the general question of continued graduation from professional schools, particularly law schools, of graduates simply cause these people want to get in when there's no jobs available when they get out. And I hope that once we make this step we'll at least look a little more carefully in... in the future."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Richmond: "...Right ahead."

Keats: "Could you inform the Legislature of the number of law schools, both public and private, the State of Illinois already has?"

Richmond: "No, I do not have those figures, I'm sorry."

Keats: "Yeah, I was wondering since Illinois is supposed to have as many law schools per capita as any state in the entire country,

I was wondering why we would need to continue another law school when, at this time, we do have as high a per capita number of law schools as anywhere in the country. Is there some justification for giving up, probably the number one status, of turning out more of these lawyers than any other state in America?"

Richmond: "Perhaps the survey you're speaking of includes the school at SIU which this Legislature did by their action appropriate money to start in 1972. So perhaps the...the overall figure you're referring to as being excessive in Illinois does include those that are graduating from there now. And I'm not sure that...I'm sure in southern Illinois the figures you're referring to....don't seem to apply because I don't think we have an overly abundance of attorneys at this time."



Keats: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Bill, I appreciate your comments. The only problem we have is that we probably are turning out too many lawyers, and not just lawyers, but technical degrees in general. We also have a problem of turning out too many graduates in the social sciences. I think we have to ask questions if we're going to spend money for new schools. Do we really need it? And I think the answer in this case is probably a rather resounding no. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would also like to speak to the Bill. First, I have.... I'm not in any way questioning the motives of the Sponsor of this Bill, I'm sure he's doing something that has been requested by a major school ^{in his} area. Nor am I assuming the greatness of Southern Illinois University as the center of learning; its medical school here in Springfield has established itself as a very fine professionally and well-needed school. However, as an attorney, I, as other attorneys on this floor know, if there's one profession that is receiving an overabundance of attendant...potential attorneys - and then turning out those same people into a field where they are not needed - it is the profession of law. To this end I don't think there's any good purpose to spend money of this state at the present time to build a law school at Southern Illinois University. To follow through on this, at the beginning of the next Session, I will introduce a Bill to abolish the law school at Southern Illinois University. I do this with the idea that it's an unnecessary part of our governmental process in this state. I think it has been brought out, and accurately, that Illinois has more law schools per capita than any other state in the union. Our sister state to the north, Wisconsin, has but two law schools and therefore is more than adequately attended. We have more law schools in the City of Chicago than most multistate do as a regional matter. There is no need for this law school. There's no jobs for the lawyers, thus there's no need to spend state money on a fancy new law school."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some of the things that are being said around here don't add up. We're seven lawyers short in the Legislative Reference Bureau and so far we are not being able to get applications from competent lawyers to apply. So if you lawyers know of a lot of unemployed lawyers, who are good lawyers, I suggest you have them see George Nichols. But as long as we're short and can't get applications, I can't believe there's an overabundance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bennett. Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this, so I think it's one of the best Bills that could be introduced in this Session. I recently have had the pleasure of interviewing some recent law school graduates of SIU and I tell you they're turning out a fine group of people. The question from the people from the north, from my colleagues who live in the Chicago area and up there, they need to come down to southern Illinois and look at some of the small schools that are...our small towns that are being provided with legal talent now that they didn't have before. If you look at the roster from SIU Law School and see where these kids are going, they're going to southern Illinois, they're going to central Illinois where we've had trouble getting lawyers. I... I think it's absolutely needed. The school is there. It's not a question of eliminating a law school or eliminating new graduates. It's going to happen. That this is something that is long time coming, long time in need and I support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this piece of legislation. I remind the Members of the House that the Governor of this state has also said if we were fortunate enough to pass this Bill and get it to his desk, that I understand it from what I read in the news media, that he intends to sign the Bill. I can't understand some of the thinking and some of the statements by some Legislators who are opposed to providing the State of Illinois with more attorneys or with the opportunity for the



students at the State of Illinois to attend law school. Each and everyone of us, I'm sure, have students that are presently attending Southern Illinois University and if we do not build a building they're going to lose the accreditation and we would have students from our districts graduating from a law school without accreditation. They could not become lawyers and practice in the State of Illinois. We had the same situation not too many years ago with too many teachers in the State of Illinois. Well, we didn't close down the teacher universities and we continued to provide the educational ...teacher education facilities throughout the State of Illinois. I think we are very timely with this Bill, we certainly should support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler. Pardon me, Representative Lucco. Pardon me. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The students who are now on their way out of the House of Representative's hall here are students from John V. Leigh School in Norridge, Illinois. They're all sort of represented and claimed equally by Representatives Capparelli, Kosinski and McAuliffe. Nice to have had you here, Norridge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just clear up a little bit for ...a couple of questions that were presented a while ago. Southern Illinois University does have a law school. We have the school. We have graduates from that school at this time that are practicing law in the State of Illinois but we just don't have a building facility that meets the requirements for such an institution. Not too long ago, several of the Representatives, Senators and interested persons of southern Illinois visit(sic) the campus to see the library placed in housing - what was dormitories - we also saw the fine students that participate ⁱⁿ the program. The land site is available. Money has been appropriated already for the planning, that came in years prior to now. We have the promise of the Governor that he will sign the Bill if we get it to his desk. So, let's don't say it's another law school. We have a law school and it



is in existence and I ask that you give us support on this particular Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of this very good Bill which may come as a surprise to some but I only wish that twenty years ago this Bill had passed and that the law school would have been funded and existed at that point, in that case you might have had another lawyer in the General Assembly. I, too, could have attended that law school. I started at Southern Illinois University, and even though I represent Will County, I grew up in Southern Illinois. And I started and saw that small prairie, Normal University rise into one of the greatest universities in the country today. And I think the great State of Illinois can stand two fine, public, funded university law schools. Don't be afraid, ~~of the University of Illinois.~~ Southern Illinois is not going to take it away, we're just going to add to it and make Illinois the greatest center of education in the ⁵⁰ states. I urgently request you to support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Speaker, are we still on the lawyer's Bill? I was going to say, I...I just got an invitation. I understand Jimmy Carter's coming in town the 26th, he's going to have a breakfast here in Springfield. And I talked to one of his aides and he tells me that he's all for this Bill because he thinks that we need a better quality of lawyers and he understands that at Southern they'll put out a real good quality of lawyers. So I'm all for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "I move the previous question."

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

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

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

I will close very briefly. I would like to say one thing that... in answer to several comments that were made by others who oppose this. Not only have the majority of students come from Southern



Illinois that have stayed....they have stayed there to practice law. And by January of '78, over a hundred and fifty students that graduated; and between five and ten percent were located in other states; fifty percent were located in southern Illinois and the remainder were about evenly divided between central and ...Illinois and the Chicago area. Obviously, they had no problems in being...finding employment as graduates of this fine school. I...we need the building badly. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 129 'aye' and 20 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed."



Speaker Redmond: "2945. Representative McClain."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2945. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employee's Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, the Gentleman from Adams."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2945 amends the State Employee's Group Insurance Act of 1971. In 1971 the State Employee's Retirement System, when they enrolled annuitants in their application, they informed those people that they would always be qualified for group health insurance. Well, the problem is that then on October 20 the Director of Personnel was informed that they, because the... some employees did not fulfill their eight years of state service, they did not qualify for this group insurance program. The State Employee's Retirement System refused to go along with the Director of Personnel and then the Attorney General ruled an opinion dated January 25, 1978, wherein he concurred with the Director of Personnel. The problem, of course, is that as of March 20, 1978 271 people that had less than eight years of service, state service, were then disqualified from continuing their group insurance program. The issue here is, that when they first applied for health insurance in state employment they were informed at that time and promised by the state that they would always qualify. What we're faced with here is 271 people in the State of Illinois, all of whom are retired and no longer able to work, now faced with the issue of not being provided a group health insurance. I believe that this Bill does then grandfather those 271 employees in so that they qualify for group insurance just until...and it would be a dwindling number. So over the years the 271 would gradually dissipate, obviously, to zero. And it clarifies the law so that from now on any new employee or annuitant will know that he will have to have or she will have to have eight years of full state service in order to qualify for group insurance. There is a fiscal note filed, it will cost the State of Illinois six thousand four hundred and thirty-one dollars and seventy-nine cents a



month for this...these 271 employees. But like I said before, it's a dwindling number. The issue really is, that the state gave its word and now because of a misconception of the law we've had to knock the 271 off. And for those reasons I would ask for a favorable vote. Bill Mahar is the Chief Cosponsor with this Bill with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Pullen: "Did you quote a figure that this was a fiscal impact figure on a monthly basis?"

McClain: "That's correct. Seventy...Seventy-five thousand a year, which is what we have been paying up to March 20, 1978. So, I mean... it is new money, agreed, but it's something we have been doing since...up to March 20, 1978."

Pullen: "I just thought there was a small difference between six thousand and seventy-five thousand and that some people aren't listening too well...ought to get it across that it's seventy-five thousand annual fiscal impact."

McClain: "Well that's okay. I was just trying...I just figured that maybe you'd understand six thousand four hundred a month better than you would seventy-five thousand a year."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mike."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye' and 28 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2947."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2947. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2947, the thrust of it would be to empower a board of directors of a corporation, when authorized by the Articles of Incorporation, to



select directors to fill vacancies occurring between annual meetings. The intent of it is, where there could be some disaster of some kind, rather than waiting until the annual meeting or calling a meeting of the board of directors, which can be a very expensive... calling a specific meeting for that purpose could be a very expensive venture. In this case, the person who fills that vacancy would serve only until the next annual meeting, when the shareholders would then elect somebody to fill that term. I would appreciate your favorable Roll Call on 2947."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

You've got a full blast there, John."

Matijevich: "I hear it coming."

Bluthardt: "You hear it coming? John, what's the emergency in this Bill?"

Matijevich: "The emergency is that some corporations tell me that it can be very costly if there is, now days with air travel and the mobility such as it is, they can almost be wiped out... And therefore, it would be very costly for them to...the expense of mailing, so forth, getting shareholders meeting. That was the emergency as they...I was informed of it and the Rules Committee went along with that type of emergency."

Bluthardt: "Do you know of any particular person who is interested in this legislation...that would require that emergency?"

Matijevich: "None that I know of..."

Bluthardt: "You don't have an executive corporate president that would like to have this Bill put through?"

Matijevich: "I don't know any corporations, Ed."

Bluthardt: "I didn't think you did, but you know, John, you've been asking for it and I thought I'd ask you the question. I don't really see anything wrong with the Bill but I kind of wonder whether we ought to be taking up time on nonemergency matters such as this. I'm sure if we had a Sponsor from this side of the aisle it would never be on this Calendar today. Thank you."

Matijevich: "Aren't you glad I'm here?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Well the Digest doesn't say this and I can't find the Bill... Isn't there a restriction in the Bill as to the number of directors that can be appointed to fill a vacancy?"

Matijevich: "There is and I don't have the Bill in front of me, myself, Representative Schlickman, but I know there is a number. But I thought that's in the law itself, not in the..."

Schlickman: "Well you're changing the law to fill vacancies by appointment of the board of directors."

Matijevich: "Right."

Schlickman: "And I recall that there was a restriction as to one third of the total number of directors to be appointed this way, is that correct?"

Matijevich: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "Anything futher? Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, just to correct the record, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for Representative Bluthardt...as a matter of fact I had a Bill similar to this one that was reported out of the Rules Committee at the same time this one was and I... I think we've both cleared it for that reason and I very strongly recommend an 'aye' vote. It's very direct legislation, it's necessary and I hope the Members will vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Waddell: "Are the shareholders notified of this meeting?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I...I don't believe they would have to be notified of this type of meeting. That...that would...that would create the situation we're trying to avoid, the heavy costs that you would have to bring about for such notices."

Waddell: "Well I would have to... May I speak to the Bill? I would"



have to object to this then because I think one of the vital things that you're missing here is the fact that the shareholder's interest may be disproportionate. If it's disproportionate and you have this kind of an action you could freeze them out, and therefore, I would object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Davis: "Representative Matijevec, are the shareholders granting the authority, under your Bill, to the director to perform this action?"

Matijevec: "Yes, it's authorized by the Articles of Incorporation.

So it's a delegated authority by the Articles of Incorporation. And all it is is to fill the vacancy up to the time of the next annual meeting. That's all the purpose of it is."

Davis: "Well, what's wrong with the special shareholder's meeting to do the same thing? I can think of a couple of hypothetical situations in small boards of directors where major shareholders, who were serving on that board, might have passed on or whatever, be incapacitated, find themselves...out of...out of contention in the board of directors for a period extending the 364 days... Finding themselves in a position whereby the wide discretionary powers granted to a board of directors...to find themselves completely out of action and out of...out of touch with their own corporation. It would seem to me... I guess I'm speaking to the Bill. It would seem to me it would be a poor precedent to set, unless the corporation, by the board of directors, was incapacitated to act because there weren't enough of them and they were deadlocked I could see maybe some ethicacy(sic) to it. But in the meantime, I think maybe you're infringing upon shareholder's rights, with this legislation, and I'm inclined only to vote 'present' this time...although I see Representative Porter heading towards my desk to explain it to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Matijevec, to close."

Matijevec: "Yes, in asking for your vote, in closing I would say that



efficacy

Representative Davis might have a point regarding a very small corporation, but I would think if that were the fact of the small corporation that they would not so authorize in their Articles of Incorporation. And that the situation, however, could be the reverse...where you have a large corporation...and I very seldom find myself on the floor speaking for large corporations, but in speaking for those large corporations, they would find it a very huge expense. And this would only serve the purpose of filling that unexpired term, that vacancy, up until the annual meeting. I think it's good legislation. I therefore request your 'aye' vote on House Bill 2947."

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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Another former House Member, former House Member John Grotberg. 2984. Representative J. David Jones desires to be recorded as 'aye' on 2984. Representative Mulcahey, 'aye'. Representative Murphy 'aye'. Kosinski 'aye'. Ewing 'aye'. Representative Vitek 'aye'. 2984."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2984. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis."

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

House Bill 2984 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Mines and Minerals for FY79. This represents an increase of approximately 12 percent over FY78. The Department has the regulatory responsibility for maintaining surveillance over mining industries to insure protection of the health and welfare for 16 thousand coal miners in this state. Now, through training of miners



and vigorous inspection programs, they have led the nation during the past two years in the fewest number of fatalities. And with the expansion of the coal industry and the need for additional manpower, the department must continue to grow. Now, Illinois has the largest reserve of bituminous coal in the nation, which underlies 96 of our 102 counties. During 78 and 79 there will be 47 new mines in the various stages of opening and I have a list with me, if anybody is interested in seeing where the mines are going to open and... I'm open for questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is... Representative Murphy, are you seeking recognition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Another former House Member, former House Member...former Representative, Don Moore up there...returned to the scene of his conquests. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for the record, isn't this the Bill that there was a...there was a Committee Amendment that was removed in the restoration... Mines and Minerals? I just want to bring to the attention of the floor, that this was the Bill where we had a Committee Amendment that was tabled on a floor action. This is the Bill where supposedly there was a fiscal expenditure in 1978 of 44 thousand dollars and they increased it to 100 thousand without justification of this Body of the new position⁵ within that budget. I agree that this is probably one of the more important Bills in the Governor's Budget, especially as far as the promotion of the safety and welfare of the people that mine for a living and provide the necessary resources of coal in the State of Illinois. But I, for one, for the first time in 10 years, will not be supporting this Bill at this time. Because in my personal opinion, there was an



Amendment, a proper Amendment, that was adopted in Committee and after careful research by both staffs the Amendment was adopted. And in turn, upon political ^e persuasion of both parties, the Amendment was tabled. And there is an excess of approximately 54 thousand dollars in this budget and for that reason I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 14 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jane Barnes, do you seek recognition? Representative Barnes requests permission to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Does she have permission? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Hudson. Representative Hudson requests permission to be recorded as 'no'. Does he have objections...permission? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler, does he have leave to be recorded as 'aye'? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 2985. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, point of information. Does it still cause a lot of work in the Clerk's Office when everybody changes their vote after you take the Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, it does."

Byers: "Does it slow down the work of the Clerk's Office?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, it does. It cost money."

Byers: "I'd like to remind the Members that they should vote and that should be it. And I'm going to have to object to anyone getting on or off afterwards."

Speaker Redmond: "2985."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2985. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2985 makes the ordinary and contingent expenses appropriation for the Emergency Services and Disaster Area. The budget is 10 million 5 hundred and 2 thousand 7 hundred dollars. It represents a 2.20... 2.4 decrease over the FY78 appropriation. Of that, 9 percent or 9 hundred and 19 thousand 4 hundred, comes from the General Revenue Fund. The remaining amount comes from federal funding. Of the 19 hundred and 14 thousand 4 hundred dollars, 450 thousand dollars goes into the State Disaster Fund, which is used to fund emergency needs connected with the state's response to disaster. Two Amendments were adopted in Committee. One reduced the appropriation to 24 thousand 2 hundred dollars and #2 line itemed the nuclear civil protection fund. The Bill passed out of Committee without dissenting vote and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Matijevich:"

Matijevich: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matijevich: "Representative Mahar, I... This Bill wasn't in our Committee, but I understand... Is this the Bill where the director had been accused by, I think the Federal Government, of improper travel vouchers, or not?"

Mahar: "Yes, that's correct."

Matijevich: "I... Well, you know, I'm of the opinion... when you have widespread abuse by a director that we shouldn't be hasty in moving out their Appropriation Bills. We've got to put some lesson upon them, I think, that we, as the legislative process feel that they have abused what are travel regulations...not only state travel regulations but federal regulations. And all I know is what I read in the newspaper because this Bill



wasn't in the Committee, but as I understand it this Member...this director would have only...probably not even got a tap on the wrist if it weren't for the fact that the Federal Government was the...the Government which put him in place. And here we are, as a State Body, going along quite quickly with no Amendments touching that at all. And I just felt that on the floor of the House, at least, that somebody ought to make mention of it. I'm not going to vote for it just on that account. I think he's a personable gentleman, I think he tries to do a good job, but I think when you have abuse such as that... I think that we, as legislators, ought to stand up and say that we don't like it. And therefore, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the last speaker, just because somebody writes something up in a newspaper doesn't make it true. We investigated ^{this} ~~it~~ before our Appropriations II Committee, everything was in order and I would recommend an 'aye' vote. This is one of the...the director of this department, I believe, is one of the hardest working directors, most knowledgeable, he's worked with a lot of disasters over the past year and I think we should vote this budget out without any question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to associate myself with Representative Byers' comments and add to them just slightly. The current director is not a new appointee of this Governor, he's a holdover that's been involved in the effort for quite some time. He's a very professional man in this field and I think one of the reasons why some of the federal bureaucrats have been chasing him is because he has led the effort to try to reform the Federal Disaster Law that vests so much discretion in those



bureaucrats. And I call to the attention of this chamber, the fact that under the current President 70% of the disaster declarations of this country have occurred in the old South, while they've ignored states like Illinois and those in the Midwest."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "In answer to the previous Gentleman, I'd like to say the time that this incident came up, it had already been settled and the director has a written settlement, a written authorization both from the state and the Federal Government that, actually, what appeared in the newspaper was incorrect. And I think he has done an outstanding job, both in the previous administration and in the present administration. And it was unfortunate that this type of material appeared in the paper which actually was not correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to urge an 'aye' vote for this Bill. I had the opportunity, when we had the flood at Kaskaskia Island in '73, to work with this director in his emergency work. I think he's done an outstanding job in the State of Illinois and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Inasmuch as this director is appointed by the Governor, we've forgiven the Governor for taking a trip down to the Kentucky Derby with the railroad company we regulate. And we forgive the Governor for taking money from firms that he has given immunity to while ^{he sent} ~~we send~~ people to jail. We forgive the Governor for blowing dough all over the mansion for friends that are political hacks, so I think we can forgive this director for this."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Van Dyne."



Van Duyn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sit on the Appropriations II Committee also, and the consensus of opinion in our Committee was that there was some vagueness about where or why this gentleman had used some airplane trips to some other functions, other than disasters. Also, the main thrust of the inquiry was that the gentleman has his office of operations in Marion, Illinois, where heretofore any head of any agency was housed, or at least his agency was housed in Springfield. So, I don't really think that there's any attempt here to push anybody around. It's been a practice in the past that they have their headquarters here in Springfield. And it also was the consensus...the opinion of the Committee, that it would probably save us some money in travel if this gentleman would do likewise, so it's up to you whether or not he's using his money properly, but... Well anyway, that's what we talked about."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, listening to Representative Giorgi, all I can say is considering the Democratic record in this state, they can forgive anything."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Just to move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this matter has been fully debated. It's a good budget and I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain my vote. I've had



some experience with the abilities of the director, then known as the Director of Civil Defense, in tornadoes we had in my area two years back. He's a hard working, knowledgeable gentleman, doing everything he can to help the...the disaster areas and I'm very happy to support his appropriation. I just get a little teed off around here listening to the same cheap-shot-johnnies taking their cheap shots every chance they get, at the Governor or a director, and especially a director that was appointed by one of their Governors several years ago. It's always the same two. And I vote...and I'm proud to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich, point of personal privilege."

Matijevich: "No, I was just going to tell Roger Keats, I just pulled ahead of him and Penny Pullen now, I just pulled ahead of you, Rog'."

Speaker Redmond: "289...2987."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2987. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Historical Library. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2987 provides for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois State Historical Library. There was a reduction Amendment in the House, it was reaffirmed on the floor last week, so I move its passage, as amended."

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



On this question there's 142 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2988."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2988. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the St. Louis Metropolitan Area Airport Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2988 appropriates 323 thousand 900 dollars to the St. Louis Metropolitan Area Airport Authority. I am convinced that this is the best and most economical way of developing the Columbia - Waterloo Airport. It is crucial to the economic development of Southern Illinois. And since we discussed this last week, I would ask for a favorable vote."

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

Porter: "I wonder if the Sponsors of Appropriation Bills would be kind enough to not only tell us what the amount is but also to tell us what the previous years appropriation was and how much of an increase or decrease there has been. I want to ask this once and I intend to ask it for everyone that does not lay it out for the Members. So, Representative Stiehl, could you tell us how much of an increase this is, if any?"

Stiehl: "There is not increase, it's a decrease. Last year it was 363 thousand 600 dollars, this year it's 323 thousand 900 dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies of the House, wishing won't make it so and spending 363 thousand dollars every year from now till the end of time won't bring an airport for Southwestern Illinois. I want to see an airport there just as strong as the Sponsor. And I'm sure that the Bill will pass, because many Bills receive a



vote in the inverse proportion to their merit. When this Bill came before Appropriations I, it sailed through because of the irresistible charm of the Sponsor, but we, as adult politicians, realistic in the ways of the world, need to recognize that we're not going to locate the airport by anything that we do here today or how much money we spend. The Missouri mules will never give Illinois an airport voluntarily, though the arguments for it logically should be unanswerable. The only way that we're ever going to get an airport in Southwestern Illinois, for the metropolitan area of St. Louis, is to change the occupancy of the White House. I suggest that you'd do better to focus your energies in that direction in 1980, all get behind big Jim Thompson, let's put him in the White House and then we'll get our airport. Meanwhile, let's save the 363 thousand dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is in response to Representative Porter's question. The 1977 expenditure was 537 thousand. The 78 estimated expenditure is 343 thousand. The Bill originally, as it was introduced, asked for 363 thousand 400. As it was amended in Committee and adopted on the floor, it now calls for an expenditure of 323 thousand 900."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Stiehl, to close."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I said before, this airport is absolutely essential for the economic development of Southern Illinois. We have thousands and thousands of jobs at stake here and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars of revenue for this state. All studies have shown that right is on our side. The merit of our



cause will prevail and this is the most economical way of achieving the Columbia - Waterloo Airport. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all... The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Representative Byers, do you seek recognition?"

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the legislation that will provide for the money for the continuance of the Columbia - Waterloo Airport site. And this is going to be a project that will employ 12,000 people and provide jobs to replace the antiquated airport in St. Louis and will establish sales tax revenue for the State of Illinois and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye' and 41 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman attention, a very important announcement."

Clerk O'Brien: "Emil Jones' wife has just had a six pound, bouncing baby boy, the future President of the United States, Emil Jones III."

Speaker Redmond: "2995. I've been reminded by the press corp that there's a few tickets still available for the gridiron dinner on the 24th. \$15.00 a piece. Don't get shut out."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2995. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3004."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3004. A Bill for an Act revising provisions pertaining to first offender probation in..."



relation to certain offenses. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You'll notice that this Bill is jointly sponsored by myself, Representative Breslin, Mudd and Brady, which is indicative of the serious nature of the Bill. After the enactment of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act and the Cannibas Control Act the courts in this state have followed a procedure on first convictions of granting probation and levying fines and charging court costs, which is permissable under the Unified Code of Corrections. In the case of People vs 'Dumontel', the State Supreme Court held that the two Acts I mentioned, the Illinois Controlled Substance Act and the Cannibas Control Act, do not specifically grant this authority to the courts in this type of case. And as a result, I have introduced this legislation to make these two Acts consistent with the Unified Code of Corrections. I would appreciate your support of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was heard in Judiciary II, came out...considerable majority of vote and it's our feeling that all this does is bring the statute into conformance with the Supreme Court decision. I would support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 159 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3009."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3009. A Bill for an Act in relation to writs. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3009 creates an Act in relation to writs. A writ is an order issued by a court to a Sheriff or other officer of law or to an individual requiring the performance of an Act. Over the years the court systems had to duplicate, by typing up the court orders with regard to judgements. And the reason for this is that there wasn't any duplicating equipment available. Since that time it has caused an extremely substantial amount of paperwork, which was duplicated and this simply will allow the courts to take 'Xerox' copies of it and certify it to be a true copy. It's estimated that there should be a savings in the court system of approximately two to three million dollars and I would urge support of House Bill 3009."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3010."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3010. A Bill for an Act to provide for the registration of container trademarks and to make certain Acts within respect to the use of registered containers unlawful and providing a penalty for the violation thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to request that this Bill be taken back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. I am informed that the Amendment has not been printed as yet but I would like the Bill held on the Order of Second Reading, please."



Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to have 3010 returned to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted, it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading and there held pending the printing and circulation of an Amendment. 3014."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3014. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, the next three Bills are a series of Bills that came out of the legislative program of the Legislative Audit Commission. These are the three we brought out as an emergency measure this year, primarily because they dealt with the savings of money and not just the change of Act. House Bill 3014 eliminates an unnecessary audit of the State Community College of East St. Louis. There was an Amendment added by Representative Kane, on the floor, that protects that they will be audited. It's not a question of going by it but it's a question of eliminating a duplication... an amount of savings of somewhere...at least 30 thousand dollars a year and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3016...3015, pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3015. A Bill for an Act to change the frequency of certain audits required of the Auditor General. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."



Brady: "House Bill 3015, Mr. Speaker, places both the toll highway authority and the urban transportation district on annual audits rather than six months audits. The auditors are meeting themselves coming and going and it's estimated to save at least 25 thousand dollars annually and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3016."

inter ✓
Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3016. A Bill for an Act authorizing temporary ^Tinter agency transfers to state employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

✓
Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, this Bill does what the Clerk said it does. It establishes procedures for temporary ^Tinter agency transfers of employees. I think this clears up a Section of our state employees transfer between agencies and it now puts it in the statute so they can do it on a 90 day period, renew it again on a 90 day period, so that our budget ^{ins} and procedures can be properly followed and we know where the employees are and I urge your support of this."

✓

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3019."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3019. A Bill for an Act to



amend Sections of the Bingo License and Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Committee, House Bill 3019 is a very important Bill. It amends the Bingo Act. It reduces from 10 percent to 5 percent the percentage of ^{gross} growth proceeds that must be paid to the state. As I mentioned to you, it's a very important Bill. Bingo really keeps our parochial schools going and educating our youth of tomorrow. I need your support to pass this important Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have my tax so I've got to vote for the Bill...but I know Representative Kornowicz feels as I do, that the more money we give to the charitable organizations, the church organizations, the better. And I feel strongly about that. In fact, as far as I'm concerned, if all the state got was the monies needed to regulate, that would be enough. I don't think the intent ever was to provide monies for the state. We just use that as an excuse to get the bingo ^{Act} back. But I want Representative Kornowicz and anybody in the future...so far the Bingo Act has been scandal free but I think they're getting fairly close to not being scandal free. In my area they've got what they call 'Bingo Houses' and some of the...some organizations, which I have some doubts whether they really are charitable organizations, have one night a piece, for example, in that 'Bingo House'. And I don't think that was ever the intent of the Act. And I think we're getting dangerously close that bingo may come to the day where... that the elements that we never wanted to get into bingo revenue, are going to find their way into it."



I'm all for this. I'm for giving the charitable organizations more money. That's why we wanted bingo in the State of Illinois. But we had better be looking at these big bingo houses that are cropping up and I think that if we don't start looking at that we're going to put an end to Bingo in the future and I don't want to see that happen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield? You indicated that the beneficiary of this would be the Catholic Churches. Now, aren't there other organizations that are involved in the playing of bingo?"

Kornowicz: "Yes."

Schlickman: "What are some of the other non-church organizations that are involved?"

Kornowicz: "Veteran's organizations and various civic organizations."

Schlickman: "Now, your Bill would provide for a reduction of from 10 to 5 percent of the state's share, is that correct?"

Kornowicz: "Right."

Schlickman: "And what is the net fiscal effect?"

Kornowicz: "The impact is about four and a half million dollars."

Schlickman: "Four and a half million dollars?"

Kornowicz: "That's right."

Schlickman: "The state would be losing that much, is that correct?"

Kornowicz: "Well, I wouldn't say the state is losing that money, the people are gaining that amount of money."

Schlickman: "In fiscal year 1977 the state realized approximately 8.8 million dollars, is that correct?"

Kornowicz: "That's right."

Schlickman: "And that 8.8 million dollars went into the State Mental Health Fund and the General Revenue Fund?"



Kornowicz: "That's right."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when the lottery was approved, when bingo was approved, it passed the Legislature on the basis that it was going to produce money for the state. And to provide money to support needed human services in the State of Illinois. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, fortunately, the Governor of this state acknowledged yesterday that he's got some soft spots in his budget and he is determined that we have to spend more money to take care of our child abuse problem. We've got to spend more money for the care of our kidney victims. And there are other areas of human need that can only be satisfied by money in the General Revenue Fund. If this Bill passes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there won't be the money that the state needs to take care of child abuse victims, to take care of the kidney victims. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that we put our priorities in order, keep them straight and beat this Bill so that we can help the citizens of the State of Illinois. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz to close... Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill, having...being a member of a couple of organizations which conduct bingo games and being a person who happens to work somewhat closely with one of those organizations and even calling some games at times... We've been in the position where we may not have any bingo games in some of these organizations if this sort of legislation doesn't pass. So, we're not going to be putting money from those people into anything, they're going to simply stop doing anything at all in the way of having bingo games to produce any revenue proceeds. I think this is



a step in the right direction. I think it will balance itself out over a period of time, it will allow many of these worthwhile organizations, which in the case of the ones I operated with happen to put every dime of the proceeds that they make, which are minimal, into programs of health and welfare for their members and for the communities which they serve. It's a necessary Bill, it ought to be passed and voted for by every Member of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the expected growth of our taxes in this next 50 years is going to be almost 400 million dollars and the reverend...the reverend, listen to me...the Representative from Arlington Park talks about a 4 million dollar loss to the state. 4 million dollars of a 400 million dollar growth is only one percent. This money is only going to accrue to the citizens of Illinois. And further, those of us that have sponsored bingo in the previous years and the lottery in previous years, knew that those monies would never amount to much for use in state government but to get the hypocrits^e to help support those Bills we had to say that it was going to help benevolent issues for the state. We've never claimed that there's going to be alot of money made from bingo or from lotteries or there won't be much money made from off-track betting. But the point is, this 4 million dollars will accrue to the not-for-profit organizations that are having trouble meeting their utility bills that we've increased on them and meeting bills to keep their operations open. I suggest we support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlien."

Schoeberlien: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The



'ayes' have it. Representative Kornowicz, to close."

Kornowicz: "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 Davis."

✓
J
Davis: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. Under the O, one-half
I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will
take the record. Representative Macdonald 'aye'.

129
2
The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's
179 'aye' and 21 'no'. The Bill, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3023."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3023. A Bill for an Act to
amend Sections of an Act to regulate the employment of
children. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I was on the telephone and I wanted
to vote for that Bill. It won't change the...Can I have
leave to vote 'aye' on that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be
recorded as 'aye' on 3019? All those in favor vote
'aye'. Representative Greiman. 3023."

✓
✓
✓
Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House. In 1975 we passed the Administrative Procedure's
Act and made it applicable with state agencies in 1977.
Accordingly, when it became applicable to agencies, such
as the Department of Labor, it made all of their processes
and all of their procedures applicable also to the
Administrative Procedure's Act, which meant that where a
simple certificate for a minor to go to work was issued
the revocation of that became subject to the Administrative
Procedure's Act, with all its formalism, notice and hearings
and what not. and it made a very simple kind of a thing
a very complicated thing. This Bill...the concept of the



✓

Bill is to take that out of the operation of the Administrative Procedure [?]s Act and to...to...however, to make sure though that there is a hearing for young people who are denied their license. They do have to have a hearing and it would have to commence within 21 days. There was an Amendment put on it that is not related specifically to the Bill as originally filed but it merely extended the Illinois Commission on Labor ^L Laws for a period of time until July 30...or June 30, 1979.

cap

I ask that you for favorably on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question..."

My staff analysis indicates that one effect of House Bill 3023 would be that it would lessen the discretion of a local school authority in connection with the granting of work permits to minors. Would you comment upon that staff analysis's statement?"

Greiman: "Yes, it's not a discretion that they particularly want. And their...their judgement is then to merely say that in fact the student is in good standing. And that really is the criteria that they do use and to the notion...it's not something that the school people want. They want to be through...out of that kind of judgemental situation."

Deuster: "The Association of School Boards and School Administrators are supporting this Bill?"

Greiman: "I really don't know that they have a position on it, but the school people that I've talked to have said, as well as the Department of Labor, that that's the kind of thing that they don't really want to have long, protracted hearings on. They want to have some kind of a standard so they can merely give a...sort of a rubber stamp situation."

Deuster: "Well normally, Representative Greiman, the schools are saying that they want local control and they want



discretion and they want authority, but you're telling us in this case they don't want it."

Greiman: "Well, I think the authority that normally schools want is authority over their fiscal problems, authority over curriculum, authority of a lot of things. This is not the issuance of a local permit, this is a situation where we have sort of a split cap. We have the local authorities distributing or delivering a state certificate so that they're not really quite the same. It's not a typical situation and you can't use the analogy of local control, it just isn't applicable in this case."

Deuster: "Could you give a simple example of what kind of what kind of a child...what kind of a school student would be asking for a work permit and how it's handled now and how your Bill would change that?"

Greiman: "Well, as I understand it, if the youngster wants to work he applies, if he's in good standing he would get it...rather...automatically. If there was some reason why he wasn't entitled to it, perhaps the job itself, for example, was a job that was not appropriate or some other reason. Now, to revoke that you would have to go through a very formal kind of proceedings, Representative Deuster, that would be wait...and the question is, who would pay for that, by the way? Because you have, in this situation, school authorities issuing state licenses. The question is, whether or not those licenses or those certificates are licenses under the Act. And we're just taking them out of that. Really, that's what we're doing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor respond to a question or two?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "How would this affect the summer job programs from the Federal Government, based upon need? There's



a lot of federal money that comes in the respective municipalities in the state providing employment of needy children who may not have the scholastic ability, as are required in your Bill."

Greiman: "No, they have that...they have that requirement there now, Ted. That's one of the things...we're not adding a requirement. What we're...if anything, we're detracting from the requirements. We're merely saying that they're in standing in school, good standing in school. It has nothing to do with that kind of problem, we have that now. So, we're not changing that one single bit. It would have no application there and no impact on the situation that you suggest, none at all."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schuneman: "Representative Greiman, I'm somewhat concerned about this Bill. The park district,^S cemetery organizations of this sort in my districts, I know, have been having problems with the Department of Labor as respect to (sic) the employment of youngsters for such summertime jobs as mowing lawns and this sort of thing. That is mowing for cemeteries and park districts. And they're having difficulty now complying with the law, in that the law seems to be so stringent, as respect^S to these age requirements. And the youngsters want to work, the parents want their kids to work, it's good for the kids to work and now are you taking away that discretion in the local community that might permit some of those youngsters to work?"

Greiman: "Not at all...not at all. This deals with the revocation of the certificate. This says that the certificate, the revocation of the certificate and the



issuance of the certificate are not under the formal licensure provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act. To the contrary, if somebody, I suppose, really was interested in not having kids work they would say, 'Well, we have to go through the whole licensure provision of the A.P.A.' To the contrary, this simplifies. This makes less complicated that process and doesn't have any impact on it. It is, I must tell you, a Bill that is generated from the Department of Labor, but not for that purpose. It makes it easier, Sir, if anything."

Schuneman: "But it does remove from the local authority those judgements which they are now exercising?"

Greiman: "It removes negative judgements. You know, that he couldn't, that he's not able to. It really says if he's in good standing then a certificate gets issued. And that's basically what they do now. That's really... The local people are the ones who issue, who issue those certificates. So, I think there would be less reason and less grounds, at this juncture, after the passage of this Bill, for a local authority to deny a certificate. Actually, it will encourage and not discourage employment."

Schuneman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Greiman: "Yes."

Darrow: "Representative Greiman, up until this time, the Attorney General enforced this Section of the law, isn't that correct?"

Greiman: "I...I think so, yes."

Darrow: "And now you're taking this power away from a statutory office...a Constitutional office and transferring it to the Department of Labor. Would this mean the Department of Labor will be employing additional attorneys?"



Greiman: "I wouldn't think so..."

Darrow: "What was the reason..."

Greiman: "I wouldn't think so at all... I don't know, I didn't draft...."

Darrow: "What was the reason for taking this away from the Attorney General?"

Greiman: "I think it...probably because it's such an informal procedure. You know, these are not the kind of things that go to court, they're the kind of things that are really handled administratively. The ideas...I think simplify the process and not complicate it, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Well, I recall last year..."

Greiman: "I can't think of the answer, though."

Darrow: "Last year we removed some power, with regard to franchise, from the Secretary of State and this would appear to be something similar to that. Also, in regard to Article II of this Act, it sets up a commission. Am I to understand that there will be an Appropriation Bill to follow this, pertaining to the commission?"

Greiman: "Well, the commission, I understand, is in existence already. That was amended on the Bill, it was not something that the original author of the Bill... Sponsor of the Bill put in. But there already is a commission on labor laws. This merely extends it for a year. Now, I don't know what its appropriation was. I'm sure there must be a Member on the floor here that was a member of that and perhaps could tell us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to Representative Darrow's question, first of all this is a good Bill. It was voted out of Labor...Labor and Commerce Committee with a real solid vote. What the Amendment is, it's the extenuating Enacting Act for the Labor Laws Commission and there's a 20,000 dollar appropriation. I had to use



this Bill as a vehicle for the Labor Laws Commission. The Commission...enacting legislation got a little jammed up and this was the only vehicle that we had to continue our Commission. So, in answer to Representative Darrow, there's a 20,000 dollar appropriation to the Labor Laws Commission and that's what the Amendment is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Birchler: "My question probably was answered, probably by the last man. I note that the Bill has been amended to set up a board to do this work. Is that on a per diem basis or how will they..."

Greiman: "That's not the case at all. The Bill has not been amended to do this work. The Amendment is something totally separate from the essence of the Bill. There is a Commission on Labor Laws. It now works, it has nothing to do with the granting of these certificates and there are needed...there was a vehicle... There was a vehicle shortage in the General Assembly and the people interested in extending the Labor Laws Commission asked that they might use it to extend the Labor Laws Commission. That Commission does not...does not have any impact on the initial parts of the Bill, none at all."

Birchler: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Greiman, to close."

Greiman: "Well, I think the questions have been lively and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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



On this question there's 122 'aye' and 20 'no', the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3027. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 3038. Out of the record. 3042. Representative Kent."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3042. A Bill for an Act amending an Act that authorizes conveyance of certain property to several units of local government. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year there was a Bill that I sponsored to give to the City of Bartonville some land that was held by Conservation Department for a park. We did not include the word 'library' and their present library happens to sit in the middle of this land in a building that was there at the time that the land was acquired. And so, in order to see that they do not tear down their library would you please permit me to add that word? I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 158 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3050. Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3050. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan. Ryan. That's the umbrella down there in..."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3050 appropriates 10 million 700 thousand dollars for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the General Assembly and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Porter."

Porter: "Would the Representative yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Porter: "George, how much was the appropriation last fiscal year, please?"

Ryan: "I don't...I think it's basically the same. It may be a little more but I don't think it's...same as last year."

Porter: "Same as last year?"

Ryan: "Pretty close, yeah."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Anything that lapse we'll transfer to Congress. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 151 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3053. Representative Caldwell. Representative Robinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3053. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Well, I'd be happy to go ahead with this Bill but Representative McClain is complaining that you skipped 3051."

Speaker Redmond: "3053 is on the call."

Robinson: "Okay. The Bill that passed out of Public Utilities with no ~~descending~~ votes, would require that when a natural gas utility sets up a preference...sets up their list of who can be cut off of natural gas during a crisis, that they give a preference to residential structures. And we define 'residences' as meaning any multi-family residence, single family residence, any nursing home, hospital or other area where people are living

dissenting



for at least six months or more. The Bill was brought to my attention by the public housing authorities in Springfield and Peoria, by the Catholic Archdiocese of Springfield and Peoria, the Illinois Hospital Association and other groups like this that do have residential facilities and want to know that when a natural gas company draws up their plan for cut offs in case of a crisis, that preference for natural gas would go to residential facilities. I would be willing to answer any questions, so I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye', 14 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.



Speaker Redmond: "3054. Representative Lucco."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3054. A Bill for an Act to add Title VI-B to the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco, the Gentleman from Madison."

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

House Bill 3054 is a Bill which amends the Environmental Protection Act. It permits industry such as steel plants and so forth to shut down their afterburners in the wintertime when the temperature is 59 degrees or cooler. Now this has been proven by the United States E.P.A. that this is very feasible. This permits them to cut down about from one to three million cubic feet of gas...to save it during the wintertime. This gas could be used, well it really can't be used in residential homes, but it would conserve enough and it would heat 20,000 homes in the State of Illinois alone. Now, this would not destroy the clean air concept of the Environmental Protection Agency, it merely permits the hydrocarbon^s to be emitted without being burned off during the cold weather because they have proven that it's not necessary during cold weather. The Environmental Protection Agency testified on this Bill¹ and they admitted that the Bill had a good concept and was very good and that they were thinking of introducing such a Bill in the very near future. So I solicit an 'aye' vote on this Bill... It would aid our Illinois industry tremendously."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Just a question of the Sponsor, will he yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Bowman: "The... Would you elaborate a little bit more on the position of the Environmental Protection Agency? It sounds as if they were saying that there was a...a germ as an idea here that was okay but do they have any objections on any portion of it?"

Lucco: "I'll get to you in a minute... Pat Lynch, a Representative of the E.P.A. from the State of Illinois, testified. He said that they have been studying this for about 3 years and that they felt



that this was a good Bill but they wished that they had done it or that we would allow them to do it. But we...instead of dealing with the E.P.A., I think it's necessary for us sometimes to stir them up and the passage of this Bill will do exactly what I think they would intend to do within the next year."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have some reservations about this Bill. I wish I had been able to hear the E.P.A's remarks because I would like to know precisely what they said on the subject. Because, it seems to me that the purpose of burning out the hydrocarbons really is twofold. One, is obviously the reduce of hydrocarbons in the atmosphere; the second is that it...hydrocarbons help generate ozone. And I believe the situation that Representative Lucco is addressing himself to is; when the air temperature falls below a certain level the reaction which creates ozones from hydrocarbons is dramatically reduced and so you don't have the...you know, the ozone problem; however, you still have the hydrocarbons in the atmosphere. And hydrocarbons are essentially the same chemicals that are given off by automobile fumes and it seems to me that...you know, we're continued to be plagued with the problems that hydrocarbons themselves produce. And I can certainly see that in the case of emergencies, during winter months, one would want to conserve natural gas supplies but I...I think a better approach would be simply to provide emergency relief rather than an automatic ^{cutoff} ~~cost~~ when the weather...temperature falls below 50 some degrees, you know, which is not exactly freezing. So, for that reason, I'm going to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "To close? The United States[?] Environmental Protection Agency reported that hydrocarbon emissions were significantly reduced during the period when the outside air temperature was below 59 degrees in the wintertime. Now, we're not dealing with any other pollutant⁵ other than hydrocarbon and during the last winter we found that the shortage of gas throughout the country... natural gas could be taken away from the State of Illinois and shifted



to the northeastern states in another situation, such as we had last winter. Now, the Environmental Protection Agency in the State of Illinois did not oppose the thought or the concept of the Bill at all, in fact said that they had been studying it for three years, they agreed with the concept and had no really objection to the Bill itself."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 28 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3059."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3059. A Bill for an Act in relation to the licensing of ambulance services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor on 3059? Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "House Bill 3059 is an attempt to set standards for emergency medical services in the State of Illinois. The Bill has the support of all the groups involved in providing these kind of emergency medical services. It has the support of the Illinois Medical Society, the funeral parlor directors, the ambulance service people. It sets up licensure for ambulances, such minimum standards to make sure that when the ambulance comes there's real quality of care. It says, for instance, that there will be emergency medical technicians on the ambulance. There's over 22,000 now claimed in the State of Illinois and the department is claiming many more, every day at 50 locations in the state. And it says that there will be radios on the service. It says, in effect...in essence, that there will be top quality emergency medical care when the ambulance comes. I would appreciate support of this Bill, which passed out of the Human Resources Committee and as I said, has support of all the groups that provide medical care."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Now, what about the areas that cannot, you know, when there's an emergency...I'm sure that if I was in an emergency I wouldn't care if they got me there in a jeep or what have you. What are you going to do in areas where they can't afford to comply with the rigorous regimentation that is obviously amplified in this Bill?"

Robinson: "Well, Adeline, as a matter of fact there really are not such areas. Right now in the State of Illinois



87...88 percent of ambulance service meets the requirements in this Bill. Okay? The other small percentage that does not already meet these, the Department of Public Health is committed to providing the ambulances, the radios and the training to do this. They will bring any ambulance company that is...or public ambulance service that is serious about this, into compliance. This Bill is not to cut off service. And as a matter of fact, it allows four years for compliance. This Bill is to stop in the future, not any company now operating, but to stop the fly-by-nights from getting into the business. To stop a situation that happened in central Illinois when a person started an ambulance with a Gremlin. The sort of situation that happened in Danville, where an ambulance call was answered, there was only one person an 18 year old attendant, untrained, no training at all, who actually requested a reporter to help transport the patient to the hospital. It would stop the fly-by-nights but it would not stop those ambulances that really wanted to provide services."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself on the Bill.

As much as I like my colleague on the other side and I listened very assiduously to his comments and explanation of this Bill, it seems to me that we already have a purely voluntary program now under the Good Samaritan Act and...it is administered at the present time by the Department of Public Health. And going back to the example of the fella with the Gremlin...even asking the reporter to help, at least the reporter was around to help. He might not have anybody to help and there are instances in situations like that... So, I don't think the Bill is really necessary, as much as I know that my worthwhile colleague on the other side has worked very assiduously on it..But I do feel that we are going to be depriving some areas of service, due to the ability to meet the standards of this Bill, because to me, "I think the emergency should be addressed no matter what kind of a car there is rather than putting rigorous regimentation and more licensing and more licensing and more bureaucracy till it comes out of our skulls."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition of this legislation. This Bill was defeated in Committee last year by a vote of 11 to 2. It was a bad Bill then and it's still a bad Bill. This legislation will make cost prohib^{ive} for small units of government that are presently having an extremely difficult time in providing ambulance service at all. It will increase costs in the home rule units that have less stringent standards than those established by the Department of Public Health because they will be licensed by both home rule districts and also by the State of Illinois. In all instances proliferation of regulations is the consumer who pays through the nose. And I don't think the Department of Health needs another power grab to justify its existence and I respectfully ask you to vote 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a reference was made to a community in my district and Representative Campbell's who's just arisen in opposition to this Bill. I think he hit the nail squarely on the head. The people in the area that I and he represent, I think, are more concerned about getting an ambulance than the fact that we have some sort of proliferation of qualifications and standards and equipment and so forth. The problem we have in our district is one of finding an ambulance, not so much one of standards and qualifications. We've worked with various ambulance groups and districts and so forth and I think that they do a good and adequate job. I think this would provide a hindrance to them, it might even cause, in some cases, some elements of increase, in fact would in private and public systems and would indeed put some people out of business. It may be laudatory in concept but I think it's going about it in the wrong way and urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor of this Bill very candidly explained that this Bill is intended to solve a problem



that absolutely does not exist. He states that right now all of the...apparently the local regulations and what voluntary regulations that are being carried on by the Department of Public Health are proving more than adequate. As the previous speaker just pointed out, if you're going to add regulation upon regulation in all home rule units and non home rule units, I am told, have power to regulate and in all probability do regulate ambulance services right now. You're going to have duplication of regulations, you're going to have...drive people right out of business with all this red tape, in attempting to solve a problem that doesn't exist. This is one of those situations where I can't understand how this Bill would have gotten emergency status, because as the Sponsor pointed out, there is no ~~X~~ problem at the current time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will!"

Mautino: "Representative, I've heard a lot said about public and private ambulance services. Are you telling me with this legislation, as I read it, that a volunteer ambulance service such as the 10-33 Ambulance Service would also have to have those volunteers licensed and qualified under this legislation?"

Robinson: "The volunteer^s would have to take the 80 hour course as Emergency Medical Technicians. As a matter of fact, almost all... almost all volunteers who are involved in the services avail themselves of the service provided by the Department of Public Health."

Mautino: "That's the E.M.T. Program...now, are you going to license those same people?"

Robinson: "No, the licensure will be for the ambulance system. And to get a license they have to show that the participants have the E.M.T. training."

Mautino: "Well, since they already have it, what is the reason for the licensing?"

Robinson: "Well, you were talking about volunteer ^{ambulance} licenses. There



are some private ambulances that have not gone through E.M.T., although many have and in addition it would require radio equipment and certain kinds of medical equipment on the...on the vehicle. It's been estimated...the Department of Public Health that most of the volunteer, almost all of the volunteer systems that, as you know have been set up recently with the help of the Department of Public Health, would meet these standards. As I said, this is an attempt to catch the fly-by-nights and the fact that many of the volunteer agencies in your district, many of the public and private agencies in all of our districts, need it is because of the pressure the Department of Health has put on them and the eminence of this kind of..."

Mautino: "Hold it...hold it one second, Representative. One final question. How do you license a volunteer ambulance service, since in most cases the board changes every other year and also the administrator, how do you license that facility?"

Robinson: "I don't see any problem with that. It would be licensed as a ...as an entity to exist just like any other."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Representative Bluthardt, for what reason do you rise?"

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes is necessary to pass this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "34..."

Bluthardt: "34..."

Bluthardt: "The question, Mr. Speaker, is whether reduces and restricts home rule power, in that it requires home rule units of government to either adopt these rules or adopt rules more stringent and that is a restriction of home rule powers and I think it would take 107 votes to pass it,"

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian says it's a restriction but not a preemption and it takes 89 votes. Representative Robinson,



to close."

Robinson: "The Bill, as outlined here, would meet the standards of the Federal Highway Safety Act, the standards that the state says it will meet when it takes that Federal Highway Safety Act money and as a matter of fact, we have already used tens of millions of dollars of that money. Studies in other states that have adopted licensure shows that this kind of system will lead to lower mortality and ^{lower} morbidity, fewer people will die, their injuries will be less and less severe if this kind of system is adopted. Do not vote on the basis of prejudices of past years. The fire chiefs in this state support it. Who says local government opposes it when the fire chiefs support it. The ambulance operator association supports it, the funeral operator association supports it and the medical society supports it. This is a good Bill, I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Before I put the question, Representative Bluthardt, Section 19 provides that a home rule unit may establish standards in requirements for ambulance service. It is not a restriction... it does require 89 votes though. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Holewinski, to explain his vote."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This looks a little bit like a hopeless cause. I think I'm going to address the question anyway. I think Representative Robinson hit on one thing at the very end of his comments, I'm afraid no one was listening. Every state in this country has ^{is} mandated, under the Federal Highway Safety Act, to establish some sort of standard ^s for the operations of ambulance services and for the training of those who serve on ambulances. The penalty for not complying with that Federal Act is a loss of Federal Highway Safety Act dollars. Illinois has ^{clawled} ~~got over~~ with this subject matter for a number of years. ^{The} ~~It's~~ early legislation with the subject matter met with considerable resistance but over the years the problems have been worked out. If you ^{took} ~~take~~ the time to read this legislation and to see what it means ⁺ and the



impact it was going to have on your community, you'd find that your local community is probably wholeheartedly behind this effort. The Bill is very simple in concept and sets minimal standards. and all we're asking is that those people who are in the position of... least making the responsible decision about services and if they're lying on a highway injured or something ^{be} ^d ~~it~~ guarantee some sort of minimal level of services. I would ask my colleagues to reconsider this very important Bill. It really is more deserving of your consideration than as it has been treated here today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Point of parliamentary inquiry; Mr. Speaker, are you sure this doesn't take 26 votes to pass?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I hope some of those people that were speaking against this Bill, like Representative Stuffle or somebody don't have to get picked up by some of these fly-by-night operators. They may just pick them up and throw them in the back and when they get to the hospital they'd see a whole mass of bones and whatever. I think somebody should take that into consideration. This is a good Bill and it deserves passage."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we get two more votes...well we've got it...Bluthardt will get his Constitutional 107."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I've always said the way to restrict legislation would be to leave things up to the Committees to come out with Committee Bills and this...this is an indication that that system would work real well."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all... The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 31 'aye' and 109 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the necessary 34 votes, is hereby declared lost. 3079."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3079. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 3079 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code and will provide that schools...there are two in the State of Illinois at the present time, who are vocational schools and they have the right to receive chauffer plates for their trucks. What we're attempting to do in two specialized school systems is to teach young people how to drive the heavy duty equipment. And up until this time no school has had the opportunity to do so. Now we have two school systems that will teach people how to drive, teach young people how to drive heavy duty trucks. We need an exemption in relation to the licensing. The license...the license now costs three thousand dollars and of course that's prohibitive in most of our school systems. This Bill was introduced and requested by the Secretary of State's Office and the Illinois Office of Education. It went to Motor Vehicles and came out 13 to nothing and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Friedrich, are you seeking recognition?"

Friedrich: "Well, I was about 10 minutes ago, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, better late than never. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm voting in favor of this, but for the life of me I can't see why it's an emergency."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Because Polk's the Sponsor.

Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed? 3083. Out of the record. 3097. Out of the record. 3108. Representative Bartulis."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3108. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and it's Macoupin. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3108 eliminates the mandatory requirement that persons convicted of unlicensed driving or driving while their license or permit is revoked or suspended, shall be in prison for not less than seven days. Now, both of these offenses now are considered as Class A Misdemeanors, for which mandatory incarceration penalties of not less than seven days is required. My intent is to reduce the county government expenses associated with the prosecution of these cases. Many of the defendants in these cases are indigent and then the county is forced to pay costs for impaneling the jury, hiring the public defender and incarcerating the convicted individual for a minimum of seven days. Open for any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 16 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, - 3112.3111."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3111. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan,"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during the last Session the Legislature, with the concurrence of the Governor, adopted a program of state support of public museums throughout the state. The responsibility for disbursement of the money was given to the Department of Registration and Education, however, when Director Anderson attempted to disburse the money pursuant to a rule adopted by her office, she was told by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, that she did not have the legislative authority to adopt such a rule. This Bill is intended to give the Director of the Department of Registration and Education the authority to adopt a rule to provide for the



disbursement of that money. Additionally, an Amendment has been to the Bill, which would provide that in no case would the amount of state subsidy exceed 50% of the amount of money provided by the local governmental entity, which is responsible for the operations of the museum."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "What happens if we don't enact this Bill?"

Madigan: "If we don't enact the Bill then I presume that the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules would be required to review its previous decision to the effect that there was no legislative authority for Director Anderson's proposed action."

Totten: "Did the Director disburse funds last year?"

Madigan: "The money that we appropriated has not yet been disbursed. She is waiting for this action."

Totten: "Okay, if we don't act then you're saying she can't disburse it?"

Madigan: "Well, I don't want to go that far. I've familiarized myself with the legislation ^{at} they created on the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules and I'm not sure that that legislation is so specific as to allow me to make a definitive statement."

Totten: "Thank you, no further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "I just request a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bradley in the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'aye', 11 'no', 6 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3112."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3112. A Bill for an Act requiring reimbursement to units of local government. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave to move House Bill 3112 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, the Bill will be returned to Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Yourell- Lynn Martin. Amends House Bill..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, on Amendment #1."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I defer to Representative

Lynn Martin, who suggested the Amendment. The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin."

Martin: "It is really a technical Amendment. There was some clarification of language needed in the Bill. Again, these are Bills that are now... will be identical to House Bill 297, which passed this House by a huge majority. The Amendments have the consent and support of the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3113."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3113. A Bill for an Act requiring reimbursement to units of local government. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave for the same purpose as granted for 3112, to move this Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment,"

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, the Bill is returned to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Yourell - Lynn Martin. Amends House Bill 3113 on page 3 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin."

Martin: "Same Amendment to this Bill."



Speaker
Bradley

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3118."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3118. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill,"

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I was requested by the other side of the aisle to speak very explicitly and implicitly on this Bill because they don't want me to mumble like I do with the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Bradley: "Could the Gentleman have some order."

Giorgi: "This has to do with slot machines. Mr. Speaker, this Bill permits the position of antique slot machines that are neither used or intended to use^b in illegal gambling and it requires the return of a seasoned machine to owner...who successfully relies on the above defense in any court of law. I move for the adoption of this Bill. There's no opposition that I know of."

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

Yourell: "Yes, he might have spoken plainly to the other side but I didn't hear him on this side."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, maybe Representative Giorgi could use someone elses microphone and maybe the microphone is the problem and not Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Thank you..."

Speaker Bradley: "The electrician says he has worked on all the microphones and they're all working well. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "What is an antique slot machine?"

Giorgi: "It's in the industry...a machine 25 years old or older."

Ebbesen: "Does it work?"



✓
Giorgi: "Generally it does. It's a collector's item. It's in someone's basement and being in his basement he's subject to arrest and he's subject to a felony ¹⁰⁰⁵ charge and I don't think we want our people to be...the conspicuously wealthy that collect these things, we don't want them arrested. The poor people don't have them."

Ebbesen: "How many do you have?"

Giorgi: "I don't have any."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Giorgi, do you wish to close the debate?"

Giorgi: "I urge a favorable vote because there is no known opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, every slot machine I ever ran across is a collector's item. That's all it does."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 117 'aye', 13 'nay', 27 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3119."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3119. A Bill for an Act relating to filing of returns on the..."

Speaker Bradley: "Is Mr. O'Brien in the chamber? Take it out of the record. 3129."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3129. A Bill for an Act relating to county and municipal jails. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Dunn in the chamber? Representative Mudd, do you want to handle this... Take it out of the record. Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 3134."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3134. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Do you want that out of the record? The Representative from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman,"

VonBoeckman: "What happened to 3132, Mr. Speaker? We have a..."



Speaker Bradley: "It's been a policy of the Speaker when he was up here..."

VonBoeckman: "We have an Amendment that we...we want to take it back to Second for an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, we'll get back to you... Do you want 3134 out of the record right now?"

VonBoeckman: "Out of the record."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, back up to 3132. The Gentleman is asking leave to return this to Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection the Bill will be returned to Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to table Amendment #1. Representative Neff."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd like to, at this time, table Amendment #1 and then we have another substitute Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 and 2. Do you want those both at the same time, Mr. Neff, or do you want to table..."

Neff: "Both of them, yes."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman is moving to table Amendments #1 and 2 that were adopted earlier to the Bill. And it's agreeable with the Sponsor. So is there any objection to...hearing no objection the two Amendments...Amendments #1 and 2 are tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Neff. Amends House Bill 3132 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1 and 2 were tabled because the Secretary of State found a technical error in those...in both of those and ... #3 clears that up. And so it's a technical clarification that we're asking for on this Amendment #3,"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kosinski would like an explanation of the Amendment."

Neff: "The...the Amendment adds Van Camper to the definitions of home rule. And I better explain the Bill a little bit. What we're doing..."



A year ago we added on extra fees and we intended to just get the vans and pickup trucks with toppers on them because we were finding that was abused...they were buying \$18.00 plates abusing these... using them for transportation of materials, tools and so forth... delivery trucks. And during that process we raised, also, regular trailers...camper trailers and at this time we want to take them back. This Amendment removes the word...adds 'Van Camper' to the definition of motor homes in Section 145.1.... Van Camper was not previously defined in the act. It removes the word 'floor' from the definition of truck camper in Section 123.11, camper shells, which fall under this definition and...which are not built with it... Therefore, this will eliminate confusions that will arise at a later date... Deletes the word 'vehicle' and 'maximum load' and inserts 'trailer' and 'equipment'. This is being done to make the format in this Section consistent with the other Sections of this Act."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kosinski, on the Amendment."

Kosinski: "Clarence, is this the Amendment that we agreed on in Committee?"

Neff: "Yes, it is, Representative. The only thing is, the Secretary of State found a technical error in the way we have it worded."

Kosinski: "All right but nevertheless, the thrust of it is the same as we agreed to in Committee."

Neff: "Yes, what we agreed in..."

Kosinski: "Then I have no objection."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3134. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor, 3147, 3135, Mr. VonBoeckman, Did you wish to return 3135 for an Amendment?"

VonBoeckman: "Yes, I filed a motion. We want to return 3135 to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 3135 to Second Reading? Hearing no objection, we'll return it and it will be



on the Order of Second Reading,"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. VonBoeckman. Amends House Bill 3135 on page 1, line 14 and so forth."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this does is defines chartered bus. And what it also does, it also defines 'being used for the transportation of said persons.' However, this provision of Paragraph B shall not extend the buses chartered for school purposes. And this is a clarification so that we don't involve school buses with...allow liquor."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? If not, the... The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3147."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3147, A Bill for an Act to establish a volunteer program whereby private forest land owners may earn sufficient money..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Harris...the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Harris, on 3147. Out of the record. Take it out of the record."



Speaker Bradley: "3153."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3153. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Sharp, this Bill was taken back to Second today and we've not been...and amended and we've not been calling..."

Sharp: "It was not amended today, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon?"

Sharp: "It was not amended today."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we moved it back and tabled an Amendment and moved it back to Third Reading today and..."

Sharp: "There's nothing wrong there...with that that I see."

Speaker Bradley: "3153."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3153. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp."

Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 3153 is, in my opinion, the first piece of legislation that has come before this General Assembly on Third Reading that tries to address the problem of hazardous waste disposal sites in the State of Illinois. This legislation is a product of a Sub-Committee that was established by the House Environment and Natural Resources Committee. It's a Bill...It's a Committee Bill that was reported out by the House... Natural Resources Committee. And it's legislation that establishes a special fund that calls for the monitoring and the maintenance of hazardous waste disposal sites in the State of Illinois. House Bill 3153 establishes a user fee for the disposal of hazardous wastes in the State of Illinois. The user's fee is to be deposited in a hazardous waste fund that is maintained by the State Treasury. The fee that was established is 2 dollars and 2 cents or...per cubic yard and a penny per gallon of hazardous waste. Sludge from municipal sewage treatment facilities are excluded under this legislation because we feel that the State and Federal



Environmental Protection Agency are taking actions now to correct the problems of hazardous waste in sludge from municipal sewage treatment facilities. Under the legislation the hazardous waste fund is established, a cap of twenty-five million dollars is placed on this fund so that we have adequate revenues available when and if emergencies arise in the state; and also so we have adequate funds to properly monitor these hazardous ^{waste} ~~lake~~ disposal sites in the State of Illinois. The operating budget for the annual monitoring of hazardous waste disposal sites is left up to the discretion of the General Assembly and the appropriations process; so we won't be freely spending the money that's ^{placed} ~~left~~ in this fund. If an emergency should exist at one of the hazardous waste disposal sites it has to be certified by both the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency as well as the Governor of the State of Illinois. In addition to these things, the Illinois Pollution Control Board is placed with the responsibility to set up guidelines for proper closing and maintaining of hazardous waste sites in the State of Illinois. And it says: 'By 1980, the Board shall adopt regulations consistent with federal regulations', which we are expecting later this year, 'requiring standards for the closure, post-closure, monitoring, maintenance and use of hazardous waste disposal sites, as well as requirements and standards for demonstration of financial responsibility by owners and operators of solid waste disposal sites upon closure and post-closure and care of such sites.' I believe that this is a responsible manner to begin addressing the problem of hazardous waste disposal sites in the State of Illinois. I am very familiar, as well as Representatives ~~Riley~~ and Bartulis, with the problems of hazardous waste disposal sites in the State of Illinois. As everyone here knows, the problems of Wilsonville have been clearly explained, not only in our district but throughout the State of Illinois. The people are demanding that we, as Legislators, take meaningful action to deal with this problem. I believe that setting up this fund will guarantee that we have the resources available to

Riilly



take care of any problems that may arise at these sites and I would ask for the favorable action of the House of Representatives."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schuneman: "Representative Sharp, under the present set up on these hazardous waste sites, if the contractor should leave the site whose responsibility is it to maintain and monitor those sites in the future?"

Sharp: "Well, that's one of the questions that nobody seems to be able to answer. The state, I guess, would have to pick up the burden because we do have the hazardous waste sites. It would be a...threat to the welfare and well-being of the public and unless we could go after the past owner I guess it would fall upon us."

Schuneman: "So if the past owner had gone out of business, for example, the State of Illinois is going to get stuck with the Bill. Is that what you're saying?"

Sharp: "I would imagine that's what would happen..."

Schuneman: "Under our present set up?"

Sharp: "That's right."

Schuneman: "Now, what kind of fees do you propose to charge for the disposal of the hazardous waste?"

Sharp: "We're talking about 2 dollars and 2 cents per cubic yard and a penny per gallon. And it's estimated that this will bring in the neighborhood of 4 to 6 million dollars annually but we do have the cap of twenty-five million dollars on the fund."

Schuneman: "Is there, in the Bill, proposals for these fees to go into a trust fund so that that money will be in some kind of trust fund posture rather than into the General Revenue Fund?"

Sharp: "Yes, it goes into the special fund...hazardous waste fund."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 3153. I think we've had a severe problem building for the future unless we pass legislation such as that embodied in this Bill. One of the waste sites used by the



State of Illinois is in my district, at Sheffield, and we're very much concerned about the possibility of the proper monitoring of that site in the future. And I would certainly urge support of this very good Bill."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really just can't find anything wrong with the Bill, the concept of the Bill, but I'm not an attorney...but I am concerned about the constitutionality of this Bill - whether we're giving the Environmental Protection Agency the legislative power to tax. Are we setting a dangerous precedent here by doing so?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker... ~~Mr. Sharp~~, could I respond ~~to that?~~" *Mr. Sharp,*

Speaker Bradley: "I didn't realize he was asking a question. If it wasn't a question, why don't you wait until we close the debate? Is that all right? Mr. Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I stand in support of this Bill because it is vital, because the numerous and costly responsibilities associated with hazardous refuse disposal will be borne by those creating the hazard - and it makes economic sense. Illinois will end its subsidy of the hazardous refuse disposal industry as monitoring becomes a cost of their doing business. And also, this is the last and only Bill left in this Session which concerns hazardous refuse and the state should begin to place responsibility on the care of those sites ^{who} are creating the problems before state costs get out of hand."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know whether I'm particularly in favor or against this piece of legislation, but I'm reading the analysis of the Bill and I think that the Membership should be aware that we're giving an awful lot of power to the E.P.A. And if the E.P.A., which I think stands for Environmental Pollution Agency, not protection...and we sort of sanctify the E.P.A. by giving



✓ them rule-making authority and rights to tax and rights to make
 their own regulations, I think we should be a little suspect before
 we just willy-nilly pass^s another piece of legislation giving
 that organization any kind of authority. All you have to do is
 go around in this state and find out what E.P.A. has done for
 you in Illinois. Have they protected anyone? All they have
 done is moved the pollution around, that's all they have done.
 They haven't done one damn thing to correct pollution of any
 kind in this state. And I predict..I predict..that by giving the
 E.P.A. any more power. all you're going to do is..not correct the
 abuses in pollution, all you're going to do is have them funnel
 them in your district maybe, next time, because that's all that
 ✓ organization stands for; environmental pollution, not^{for} environmental
 protection because they haven't done a damn thing in Illinois
 to protect any citizen. What has happened in Illinois in the
 past year on pollution protection by this organization? They
 go and they remove standards, go before the Pollution Control
 Board and ask for willy-nilly standards. I don't think giving this
 Bill passage should sanctify the E.P.A. one bit. And I don't
 think we should pass it easily."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp."

Sharp: "Yes, would he please address the Bill and not the E.P.A."

Speaker Bradley: "I think he's finished. The Gentleman..."

Hanahan: "I conclude by saying, that the Bill itself may be well-founded,
 the concepts may be good, but in the Bill is giving the power to
 an organization that is phony, as far as I'm concerned, in protecting
 the Citizens of Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Riley."
Riley

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

I rise in support of this Bill. In response to the last speaker,
 it seems to me that...that while we do have to be careful about
 grants of power to administrative agencies and particularly this
 one, we need to look at the power that's being granted. And in
 this Bill there are more standards set up for the exercise of this
 power, there are more limits to that power than in almost any other



Bill that we've enacted, dealing with environmental protection. But in general, let me say, that I think this Bill must be enacted by the General Assembly. We can't prevent the tragedy that's already occurred at Wilsonville, the tragedy at Wilsonville has occurred and the courts are going to have to rule on that issue in one way or another. But we can protect and we can provide protection for the future sites and for the site at Wilsonville and for other sites of that kind. For too long we have ignored the fact that our society, in producing the kind of materials we need for our standard of living, produces as an inevitable by-product - waste; and that those wastes are sometimes hazardous to the environment. We can't prevent that, we can't stop that, but we can stop ignoring that and this Bill takes the responsible first step towards providing protection. It simply says, that those who create these wastes and who benefit from the creation of these wastes must bear the cost of protecting us into the future against the consequences of those wastes. I think it's a very simple Bill, very well worked out and should receive a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill had ample hearings before the Sub-Committee of the Illinois... the Energy Environment and Natural Resources Committee. This Bill is a Bill that is a necessity because this Bill is going to alert that those companies creating health risks are finally going to be financially responsible for the present and future care of the hazardous sites. I think it's a good Bill. It was passed out with a good vote in the Illinois Energy Natural Resource Environment Committee and I certainly wholeheartedly support this Bill and let's get on with the show."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor signify



by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Sharp, the Gentleman from Madison, to close the debate."

Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this type of legislation, I think, is...is long overdue. Today we passed legislation providing funds for an agency to determine which abandoned mine sites in the state are going to be reclaimed, at your expense and my expense. What we're trying to do here is guarantee that down the road somewhere that we don't have a bunch of hazardous ^{waste} landfill sites on our hands that we don't know what to do with and then we ask the taxpayers to take care of that problem too. We also want to have adequate funds to guarantee that we're monitoring these sites properly and that we have funds to take care of any emergencies that might arise at them. This legislation is necessary, from my first-hand experience in my district. This is not going to satisfy the people in Wilsonville. They don't want a hazardous landfill in the middle of their community and I can't blame them. But at least if an emergency arises there or if down the road the courts say that landfill has to be closed, we'll have the money to take care of whatever corrective action is necessary. There are hazardous waste landfill sites throughout this state. We need the money to make sure that these landfill operations are run properly and that we can take care of any problems that might arise there. I ask for your favorable support on this legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 159 'aye', no 'no', 3 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 3191."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3191. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz. Out of the record. 3201. Mr. Ewell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3201. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Purchasing Act of the Metropolitan Sanitary District. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill requested by the Sanitary District. It simply makes some technical changes and allows them to conform with some federal laws in relationship to their contracting."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? If not, the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMasters, to explain his vote."

McMaster: "I was trying to get back over here, Mr. Speaker, in order to ask a question. Mr. Ewell, is this the Bill you had in Committee that would allow the Sanitary District to take a bid other than the lowest and best bid?"

Ewell: "In some fashion, yes, Sir."

McMaster: "In other words it's kind of a destruction of the law that says a municipality or unit of government must take the lowest and best bid?"

Ewell: "No, Sir. What happens is, is they do have some bidding by minority contractors and the like and what happens is sometimes it's very difficult to get to an absolute low bid when you're talking about smaller items. And in an effort to comply with some of the federal laws, they came in and this is what they requested and this is how they explained it, very adequately in Committee and I do think it's a very good Bill."

McMaster: "Ray, I'm not against the use of the minorities and the hiring and bidding and one thing or another but it does concern me if we ever get away from the law that says we must take the lowest and



best bid. I think that happens to be a very good law and I wish we could adhere to it. I realize your problem and your position, Ray."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, there's some agencies that have already done this. The Regional Transportation Authority, for example, just let a \$200,000 contract to Continental Bus when there were four willing bidders who were never asked to bid. I presume, however, Continental would be considered a minority enterprise in the R.T.A.'s way of thinking."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ewell, do you wish to explain your vote, Sir?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps we ought to confer with the Minority Party or something on this Bill and find out what defects they see in it. I didn't see any defects and it looked like a good Bill to me. And I'm sort of appalled at the number of people voting 'present'. And you know...you know, no real opposition to this kind of structure. And maybe I ought to take this out of the record and confer with the... Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could just poll the absentees once and try to let it go at that."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will poll the absentees. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Breslin. Daniels. Ebbesen. Friedrich. Hart. Hoffman. Hudson. Emil Jones. Kempiners. Marovitz. McClain. Meyer. Schneider. Schoeberlien. Schuneman. Stearney and Winchester."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question... Mr. Ewell. Turn Mr. Ewell on."

Ewell: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman asks leave to have Postponed Consideration and it will be placed on that order of business. 3203."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3203. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is a...Amendment to the Pension Code of the Sanitary District. It's a Bill that attempts to help alcoholics that are now employed by the Sanitary District. And what it does is, it deletes chronic alcoholism as an exclusion for ordinary disability benefits and it provides that if a person submits to a rehabilitation program then they can get ordinary disability benefits when they're sick from drinking too much. So, the purpose of it is a very humane purpose and I urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 102 'aye', 2 'nay', 24 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have a motion relating to House Bill 2778. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, earlier today before many Members were present, there were 33 absent as a matter of fact, a Bill passed the House, which I was recorded as voting on the favorable Roll Call on the affirmative side and I now move to reconsider that vote by which it passed so that more Members and the Membership could have the opportunity to base the merits or the demerits of the Bill and I ask for a favorable Roll Call for that motion to reconsider on House Bill 2778."

Speaker Bradley: "Having voted on the prevailing side the Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 2778 passed. On that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I object to that motion. I think the Bill was adequately discussed. It was talked about and as far as I'm concerned, I don't think it should be. I don't see why the Bill is still here. Hasn't it left the House already?"

Speaker Bradley: "I'm told that the Bill is still here, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Well, I move that that motion be tabled."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Byers, on a point of order. State your point."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, is this motion debatable?"

Speaker Bradley: "The motion to table or the motion to reconsider?"

Byers: "The motion to reconsider?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes. The motion to table is not debatable and the Gentleman has moved to table Mr. Hanahan's motion to reconsider. So, on that question those in favor of tabling shall vote 'aye', opposed shall vote 'no'. We're voting on Mr. Giglio's motion to table Mr. Hanahan's motion to reconsider House Bill 2778. If you're in favoring of tabling and leaving the Bill where it is presently, as passed, you vote with Mr. Giglio and that's 'aye'. If you vote to reconsider, to support Mr. Hanahan, you vote 'no'. The tabling motion is not debatable. Mr. Hanahan, to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it's quite unfair of the Gentleman from Cook to allege that the Bill was debated. There was not one word said that this Bill is opposed by the AFL-CIO. There was not one word said that the Department of Administrative Services opposed the Bill. There was not one word said in debate when a lot of people here on the floor of the House were absent. The fact remains..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan... He's not debating, he's explaining his vote. One minute..."

Hanahan: "I'm explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker and why I came to the conclusion I did to move to reconsider and then on this motion to table, I'm opposed to this motion to table. It's based simply on a fairness doctrine that this House should always have uppermost. And the fairness that I'm asking is many Members of this House were misled by the ^{switch} quickness of the movement of this Bill out of the House. There's some Members, including myself, that were recorded as favorable on this Bill that were not present and that were not here to vote their switch but had it recorded as voting favorable. I happen to be one of those people. This Bill is a very bad Bill. It should be reconsidered by this House. The Sponsor himself knows he has no way of passing this Bill in the



Senate. He should at least have the courtesy to allow a new Roll Call to be taken on this Bill and I ask for a negative vote on the motion to table."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, on a point of order."

Leinenweber: "Actually a parliamentary inquiry. The Gentleman has indicated he did not vote on the affirmative side and somebody pushed his switch. Is this motion in order? That's a matter of the record too because he just said it."

Speaker Bradley: "We have to assume that he was here when the vote was cast. There was no objection at that time and so your objection is not timely. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 88 'aye' and 53 'nay' and the Gentleman's motion to table prevails. 3204."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3204. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Purchasing Act for the Metropolitan Sanitary District of greater Chicago. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

House Bill 3204 amends the Purchasing Act of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of greater Chicago. This Bill adds a new Section to the Purchasing Act, in that it would bar for three years the awarding of a contract or sub-contract to a company with an officer or agent who has been convicted or made an admission of bribing or attempting to bribe a federal, state or local government official or employee. This is very similar to a provision added to the State Purchasing Act last year. A provision which incidentally has been upheld by the courts, Chapter 127, Paragraph 132.10-1. The intent is to cover both those who are convicted of such offenses and those who admit such offenses and ^{are} ~~then~~ granted immunity and thereby escape conviction and punishment.

The Bill contains language to cover situations where an intermediary was used. The prohibition ^{begins} ~~became~~ upon conviction, public ^{disclosure} ~~exposure~~ of the admission or at the final determination of an appeal...

This Bill, House Bill 3204, is an ethics Bill and I urge a favorable



DATE
✓

vote on House Bill 3204."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from...the Gentleman from McHenry,
Mr. Skinner."

✓ Skinner: "May I ask the ^{ethical} Sponsor a question or two?"

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

Skinner: "From what date does the three years start running, from the
date of sentencing, from the date of grant of immunity, or what?"

Yourell: "It would bar for three years, three years the awarding of
a contract or sub-contract to a company who has been convicted or
made admission of bribing or attempting to bribe a federal, state
or local government employee. So I would assume that it would
be upon conviction."

Skinner: "I appreciate that interpretation because if you had answered
that it would be the date when the offense took place it's con-
ceivable the 'England Barge Company' would be eligible today
to be able to again contract with the Metropolitan Sanitary
District. I would point out for the General Assembly's information
that this is a much weaker Bill than was sponsored by Representative
Stearney and myself last year. We forbade these people from ever
being able to sell things to the State of Illinois. This
only allows...this is only a three year limitation."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Representative Skinner just touched on the question that I
had, Buz, and that is, why did you limit it to the three year non-
award? Why not extend that beyond three years?"

Yourell: "Well, Representative Tuerk, if you want to place an Amendment
to this Bill, I'd be delighted to return it to Second Reading
for that purpose."

Tuerk: "Well, I was just interested in why you picked the three years
and why not a longer period?"

Yourell: "Well, I don't see any magic about the number 3. If you
want it 4 or 5 I have no objection."

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



Mr. Schlickman."

✓ Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? On page 2 of the Bill you charge a corporation with the criminal act of an employee and make that charged ~~X~~ based on the direction or authorization of a responsible official. Is there a definition of 'responsible official' anywhere in the statutes, or do you know of any case law by which the words 'responsible official' are defined?"

Yourell: "No."

Schlickman: "If a corporation the size of U.S. Steel has two individuals in its Purchasing Department and these two individuals, between them, engage in the kind of illegal conduct that you set forth in this Bill, on what basis or by what theory of law would you make U.S. Steel chargeable with that illegal action and prohibit the Sanitary District from entering into any contract with U.S. Steele for a three year period?"

Yourell: "Well, I would suggest to you, Representative Schlickman, that not being an attorney I'm not...I do not know the law as the case law that you recite or have knowledge if that is in the law or in the statutes. All I can suggest to you is that this is the legislation that I'm proposing. And the word 'responsible' has a meaning to me, as I am sure it has to you, as an attorney. And I think this is good legislation and gets to the point of the problem that we've been experiencing, not only with the Sanitary District but at other levels of government as well. Now, I can't tell you what the court is going to adjudicate or what they're going to determine as to who is liable. They would have to use the verbage in the legislation, if it passes of course, and make a determination at that time."

✓ Schlickman: "Do you agree that my hypothetical example is correct in that if two persons within the Purchasing Department of U.S. Steel engage in the illegal conduct that the Metropolitan Sanitary District would prescribe the prohibited ^{ive} for a three year period? From entering into any contract with U.S. Steel?"

Yourell: "Well that's the way the Bill reads. And I would suggest that's right now if you have a problem with the...the plurality or the



singleness of the responsible official or officer, I think that you could interpret the word 'responsible officer' or 'official' as to meaning anyone and not specifically one, but more than one."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to close the debate. Oh, I'm sorry, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Willer: "Representative Yourell, what if the Sanitary...what if this applies to, say an official from Illinois Bell was found guilty of this, could the Sanitary...would the Sanitary District be prohibited from having any kind of business to do with the Telephone Company?"

Yourell: "I can't hear you, Representative."

Willer: "Would this apply to a company like Illinois Bell? The Sanitary District certainly cannot do without their services. What if an official of or a member of the Illinois Bell Telephone Company was convicted of this offense?"

Yourell: "I would assume that's correct, Representative."

Willer: "Well then the Sanitary District would be doing without telephone service."

Yourell: "Well I would assume that's correct."

Willer: "Thank you."

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

Katz: "Yes, if the Gentleman would yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he would."

Katz: "Well, I'm concerned, Mr. Yourell, that the effect of this may be to discourage people who have engaged in unlawful activity from reporting the activity. The only thing worse than a company official who is bribing a public agent is one who does that and gets away with it. And so I am concerned that this may discourage people who have participated in that kind of activity from ever revealing that fact, since if they do their company is going to get clobbered. And as Mr. Schlickman has pointed out, they may be a minor official in that company. What would you say to that, Sir?"



Yourell: "If I understand the...the rhetoric and the question, the rhetoric was rather lengthy and I had difficulty following it, but I would suggest to you, Sir, that we can in no instance determine whether a person would report that incident or would not report it. I think we're talking about, or you're suggesting that we have a matter dealing with human nature here and all I'm trying to do is to prevent a person or a company who has an official responsible for attempting to bribe a government official or employee, from ever doing business with that entity again for a period of three years."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Yourell, to close the debate, Sir."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know this is a rather difficult concept to understand when the two preceding Bills had to do with an entirely different subject matter. And this is simply an attempt by the Sanitary District and the Sponsor to try, in some measure, to prevent what has happened in other instances. Not only with the Sanitary District, but with other entities of government as well. I think that if there is an opportunity for discussion in the Senate, if this Bill gets there, if there seems to be a disagreement or a magic number, magic...to some number, why these contracts should not be awarded for three or four or five or maybe forever, I have no objections. I think this is good legislation and I urge your support because it gets to a problem that is presently creating some difficulty with the Sanitary District. I'd appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record, On this question there are 140 'aye', 7 'nay', 11 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3205, Representative Yourell, on 3205 Mr. Levin and you are Cosponsors. Do you want to handle it or wait till Mr. Levin is here?"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3205. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the



Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Yourell: "No, I think I'd rather have Representative Levin..."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out...take it out of the record then?
3209."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3209. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections
of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the
Bill."

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

McLendon: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the
Environmental Protection Act to authorize local governments
to adopt affirmative action measures to comply with state
and federal grant requirements. This, of course, was conferred
upon the designated units of local government in order for
them to adopt the ordinances, regulations necessary for them
to be eligible for federal grants for the construction of
sewage plants. This legislation adds a provision for authorizing
units of local government that own and operate sewage work
to adopt ordinances and regulations deemed appropriate to comply
with the state and federal grants and regulations. As to affirmative
action and the utilization of small businesses to the...and the
construction and procurement contracts. I ask the support of
the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would
like to point out that this Bill appears to be virtually the
same Bill as the one that was defeated a few moments ago except
that it ^affects a different agency of government, but it does
allow ^{bidding} ~~giving~~ without regard to the lowest responsible bidder."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, for the
purpose of an announcement."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, for purposes of an announcement to allay some
fears of Democratic Members, the cocktail party scheduled by
Dick Troy, the Democratic candidate for Attorney General, has
been scheduled to begin at 7:00 rather than 6:00. The notices
you received had indicated that the party would start at 6:00 and



it has been rescheduled for 7:00."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McLendon, to close the debate. Oh, pardon me... Mr. Skinner, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from McHenry, on the Bill."

Skinner: "No, I wanted to know if we could come too, to this cocktail party?"

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

McLendon: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill came out of the Committee on Environment Energy and Natural Resources by a vote of 12 to nothing. It is an entirely different Bill from the one presented by Representative Yourell a few moments ago and if the Representative will take the time to read the Bill she will be able to distinguish between this Bill and the one presented by Representative Yourell. I ask, at this time, an affirmative vote from the House."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 180 'aye', 19 'nay', 22 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3218."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3218. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to injunctions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from ^{Cook} ~~Frank~~, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3218 is a Bill from the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County. It would delete the implied appointment of the Clerk as an agent and would instead require the copy of the enforcement motion and notice go directly to the surety either by service or by mail. The Circuit Court of Cook County, in recognition of the risk involved, has attempted to reduce this risk by enacting a rule of the court, effective February 1, 1978, requiring such notice and motion be served on the Clerk personally, or his deputy clerk assigned to the department, division or district in which the case has been filed. The proposed Amendment should be



enacted into law to eliminate this problem and I would appreciate your support of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McClain would like to be recorded as 'aye'. Matijevich... Representative Matijevich, would you push Representative McClain's green light? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 162 'aye', no 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3219."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3219. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act and revise the law in relation to Clerks and Courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, since everyone understood that legal description of the previous Bill, I would like leave of the House to bring back House Bill 3219 to Second Reading for a correction of a...a little technicality in the Bill. It's a..."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to bring it back to Second Reading? Hearing no objection, the Bill will be returned to Second Reading."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2. Terzich. Amends House Bill 3219 on page..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, on Amendment #2,"

Terzich: "Yes, the House Enrolling and Engrossing has brought to my attention the omission of a line in House Bill 3219. It simply includes felony complaints - \$30,00' and the word 'misdemeanor' and I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment ... of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3219. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I have a question for the Sponsor. Will you run through that once more, Bob?"



Terzich: "Yes. When they drew up the Bill the fees that are being changed on there...they didn't put the word in there 'felony complaints 30.00' and I believe misdemeanor was 20.00. So we're just adding on 'felony complaints' and 'misdemeanor'. That was brought to my attention by the Enrolling and Engrossing."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3225. Out of the record. 3227. Out of the record. 3228. Out of the record, 3257."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3257. A Bill for an Act relating to the exchange of real estate between the State of Illinois and the Department of Transportation Division of Water Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a land exchange that's been negotiated between the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Department of Conservation, the Vermilion County Conservation District and... Actually, what is happening here, at the time of the purchase of land...acquisition of land for the middle fork reservoir...this neither prevents nor promotes the middle fork reservoir, I want everyone to know in this House. First of all, at the time of the acquisition of the land the...the Department of Transportation purchased some...acquired some of the land and the Vermilion County Conservation District also acquired some of the land. It ended up that in the...the patchwork of land that is owned on both sides of the river by both parties and we have a very good Vermilion County Conservation District and they would like to consolidate the land holdings on the East side of the river to consolidate that so that they could make it accessible to the public. And in exchange for that, to give back to the state, dollar for dollar based on the actual purchase price, the West side of the river which is contiguous with Kikapoo State Park. It will be more manageable from the standpoint of the



state and I know of no opposition to the Bill and I would appreciate your favorable support... It's dollar for dollar exchange and equal number of acres between the state and the Vermilion County Conservation District."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? If none... The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chuck, what's the intention as far as you can tell, of water resources...or the Division of Waterways rather, what is their intention with that property you're exchanging one for one? I know in their area, for example, they're dumping spoilage from dredging onto wet lands and I'm a little curious about what you think they'll be doing with that property."

Campbell: "That is simply going to the state and presumably they will just hold title to it and possibly make it adjacent to Kikapoo State Park. Are you talking about the Vermilion County Conservation District or are you talking about ..."

Schneider: "You're saying it's a one to one exchange, right?"

Campbell: "It is a dollar for dollar exchange based on the original purchase price of acquisition of the land."

Schneider: "Is there...there's property involved, right? You're transferring property?"

Campbell: "There's roughly 1,280 acres both ways, with a value of approximately 481 thousand dollars. And there is no dollars to be exchanged between the two..."

Schneider: "I just have some concern with that division in state government. They're the equivalent of the Corp^s of Engineers on the federal level, And because I am that suspicious I think I'll oppose the Bill and I understand it has nothing to do with the middle fork and all of that but my opposition is purely directed toward my apprehension over that agency."

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

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Doesn't this make it easier, both for the local conservation district and the State of Illinois to manage its land holdings?"



Campbell: "Yes it does. Very much so. The state will have the lands on the West side of the river, which is adjacent to ^cKikapoo _^ State Park and the Vermilion County Conservation District, which does an excellent job, will have the land holdings on the East side of the river."

Leverenz: "And it will eliminate just a hodgepodge of land ownership?"

Campbell: "That is exactly correct."

Leverenz: "You couldn't build a reservoir without having both sides."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Campbell... Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "In answer to you, Glen Schneider, perhaps I can get your vote now, it's the intention of the Division of Waterways to transfer the land to the Illinois Department of Conservation for use of wildlife refuge. I've just been informed of that matter."

Speaker Bradley: "We called on you to answer Mr. Leverenz question... Turn Mr. Schneider on..."

Schneider: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I do trust the Department of Conservation far more than that other unnamed agency and therefore I will support the proposal."

Campbell: "Thank you,"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leverenz,"

Leverenz: "Representative, the Department of Conservation then is in full support of the Bill?"

Campbell: "Yes."

Leverenz: "You've got my vote,"

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Campbell, do you wish to close? Do you wish to close, Mr. Campbell?"

Campbell: "I'd ask for your favorable support,"

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 167 'aye', no 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3260."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3260, A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the fees of Sheriffs, Recorder of Deeds and



County Clerks. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. In three instances in the Act regarding fees to Sheriffs and County Clerks and Recorders, there was a fee changed in Cook County and the County Clerk's Office from a dollar in one instance to two and from a dollar fifty to two in another instance. There was a lawsuit filed on this and the monies have been placed in escrow because of the lawsuit...has ruled that it's unconstitutional, under the home rule power, to raise this. And I'm seeking this legislation to rectify this situation. I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'aye', 3 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3269."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3269. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Park District Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

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

House Bill 3269 is a Bill which would permit the Illinois Parks and Recreation District to increase the levy to ten cents. Now this is by a referendum and it does not apply to the Chicago Park District. So keep in mind this is by referendum only and it permits the Park Districts to increase their levy to ten cents."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'aye', 11 'no', 6 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3272."



Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3272. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year the General Assembly passed and the Governor signed into law a Bill that provided for indemnification of corporate officers, directors and employees. It brought Illinois into compliance since 48 of the 50 states, not including Illinois, already had legislation of this type on their books. So we became the 49th. This Bill addresses the same problem for Illinois Insurance Companies. As you know, they do not fall under the Business Corporation Act and it would simply extend the protection of that law to Illinois Insurance Companies and I know of no opposition to it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, In addressing the Bill, last year the Bill that Representative Porter is referring to was a Bill of, at least in my opinion, some considerable controversy. Because it represented the first time, that I'm aware of, that we had taken a posture of allowing corporations to indemnify their officers and agents for criminal actions done apparently in the scope of their corporate activities. There was a specific piece though that Representative Porter, who was the Sponsor of the Bill at that time, was referring to which had imposed strict liability in a criminal...in a federal criminal proceeding for corporate officers and agents who were not...personally knowledgeable of the acts of the corporation. It was on that basis that I was persuaded at least that it was not a bad Bill. But I am unpersuaded that we should extend that concept of indemnifying officers of industrial...of...insurance companies along the same line. This is a relatively new concept to indemnify corporate officers or agents for criminal acts. Before we start expanding that concept I think that we should take away...to see attitude, to see what the result it on it as far as corporate entities before we extend it to insurance carriers. I don't think the provision here is well founded at this time and I would ask



for a negative vote."

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

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I couldn't agree with my good friend, Dan Houlihan, more. If there's any one industry that should be taken a very close look at that's the insurance industry of this state. I don't have to recall to the Membership of this House the escalating rates, not only on automobiles but in industrial as well as individual homes. Many homes in my area are not even afforded a renewal. And now we've got a Bill here to indemnify the directors of the insurance companies. If there's anything that should be defeated it's this Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Well, I'd like to add my voice to those who oppose this measure. Just a little while ago we Members of the General Assembly and I had some problems with that Bill... However, a great majority of the Members here voted that we should not allow those who attempt to bribe, for example, to do business with the State of Illinois. I don't think we ought to, by this Bill, indemnify those who might be guilty of criminal acts. As far as I'm concerned, I just got my notice of what my insurance rates are going to be on my automobile, as far as I'm concerned, whoever figured that ~~audit~~...ought to be guilty of a crime and I certainly wouldn't want to see him indemnified. But the truth of the matter is, I agree with both Representative Houlihan and Representative Lechowicz, that we could not, as a Body, indemnify those really of criminal acts."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a lot of these concepts are already extended to banks and some other companies that are using this indemnification provision right now. But I know there are a substantial number of questions here that I think can be straightened out very early. I might suggest to the Sponsor that maybe he might want to take it out of the record



for the moment to answer the questions of Mr. Houlihan and Mr. Lechowicz. I know they can be answered, so they can understand it better."

Speaker Bradley: "...Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, it's rather amazing to me that the same Gentlemen that are speaking against the Bill were those people who voted it out of the Insurance Committee unanimously earlier. There must be some questions on their mind and so I think I will take it out of the record and address those off the floor."

Speaker Bradley: "Take the Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor."



Speaker Bradley: "3274."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3274. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3274 amends the Public Community College Act. It provides for the Community College Board to vote to abolish its working cash fund by Resolution and transfer those monies to the operating fund. The current Act allows for the funds to be established but not abolished. This provides that it could be done once only every ten years and could not start a new working cash fund the following year. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have several questions for the Sponsor."

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

Leinenweber: "Representative Leverenz, how many of the community colleges have these working cash funds?"

Leverenz: "I don't know the answer. I would expect that they all do."

Leinenweber: "And what is the statutory limit to the size of the amount of bonds that can be issued to supply the cash funds?"

Leverenz: "Each would be different as it was enacted by the local board."

Leinenweber: "It's my recollection, when an Amendment, I think, was under discussion you mentioned that a particular Junior College Board had a limit of 7 million. Is that right?"

Leverenz: "I talked about no 7 million dollar figure."

Leinenweber: "My recollection is you were discussing a particular... a particular junior college district the previous time this Bill was up, didn't you?"

Leverenz: "We talked about a couple of them, yes, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Well, specifically the Triton, how...what is their limit for working cash funds?"

Leverenz: "I don't know what their limit is."

Leinenweber: "Well how much money would this involve for..."

Leverenz: "Four million."

Leinenweber: "And what about the other junior college districts?"



Leverenz: "Sir, I don't know. What this does is allow them, at the local level, to have the choice to abolish their working cash fund."

Leinenweber: "I have another question in the Bill. You also have changed a 'shall' to 'may' in the Bill, which provided...the law previously provided, as I read it, that when a district had a working cash fund then it must transfer funds into the particular fund, being educational or building and maintenance purposes fund, in order to avoid wherever possible the issuance of tax anticipation warrants. And as I see the Bill, that goes from 'shall' to 'may'. Why is that on?"

Leverenz: "That they may rather than shall."

Leinenweber: "Why is that in there?"

Leverenz: "Permissive."

Leinenweber: "Well, wouldn't that permit, enable a particular district who is in a position where they either have to use the working cash fund or issue tax anticipation warrants to...that has a working cash fund, to ignore that...transfer that into whatever fund this Bill permits and then go ahead in the same year and issue tax anticipation warrants?"

Leverenz: "I don't believe so, the way it's written, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on the Bill, I'd like to make a couple of points. One thing, when the Junior College District Act was passed provisions were put in for the establishment of a working cash fund. This was all to be done without voter... without necessary voter approval and provided by Resolution they could create the fund, by Resolution they can establish the amount of the permissible issuance of bonds up to 75% of the total taxes ^{per} submitted to be levied for educational and building purposes. And in districts that say, have two billion dollars assessed valuation...I think most of them do and most of these districts have tax rates in the neighborhood of 33 cents, this would enable them to issue bonds up to 7 million dollars without voter approval. They can sell these bonds and they can issue...they can levy a tax to pay for these bonds all by Resolution. Now, this statute



also provided, these are not to be current assets and they're not to be appropriated. Now, what this Bill simply does, by a backdoor method, it enables the local Junior College Boards and not just any particular one but all of them in the state, by Resolution to turn a working cash fund, which by statute is not an asset, into an asset subject to being appropriated. And not only that, the same Bill changes what we had originally put in the Act which mandated the use of the working cash fund. "In a situation where a district cannot meet its bills out of current tax receipts, we permit them...even though they have a working cash fund, to go ahead and issue tax anticipation warrants and then by Resolution transfer the entire working cash fund, which may in certain districts be up to 7 million dollars or higher in a particular year. And the very...two years later, all you got to do is skip one year and two years later they'll come back again without voter approval and start the whole process over. This is a, about the backdooriest (sic) way to provide for a one-time tax increase on behalf of your taxpayers that I've ever seen. You're going to find out that all junior colleges in the district...in the state are going to abolish their working cash funds and go out and spend this money on building a new building or doing whatever they want to do with it and issue tax anticipation warrants at the same time. This is a very bad Bill. It ought to be defeated and I certainly hope that we do so."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr, Speaker, this is really a terrible proposal. I've read the testimony of the proponents, I'd like to quote from one of them, he says: 'This is a very conservative piece of legislation. It minimizes abuse and corrects the deficiency in the original Community College Act while maintaining its intent.' I would suggest instead that this is a very conservative rip-off of the taxpayer. It minimizes abuse against the taxpayer. It creates a deficiency in the Community College Act, question mark? Do you know what it really does? It enacts the same system that



local high schools and grade schools and unit school districts have been abusing the taxpayer with for decades. The community college districts want to be treated like universities when they get their funding in Appropriations I. but they want to be treated like the little guys, the elementary and secondary schools when it comes to ripping off the taxpayer and that's what this Bill will allow junior colleges to do. They may create a working ^{cash} ~~tax~~ fund, using the rhetoric that it will save interest, we won't have to borrow from the bankers anymore to pay anticipation warrants. And then they can abolish that working cash fund and two years later do the same thing again, same rhetoric. I should think the General Assembly would have learned experience, the bad experience that high schools and grade schools and unit school districts have had in abusing working cash funds and would have learned enough to resoundingly defeat this proposed rip-off against the taxpayers which...by the way, I noticed that all those conservative Democrats who are going to be campaigning on protecting the property tax payers this fall, are sponsoring. How amazing. Is Bakalis really for this? I can't imagine."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, to close the debate."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some of the information that was provided by an earlier speaker, I think does not fit, in that this can only be abolished every ten years. It is not like any elementary or high school district and that it could not start a working cash fund for a minimum of two years. With those provisions, I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's with reluctance I get up here to explain my vote and tell you that I'm voting: 'no' and I'm asking you to vote 'no' likewise. This Bill is designed for Triton College, which is in my district. Triton College did receive,



through the help of Mr. Leverenz, the Sponsor of this Bill and also with my help, 6.6 million from the State of Illinois. They submitted... They were in need of additional money, they submitted a question to a referendum about a week ago and that referendum lost. I know they're in dire need for a couple million dollars and this is where they hope to get it. On the other hand, if you look at the principle of this, you just can't buy it because what it is is... It's an additional tax upon the People of the State of Illinois of the community college districts without a referendum. I did make a proposition earlier today that if you would eliminate, if you would provide that at no time thereafter may you reestablish a working cash fund, perhaps I could support this Bill. That was not acceptable; nevertheless, what's going to happen here is that every ten years they're going to abolish the working cash fund, pick up another 4 or 5... incidentally, Triton College has an assessed valuation that will allow them to raise nine and a half million dollars this way. So every ten years they could raise nine and a half million dollars, abolish it every ten years and then reinstate it two years later. I think that is the wrong way to raise funds. I think it's a misuse of the original statute that provided for working cash funds and I think you ought to vote against this Bill."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to reiterate what Representative Bluthardt so courageously said because Triton College is in his district, almost all of his district. I have a part of Triton College, a very small part, in my district. But the thing that you ought to all be considering is that this applies to each and every junior college district. This is what those cards and letters that people have been writing to you about property taxes is all about. This amounts to about an 8% increase in their education and building fund levy every year. That's what it amounts to and I don't think people want you giving the junior colleges that much money. A few years ago when we enacted and permitted the junior colleges



to issue bonds for the purpose of creating a working cash fund, we were told that this was a one time and a one time only provision. Representative Leinenweber pointed out that by changing 'shall' to 'may' what we're doing is abolishing completely the purpose of the working cash fund. There's absolutely, under this Bill, no reason on earth why a junior college district should have to use the working cash fund to avoid the issuance of tax anticipation warrants. We do away with that in this Bill. I suggest to you that this is a bad Bill, it's bad...we are authorized, by the issuance of bonds, by the issuance of bonds over and over again, once every ten years...we will not have the bonds paid off when we are using the proceeds from those bonds to pay salaries. My God, the concept is terrible and I suggest to you this is an awful Bill, Mr. Speaker, and urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just...I just rise to explain my vote and that... Basically, what Representative Skinner said in terms of how elementary and secondary schools use their working cash fund is pretty close to ^{the} truth. This program for junior colleges is even worse than what elementary and secondary schools use it for because they don't use it this way and it's for that reason that I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I request a poll of the absentees, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr...Mr. Darrow wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Change me to 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson. Emil Jones. Marovitz. Pechous. Stearney and Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Bradley: "On this question we have 88 'aye' and 71 'nays'.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz. The Speaker wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 89 'ayes', 72 'nays' and the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, a Bill like this that involves tax increases without referendum, I think everybody ought to make sure that we're not voting people who aren't here so I ask for a verification."

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

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

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Gaines: "Change me to 'present', please."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded as voting 'present'. Are there any other changes now? Mrs. Geo-Karis. How is she recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "She wishes to be recorded as voting 'present'.

The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, wishes to be...change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Harden, Mr. Winchester, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please put this on Postponed."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection it will be on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 3277."



Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3277. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3277 corrects only spelling errors in certain drugs which are listed in the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. It makes two changes or corrections of seven spelling errors of the drugs that are listed here. And that is absolutely all that this Bill does, it corrects spelling errors. I sincerely solicit your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Peters: "No."

Wolf: "Representative... Could you tell me what drugs names you're changing and how do you spell them?"

Peters: "Vitamin C, E, D."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 158 'aye', no 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins... to explain your vote, Sir?"

Collins: "Well really a parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I was curious...I did want to ask the Sponsor if Myaglyacin was properly spelled within the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "He wasn't listening. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3281."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3281. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill very simply... all it does is extend for an additional ten days the time that a property owner has to complain to the Board of Review that his



property has been incorrectly assessed. It is now 20 days, it extends that to 30. It does not in any way impose upon the Board of Review to keep them from being able to do their business, it gives them still plenty of time. It's supported by the Taxpayer's Federation of the State of Illinois and it just simply gives the property owners a little more time to be able to compare his assessment against other assessments and against the sale of property in his area to know whether or not a complaint should be brought or not. This is just 10 days of fairness to property owners."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Just a question of the Sponsor, if I may. When you say downstate, Representative, you include Lake County too, don't you?"

Tipsword: "I don't think I said downstate, but includes all the counties that have a Board of Review."

Geo-Karis: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 157 'aye', no 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3283."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3283. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, the Insurance...Chairman of the Insurance Committee."

Tipsword: "On this Bill, I wonder if I might yield, perhaps, to the Gentleman from Sangamon County, who had proposed this Bill in Committee. If he would like to present it at this time... What this... What the Bill does, it just says that companies may not discriminate against individuals with handicaps or disabilities. The Gentleman who presented the Bill in the Insurance Committee would like for us to take it out of the record for right now."

Speaker Bradley: "3327."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3327."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor.
3339."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3339. A Bill for an Act to abolish certain
Committees, Councils, Commissions and to repeal certain Acts.
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane and Mr. Houlihan. Mr. Kane and Mr. Houlihan.
3339. Out of the record. 3340. Mr. Houlihan. Out of the
record. 3349."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3349. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections
of an Act to license and regulate grain dealers. Third Reading
of the Bill"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
this is the legislation that was written in response to the
number of elevator failures that we have had throughout the
state in the last ten years of time. And particularly in line
of a couple rather large and spectacular failures that have
taken place in the last couple of years. The legislation does
several things, it tightens up the auditing procedures for
elevators and the main question that it addresses is the
problems that are created by the practice in the industry known
as 'price later contracting.' It particularly tightens up the
procedures for those who engage in this process. Less I tell you
more about the Bill than perhaps you want to know, I think, Mr. Speaker,
at this time I would just rather entertain any questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a
question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "How does this deal with the small grain...farmer grain dealer?
Does he have to comply with these rules and regulations?"

Rigney: "Well a small farm dealer, for the most part, is not the
individual that's engaged in 'price later contracting.' If he
is, yes, this Bill will have a rather substantial impact upon his



business because he will then have to follow the procedures for maintaining his solvency throughout this whole transaction. We do put an overall limit of one year upon anyone that's engaging in any 'price later contracting.' In other words, that contract has to be fulfilled within one year's time. In the industry now, for some reason, these 'price later contracts' have gone on for as long as three and four years. And this has created a substantial problem. So...the small dealer that you're speaking of, for the most part, will not be affected by this because he just hasn't been engaging in that practice."

Ewing: "Well, that's a very nice answer, I think you evaded the question though. The question I'm wondering is, is he required to submit to the audit, is he required to have office hours, is he required to go out of business because of the regulations in here - not whether he's involved in 'price later contracts'?"

Rigney: "He will have to, as you point out, have good accounting procedures. He will have to submit his records to a C.P.A. audit, he will have to maintain regular office hours. These are some of the weaknesses in the present Act and some of the things that the task force on grain elevators addressed themselves to. And yes, he definitely^e should be...should be following these procedures."

Ewing: "Were any of the small farmer grain dealers involved in the task force that came up with this Bill?"

Rigney: "Yes, there was."

Ewing: "And what was their response to that?"

Rigney: "The Bill was voted out unanimously by this task force on grain handling."

Ewing: "And they agreed to this type of thing?"

Rigney: "They agreed to this."

Ewing: "And it will put a lot more restrictions on the grain dealers then?"

Rigney: "Well, I think I've probably answered that question, Representative Ewing, to the extent..."

Ewing: "I just want to make it clear."



Rigney: "To the extent that they are doing some of these practices, yes it will regulate what they're doing."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from..."

Ewing: "Do you know what the ratio of liabilities to assets is in the Bill?"

Rigney: "Is that in the nature of a question?"

Ewing: "Yes: The ratio of assets to liabilities required in the Bill?"

Rigney: "Well we're saying that any time that a dealer engages in price later contracting he must maintain at least 90% in liquid assets of some form, either cash to cover those contracts, grain margin accounts... He could in turn pass this grain on to another elevator on a price later arrangement. There are different ways that he can fulfill this obligation. But he must have proof that he has 90% in the form of liquid assets for the grain that he has taken in under this Act."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may..."

Ewing: "I think it's been made very clear, crystal clear by the Sponsor of this Bill, that we're aiming to get at the problem of 'price later contracts'. And yet, they have taken a very wide brush and are painting a strip around grain dealers, they're including everyone. You should all be aware, there is a lot of added restrictions and bureaucracy in this Bill. And it is not aimed at just those who deal with 'price later contracts.' I think it's a very serious Bill, there is a problem but the group refuses to take out those who are not creating the problem."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker...in part of the Bill he suggests that the department may require applicants to participate in training programs. Is that for the grain dealers or is that for the 20 patronage workers that are expected to go to work, which training program is that going to be for?"

Rigney: "We're talking, Mr. Giorgi, about those that are going to become grain dealers. Right now we don't have the means to...in the



law to bring these people in to train them for the very serious that they're going to be embarking upon. Grain handling is a very...a very serious, a very risky business."

Giorgi: "Is there going to be training for the 20 patronage workers that are going to go to work on this program? Will they be taught with speculative means?"

Rigney: "Well first of all I don't know just where you're reading in this Bill about the 20 patronage workers. If you can point out what page and Section and so forth that's on, I'd be happy to answer that question."

Giorgi: "Are you denying in the record that there won't be additional people employed, especially patronage workers from out of this program, are you denying that today?"

Rigney: "The only thing I'm saying, Representative Giorgi... We are setting up a procedure here for..."

Giorgi: "You're not denying it, okay. The other point is, did Carter signing ~~in~~ the wheat subsidy Bill make any change in this program? Aren't the farmers now going to be paid for not speculating... for just not plowing the wheat fields, ^{aren't you one} going to be gained from that Bill that Carter signed yesterday on wheat subsidies?"

Rigney: "Well, I don't know how farmers are going to be affected by wheat subsidies but I'll assure you it has absolutely nothing to do with a grain elevator Bill of this kind. We're...it's two entirely different subjects and I don't actually see the connection that you're making between the two."

Giorgi: "Okay, where is the speculative training going to show up, for the grain dealers or for the monetary employees? Where are ^{you gonna} ~~they~~ ^{them} teaching speculation?"

Rigney: "Well first of all, for any dealer that's going to be engaged in grain handling, this does provide a system for educating these people and requiring examinations to become grain dealers. This is not found in the present Act and frankly, I think this is why we've had some of the troubles that we have had. Inexperienced people have gone into the grain trade, they have started in to speculate for one reason or another, usually it's because they



got themselves in trouble with some type of a price later contracting arrangement and attempted to bail themselves out by speculating in the grain trade. The problem was that one thing let to another and the situation only became worse down through the years. Some of these failures have built up over perhaps three or four years of time. They have tended to cover their tracks through various forms of speculation and only made the situation worse. The result was that when one elevator on Southern Illinois went down recently, there were about 200 farmers down there that lost about 5 million dollars in that particular elevator failure. There was another one in Northeastern Illinois where they lost about a million and a half. So I think you can see that this is rather serious and has quite an impact upon agricultural communities when one of these speculative type of ventures fails."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, will he yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Byers: "Mr. Rigney, does this Bill change the method of accounting that's now used to establish a grain dealer's net worth?"

Rigney: "About the only thing that it changed, as far as accounting procedures are concerned, we do now under the terms of the Bill require a C.P.A. audit. That is not a feature of the present Grain Dealer's Act."

Byers: "Doesn't this effectively knock out a lot of small grain dealers, that they will not now qualify?"

Rigney: "I see no reason for that. We haven't...we haven't raised the bonding requirements or anything of that nature. We haven't attempted to change any of that, we're just merely saying that we're going to have to have better business and accounting procedures to be a grain dealer in this state."

Byers: "But isn't it true that accountants that now do books for some of these people use a different method of accounting than C.P.A.s would be required under this Bill?"

Rigney: "Well, apparently so. And maybe that's been also a part of the



problem, Representative Byers, in that for one reason or another the various accounting firms and even state auditors and so forth have not been able to detect some of these elevator failures as the problem is building. This is what we're hoping to eliminate, part of the problem we're trying to address."

Byers: "Who's in support of your piece of legislation besides the Department of Agriculture?"

Rigney: "On that task force were representatives of your various farm organizations, including the State Farm Bureau, the Grains and the Illinois Farmer's Union. In addition, on that task force were representatives of the grain trade. Both the larger elevator operators, the co-op operators and even, yes, the local truck dealers that sometimes are referred to as the farmer type dealers. They were all represented on that task force. In addition to that we had a representative of the banking industry, of the bonding industry, really most anybody that has some hand in the grain trade. This, I think, was a blue ribbon task force that was assembled and, you know, went over this whole problem of the elevator failures and what should be... at least our answer to try to prevent these in the future."

Byers: "Wasn't this...basically was people... There were very few small farmers represented on this Committee, most of them that you named represented big corporations or big business interest rather than the small average farmer.... The small truck farmer, really he only had one vote on there against 35 or 40 votes the other way."

Rigney: "Well I don't see anything that's going to do any violence to any grain dealer in the State of Illinois that wants to operate fairly and above board and keep good books and do a good job of operation. I can't see where they're going to be adversely affected."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, if I might briefly address the Bill. I only know one person that was on that Commission and he happens to live right in my district and nearby that and does business there and he wasn't for this and I did discuss this with him and I do think



the method where they change the accounting...from...now accountants can not do business, only a C.P.A. can audit the books and I do think that it's a Bill that is not needed at this time and I would recommend a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Representative Rigney, do we...does this Bill in any way limit, under any conditions, any of the speculative ventures that grain dealers are heretofore entered into?"

Rigney: "Only in the broadest of language, in that the Department, under the terms of this Bill, would be able to determine when someone is in a speculative position. And that, in that...the broad terms of the Bill that is prohibited. We don't attempt to tell them, you know, what constitutes a speculative position, that will develop...be developed by departmental regulation after the Bill once becomes a law. And it is the...these speculative actions taken by certain grain dealers under...when they find themselves in rather bad financial situations, that have really led, has it not, to these...these failures."

Rigney: "Yes, that seems to be the pattern of them. Keep in mind... I'm not sure if everybody understands what I'm talking about when I talk about price later contracting. This is where the farmer actually delivers his grain to the elevator, the elevator takes title to it, it no longer belongs to the farmer. Then the farmer says, 'I'll be back some day in the future and we'll agree on the price for this grain.' He may come back six or eight months, ten months later, maybe even two years later in some instances. This is a very risky type of venture. Frankly, I guess if I had my way about it I would simply ban price later contracting."

Tipsword: "Why... Do you know why this group didn't ban that or limit it to some great degree?"

Rigney: "I suppose the best answer to that is that price later contracting can at times serve the best interests and the selfish interest of



both the farmer and the grain dealer. Consider, for instance, the farmer that's delivering his corn, say, in the latter part of November to a local elevator. Maybe because of his position as far as income taxes are concerned that year, he doesn't want to take his money in that calendar year, he prefers to let it ride until sometime into the next year to get some type of a tax advantage. This is...this is one of the common reasons why this practice was originally started. There are many reasons, I guess, why people enter into price later contracting arrangements, but that is one of the...the things that have happened. And this is the practice that in turn has then led to speculative positions that sometimes the grain elevator operator has found himself in, he has sold the grain, he doesn't have the room to store it, the farmer comes in six months later, he wants that days price. In the meantime the grain has maybe gone up 50 cents a bushel and, you know, he doesn't have the money..."

Tipsword: "Pardon me, if I could ask just one more question on this Bill... What is there that this Bill does, the one or two or three major things that makes it any better than what we have right now?"

Rigney: "Well, I think it does a very substantial thing; particularly in the area of price later contracting when we say that that grain dealer must have at least 90% on the form of liquid asset^s that cover his position on that price later grain. In other words, he can go ahead and sell it, he can...he can dispose of that grain but he's going to have to have a minimum of 90% in the form of liquid assets. And that can be such things as cash or certificates of deposit, an irrevocable letter of credit, a price later contract maybe with another elevator, a warehouse receipt, there are many different things that he can do to satisfy that 90% obligation. But keep in mind, right now he doesn't have any obligation to keep any liquid assets on hand. So, I think this is a substantial tightening of that requirement."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I hope all of you that have farm land in your area will listen to what I'm going to say. This is a bad Bill. I don't... I have not very often, on the opposite side with the Farm Bureau or Harlan Rigney either one, but I don't know who led them down the path on this. In the first place, the Farm Bureau runs one of the biggest grain elevators in this state, so they're not the little guy we're talking about. In the first place, let me tell you that when a farmer takes his grain into the elevator on a price later he does it on a selfish basis because he thinks he's going to get more money or a tax advantage for holding it. And if he wants to extend credit to that elevator that's his problem. We can't protect everybody from everything and that's what this is suppose to do. But what you're really going to do, you're going to add another layer of government in this state. And Zeke Giorgi was exactly right because the Director of Agriculture sat in that Committee and said he was going to add 20 employees to help impl^ement this Bill. Now, let me tell you something, if you think that this Bill is going to protect everybody from everything, you better look out because it isn't. The elevator that went broke in Southern Illinois had been audited by the Department of Agriculture 60 days before the guy took bankruptcy. Now you want to add 20 more guys to go around and look and if you think you're productive you're just kidding yourself. Let me tell you something, at the price of grain today a guy can be completely solvent today and completely broke next week if he's playing the futures and that's the way that most of them go broke that go broke; you know it and I know it. But we've got a lot of grain now that never goes to the elevator. A lot of farmers now, more and more farmers have storage on their own farms. They store up to 100,000 bushel on their own farms. And when that grain goes it goes directly from there to the terminals and that's the way they eliminate the middle man and the farmer has a chance to make a few more dollars



and I think it's all right. But those grain dealers sometimes own a couple trucks and that's the whole thing. Now you're going to require them to all the harassment of having an office, having office hours, having a C.P.A. and all of the things that go with it. You continue, in this Body, to discourage a little guy who's willing to work hard and be honest and...under the guise of protection, we're suppose to protect everybody from everything. but this Bill will not do that. I wouldn't object if we passed a no price later Bill. But this...you're doing that...that's just one of the things you're doing and actually it...as Representative Tipsword pointed out, you really are not any safer when you get done than you were here. This doesn't stop price later, this doesn't keep the farmer from doing it. In the first place, if he's stupid enough to leave his grain in that elevator for 4 years, I think he's on his own because he's lending his assets to that elevator. For goodness sakes, let's quit harassing the little businessman and adding more and more regulations and more and more costs."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion prevails. The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney, to close the debate."

Rigney: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, again I don't always find...very seldom find myself agreeing...disagreeing with my good friend Dwight Friedrich but I guess I have to on this occasion. I think we're going to have to recognize that we have an obligation here to the farmers of the State of Illinois to do everything that is humanly possible to protect them in the grain trade. When we stop to realize that many farmers have lost 40, 50, up to 100 thousand dollars in some of these elevator failures and are...virtually wipes them out almost over night, unbeknown to them the fact that elevator was in any type of financial trouble,



there was no indication at the time that it was in trouble but all of a sudden over night all of the assets are gone, the elevator is bankrupt and the farmers of that particular community are bankrupt. Now, I guess probably what we have to do is decide whether or not we're going to be insensitive to that type of a situation. I think it's happened often enough in the State of Illinois that we no longer can afford to be insensitive. If this was the sort of thing that just happened once every ten years or twice every ten years it might be different. It's happening all too regularly. We've only talked about the larger and more spectacular failures, there have been a number of other failures in this state that fortunately have been covered by the 100 thousand dollar ^{bond} provision that the State of Illinois also has. Those farmers can...and they were able to be covered by it. But I... I think the choice is going to be up to us. We're simply going to have to decide that...whether or not we do want to afford some reasonable protection to Illinois farmers who have a substantial investment here... I remember my first term down here, when we had the gallery full of folks that had unfortunately been hit with a bank failure and they were not asking just for regulations they were expecting the State of Illinois to reimburse them. Because the State of Illinois had not done a good job in regulating the banking industry. And because of that they lost some substantial amounts of money. Well, the farmers of the State of Illinois are not asking for any reimbursement. All they're asking for is for the State of Illinois to do its job, as it has promised to do, in regulating the grain trade of this state. For that reason I ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, to explain his vote."

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

I stand in support of this Bill. I think that there are a number of safeguards in this Bill that Representative Tipword asked



about that have not been mentioned. One is the fact that anyone who engages in price later contracts now, must have numerical copies of every price later contract. And those copies will be kept track of by the Department of Agriculture. Now, this institutes a real control in the price later contract business which has never existed before. What's happened, in some of these failures has been that the grain dealer has simply hidden those contracts. And so when the auditors come in, nobody knows that he has all this outstanding liability. I think that that's a safeguard in the Bill. I think another safeguard that's important is the certified audit. Now there's been some questions raised here about other bookkeepers and why their figures couldn't be accepted. Well, I think the logical answer for that is that the C.P.A. is the only one who can certify an audit. And I think those certified audits will go a long way toward correcting some of the practices in the grain trade that have brought about the failures that we've seen here in Illinois. I think this legislature has to measure what impositions we may be making on the small business man. We have to measure that against the protection that we're providing for the farmer. And I think we're providing a real protection for the farmer. I think this is a good Bill and it should be passed and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, to explain his vote for one minute."

Waddell: "Unlike the incident that Harlan had mentioned with the banks, where we were blamed as the people of the State of Illinois for having inspectors that didn't do their job, the difference between that and this is the fact that these guys that are 'schlock' operators keep two sets of books. Then your people, your farmers come back and say, 'You, the State of Illinois, have not protected us.' And this is what happened in the one in Kane County. They say, 'You're at fault, the State of Illinois is at fault.' And this is not true. They did not show our inspectors the other set of books, where you have



the price later contracts. So he did not know that they were on shakey grounds. What you're saying here is that they will have to show the right set of books and this is a farmer Bill.

I vote 'aye'."

✓ Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Harden, Mr. Winchester, to explain his vote for one minute."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. About two months ago I had the, not the pleasure, to stand in front of about 500 very sad hearted people who were broke as a result of a bankruptcy in my district. And that bankruptcy was because the grain elevator operator was running two sets of books and there was no way in the world that that grain warehouse inspector could have discovered that. I'm one of the Cosponsors of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I've worked with Mr. Rigney and the Department of Agriculture and I sit on those task force meetings and I saw those members were in complete agreement with this piece of legislation. Something has to be done, Mr. Speaker, because we're averaging one, two and three bankruptcies a month. And when you see 500 farmers sitting in one building with tears in the eyes, wanting to know where they're going to get enough money to start another farming crop, you too would be concerned, as Representative Rigney and I am.(sic) Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to vote green on this Bill. It is important to every farmer in this state. Maybe some districts have not had bankruptcy, but one day you will have and you'll see the same situation that I did. And believe me, it's a sad situation. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Skinner wishes to explain his vote for one minute."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, there seem to be a lot of hidden agendas here today, there's one thing however the critics can not be accused of and that is, they have no alternative to the problem, which is very, very real to the people that it affects. How are they going to solve the problem of farmers losing money through no fault whatsoever of their own? How do they answer the city savings



and loan parallel, which is exactly...it's about as exactly the same as you can get. Either we should protect the farmers or we should repeal the Grain Elevator Regulation Act and absolutely take away all pretense that we are protecting the farmer. The Agriculture Department has obviously been incompetent and I do not stand here to defend them. They have not prevented grain elevator bankruptcies. Grain elevators are very similar to banks and savings and loans, to refer to one point that was made from a Representative from the Southwestern part of the state. You put the grain in and it's just like money. Why shouldn't a C.P.A. audit be required for grain elevators if we require them for banks and savings and loans? That is very important and probably one of the most important parts of this Bill. Prohibiting two sets of books is also important. And that will be required because all price later contracts have to be registered. I've received several letters from constituencies that have put in better words than I can use, here's one; 'The Illinois Department of Agriculture failed to audit him ('Gerens'), the largest independent grain dealer in Illinois, doing 20 million dollars of business annually. He was not audited for five years. The state is responsible for horse and buggy bonding requirements of only one hundred thousand dollars maximum. I myself...over two hundred thousand dollars worth of grain annually. The Illinois Department of Agriculture was negligent in not monitoring him and the state is negligent in their laws. I now have suffered great financial difficulty.'

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner, I think...I think you've gone two minutes..."

Skinner: "And they should...with reimbursement for their faults. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very briefly wanted to explain my vote and why I was voting 'no'. I would draw the attention



of the Membership to the Bill, which provides as follows: 'That any grain dealer determined to be in a speculative position, in excess of normal merchandising practices, shall be deemed to be in violation of this Act.' Violation of this Act happens to be a criminal offense and yet there is no definition in this Act of either a speculative position or the standard normal grain merchandising practice. I suggest to the Membership that this Bill is defective on its face, as far as seeking to import a criminal violation for...as a sanction for a violation of this Act. It's a serious defect. This problem that the Bill seeks to address are serious problems also, but it will not be well addressed by this Bill, which is patently defective on its face, it needs substantial reworking and I think it deserves, I know it deserves a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 101 'aye', 26 'nay'... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mann: "Just to be asked to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.—3351."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3351. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to convey rights and titles in St. Clair County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3351 is the Department of Transportation's Easement Bill. And all it does is convey about one hundred feet of land from the State of Illinois to District 189 in East St. Louis for use as a playground at the Longfellow School. I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and no 'nay'."



The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 400. Representative Skinner, do you want that one, in relation to regulatory agency officials upon termination of the government... 400. It's on page 6."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 400. A Bill for an Act in relation to regulatory agency officials upon termination of their governmental service. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm gathering evidence daily in the Appropriations Committee for the need of this Bill and so I would like to hold it for a little while longer."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. E.M. Barnes, do you want 1238? That's noncontroversial, isn't it? Representative Huff, 1274?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1274. A Bill for an Act creating the Chicago Community Schools Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1274 creates the Chicago Community School's Study Commission. I... It creates a Commission body from three Members from the Senate and the House for the purpose of studying the feasibility of decentralizing the Board of Education in Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor of the Bill yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hoffman: "What...is there a companion Appropriation Bill with this Bill?"

Huff: "Yes there is, Gene."

Hoffman: "Where is that Bill?"

Huff: "I believe it is in the Appropriations... I don't know which one."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, do we...do we have a rule that we will not consider Bills whose appropriation is not out?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not to my knowledge, we do not."

Hoffman: "All right, what is the amount of the appropriation, Representative?"



Huff: "Well presently it's...the bottom line is 75 thousand. But I'm sure that when that comes up, at the appropriate time, we can entertain some Amendments on it."

Hoffman: "Which way did you have in mind, up or down?"

Huff: "Down, definitely."

Hoffman: "All right...According to the...according to the Digest, the Appropriation Bill, on the 5th of April, went on the Interim Study Calendar in the Executive Committee."

Huff: "No, I think that's not correct, Mr. Hoffman. It came out of Committee on that date."

Hoffman: "I don't know why an Appropriation Bill would end up in an Executive Committee anyway."

Huff: "Well that's not for me to reason why, I assure you."

Hoffman: "Was it in the Executive Committee?"

Huff: "Yes, it was."

Hoffman: "And the Bill came out of the Executive Committee on that date, rather than going on the Interim Study Calendar?"

Huff: "Are you saying April 5th?"

Hoffman: "Well I'm just looking at the Digest on page 550."

Huff: "I looked at it some time ago, I'm not too sure of the date but that sounds right. It came out of Committee on that date."

Hoffman: "And then went to the Appropriations Committee?"

Huff: "That's my understanding, yes."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion on this.

And...this looks to me to be quite similar to another Bill, which we discussed of Representative Terzich, where he wanted to set them up...and this is a Study Commission to study and report the question. I'm not sure that the State of Illinois ought to be using their funds for this purpose. And at this juncture, not knowing the disposition of the appropriation, as far as the Appropriation Committee is concerned, I would be inclined, I think, under these circumstances, to withhold my support of the Bill at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I tend to agree with Representative Hoffman.

I'm looking at the Digest and I see that the substantive Bill is in Interim Study Calendar, I believe. But what we've been doing with the Commission Bills, has been putting them in the Subcommittee, both Appropriation I and Appropriation II. To my knowledge, this is the only Bill that's been on the floor that is a Commission Bill and we, in fact, have been attempting in the end to have an Omnibus Bill for Commissions. And this would be, therefore, hanging in mid air, suspended by itself and I don't know if that's what Representative Huff wants to do but...but this is surely in a different category than all the other Commission Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. Commission Bills, I think, have customarily directed their interest to exploring and speculating on various kinds of problems. I see some difficulty with 1274 on page 2, because into the Commissions... into this proposal is the conclusion. So, for example, the strongest statement being number one, that is the Commission shall recommend a plan to effectuate the transition of the educational system within Chicago from that of a single unit to that of 26. If you're going to do that you might as well skip the Commission and just go ahead and propose the Bill or take the Terzich Amendment as it is on the Capparelli Bill. So, presently, unless I err, in the few years I've been here I recall Commissions being explorative. This appears to have the conclusion built into the Commission and I think we should oppose that kind of a Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Huff, to close."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to Representative Schneider's remarks, I agree that the...the thrust of the Bill is to be exploratory. And while it speaks in a conclusive manner, I think it's appropriate in light of the fact that Representative Terzich's Amendment on 2926, which creates independent districts, that



the Bill that I'm presenting would be appropriate in light of that...the fact that that Amendment did pass. Because it will answer the questions that are sure to rise with regard to boundaries,^a federal funding, contracts, union structures, as they're all plugged into the system. Whatever we may propose in the end, the Bill provides for a referendum to ratify that proposal in the event that it clears the House. I think this is a good Bill and I think it is needed, because it addresses itself to breaking the districts down into smaller, more comprehensive units, that the parent can identify with. And today, presently, the structure has become so big and so insensitive and so vested in its own interests that it is not providing what I consider to be a basic education for the children in its charge. And for that reason, I would solicit your 'aye' vote."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe this is a good Bill that merits our attention. This Commission would be planning for the transition into 26 districts, school districts in Chicago. Such type of planning should be done by an independent agency of the state, not by the State Superintendent of Instruction, not by the Chicago Public Schools. This could be a very useful body and I would ask for your support of this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 87 'aye' and 42 'no'. Representative Huff desires a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. Brady."

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

D. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the prior announcement by the Majority Leader, we were under the impression here that we would be adjourning at approximately 7:00. It's beyond that time now."



Could you indicate what the intention of the Chair respecting adjournment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Originally we said between 8 and 9 was what we thought. We're kind of playing it by ear. It depends on the kind of Bills we have as to how long we're going to be here. We've done 50 Bills today."

D. Houlihan: "I think I remember earlier today, Mr. Speaker, you saying, 'If you drive the troops too long the effect would be lost the following day.' My feeling is, if we've done 50 Bills, that's far more than we've done on any other day in this Session and I would really ask that the Chair consider that we adjourn rather soon..."

Speaker Redmond: "I will..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams. Brady. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Catania. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Corneal Davis. DiPrima. Dyer. Ewing. Friedrich. Gaines."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines. Hart. Emil Jones. Keats. Klosak."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kozubowski. Levin. Lucco. Luft. Madison. Mahar. Marovitz. McClain."

Speaker Redmond: "James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pechous."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler 'aye'. Who requested a verification? Have you withdrawn that request? The request for a verification still persists, is that correct? Okay, go ahead."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, what was the count?"



Speaker Redmond: "93."

Houlihan: "I know many Members that aren't here."

Speaker Redmond: "I... According to Murphy's Rules on this one, I think we better take this one out of the record. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, not to take up the time of the House, I'll just ... I'll ask for Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1913, Representative Bowman, is that an easy one or a tough one? 1913, Representative Bowman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1913. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Act to revise the law in relation to landlords and tenants. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I'll just ask for a favorable Roll Call on this. Let's just have a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to take the time of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman, do you want a vote right now?"

Bowman: "I want to vote right now. Let's go, come on. I want to get over to that cocktail party. Come on, let's go."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's fair for a Sponsor to simply say, 'Let's have a Roll Call,' without even explaining his Bill. If he doesn't want to take up the time of the House let's have it taken out of the record."

Bowman: "Well, Representative Pullen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Members standing between the Chair and Representative Pullen please be seated."

Bowman: "I will give the House the courtesy of a brief explanation on...there is presently on the books a statute which is really incredible. I don't think anyone ever realized this would ever be used, it simply...it provides that the landlord or his agent can seize anybody's property, anywhere in the county...anywhere in the county on his own behalf. He doesn't have to go into a court and get a writ or anything. All this Bill would do would be to provide a legal remedy for the landlord to obtain obtainment by



having the Sheriff seize the property instead of him doing it directly. I think this Bill would prevent some ugly confrontations between landlords and tenants and...and I think it would...a Bill that needs to be passed. So, let's have the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye' and 23 'no'. The Bill, having received... Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "May we have a verification of that Roll Call, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. It's too late. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Madigan, motion to adjourn."

Madigan: "Your wisest decision, Mr. Speaker. I move that we adjourn until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it... Representative Matijeivch."

Matijeivch: "Yes, there's two motions that I cleared on both sides of the aisle. One in behalf of Representative ^{Reilly} Riley, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3383, leave to suspend the posting notice for it to be heard in Appropriations I tomorrow and use the Attendance Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The other one, and I cleared that with the other side...House Bill 3383 is now the Insurance Appropriation Bill, leave to discharge Appropriation I Committee and put it on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent... Representative Ryan. Representative Ryan, do you seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Well I did earlier, Mr. Speaker, on the verification but you didn't recognize me. I don't know if your eyesight's failing, your hearing's bothering you or what."

Speaker Redmond: "It's bad today. Representative Ryan... Representative



Barnes. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we have adjourned. However, there are some motions that must be answered upon and accordingly, having voted on the prevailing side of the Adjournment Resolution, I move that that vote be reconsidered."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, having voted on the prevailing side, moves that the vote by which the adjournment... Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Matijevich tells me that he has some motions to offer, which are designed to benefit Republican Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely true. One of them is a transfer Bill that the Department of Transportation wants to be heard tomorrow. If you don't want it, it's all right with me if you want to forget about it, that's all right."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have the posting notice... Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, what time did we adjourn to till tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't yet, we reconsidered that vote. You know..."

Ryan: "At that time, what did..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, when the motion is put it will be 10:00 o'clock..."

I'm trying awfully hard to make sure that we don't have to stay here Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. Now if you want to have all the fun it's perfectly all right with me...I have an appointment."

Ryan: "Would you save your lectures for a minute, we've heard them all and we don't want to be here those days either. If you'd run the Chair in a fair manner we probably wouldn't have to be."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll be in all day tomorrow...till 10:00 o'clock tomorrow night."

Ryan: "Will you let me talk now. Is there any reason that we can't handle these motions tomorrow morning when we come in at 10:00 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."



Matijevich: "It's all right with me, I just told you I was going to go along with you on these motions but that's all right with me."

Ryan: "Is there any Committee Meetings prior to coming in tomorrow morning at 10:00?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Ryan: "Then why can't we have these motions..."

Matijevich: "We can go ahead. I just made a committment to Jim Rife^{RILEY} that I would make that motion, that's why I did it."

Ryan: "Well I would suggest you do it tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "Representative Barnes... Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn till 10:00 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "After five minutes perfunctory. The question's on the Gentleman's motion that we adjourn. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills with the following titles, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills 237, 238, 1436, 1468, 1469, 1472. 1514, 1528, 1546, 1562, 1569, 1627, 1634, 1689, 1696, 1704 and 1723. Passed by the Senate May 16, 1978." Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills 1749, 1859 and 1862. Passed by the Senate May 16, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills 1674, 1646; that's 1746, 1777, 1790 and 1848. Passed by the Senate May 16, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.



Senate Bills. First Reading. Senate Bill 1475. Jack Davis. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1616. Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the drug Laetrile. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1630. Telcser. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1667. Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Park District Code. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1674. Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Public Transportation Act. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1746. Pullen. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 237. Porter. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Board of Higher Education. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 238. Porter. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1472. Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan Regional Planning Act. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1546. Kane - Mudd. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1562. Lynn Martin. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to amend the title of Section 1 of an Act to provide for the enforcement of the Department of Public Health and certain state and local food handling and health regulations. First Reading of the Bill. No further business. The House now stands.

Introduction and First Reading. House Bill 3389. J. David Jones. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	1:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Reading of journal	
2		Speaker Redmond		
		Lechowicz	Move to dispense	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee reports	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Waddell	Introduction	
3		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3153	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Sharp	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Sharp	Moves to reconsider vote	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Sharp	Move to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries, 3rd	
		Ryan		
4	1:14	Speaker Redmond		
		Lechowicz	Excused absence	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Redmond		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Polk		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2652, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
5		Polk		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brady	Yield	
		Polk		
		Speaker Lechowicz	In chair	
6		Polk		
		Brady	Discussion	
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2666, 3rd	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
7		Davis, J.		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	1:23	Steele, E.G.		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
8		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Matijevich		
9		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Hoxsey		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Davis, J.	To close	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	3.
10		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
11		Greisheimer		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schoberlein	MPQ	
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 2666 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2670, 3rd	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Wolf		
		Clerk O'Brien	#2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Wolf		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Wolf	TOOR	
12		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Birchler	Introduction	
	1:34	McClintock, Dave		
13		Vogel, Bob	Introduce squad members	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave to bring HB 2418 back to 2nd	
		Mugalian	#5	
		Speaker Lechowicz	#5 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	#6	
14		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mugalian		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Ewing		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	4.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Houlihan, D.	Question	
		Ewing		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Moves to reconsider & table	#4
		Speaker Lechowicz	Tabled	
15		Ewing	#6	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mugalian	Yield	
		Ewing		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Skinner	Yield	
	1:42	Ewing		
16		Skinner		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
17		Mugalian		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Van Dwyne	Question	
		Ewing		
18		Van Dwyne	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Geo-Karis		
		Ewing		
		Speaker Redmond	In chair	
		Schuneman	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
19		Ewing		
		Speaker Redmond	#6 adopted, 3rd	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Waddell	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2702, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kempiners		
20		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2714, 3rd	
		Bennett	Question	
	1:55	Speaker Redmond		
		Peters	HB 2714	
21		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2722, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Vinson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bradley	Answers Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
22		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2736	
		Speaker Redmond	T00R	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2766, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Totten	Question	
23		Bowman		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Van Duyne	Yield	
		Bowman		
24		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2767, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:03	Reilly		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner	Question	
		Reilly		
25		Skinner		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brady	Question	
		Rei-ly		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Reilly	To close	
26		Speaker Redmond		
		McGrew		
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2767 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2778, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
27		Giglio		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2787, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brummet	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
28		Brummet		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2793, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipsword		
	2:15	Speaker Redmond	HB 2793 passed	
		Dunn, J.	Leave to be recorded no, on 2778	
29		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2818, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brady		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2833, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
30		Ewell		
		Speaker Redmond		
31		Kent	Question	
		Ewell		
		Speaker Redmond		
32		Schlickman	Discussion	
33		Ewell		
34		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd	Question	
		Ewell		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
		Johnson	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
35		Ewell	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Redmond		
36		Cunningham		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewell	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Epton		
37		Clerk O'Brien	Polis absentees	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Terzich	Aye	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2833	
		Ewell	PPC	
		Lucco	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:40	Clerk O'Brien	HB 2839, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
38		DiPrima		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich	Yield	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
39		DiPrima	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Catania		
		DiPrima		
40		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2842, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Flinn		
		Speaker Redmond		
41		Conti	Yield? HB 2842	
	2:40	Flinn	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2843 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2865, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2893, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich	Explains	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
42		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2894	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matejek	Explains	
	2:50	Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2899	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Yourell	Explains	
		Speaker Redmond		
43		Geo-Karis	Yield?	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Yourell	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti	Yield?
		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2926
		Speaker Redmond	T00R
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2927
		Speaker Redmond	
	2:55	Richmond	Explains
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Richmond	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	
		Richmond	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Keats	Yield?
		Richmond	
	3:03	Speaker Redmond	
		Griesheimer	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bennett	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	Supports



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco	Introduction	
		Speaker Redmond		
	3:07	Birchler	Supports	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, J.	Supports	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich	Supports	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Waddell	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Richmond	To close	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2945	
		Speaker Redmond		
54		McClain	Explains	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Pullen	Yield?	
		McClain		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2947, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
55		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bluthardt	Question	
		Matijevich		
56		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Schlickman	Yield	
		Matijeivhc		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Porter		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Waddell	Yield	
		Matijeivhc		
57		Waddell	Speaks on bill	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, J.	Yield	
	3:21	Matijeovich	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
	3:26	Clerk Hall	HB 2984, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
59		Bartulus		
		Speaker Redmond		
60		Lechowicz		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Birchler	Aye	
		Byers		
		Clerk Hall	HB 2985	
61		Speaker Redmond		
		Mahar	Explains	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijeovich	Yield?	
62		Mahar		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Speaker Redmond		
	3:32	Byers		
		Spaker Redmond		
63		Vinson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mahar		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Birchler		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond		
64		Van Duyne		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Collins		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schüneman	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mahar	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
65		Bluthardt	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Matijevich	PPP	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2987, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
	3:40	Jones, J.D.		
66		Speaker Redmond	Passed	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2988, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Stiehl, C.M.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Porter	Question	
		Stiehl, C.M.		
		Speaker Redmond		
67		Cunningham		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lechowicz	Responds to Porter	
		Speaker Redmond		
68		Stiehl, C.M.	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Byers		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	Announced Emil Jones baby	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3004, 3rd	
69		Speaker Redmond		
		Kempiners		
		Speaker Redmond		
	3:48	Kosinski		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3009, 3rd	
70		Speaker Redmond		
		Terzich		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 5-16-78

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3010, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.	Leave to return to 2nd	
71		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted hold on 2nd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3014, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brady		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Brady	3015	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3015, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
72		Brady		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3016, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brady		
	3:55	Speaker Redmond	Passed	
73		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3019, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kornowicz		
		Speaker Redmond		
74		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	Yield	
75		Kornowicz	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
76		Stuffle	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schoberlein	MPQ	
77		Speaker Redmond		
		Kornowicz	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, J.	Yes	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 3019 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3023, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Conti		
		Speaker Redmond		
78	4:05	Greiman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Deuster	Question	
79		Greiman	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
80		Lechowicz	Question	
		Greiman	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schuneman	Yield	
81		Greiman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Darrow	Yield	
82		Greiman	Discussion	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
		Speaker Redmond		
83		Farley	Answers Darrow's question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Birchler	Yield	
		Greiman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Greiman	To close	
84		Speaker Redmond	HB 3023 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3042, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
	4:16	Kent		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3050, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan		
85		Speaker Redmond		
		Porter	Yield	
		Ryan		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3053, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
86		Robinson		
87		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3054, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
88		Bowman		
		Lucco		
		Speaker Redmond		
89		Lucco	To close	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
90		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3059, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Robinson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Keris	Yield	
	4:30	Robinson		
92		Speaker Redmond		
		Campbell	Opposed	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Stuffle		
93		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mautino	Yield	
94		Robinson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, J.	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bluthardt	Parliamentary inquiry	
95		Speaker Redmond	89	
		Robinson	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
96		Holewinski	Explain vote	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti	
		Speaker Redmond	
	4:42	Matijeich	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 3059 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	EB 3079, 3rd
97		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3100, 3rd
98		Speaker Redmond	
		Bartulus	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3111, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	
99		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	Yield
		Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20.
		Speaker Brádley	HB 3111 passed	
	4:51	Clerk O'Brien	HB 3112, 3rd	
100		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted	
		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Defer to Martin	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Martin, L.		
		Speaker Bradley	Adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3113, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted	
		Clerk O'Brien	#2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Martin, L.		
101		Speaker Bradley	Adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3118, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Bradley		
	4:55	Yourell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.		
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
102		Ebbesen	Yield	
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3134, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Von Boeckman	Question	
103		Speaker Bradley	TOOR. HB 3132 leave to re-	
		Clerk O'Brien	turn to 2nd	
			Neff's motion to table #1	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Neff	Move to table #1 & 2	
		Speaker Bradley	Tabled	
		Clerk O'Brien	#3	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Neff		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kosinski	Question	
	5:02	Neff		
		Speaker Bradley	Adopted, 3rd	
		Von Boeckman	Return HB 3135 to 2nd	
105		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
		Von Boeckman		
		Speaker Bradley	Adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3147, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	22.
		Harris	TOOR	
106		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3153, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
107		Sharp		
108		Speaker Bradley		
		Schuneman	Yield	
109		Sharp		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Conti		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Sharp	Responds to Conti	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bartulus		
		Speaker Bradley		
110	5:14	Hanahan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Sharp	Adress the Bill	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Hanahan	Concludes	
		Speaker Bradley		
111		Reilly	Support	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Friedland	MPQ	
112		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Sharp	To close
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
113		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3191
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3201, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewell	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McMaster	Question
114		Ewell	
		Speaker Bradley	
	5:25	Skinner	Explain vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewell	Poll absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewell	PPC
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3203, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	
115		Beatty	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Hanahan	HB 2778, move to reconsider
		Speaker Bradley	
		Giglio	Objects



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Giglio	Move motion be tabled	
116		Speaker Bradley		
		Byers	Question	
		Speaker Bradley		
117		Hanahan	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leinenweber	Point of inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley	Motion to table prevails	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3204, 3rd	
	5:35	Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell		
118		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	Question	
		Yourell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tuerk	Question	
		Yourell		
		Speaker Bradley		
119		Schlickman	Yield?	
120		Yourell	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Willer	Yield	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Willer	Question	
		Yourell		
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Katz	Yield?
		Speaker Bradley	
		Katz	Question
121		Yourell	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Yourell	To close
		Speaker Bradley	HB 3204 passed
122		Clerk Hall	HB 3205
		Yourell	
		Clerk Hall	HB 3209, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	
		McLendon	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Bradley	
123		Madigan	Announcement
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	Question
		Speaker Bradley	
		McLendon	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 3218, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	
124		Terzich	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 3219, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
		Terzich	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted	
		Clerk Hall	#2	
		Speaekr Bradley		
		Terzich		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leinenweber	Question	
125	5:54	Terzich		
		Speaker Bradley	Adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk Hall	HB 3257, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
126		Campbell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schneider	Yield	
		Campbell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leverenz	Yield	
127	5:59	Campbell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schneider		
		Campbell	Tank you	
		Leverenz	Mr. Speaker, thank you	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Campbell	To close	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
128		Clerk Hall	HB 3260	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Brady	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 3269, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	
	6:01	Lucco	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
129		Clerk Hall	HB 3272, 3rd
	6:05	Speaker Bradley	
		Porter	
		Speaker Bradley	
130		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Daniels	
131		Speaker Bradley	
		Porter	TOOR
		Speaker Bradley	
132		Clerk Hall	HB 3274, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Bradley	
133	6:10	Leinenweber	Question
134		Leverenz	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	28.
135		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leverenz	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		
136		Bluthardt	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
137		Walsh, Wm.		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leverenz	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes	Change to present	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees	
138		Speaker Bradley		
		Leinenweber	Verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Gaines	Change to present	
		Speaker Bradley		
	6:25	Leverenz	PFC	
		Speaker Bradley		
139		Clerk Hall	HB 3277, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Peters		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Wolf		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			29.
		Peters	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Collins	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	HB 3281, 3rd
		Speaker Bradley	
140		Tipsword	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Questions sponsor
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk Hall	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 3327
141		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3320
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3339
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3349
		Speaker Bradley	
		Rigney	Speaks on HB 3340
		Speaker Bradley	
142		Ewing	
143		Rigney	Question
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewing	Speaks to Bill



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	30.
144		Giorgi	Question	
145	6:38	Rigney		
		Speaker Bradley		
146		Byers	Yield	
147		Rigney		
		Speaker Bradley		
148		Tipsword		
		Rigney		
149		Speaker Bradley		
150		Friedrich		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Van Duynes	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley		
151		Rigney	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		
152		Schuneman	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
153		Waddell	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Winchester	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
	6:59	Skinner	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
155		Houlihan, D.	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mann	Voting no	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 3349 passed	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3351, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	In chair
		Stiehl, C.M:	
156		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 400, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	TOOR
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1274, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	
157		Hoffman	Question
		Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	
158		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:10	Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
159		Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	Explain vote
		Speaker Redmond	Poll absentees
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
160		Houlihan, D.	Question on adjournment



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	32.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Freidrich	Aye	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, J.	Verify	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, J.		
161		Speaker Redmond		
		Huff	PPC	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1913, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bowman		
		Pullen		
162		Speaker Redmond		
162		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Pullen		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Madigan	Move adjourn	
		Speaker Redmond	House adjourn	
		Matijevich	Motion HB 3383	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted	
		Matijevich	Motion	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	33.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Redmond		
163		Madigan	Move vote be reconsidered on adjournment	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Redmond		
164		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Move to adjourn till 10 A.M.	
		Speaker Redmond	House adjourn after pref.	
165	7:25	Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate, Senate Bills Ist. Adjourn	

