

Doorkeeper (Emery Koehler): "Testing...testing...Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in 15 minutes. Thank you. All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery. Attention, Members of the House, the House will convene in 5 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the record show that Representative Geo-Karis is in her seat. The House will come to order, the Members please be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Abraham Lincoln said, 'Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it'. Let us pray. Almighty God, we come to Thee this day acknowledging our weaknesses and our limitations in dealing with the problems confronting our society. We recognize, O God, that Thou alone can deliver us from this perplexity. Strengthen our faith in Thee, O Lord, so that maybe...so that we may receive direction from Thy Divine Wisdom and thereby be enabled to perform our duties as Members of this House of Representatives for the general good of the people of the State of Illinois. We ask this in the name of Christ our Lord and Master. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 163, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to use of assumed names in the conduct of transactions of business in this state. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 550, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Air Carriers Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Any excused absences?"

Madigan: "Do we wish to go on Roll Call for Attendance, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for Attendance."

Madigan: "And, Mr. Speaker, will the record show that Representatives Mann and Kornowicz are excused because of illness; and that



Representative McPike is excused because of his attendance at a funeral but that he expects to return to the chamber at approximately 2 o'clock this afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "May the record so show. Hearing no objections, the record will so show. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Epton is absent due to illness today."

Speaker Redmond: "May the record so show. No objection. Leave for a few minutes. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative J. M. Houlihan and Kane, Co-Chairmen from the Committee on State Government Organization, reported the following Committee Bill for introduction; House Bill 2400, action taken May 19, 1977. Representative J. M. Houlihan and Kane, Co-Chairmen from the Committee on State Government Organization, reported the following Committee Bill for introduction, House Bill 2401, action taken May 19, 1977. Representative Eugene M. Barnes, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations II, reported the following Committee Bill for introduction; House Bill 2403..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2401 was supposed to be posted with House Bill 2400. It's the same substantive matter. I'd move to waive the appropriate rule to have that posted with House Bill 2400. There is agreement on...on those Bills. It was inadvertently not posted with 2400, it's accompanying legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. What was that Bill again? 24..."

Houlihan, J.: "...01."

Speaker Redmond: "...2401. Taking a photograph is not permitted in the chamber, up there in the gallery."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Committee Report from Eugene M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, reports the following Committee Bill for introduction; House Bill 2403, action taken May 18, 1977."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2400, Select Committee on Government Organiza-



tion, a Bill for an Act creating the Joint Committee on Energy, a Joint Legislative Committee. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2401, Select Committee on Government Organization, a Bill for an Act to create the Department of Energy. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2402, Walsh-Kozubowski, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Elections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2403, Appropriations II Committee, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of various commissions, boards and agencies of state government. First Reading of the Bill."

Unknown: "Will you turn this off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar. House Bills, Second Reading. Representative Edgar, do you seek recognition?"

Edgar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Prior to making the request, I'd like to add Representative Zeke Giorgi as a hyphenated Sponsor of House Bill 788; and...he's already a Cosponsor...I'd like to request under Rule 9.1(g) that this Bill be returned to the Interim Study Calendar of the House Revenue Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan...does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Anyone else with a similar motion? On House Bills, Second Reading, is there any Bill on House Bills, Second Reading, that is not exempt that we should call and move to Third Reading? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "House Bill 951."

Speaker Redmond: "951. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday when I asked leave with a list of Bills to extend the deadline two weeks, there were two that were put back on; and I request leave and the use of the Attendance Roll Call to include 684 and 1247 on that list. It's been cleared with the Republicans and Democrats. And I'd request leave. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think you're giving me leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Sumner."



Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to vote 'yes' on 106?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to vote 'yes' on 106?"

Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones, D.: "May I be recorded 'aye' on 106?"

Speaker Redmond: "May the Gentleman be recorded as 'aye' on 106?"

Hearing no objections, leave is granted. 106 or --7, Representative Jones? Representative Hanahan on 951."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move 951 to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any Amendments on that, Mr. Clerk? Read the Amendments. Representative Waddell, do you seek recognition?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I request to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 44.

It does not change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman...does the Gentleman have leave?"

Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 951, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, Tuerk, amends House Bill 951 on page 1, lines 1 and 5, and so forth."

? Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

? Tuerk: "...that's Representative Wikoff's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Wikoff. How many Amendments are there here, Mr. Clerk? I know. Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment on 951..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis on the floor? Proceed. Proceed, Mr. Wikoff, to explain the Amendment."

Wikoff: "...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment on 951, which amends the Unemployment Compensation Act for the State of Illinois, is a long needed Amendment. The Illinois Unemployment Taxes range from one-tenth to 4 percent of the first \$4,200 paid each employee and each...each employer must pay this tax. Now, the first of the



year, 1978, January 1, the taxable wages are going to jump from \$4,200 to \$6,000. So even if the unemployed...even if the employer's tax rate remains unchanged in 1978, the amount of unemployment tax dollars, the pay is going to increase almost 50 percent. I have many letters, none of which I will take the time to read, where unemployment compen...or not unemployment compensation, but unemployment taxes have increased as much as 2,000 percent on employers even with no claims. This is an Act which is by most of the newspapers in agreement, Chicago newspapers, everyone else, that is having a devastating effect on Illinois business. It's causing them to look elsewhere to locate their business. And as every business leaves the State of Illinois, they are doing two things which has a rather drastic effect upon our economy. One, we are losing the income that they would be producing in the way of taxes, we are losing the income that they might be producing in the way of sales taxes. And we are also losing the income that those employees who were engaged in gainful employment may either leave the state following their employer or they may end up on the unemployment rolls. As of March last year or this year, Illinois had borrowed from the Federal Government more than \$700,000,000 for the Unemployment Trust Fund. June 30th. of 1976, we had only borrowed some \$314,000,000. So it's been doubled in approximately a nine-month situation, and by 1978 they're predicting under the present...present rates, we will have a deficit in the amount of \$820,000,000. Now, somehow or other, this is going to have to be paid off. In order to increase that and in order to pay that debt by 1978, all state employers are going to have to pay a penalty tax of three-tenths of 1 percent. I know you can't see it; but here's a graph showing what's happened to our Unemployment Trust Fund. Here's a similar graph showing what's happened in that same length of time to the unemployment compensation taxes in that...they've got up as rapidly as they've gone down. This is in no way meant to deprive anybody of any just unemployment benefits that are due...that are due. It is primarily a...some corrective situations where are going to



alleviate some of the burdens that are there."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 951 I rise to oppose. First of all, House Bill 951 as introduced removes the figure of \$135 from the maximum that an unemployed person may receive for the purposes of having unemployment insurance paid to a person at least a one dependent child or more. It makes the benefit of the married worker with dependent children actually eligible to two-thirds of the average unemployment compensation covered wage of \$220. Only that worker earning \$220 per week or over would be eligible for the two-thirds of \$220. Anyone making less than \$220 per week can only receive two-thirds of his or her actual wage. The individual worker at 50 percent of his or her wage, the married worker with nonworking spouse at 60 percent is calculated the same way. No one receives \$220 per week, despite rumors to the contrary. Over the years, the employers stated that they were mainly concerned about the worker with dependent children. The law, when enacted in 1937, provided a 65 percent formula for every worker, regardless of marital status and children. Amendment #1 takes away the changes adopted in 1975, and I don't know where the Gentleman gets off with the statement that this is a long-needed change. In addition, it adds restrictions never in the law before. This Amendment on behalf of the employers defeats the purpose of the Unemployment Compensation Law. There are 4,500,000 nonagricultural workers of all classifications in Illinois, from unskilled to top executives, who come within the law and surely it should be a concern to all of us. The documented fact of cost comparison is a key to this law in the employer complaints. Illinois is in the lowest 12 states in percentage of tax on the taxable payroll of \$4,200 a payroll. Illinois is in the lowest 4 states in percentage of total payroll. No employer pays a tax beyond the first \$4,200 of wages per year. Illinois went broke in December of 1974 before any change in the law beginning in July 1975. Those changes will now be reflected beginning January 1977. They had no effect on

employer taxes in 1975 and 1976. Twenty-one other states went broke too. And, yes, their benefits are lower. All of these states are borrowing from the Federal Government, why did they go broke? Two reasons. One, the Unemployment Compensation Trust Fund Reserve was down by the influence of big business in every state. Two, the widespread national economic depression started in 1973 and reached its peak of high unemployment in 1975 of 9 percent; the rate of unemployment is still 7 percent unemployed workers in 1977. These two facts, no reserves and hundreds of thousands of people out of work in each state was...has bankrupt the fund. This does not say much for the foresight and the intelligence of the big corporate funds that make corporate decisions and say so on our reserve system. The State AFL-CIO in 1955 proposed doubling the Illinois Trust Fund. With the unanimous agreement of employer representatives on the old Unemployment Compensation Advisory Board, or what we used to call the 'Agreed Board' List', a Bill passed. Then big business spokesmen went to the Governor and had him veto the Bill. Both the labor representatives and employer representatives and the advisory board were double-crossed. The Bill did not include one cent of new benefits. The tax was very modest and was spread out over a ten-year period. to accomplish the doubling of the Illinois Unemployment Compensation Trust Fund. So let's quit kiddin' ourselves and our constituents back home as to who is to blame on the insolvency of the trust fund. The money borrowed must be paid. Now, employers will have to pay higher taxes, both for repayment and to replenish the trust fund. Who do you suppose will be hit the hardest? The small employer. The big employer will easily pass the cost on. Who will get the blame? The Legislature and labor. Who helped small employers taxwise in 1975? Representative Giorgi's Bill doubled the first \$20,000 per quarter payroll to \$40,000 at a lower tax rate. That should be raised to \$50,000 per quarter in 1977. We have not seen an employer Bill introduced to help the small employer in 1977. And this Amendment isn't going to do one damn thing to help the small employer in 1977. This is just a brief resume at a



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

background of the unemployment compensation picture. And, you know, I'm not really going into a lot of detail that I could. And I don't like to necessarily bore you by repeating the facts. Adoption of Amendment #1, which includes all the items in the other 12 Amendments on the...11 Amendment on the Clerk's desk, is a disservice and a disregard of the 4,500,000 of our fellow citizens. Any one of them at some future date may need to apply for unemployment compensation benefits to meet the necessity of life. I strongly urge, strongly urge, the defeat of Amendment #1 and all the other Amendments, except Amendment #11."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Friedrich."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Corneal Davis in the Chair."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I was...I was asking to have my Bill called awhile ago, but apparently Representative Hanahan has a priority. So I'll wait until he gets through with this one."

Speaker Davis: "Any discussion? If not, the question is on the adoption of...just a minute. Representative Huff, do you wish to..."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, all I wanted to inquire was where is the Amendment?? I don't see it. I don't want to haggle over this Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Has the Amendment on...been distributed? Do you have the Amendment? It's...it's on the...it's on the desk, Representative Huff."

Huff: "All right. Well, I just want to say briefly in answer to some of the comments that I heard on the floor with regards to the statement that was made that not one Bill for the small businessman was seen in the House. I think the answer to that is that the House and its Committee in their wisdom killed all of them, Ladies and Gentlemen. All I know is that in Illinois we do have a serious problem with businesses leaving the state and I noticed last night when we left here both sides of the aisle were sort of haggling how they were going to straighten this thing out. All I can tell you, Gentlemen, is that you'd better get your act together because we are losing businesses, and the Bureau of Unemployment Security, the trust fund is bankrupt. And it's the



businessman who's going to have to pay for that. And while he's now paying the taxes on the first \$4,200, I want you to keep in mind after the first of June that tax rate will increase to the first \$6,200 of taxable income."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wikoff to close."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't take any time in closing. I think everything has been said that needs to be said other than I do have to refute what one...or a couple of statements that were made. It's true that two years ago our unemployment costs were somewhat the lowest in the country; but by the...January of 1978 we will have the distinct problem of going from the...one of the lowest in the country to one of the highest in the country in a two-year span. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask your consideration. I'd like to see a favorable vote on this. And as Representative Huff said, this is something that can help the small businessman."

Speaker Davis: "The question's on the adoption of the Amendment."

Those in favor let it be known by voting 'aye', opposers by saying 'nay'. All in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposers 'nay'. Take the record. We'll take the record in a minute when they vote. All voted who wished? All voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 88 'nays'...88 'ayes', 46 'nays'; and the...the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Porter, amends House Bill 951 on page 3, line 20, and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Porter, Amendment #2."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask that Amendments #2 through 9 be tabled."

Speaker Davis: "Are you the Sponsor of all of those Amendments? Does the Gentleman have leave to table from 2 to 9 Amendments? Leave being granted, Amendments 2 through 9 are now tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment...Amendment #10, Greiman, amends House Bill 951 as amended in the title by deleting '401' and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Greiman, this is your Amendment."



Greiman: "Yeah, I think that's the correct Amendment."

Speaker Davis: "#10, yes."

Greiman: "I would like to have leave to table that."

Speaker Davis: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Amendment #10 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, Keats, amends House Bill 951 on page 1, lines 1 and 5, and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Keats. Keats. Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Davis: "That's #11, Amendment #11. All right."

Keats: "I believe it to be an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Davis: "what?...huh?"

Keats: "I believe this to be an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Davis: "An Agreed...well, proceed, we'll see."

Keats: "Okay, what Amendment 11 does very simply is say you cannot draw vacation pay and unemployment compensation on the same day. It's one of your common sense type Amendments. I don't believe there's any opposition. It just says no vacation pay and unemployment comp. on the same day. I would..."

Speaker Davis: "The question's on the adoption of Amendment #11. Any discussion? All in favor will let it be known by voting 'aye', opposers 'nay'. Say 'aye', opposers 'nay'. The 'ayes' seem to have it. Amendment #11 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Greiman, amends House Bill 951 as amended in the title and in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #12 puts in the work product of the Administrative Procedure Study Committee and makes the work under the Comp. Acts applicable to the Administrative Procedures Act of Illinois. I ask that it be adopted."

Speaker Davis: "Any discussion on Amendment #12? No, wait a minute. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask a question of the Chair. Is this Amendment in conflict with some of the other Amendments that have been



adopted?"

Speaker Davis: "Hold on, let's take a look. It's in order. Representative Tuerk, it's in order. No conflict. Proceed. Representative Porter, just a minute. For what purpose do you arise?"

Porter: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "Question. Yes."

Porter: "Representative Greiman, did you say this came out of some Study Committee as a recommendation?"

Greiman: "Yes."

Porter: "Could you explain that a little more."

Greiman: "Yes. The Administrative Procedures Study Committee of this House of Representatives has been trying to implement the Administrative Procedures Act that adopted in 1975 and to see the best way to make the Act applicable to various agencies of state government, making exemptions and changes and what not as the mission of the various agencies considered dictate and require. And that we had another Bill which isn't too lively right now that did carry that...that issue forward. And that probably isn't going to go forward or it may not go forward. So at this point we're... I'm amending this thing which is really procedural and doesn't really affect unemployment comp. onto this Bill."

Porter: "Thank you."

Greiman: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "The question's on Amendment #12. Any discussion?"

The question is on Amendment #12. All in favor let it be known by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' seem to have it. Amendment #12 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "No further Amendments. All right. House Bill 1115. Just a minute. At the request of the Sponsor, we'll hold it on Second. 951. Wait, no, no, no. Wait a minute. That's right so it's on Second. Yeah, that's right. House Bill 1115 is next. What purpose."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1115..."

Speaker Davis: "That's it...all right...House Bill...For what purpose



does the Gentleman, Mr. Getty..."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, 1011 comes before 1115 according to the Calendar.

I just...did the Chair..."

Speaker Davis: "We'll check it. I didn't know you wanted it called."

Getty: "All right."

Speaker Davis: "All right, Mr. Clerk, 1015. Read 1011, please. I didn't know you wanted...I'm sorry, I didn't know you wanted it called. For what purpose does Representative Matijevich arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, on that Amendment 1, someone told me I...I don't know who hit my switch, but it was just the opposite of the way I wanted to vote. I was supposed to be 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "On Amendment #1..."

Matijevich: "Please record me as 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "...You mean 915?"

Matijevich: "Right. Please record me as 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Any objections? Objections have been heard, Representative Matijevich. All right, objections withdrawn, record the Gentleman 'no' on 915. Matijevich, Matijevich. You wanted to vote for it didn't you, Representative Matijevich? You wanted to vote 'no' on Amendment #1 on 915? Record the Gentleman as voting 'no' on 915...951. House Bill 1015, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "...House Bill 1011..."

Speaker Davis: "Hold it, hold it just a minute. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Who...I don't even know who the Sponsor is...Mr. Hanahan...and I hope when he has 951 on Third Reading he'll give us an honest appraisal of the 12 Amendments that were attached to it...whether they were defeated or whether they weren't. And just what net result was to the Bill. I think, especially in my area, this is highly industrial. Unemployment is a very, very important thing there. And I don't know about the rest of the people here, but I'm sure that there are some with me that are confused as to what all these Amendments did to the Bill. And I'd like to have it clarified, at least briefly, before we have to vote on the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Davis: "House Bill 1015, Mr. Clerk, did you read it?"



Clerk O'Brien: "...House Bill 1011. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted. Amendment #2 was tabled. Floor Amendment #3, Getty, amends House Bill 1011 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, being the Sponsor of Amendment #3, I ask leave to table it."

Speaker Davis: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table it? No objections, Amendment #3 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. Now, 1115, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1115, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was tabled, 2 was adopted, 3 failed, 4 and 5 were adopted. I have motions filed to table Amendments 2, 4 and 5."

Speaker Davis: "Whose motions are those, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "On Amendment 2 it's Representative Leverenz. They're all Representative Leverenz'."

Speaker Davis: "All Representative Lev...Representative Leverenz on the motions."

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. Just as a brief explanation, we were unable to have an adequate amount of time to work out some Amendments that would be agreed on both sides. We have done that, but Amendment #6 also is filed with a technical error in it. And we have Amendment #7 filed. Our intent is to table Amendments 2, 4 and 5, also 6. And go with Amendment #7 which includes things that are in 2, 4 and 5. I ask that we table Amendments 2, 4 and 5 and 6. I ask that I have leave to do that now."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman wish to table Amendment #...just a minute... 2, 4, 5 and 6, am I right?"

Leverenz: "That's correct, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Leave to take them all at once? All right. Any objections?"



Any objections? Being no...hearing no objections, the Amendments are tabled. Now, you said you wanted to proceed with what...

Amendment #..."

Leverenz: "7."

Speaker Davis: "7."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Leverenz, amends House Bill 1115 on page 1, line 12, and so forth."

Leverenz: "Briefly to explain..."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Leverenz on that Amendment, please, 7."

Leverenz: "...thank you, Sir...briefly on Amendment #7 it would...the Amendment #2 was a reduction in personal services of \$357,000. Amendment 7 would include a reduction in that area of \$110,000, I believe. And Amendment #4 was the Prosecution Assistance Act. That Amendment is included in 7 for a reduction in that program of \$164,000. Amendment #5 was the Amendment that provided job classifications or position classifications with salary rates for those, a ceiling and a floor for each job classification. And at this time I ask for the House to agree that we add Amendment #7 to this Bill. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I just want to confirm what he said. We worked these out and this Amendment is agreeable. It constitutes a reduction of \$274,600."

Speaker Davis: "Anybody discussion? The question is, shall...anybody discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #7 be adopted? All in favor will let it be known by saying 'aye', the opposers...the 'ayes' have it, Amendment #7 is adopted."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "No further Amendments, the Bill will be reported to Third Reading. Next. Representative Madigan on 1429. Do you want it moved? Out of...out of the record. Out of the record? Representative Madigan, out of the record? Wait, wait, hold it, hold it just a minute. He's holding up a hand. All right, I'll get you



Brother Schlickman, in a minute. Representative Madigan, 1429 on Second Reading."

Madigan: "I would request that that be moved to the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Davis: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, will you please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1429, a Bill for an Act to make appropriations for the Illinois Arts Council. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Wait a minute."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "No further Amendments? Third Reading. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respectfully pose an inquiry to the Chair."

Speaker Davis: "All right."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are fast approaching the deadline for nonexempt Bills. And I wonder, and I'm sure there are other Members who wonder, why are we reading exempt Bills when we could be using the time to dispose of the nonexempt Bills and thereby avoid what may be a crush some time tomorrow?"

Speaker Davis: "Well, I'm just going in order here. You want...I'm just going...following the order. Do you want the Speaker to answer that? I'm following the order..."

Schlickman: "Well, you're the Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Sir?"

Schlickman: "You're the Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Well, I know, but I'm the acting Speaker, and I'm following the orders of the Speaker. Wait a minute."

Schlickman: "Don't you think I have a good idea, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Davis: "Just a minute."

Schlickman: "Dave does."

Speaker Davis: "Well, how about we run down these real quick...House Bills ..."

Schlickman: "Well, what I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, if I may is to move under the appropriate rule that we go to the Order of Third



Reading at this time."

Speaker Davis: "Well, if we skip the appropriations, then what?"

Schlickman: "Oh, that's okay."

Speaker Davis: "We'll go to Third Reading?"

Schlickman: "Yes, please."

Speaker Davis: "All right. 1724, is Representative Terzich here?"

All right, we're going to Third Reading. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could you explain our posture at this moment to the Assembly? What is before the Body, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Davis: "I just called 1724. We're going to...to Second Reading, and we were going to appropriations after...we skipped appropriations, we just called 1724."

Madigan: "And we are on the Order of Second Reading?"

Speaker Davis: "Second Reading."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Take 1724 out of the record. Terzich is not on the floor. 1799, Representative Madigan. Out of the record. 19... 1922, Capparelli. Out of the record. On the Order of Third Reading we have a couple of Bills to be called back for Amendments. Representative Klosak, do you want...for what purpose does the Gentleman arise?"

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, I have a Bill on Second Reading, First Legislative Day, which I would like to have moved today. Therefore, I move that...to suspend Rule 33(a) so that House Bill 2395 can be read a second time and advanced to the Order of Third Reading. Without this type of action the Bill is not exempt and will die without ever having had its day in court. I ask for the necessary 89 votes."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule 33 to call House Bill 2395 back to Second Reading for purpose of Amendment. Leave? We've got to have 89 votes, I understand. Once leave is granted, we can use the Attendance Roll Call. All right. Leave being granted, we'll use the Attendance Roll Call to suspend the rule. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2395, a Bill for an Act requiring certain types



of Bills introduced in the General Assembly have provided a note indicating the fiscal effect thereof of state finances. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Davis: "None. Third Reading. Now, on Third Reading appears House Bill 1034. Representative Leverenz, wishes to take it back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Return the Bill to Second Reading, no objections."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1 to House Bill 1034 simply breaks out the bulk amount that was in the Bill into separate line items. The Amendment has been distributed. I ask for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1034."

Speaker Davis: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor let it be known by saying 'aye', the opposers 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is adopted."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk..."



Speaker Davis: "...On Third Reading appears House Bill 1205. The Sponsor asks leave to bring it back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Objections have been heard. Do you move to return it...the Sponsor moves then to return the Bill to Second Reading?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Speaker Davis: "All in favor of the Bill being returned to Second Reading will vote 'aye', the opposers 'nay'. Vote 'aye'. We know we're going to have a Roll Call...all in favor let it be known by voting 'aye', the opposers 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? On this question there is 82 'ayes'... Representative Beatty. Representative Beatty, do you want to talk? All voted who wished? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to verify this Roll Call at the proper time."

Speaker Davis: "All right, Representative Matijevich."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker..."

Matijevich: "I'd like to explain my vote. I heard many eloquent words yesterday when we had a Bill relating to the public accountants or the C.P.A.'s, I forgot which it was, and...the 775, I understand. And at that time I heard on the floor of the House where never have they disallowed somebody the privilege of moving their Bills back to Second. Now, kill the Bill, do what you want; but let the Sponsor go back to Second Reading and amend his Bill. And I...I went along on Second...in fact, somebody here on this side said let's not let that Gentleman do that. I said, no, you've got to do it. Leave him get his Bill back to Second and have it amended. And I would urge the people on both sides of the aisle, return the Bill back, do what the Sponsor wants or whoever, and do what you want on Third Reading."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I would simply like to say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for the reasons cited by the Gentleman from Lake, I am voting 'aye' on this motion,"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Mautino to



explain your vote."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree in total with Representative Matijevec. We've worked long and hard on this. I'd like to be able to take House Bill 1205 of which I'm the principal Sponsor back to Second Reading to make some additional Amendments. The Amendments are before you on the desks; and I think that I should have the opportunity to take this Bill back and put it in the posture of which I'd like to have it. I think it's only courtesy of this House. I think you're setting a very, very difficult precedent if you don't allow the Sponsor to take his Bill back and amend it the way he'd like to have it amended. I'd appreciate those Gentleman that are voting red, they wouldn't please come over and give me the opportunity to amend House Bill 1205. It's a good Amendment; and I can't understand how many Members on the other side of the aisle won't allow a Sponsor to take his Bill back to make corrective measures that they were in disagreement on originally, and by taking it back address some of those questions. The legislative process is for the Sponsor to do so. I ask for your help in allowing me to go ahead with my right as a Member of this Assembly to amend my legislation."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House; we all recognize the fact that Workmen's Compensation is probably the number one issue presented in the Illinois House of Representatives. We also all recognize the fact that there have been substantial negotiations going on between both sides of the aisle and that currently at this time we have an effort to have heard 853, which we discussed yesterday for well over an hour to only have the Chair arbitrarily call this House adjourned without even having a Bill heard proper...debate."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, point of order, point of order."

Daniels: "Now this Gentleman turns to us and he says..."

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

Mautino: "That is not the question before the Gentleman, I wished he'd



address his answer to the question of returning this Bill to Second Reading, not debating what happened on this House floor last evening."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's point is well taken. Confine your remarks to the question of the Gentleman's motion to return House Bill 1205 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Mr. Daniels, confine your remarks to the motion."

Daniels: "...We're interested in substance, that's true, Mr. Speaker. We want to go in and look at the substance of the motion. Now, will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "A point of order. All that Representative Daniels can do now is to explain his vote. We're on a Roll Call. He cannot ask a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I merely asked if you'd yield. He can yield. We've done it before."

Mautino: "Mr. Daniels, are you saying to me that you want me to yield so you can explain to me why you will not support my motion..."

Daniels: "No, I want to ask you a...I want to ask you..."

Mautino: "...to go back to Second Reading, is that what you're saying?..."

Daniels: "...no...no. We understand, Mr. Speaker..."

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

Matijevich: "Point of order. Pay attention. Both of these Gentlemen are out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "You are correct. Confine your remarks to the motion. The motion is whether or not the Gentleman will have leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment in putting the Bill in the shape in which he desires it. Now, that's strictly the question, and...Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we on this side of the aisle, any of us that are voting red are doing for one reason, when 853 is heard, and we have an opportunity...and this is directing the motion, Mr. Speaker..."



Speaker Redmond: "No, it has nothing to do...please confine your remarks to the motion. The motion is whether or not the Gentleman is going to have leave."

Daniels: "...my reason for voting 'no' on this motion, is that acceptable, Mr. Speaker?"

Unknown: "Not if you address 853..."

Daniels: "Who are you? Who's this man over here?!"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now. Come to order here...goodwill here."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I am opposing this motion until the time when 853 is heard in full. When it's heard in full, we'll be happy to sit down and entertain Second Reading Amendments by Representative Mautino and we will do what we can to assist him in having that heard. And that's the reason for opposition; and I ask all people to oppose this motion to return it to Second Reading until 853 is given a fair hearing and a vote by this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye' and 58 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill 1205 is...Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I'd like to verify the Roll, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, Representative Mautino has requested a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley, Epton, Johnson, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Madison, Mann, Lynn Martin, Meyer, Molloy, Nardulli, Stearney, Tuerk, and Waddell."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. The Gentleman in the aisle, according to Hanahan's rules, you must be in your seat. Representative Conti. Representative Willer, you're violating Hanahan's rules. Mr. Clerk, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart,



Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McAvoy, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tip sword, Van Dwyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Wall, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell..."

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

Mautino: "I'd like to be able to look around, Sir. I'd like to have all unauthorized persons removed from the floor of the House, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Unauthorized persons leave the floor. If you see any, point them out and we'll see that...this young fellow is a Senator. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. If you identify any of them, we'll have them escorted off. Representative Waddell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Waddell: "Vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'no'. Have you finished with the verification?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...Mr. Speaker. Now, I'm finished."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Huskey: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him 'no'. Any questions? Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes desires to be verified. He has to go outside for a minute. May he be verified. Who was that?"

Ryan: "Mr. Brady, Representative Brady?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Capparelli?"



Speaker Redmond: "Capparelli? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Darrow?"

Speaker Redmond: "Darrow is in his seat. He's cradling the phone."

Ryan: "Representative Ebbesen?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ebbesen? Representative Ebbesen? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Geo-Karis?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin, do you seek to be verified? May he be verified?"

Ryan: "Who...who's that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Levin. Raise your hand. Identify yourself."

Ryan: "Oh, sure that's all right. I'll let you go ahead."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the last one, Mr. Ryan?"

Ryan: "Geo-Karis was the one I called."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...that's Walsh, isn't it? Yeah. How is Representative Geo-Karis recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Ryan: "Representative Holewinski?"

Speaker Redmond: "Holewinski? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Huff?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff? He's here."

Ryan: "Representative Kane?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the middle aisle."

Ryan: "Representative McMaster?"

Speaker Redmond: "McMaster? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Mudd?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Mugalian?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd has returned. Capparelli has returned. Put them both back on the..."

Ryan: "Representative Murphy?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Representative Pouncey?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Representative Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Redmond: "Satterthwaite is here."

Ryan: "Representative Schisler?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded? He's not voted they tell me."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Schlickman? Everybody, I'm sorry about that. That speech is an error. Sharp?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sharp? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative McPike?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Whoever pushed that switch, I'd like to remind you that Representative McPike was excused this morning because he's attending a funeral. So I would suggest that you be a little more careful. Remove Representative McPike."

Ryan: "Representative James Taylor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Taylor? He's there. That big Mulcahey's standing up and I could hardly see you."

Ryan: "Representative Von Boeckman? Is he here?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Okay. Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski, He desires to be recorded



as 'aye'. Proceed."

Ryan: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the score? On this question there's 89 'aye' and 60 'nay', this motion prevails. 1205 is returned to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you arise?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is my understanding that based upon the discussion after adjournment yesterday that House Bill 853 will be called at 11 o'clock prompt, is that correct, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Daniels: "Regardless to where we're at, we will call 853 at 11 o'clock?"

Speaker Redmond: "I said I would call 853 at 11 o'clock."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with your Amendments, Mr. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "You can call it, but that doesn't mean it's going to be heard."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I have no control of it. Representative Mautino."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Mautino, amends House Bill 1205 as amended and so forth."

Mautino: "Thank...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House...Amendment #3 to House Bill 1205 does the following. It answers many of the questions raised, many of the problems that were involved in the two Bills that...one other Bill that was discussed previously that 853 and 1205. What this Amendment does is eliminate the provisions which would have established a Hearing Loss Reimbursement Fund. It takes out the escalation clause of one hundred and sixty-six and two-thirds and two hundred percent that would be going into effect July 1 of '79 and July 1 of '81. It increases the differential between permanent partial and temporary total by 4 percent. In other words, it will now be a 24 percent differential between t.t. and t.p., and it establishes the procedural rules for the Industrial Commission to follow in carrying out statutory duties. And the other portions of the Amendment



are as they appear in Amendment #2 of House Bill 1205. I ask a favorable vote on Amendment #3 to 1205."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schuneman: "Representative Mautino, I think that from your description that your Amendment apparently picks up some of the provisions in House Bill 853 as amended, is that correct?"

Mautino: "Yes, it does."

Schuneman: "What...have you done anything about changing the average manufacturing wage to the average wage in Illinois?"

Mautino: "No, the average manu...the average wage in manufacturing is retained in the legislation and in the Amendment, and we have in lieu of that taken out the one sixty-six and two-thirds and a 200 percent. That was the major concern of the employers and the major issue in...one of the major issues, of course, and the most highly significant one in House Bill 853."

Schuneman: "Well, okay, it's also...it's also fair then to say that the National Commission has recommended the average wage in each state and not the average week...not the average manufacturing wage as the basis for workmen's compensation. Illinois has the average manufacturing wage, which is higher. Then in treating permanent partial will the result of your Amendment put the permanent partial situation in the same position as House Bill 853?"

Mautino: "There is a one percent differential. As you are well aware, House Bill 853 was a .25 percent differential..."

Schuneman: "Right."

Mautino: "...and this is a 24 percent differential."

Schuneman: "Okay, but does this deal differently with the various sections of permanent partial?"

Mautino: "It certainly does. It addresses the cap or the maximum compensation tied into the manufacturing wage. In other words, that 24 percent would come off the top. It reduces the cap."

Schuneman: "Does it reduce the minimum?"



Mautino: "No, Sir, it does not. It protects the minimum."

Schuneman: "So to that extent it's the same as 853. Now, let's see, your original Amendment included the panel of physicians which was subject to collective bargaining. Is that in this revised Amendment?"

Mautino: "I'd like to correct your statement. First of all, it's not in the matter of interpretation. It is my feeling that it is not tied into collective bargaining in any way, shape or form. That was your statement, not mine. The panel of physicians is the identical recommendation of the National Commission written from their recommendations; it's identical to what they support...so the ...but..."

Schuneman: "Is the panel...panel in your Amendment yet?"

Mautino: "...Yes, Sir. It remains in Amendment #..."

Schuneman: "It leaves...it leaves the panel in. Okay. And then one other question, as to the standards being adopted or being promulgated by the Industrial Commission, is the effect of that similar to the effect of 853? I'm sorry to ask these questions, but we haven't had any time to look at your Amendment obviously, and this is the reason for all the questions."

Mautino: "It's written...it's written to allow the evidential...evidentiary rules for which the Commission can operate; but I think, Cal, you also touched on one point that you didn't make very clear. You wanted out the hearing loss reimbursement fund. I've also taken that out completely."

Schuneman: "Okay, all right. I think that's a step in the right direction...have a chance to hear that. You said that the Amendment would permit evidentiary rules to be promulgated by the Commission."

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Schuneman: "Will it permit the Commission to establish standards for determining disability...percentages of disability? This is one of the problems that has been addressed in the Insurance Laws Study Commission."

Mautino: "Cal, I'm not an attorney. I can't give you a legal interpretation. As it is written in the legislation of evidentiary rules and it's the...at least my feeling and intent that the Commission will have..."



be the final decision on what they will be using."

Schuneman: "Well, okay, I think it's important to get into the record of this House the intent of the Sponsor of this Amendment, and is it your intent that this Amendment will permit or in fact require the Industrial Commission to establish standards for determining the degree of disability?"

Mautino: "It's the intent to put the evidentiary rules into the hands of the Commission, and that's the way the Amendment is written."

Schuneman: "Well, you didn't answer my question."

Mautino: "I can only answer questions..."

Schuneman: "Would you answer my question? Is it your intent that this Amendment require the Industrial Commission to promulgate and use standards for determining disability?"

Mautino: "It is my intent to give them evidentiary rules. It is not my intent to allow them to use the American Medical Association standards..."

Schuneman: "I didn't say anything about the American Medical Association. I'm asking about standards for determining disability. And are you saying that it is not your intent to require the Industrial Commission to establish those standards?"

Mautino: "No, I'm giving them the authority to have evidentiary rules. That's what the Amendment says and that's..."

Schuneman: "Well, Sir, you keep telling me about evidentiary rules, what I'm asking about is standards for determining disability."

Mautino: "I would assume that they...that would be in the same posture of where they are now."

Schuneman: "Which would mean they have not..."

Mautino: "They...they do have..."

Schuneman: "...they have no standards, they have no right to establish standards."

Mautino: "...They have their own flexibility in determining..."

Schuneman: "Well, I...is it fair to say that the answer to my question is, 'no'?"

Mautino: "It could be. It could be fair."

Schuneman: "Well, that isn't a very responsive answer, Representative."



You should be able...you know enough about this you should be able to answer it yes or no."

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

Barnes, E.: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Gentleman's question has been answered more than once, and it seems to me that there is a dialogue going on, not a direct question. The answer was...the question was answered three times."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're correct. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, if Representative Barnes thinks my ans...my question has been answered, I'd like to know what the answer is. Is it yes or is it no?"

Speaker Redmond: "Never mind, you can't...the only person to whom you can propose a question is the Sponsor. You can...when you explain your vote on the motion, you can go into this matter; but please confine..."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "...your questions to Representative Mautino. And I would..."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "...Any further questions? Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tuerk: "I...I was having a little difficulty hearing your answers to some of the questions; and, unfortunately, I...I didn't get the answer to that standard question. Would you repeat it? Do you really know the answer to what you have in the Amendment?"

Mautino: "It is my intention...pose your questions, I'll be happy to answer it for you, Mr...Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, to what extent is the Industrial Commission going to be involved in setting standards for disability?"

Mautino: "The Amendment as written gives them power of evidentiary rules. It is not my intention to give them the guidelines and standards of the American Medical Association. That, I think, specifically answers your question."

Tuerk: "Well...no, I don't think it does. Does this require the Commission



to set standards? Would you answer the question yes or no?"

Mautino: "It allows them to set rules and regulations according to the sheet that goes...procedural rules as it's written in the Amendment."

Tuerk: "Well, you still..."

Mautino: "I've got the answer..."

Tuerk: "...you still haven't..."

Mautino: "...I'll answer it by reading it, Representative Tuerk..."

Tuerk: "...Well, I can read..."

Mautino: "...Okay, well I can too."

Tuerk: "...Well, I...I want to know what your intent is with that language and for determining the extent of disabilities sustained."

Mautino: "I've answered the question, you've answered it also. That is to...the rules that we're giving to the Commission. They shall make and publish procedural rules and orders for carrying out the duties imposed upon it by law and put a determination...determining the extent of disability sustained. It's very straight and..."

Tuerk: "No, answer my question yes or no. Is it your intent..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please bring the dialogue to a close."

Tuerk: "...Well, I have some serious questions. We haven't had an opportunity to look at this Amendment very long, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The rules have been..."

Tuerk: "...I want to know...I want to know whether it's your intent, Representative Mautino, to give the Commission the requirement to set standards, yes or no?"

Mautino: "No."

Tuerk: "Thank you. Now, second question, to what extent will this Amendment reduce premiums?"

Mautino: "About the same extent that probably 853 would. I did not state at this time or any other time that this Amendment would emphatically lower any premiums because I'm not in the insurance industry. What this Amendment will do is stabilize the premiums paid by the employees of the State of Illinois and still protect the injured worker, if that happens to be the case in the State of Illinois. There's not a person on this House floor or in this chamber that can tell me that premiums are going to be reduced in..."



in his direction to approximate 1205 to 853; but I think what he should do is hold the Bill on Second Reading, offer another Amendment or allow us the time to draw the Amendment to bring 1205 into concert with 853. And then, I think, we do have indeed a fairly decent compromise as opposed to a cursory movement toward bringing his posture, his previous posture, in concert with the posture of 853."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker; I think if we're going to have an attempt to that...what Representative Tuerk is saying is very fair. And I think that we should bring both Bills back to Second Reading and hold them both there. I wouldn't object to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in favor of this Amendment. I would just like to respond to some of the other people who talk about standards. I don't think they really know what Workmen's Comp. is all about. I haven't seen a Bill yet that could lay down standards that they're talking about. I might tell you that the standards that they have in...in 853 are just really unacceptable. Not only are they unacceptable, they're impossible to determine legally as to what they are. They don't specify what the depth of standards are. They don't specify what the source of the standards are. This ambiguity, I think, would cause an imbalance between medical guidelines and those actually given out by the Commission. I might tell you that we need medical guidelines, we don't need standards. And if you have just standards, you're not going to be able to find out what is the disability of that particular person's injury. And, after all, that's what we're talking about. What is the disability? How do we get to that disability? And in order to get to it, you need medical guidelines; and you don't need the goofy standards that some of the other people on the other side of the aisle have been talking about. And I would urge an 'aye' vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Could I yield to Representative Daniels?"



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

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hour is eleven o'clock. Let me finish my point, Mr. Speaker, before we have your Gentleman yelling over there. The hour is eleven o'clock. We are asking now that House Bill 853 be called in line with the agreement that was made last night after adjournment and in line with what has been agreed to that we interrupt this line of business and go straight to 853."

Speaker Redmond: "We're going to go to the question of the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 1205. The question is on that motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Simple Majority, the Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 87 'aye', 90 'aye' and 1 'no'. The motion prevails and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Order of business is Third, House Bills, Third Reading, Priority of Call. House Bill 853. For what purpose do you rise, Mr. Daniels? I recognize Mr. Daniels. I've called 853 on Priority of Call."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, you didn't give us a chance to talk on, regarding moving 1205 to Third Reading. Now, we ask in all favor and all benefit to every Member of this House that you reverse that and you hold 1205 on Second Reading and we go straight over to 853."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been the policy of the Chair that in the event there are no further Amendments and it's the desire of the Sponsor, the rules require that I remove it to the Order of Third Reading and that's what I did. Representative Bradley is recognized with respect to House Bill 853. It's on the Order of Third Reading."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I defer to Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec, for what purpose do you rise? State your point."

Matijevec: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have a Priority of Call Calendar in front of me and it doesn't have 853 as the first Bill



on the Priority of Call. And I think you need 107 votes to get to 853. And I..."

Speaker Redmond: "We were on it yesterday and the order of call, we had a motion for adjournment and that's the first Bill on the Priority of Call. That's what I agreed to do with both sides of the aisle and that's the order of business. Representative... who did you yield to; Representative Bradley?"

Matijevich: "I never heard that agreement, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we are. Who do you... Mr. Bradley. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last night when Representative Bradley explained to you the content of House Bill 853, I felt he did an outstanding job in delineating the five changes that have been made through Amendment #7 to House Bill 853. What 853 does in the present posture is reduce the permanent partial differential by 25% and we've discussed that at length. I don't consider that to be a question that needs any more elaboration. The death benefit cap..."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that there's a written motion filed by Representative McClain that moved that House Bill 1205 be considered before this Bill. And it relates..."

Speaker Redmond: "That motion was not brought to my attention. The motion was not put. We are on the Order of House Bill 853 and Representative Tuerk has been recognized."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we could eliminate all the confusion and interruptions, why, I'll proceed to explain the posture of 853 and how well it is framed at this point. The 25% differential in permanent partial, the two hundred and fifty thousand dollar cap on death or twenty years, it establishes the..."

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

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, does a Member have a right to object to the T.V. light being on? If so, I object."

Speaker Redmond: "The request has been made that we permit the T.V. camera and the Speaker has granted the request which has been my



custom and the custom of previous Speakers. And when you're Speaker, Mr. Dunn, if you want to take on the media and the press, why, be my guest. Representative Tuerk, proceed."

Tuerk: "I don't even see a camera up there. I don't know what the Gentleman's objecting to."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to rise but I talked to you after the conference yesterday and you agreed that if I would put the motion, that you would hear the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "I've already ruled on that, Mr. McClain. We're on the Order of 853."

McClain: "Sir, I'd like to ask why you would honor your word to Mr. Tuerk and..."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't even know that the motion was here until we had started the debate. Proceed, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Proceeding on with an explanation to 853, this Bill in the present posture does allow the Commission to set some rules. Now, I refer to two different reports. I have in my left hand here the report of the National Commission of the State Workmen Compensation Laws which did, in fact, suggest that standards do be set. They referred to the A.M.A. standard. Now, being the pragmatist that I am, this Amendment doesn't speak at all to the A.M.A. standards. It gives the Commission the right to set the rules. I think that's a step in the right direction and should be voted upon favorably on, by this House. It does address itself to another important issue, namely the average weekly wage versus the average manufacturing wage. And for Representative Mautino's behalf, let me point out that there is a disparity of some twenty-five, twenty-six to thirty dollars difference between the two. And this is a very meaningful thing and beyond July 1 of this year, the benefits for injured employees will be higher based on the average weekly wage than they are today based on the average manufacturing wage. So in my view, it's a very reasonable Amendment, a very reasonable approach and proposal to the entire Amendment that is now on 853. Beyond that, it does provide that the escalation will cease after



July 1 when the one thirty-three and a third goes into effect. It does not address itself to two very more important provisions which I think should become part of the law eventually and that's the preëxisting injury credit and the panel of physicians. Here again being a pragmatist, I felt that the five provisions that we were able to adopt in Amendment #7 was a reasonable compromise, a reasonable solution. And on the subject of premiums as Representative Mautino said five or ten minutes ago, nobody in this House, nobody in the state can give any guarantee relative to the reduction of premiums. He mentioned the stabilizing affect and I would concur in that statement that these changes will tend to stabilize the rise in premiums as we go forward. I'm sure with increased benefits going into effect on July 1 that premiums will perhaps and I say perhaps in underline and underscore that comment, may go up very slightly. But they aren't going up at a rapid clip that they have been going up in the last two years. In closing, I think this is a reasonable approach to the entire problem. It's not going as far as I'd like to see it to go, but on the other hand, it does meet some needs of the business climate problem that we're facing. And I would ask for your favorable support to House Bill 853."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I have a written motion on the Clerk's desk and I move House Bill 853 be postponed to three p.m. today."

Speaker Redmond: "Pursuant to what rule?"

Hanahan: "To the rules on motions."

Speaker Redmond: "Which rule and what does it say?"

Hanahan: "Whatever the proper rule on motions..."

Speaker Redmond: "A motion to postpone to a day certain is in order, but it doesn't say anything about a motion to an hour certain."

Hanahan: "...certain on there, too."

Speaker Redmond: "And this as I see it is a day that you have set forth in your motion so I think that that motion is out of order. Representative Ryan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The



question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative Jaffe, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jaffe: "Just to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. It's very... you know, I think it's very unfair to have a Bill called like this and all of a sudden just have the proponent speak and then cut off debate without hearing any opponents. I mean, that's worse than the Short Debate Calendar. I mean, the way we're handling this, it's absolutely ridiculous and I would suggest that we vote 'no' on this particular motion."

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

Matijeovich: "I want to explain my vote. I don't care, I'm still explaining my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Matijeovich: "Because I think the assemblage of the people here ought to know that you made a deal and you are afraid of Lee Daniels who's in your district and the deal was made in the back room and you know it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Point of order. Representative Matijeovich is clearly out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "This question, there's 87 'aye' and 74 'no'. The motion prevails. Representative... oh, pardon me. The motion fails. It takes two-thirds of those voting. Motion fails. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that House Bill 853 be postponed until May 21, 1977, tomorrow which is still within the rules of the House for an orderly time of call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman. The question is... the Gentleman's... Representative Hanahan has moved that House Bill 853 be postponed till May 21. Representative Simms has moved that that lie on the table. The question's on Representative Simms."



Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman's motion is out of order. He's changing the Priority of Call here and the motion's certainly out of order. I wish you'd rule it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I think the Gentleman is in error. The rules clearly provide for a precedent of order of call for motions and the motion is timely, it's in order and... the following motion that followed my motion that we're... vote on. That's the motion to table."

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

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Rule 37 is the rule for the calling of Bills. In that rule there are listed five separate ways that you can call Bills. The Gentleman is now proposing a sixth way to do that and I propose to you that that motion is out of order unless he suspends Rule 37."

Speaker Redmond: "Suggest to you, Sir, that it's the Members that are doing it, not the Chair. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Simms. Representative Hanahan moved that... Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. On Representative Hanahan's motion, how many votes would that take to carry?"

Speaker Redmond: "Simple Majority. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's your job to interpret the rules and rule accordingly. And I'm suggesting to you that for Mr. Hanahan's motion to be in order, he has to suspend Rule 37. And I'd like to have a ruling from you on that particular point."

Speaker Redmond: "Under your suggestive interpretation, Mr. Ryan, you would suggest that no motion with respect to a Bill whether it would be recommit or whatever it would be, would be out of order. and I don't believe that that would be the interpretation. I would feel that Representative Hanahan is in order in propounding the motion. I think Representative Simms is in order when he moved that it lie on the table. And the question is on Representative Simms' motion to lay Representative Hanahan's motion on the table."



Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. It's on the motion to table, not debatable. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "You know, you've said that over and over again, Mr. Speaker, that a motion to table is not debatable. I submit to you that it is debatable and I request that you cite in Robert's Rules or otherwise where it is not debatable."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 84 'aye' and 71 'no'. Representative Simms' motion to table prevails. Revert now to House Bills, Third Reading. We have 853. Representative Bradley to close or Representative Tuerk to close? Representative Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. That's correct. Debate... yeah, but debate was not cut off because we didn't get the two-thirds vote. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to rise in opposition to this Bill. We've heard a lot about the standards that they have talked about and let me tell you that the standards portion is enough of a reason to vote against the Bill. As I indicated to you before, the intention of the Workmen's Comp. Act is to help people who have been injured on the job. And we're supposed to find out if we're going to help them, what's wrong with them medically. I submit to you that it's the standards that they have in 853 are so ambiguous, so vague that you couldn't possibly determine anything with those particular standards. As a matter of fact, those standards create such an ambiguity that they would create an imbalance between actual medical guidelines and those promulgated by the Industrial Commission. I think what we're witnessing in the General Assembly today is really something horrendous that's been continuing for a long period of time. I would like to make one very quick point, Mr. Speaker. And that is, it's becoming more and more obvious to me as I sit in the General Assembly that this state is owned by the insurance companies. Not only are they owned by the insurance companies, they're protected by the media. First, we have the medical malpractice crisis, then



we have the workmen's comp. crisis, then we have the product liability crisis. In my mind, we don't regulate insurance companies or rates in... in very many areas. I think we regulate them in perhaps two or three and even in those areas we don't regulate the way we should. The insurance companies have been able to pit labor against management. They've been able to pit the medical society against the patients and the legal profession. And let me ask you where are the insurance companies today? We find that labor is fighting with management but you can't find an insurance representative anyplace. They're hiding under rocks. Comes an insurance Bill and you can't walk two feet without falling over them in the hall. I think it's about time we realize what the situation is and this is a situation that is more caused by the insurance company and we ought to be a Legislature and not merely be puppets of the insurance industry in this state. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

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

I stand in support of House Bill 853. This is the best vehicle that we have for changing workmen's compensation in Illinois this year. The reason that it's better than House Bill 1205 which was just amended is that 853 goes one step farther. And it changes the average manufacturing wage to the average wage in Illinois as a basis for determining benefits. Now, that change is consistent with the recommendation of a National Council on Workmen's Compensation. It's a part of their recommendation. It's a part of the recommendation of the Illinois Laws Study Commission and the Workmen's Compensation Subcommittee. The average weekly wage in manufacturing in Illinois is presently two hundred and thirty-one dollars. Now, after July 1, that's going to go up to three hundred and seven dollars. And yet, Members from the other side are constantly standing and asking that the insurance industry promise that they're going to charge less money for higher benefits. There's no logic in that argument, Gentlemen. It's totally illogical. If you accept House Bill 853, we will be changing the weekly wage in Illinois from two hundred thirty-one dollars to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

two hundred five dollars. But that amount is going to increase on July 1 by 33%. That increase will then make the average weekly wage in Illinois after the adoption of 853 higher than it is today. Now, what I'm telling you is that House Bill 853 will moderate workmen's compensation. House Bill 1205 will not address the question of the basic benefit and I submit to you that that is an elemental, that is an elemental reason for workmen's compensation costs to continue to escalate. If you want real significant change in workmen's compensation, vote for House Bill 853. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further debate? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill was debated last night at considerable length before the Majority Party undertook to adjourn very rapidly and Mr. Hanahan spoke at that time. There's several others that would like to talk and I suggest that you recognize them."

Speaker Redmond: "He tells me that he hasn't expired his ten minutes."

Representative Hanahan. You may learn something."

Hanahan: "If you listen very closely, Representative, you may redeem yourself with God and everyone else. If you listen to the pleas and the plight of an injured worker instead of just the greed and... of the insurance companies that have put us in this kind of position that we're in today. House Bill 853, that is before you, is a step backward. You know, some people would like to step so far back that they'd go back to the system that if an injured worker had the audacity to lose his life or get permanently injured, that they'd even have a claim against his estate. Some people would go back as far as the days when an injured worker got injured, that he was fired. That's what some people would like that are supporting House Bill 853. They don't want relief. The alternative to relief in the increased premiums that took place in the workmen's compensation field is not House Bill 853. Nobody has made the statement that somehow we're going to have the panacea for all the ills right now, the greed of the insurance companies that have eaten up the profits of our employers of this state. Nobody has said that here. Why all the support? Why all the movement towards



a Bill that will not even start to address itself towards that problem? I ask you where are the letters complaining about the benefit levels. Where are the complaints that the benefit level drove up workmen's compensation? The facts are that you had a Department of Insurance that was bought off by the insurance companies to grant huge and enormous rate increases. In fact, bought off so well that the guy who gave the rate increases went to work for the insurance industry, bought so well that there should be even an investigation of that kind of attitude. Then you'd be doing something for the people of Illinois and the employers. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to step backwards is not progress. The difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party is the slogan of progress. Where's progress here in saying that an injured worker should receive less for his injury? Where's the progress to that? Now you know why you're still in the Minority Party. That even though we passed House Bill or Senate Bill 234 and 235, we stood the test of election in this state and the people of Illinois reelected a majority of Democrats on this floor and in the Senate and reelected men that stood tall and voted for 234 and 235. And I might point out there's a few Republicans that ended up at the top of the ballot state-wide that supported House Bill 234 and 235. That they were not held accountable for these huge increases and that their support was not eroded. Some people could allege other people lost. I say that's a sham. It's a sham because nobody loses on one issue or wins on one issue and you and I both know that. The facts remain that House Bill 853 is actually a despicable attempt, a despicable attempt to hide behind the greedy insurance companies of this state."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this Gentleman spoke over ten minutes yesterday. He's taken almost ten minutes again and I don't know why he should get special consideration on... anytime he wants to talk on the length he talks."

Speaker Redmond: "I have the timer on. He'll be shut off when his time is expired. Representative Hudson, for what purpose do you rise?"



Hudson: "The same point, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the clock is still on. Go ahead, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "With the interruptions here, maybe we'd start all over again.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have noticed over the years of serving here that when a person is told the truth and he doesn't like it, what does he do? He gets all excited and makes all sorts of nervous gestures and gets worried to death about the truth and the truth hurts, don't it? The truth hurts that you cannot win on this issue, that workmen's compensation as you see it is not a true and a realistic viewpoint. And when you lose the next election, what are you going to blame it on? When you're still in the minority, what are you going to blame it on? I'll tell you what you can blame it on. You can blame it on the fact that you're not representing people. Corporations don't vote. Insurance companies don't vote, but people do. And as long as you represent only these corporations of the state, you're never going to be in the majority again. And let me tell you the truth is there, the facts are there. There's a heck of a lot more Indians than there are chiefs in this state. There's four and a half million working people that are concerned about whether or not they're injured and what kind of benefits they get if they're injured. And I'm not concerned about the greedy insurance companies of this state that charge two hundred and seventy million dollars to pay out seventy million dollars of losses. That's the facts. Deny it. Stand up here and put it in the record and tell me what you're going to do about it. Don't tell me what a sham of a House Bill 853. It's a sham. It's a phony and you can't win elections on it. You may get contributions from certain individuals because of it, but let me tell you something. You're not going to win any elections over it. Ask Cal Skinner. He won an election and he supported the concept of 234, 235. He didn't lose any votes. He never spent a dollar and he won higher than ever before. So I can say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that you may think you've got something, but I'd like to..."

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

I'd just like to call your attention to the fact that all you do



is delay the inevitable here. So you're not going to stop Representative Hanahan, you're not going to cut him off, and we might learn something from him. So, please..."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, I just have an observation. The acoustics are very good in here and I think the Gentleman is shouting. Either he can tone his voice down or the control can. We can hear him. I want to learn. I want to listen, but I don't want him damaging the ears of the Members. He doesn't have to be so emotional."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was on the Labor and Commerce Committee when those Bills passed..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that that's a subject matter for your explanation of your vote. I don't think it gives you the right to interfere with a man in debate. Now unless he's out of order and perfectly out of... that's a different story. If you disagree with him, stand up and respond. Representative Hanahan, continue."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if one of those Legislators have a hearing loss because they're hearing the truth, let them put in their claim and don't reduce the benefits before you put in the claim so you get a decent kind of benefit while on workmen's compensation. The fact... still, you can't change the facts. House Bill 853, there isn't one of you that'll vote for this Bill that'll stand up here and have the guts to tell the truth to the people that it won't reduce premiums. That there's no way any of you could factually stand up and say it. Oh, I'm sure some idiot could because Abraham Lincoln one time said, 'Any idiot could stand up and say a dog has five legs, but it takes a fool to believe it.' So, don't try it. Don't stand up here and say that you're going to reduce premiums because you can't say it. It isn't true. You know it, I know it, and the people of Illinois will turn you out next election because of that kind of sham attack on a good compensation law recommended by the Nixon Commission. Listen to me, Ladies and Gentlemen, your President that you voted for, that you put in office, recommended this kind of legislation. Now you want to turn your back on that? I think that's terrible. What



kind of... no wonder the guy had to resign. No wonder the guy couldn't keep in office. His own party has turned against him in Illinois, the land of Lincoln, the land of the Republican Party cannot even follow the dictates of their former President on compensation benefit levels. Let me tell you something, Ladies and Gentlemen, you will rue the day you step backwards on benefit levels in any kind of social justice program. The facts remain House Bill 853 is a phony, sham and none of you can stand up and be proud to carry it on your backs because if you do, you'll sink with it. Sink with it to the bottom, you know, lower than whale crap at the bottom of the ocean."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen, "in debate."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "The timer is on."

Ebbesen: "I've heard enough, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman... the question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes two-thirds of those voting. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest that you turn off the T.V. lights, then we'll stop hearing political speeches and we'll get to the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "All except for the Gentleman from Logan. Have all voted who wished? On this question there's 85 'aye' and 67 'no'. The motion fails, two-thirds of those voting. Representative Ebbesen has been recognized."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I haven't heard enough."

Speaker Redmond: "They've been waiting for you, Joe."

Ebbesen: "What I really would like to try to have a little consideration over there on that side of the aisle that we shut this down. You know, at midnight tomorrow there's going to be some Bills that aren't going to get heard as a result of this. We all know how we're going to vote now and I guess we could stand here and listen to each other forever. But I really would appreciate some consideration on that side of the aisle to bring this to a vote. Otherwise, you're going to be here all day, all day tomorrow until



midnight and a lot of Bills, important legislation is not going to be heard. And you heard what the Speaker said. At midnight tomorrow, he's the almighty power. When he whacks that gavel and he meant it, that'll be it. And that's all I want to say."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "If we're back on the Bill, I'll speak on the Bill. And I'd like to speak for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, the timer is on."

Friedrich: "Illinois industry is in competition..."

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

J. Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a motion."

Speaker Redmond: "No, I'm not recognizing you for that purpose. Representative Friedrich, proceed. I would suggest that we discontinue these dilatory tactics on both sides and let's get down to business. Representative Friedrich. Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully dissent from your suggestion that my motion might be dilatory. And Representative Ebbesen made a very valid point. We have spent almost twelve hours on this issue and many Member's Bills are going to be tabled at twelve o'clock. I think the only reasonable thing we can do is postpone the deadlines for both of these Bills, the subject matter of this material and hear it on Wednesday. And I would so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich continue. I haven't recognized to put that motion. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, anybody that thought anything about it realizes that Illinois industry's in competition not only with industry in other states in this United States but with the steel mills in Japan and the auto manufacturers in Germany, and manufacturers all around the world. And when you destroy the ability of business to make a profit, you destroy the ability of business to create jobs. Now, there's some advantage of having been around a little while and I lived through the great depression. We didn't have many industrial accidents then, but we had a hell of a lot of empty smokestacks and a lot of people in the breadlines. And you just keep pecking around at the ability of business to make a profit and



you're going to have breadlines again and I want you to take the responsibility for it. I wanted to give you a little example of a little trucking outfit in Mt. Vernon. Their workmen's compensation insurance went to twenty-five thousand dollars. They're going to go to assigned risk next year and it's thirty thousand dollars. All they have to do is move to Indiana and it's five thousand dollars. Now, it doesn't take a Rhodes Scholar to figure out what's going to happen to those jobs in Mt. Vernon. Companies are getting out of Illinois. Now, they keep saying what's going to happen to the rates? Well, I'll tell you what's going to happen. Even with this Bill, the rates are going to go up next year. But the blessing of this Bill is they're not going up as high as they would without it. If you want to stabilize the rates at all, this is your chance to do it. If you want to blow more jobs out of Illinois, vote against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino. The timer is on."

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

I was going to withhold my comments and some questions for the explanation of votes, but I think at this time I... to speed things along and not tie up the House, I'd like to pose a few questions and also some concerns that I have on Amendment #7 to House Bill 853. I have a, basically, a loss as far as knowing exactly what one section of that Amendment will do. That section is Section 4.1 stating that any provision herein to the contrary notwithstanding the weekly compensation rate for payments will be. After this point, I guess it's the easiest way to explain is to use it in dollars and cents. If, in fact, you use the employees wage which this Amendment will use and that employee receives one hundred and fifty dollars a week and has a loss of an arm or a leg, under this Amendment and I will compare it to a basic 20% differential from the cap., this is what would happen and this is where I have a problem. If you take sixty-six and two-thirds of a hundred and fifty bucks and then 75% of that sixty-six and two-thirds which is basically a hundred dollars, you'd come up with forty-nine dollars or, excuse me, seventy-four dollars and twenty-five cents. And if you were to multiply that out by the number of weeks that



injured employee were to receive which would be two hundred in the case of a leg, the benefit level for that man making a hundred and fifty dollars a week under that formula would be fourteen thousand, eight hundred and fifty dollars. That's what that formula would put into and equate that gentleman or that ladies leg to be. A 20% differential, just a minimum 20% differential between the caps. of P.P. and T.T. would do this to that same employee making one hundred and fifty dollars a week, would give him sixty-six and two-thirds of a hundred and eighty-five dollars for a total compensation on the loss of that leg of twenty-four thousand, four hundred dollars. Who am I or who are you to say that a leg of one person is worth only fourteen thousand dollars while that same man under the existing situation would be beneficial to twenty-four thousand dollars. That's a ten thousand dollar spread. I won't do that to any working person in the State of Illinois. That's where I have had the problem with that particular formula that's imbedded in this Amendment. Now, if you can explain to me where I'm wrong in the figures, we'll sit down and talk. But the point is, those are the numbers. One person making the same amount of money getting those figures for reimbursement for the loss of a leg, I just can't buy that particular section. For that reason, for that reason and until it's answered, I'd have to vote 'present' on that legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "I move for the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't hear you. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, of course, I'm going to vote for this Bill. But I want each of you to know that the indignation that's been expressed against the Bill is all feigned. Those who carry the labor banner recognize that this Bill doesn't go as far as needed to repair the almost fatal damage done to Illinois industry by S.B. 235 two years ago. At that time, this Legislature in its foolishness, plucked off most of the feathers on that goose that provides jobs for the people of Illinois. And this Bill doesn't put any feathers back on it. It prevents the taking away of a few more of the feathers,



the small advantages have been enumerated. It's a small step, it's a beginning, it's a beginning that's got to be made. If it isn't made, you may be certain that industry will continue to flee from the State of Illinois. I personally believe that the workmen's compensation statute after it's amended by this Bill, will remain so penalizing against industry in Illinois that it'll be, the unfortunate leaving of the state will continue. I ask you not to believe the Gentleman from McHenry. He has been shown to be a false prophet as far as industry is concerned. He has justly earned the title of being the greatest recruiter for Arkansas industry that that state has ever had. And I want to tell you that have any concern about this matter if you don't enact this law and if you don't put in further statutes to improve the industrial climate of the State of Illinois, those of you who enjoy harassing industry will have to follow it into other states to continue your feud. The additional things that are needed in the law and I hope that one of them has been suggested by the Speaker himself and that's the self-employed provisions. Somewhere along the line, that has to be added because if it isn't added, the insurance rates for whatever the cause will remain beyond the capacity of too many people who were available to provide jobs but they are run out of business by government. Vote 'aye' on this Bill and vote 'aye' on the other meaningful Bills that'll be coming down the pike in that direction for your constituents."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question. Who's going to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Willer: "Is Representative Mautino correct in the example he gave that a worker who loses a leg under this formula earning a wage he cited, would he only get fourteen thousand dollars under this Bill but twenty-four thousand dollars under the present Bill? Is that correct?"

Tuerk: "According to my information, no. He is not correct."

Willer: "Can you refute it with, can you speak further to it? This concerns me very much. I'd like you to refute it in perhaps citing something in the Bill."



Tuerk: "Well, in all candor, I don't have the figures at my desk. I am saying to you, Mrs. Willer..."

Willer: "Pardon me? I'm sorry. They were making noise over here. I didn't hear you."

Tuerk: "I'm saying that I do not have the figures at my fingertips. I am saying that I cannot accept what Representative Mautino says about that very feature that you ask. Now, Representative Schuneman does have some technical aspects of this and the figures and perhaps he can do a better job than I and I would yield to him."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that that's necessarily so, Fred, but I'll try to respond to your question, Representative. The same concern was in our minds and in the minds of Ralph Nichel, the Democrat... the head of the Democrat staff, and Ron Nelson, our staff man. They ran this question by lawyers who practice in this field and it's my understanding that Representative Mautino's interpretation of this is incorrect. Now, to cite to you the specific section, I can't do that until the staff people get here."

Willer: "Well, Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "May I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Willer: "I find it intolerable for me to vote on this when we are talking about something as a worker losing his or her leg and all these learned Legislators who have been pounding out this legislation can't give me an answer about something as serious, as great as this. Fourteen thousand dollars for losing a leg today? My God, I mean, twenty-four thousand wouldn't be ample compensation and you can't give me a yes or no. How can I vote on this Bill now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I've just been informed that by deleting... just a minute now. Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. Can I respond to that in just a moment, Representative? Can you continue the debate and let me get back to this point?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is that satisfactory, Representative Willer? Representative Byers."



Byers: "Mr. Speaker, will Mr. Tuerk yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Byers: "Mr. Tuerk, we've heard a lot of talk about industry leaving Illinois and I wonder if you have any facts or figures on that statistic."

Tuerk: "Well, in the Committee we've had a number of witnesses come forward and tell us of their plans and, in fact, some of their expeditious plans to leave this state because of the rising costs. There have been indications of jobs lost. I know of companies that are no longer looking in terms of expansion in Illinois, but rather Indiana, Kentucky, Arkansas, Tennessee and some other locations throughout this United States rather than expanding their present facilities in Illinois. Those are some of the bigger companies. Some of the smaller companies are indeed closing shop and as a result, are not doing business in Illinois."

Byers: "Can you give us the names of these companies and number of employees and things of that nature?"

Tuerk: "No."

Byers: "Mr. Tuerk, what's happened to the workmen's compensation rate in other states in the last few years where they have not made any improvement in the law?"

Tuerk: "Well, I can tell you that the neighboring states, the cost of workmen's compensation insurance is considerably lower than Illinois. And the reason for that being because of the elaboration of all the provisions of the workmen's compensation law. Now, in Iowa, Indiana, Tennessee, Iowa and some of the other states, Missouri, the rate of workmen's compensation insurance is considerably lower than Illinois."

Byers: "Have their rates been decreasing in those states?"

Tuerk: "I can't answer that whether they're increasing or decreasing, but I can tell you they're considerably lower."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might address the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Byers: "I would just like to state that, you know, you ask these questions about, you know, the companies leaving Illinois. No one knows, they don't know any names, they don't know any numbers;



and the fact of the matter is that there's employment coming in to our state all of the time. There was just in the, in my district, a new factory moving from Missouri to Salem, Illinois. It's going to employ seventy-five people. There's countless numbers of these around the state. What's happened, that we've had a consistent campaign of scare tactics conducted by the Chamber of Commerce to get, to try to make people think that everyone's leaving Illinois and that's not true. The businesses are coming to Illinois and they're expanding in Illinois. The fact of the matter about the workmen's compensation insurance rates in other states that they have increased rapidly in those states where they've made no changes in the law. And they have gone up very high in other states also. What's happened in the field of product liability insurance? Thank God, the Legislature didn't pass any that... regulations or anything in that area and it's gone up so high now that people can't afford it. And product liability insurance has gone way, way up. What's happened to car insurance rates? They've gone up. And the fact of the matter, practically everything that a person today has has gone up. The unemployment rate is going down now in Illinois and I don't see how we can vote for a Bill like this when it doesn't specify what... no one knows how much it's going, a man is going to get paid if he loses a leg. And if it's only fourteen thousand dollars, I certainly think a man's leg is worth more than that. And I guess the Republican Party will be known as the party that thinks a person's leg is only worth fourteen thousand dollars and I would urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was reference made to the Nixon Labor Commission Bill. I think this House should know what happened to the Nixon Labor Commission Bill. It came before the House Labor and Commerce Committee and the Sponsor knew and was told by the various Members of that Committee that he wouldn't have a prayer with it. And, therefore, he had to do the next best thing and put it in Interim Study Committee. And I'm happy to hear that the Gentleman from McHenry thinks it was such a great Bill. Where was he when that was needed



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

to be put across? Number two, I don't know whether this Amendment is the best Amendment, this Bill, but I'll tell you something. You cannot have labor without business. And I know, I've worked in the factory and I speak from experience of small wages. Unions are the result of bad management and we need the unions, too. But let's not kid ourselves. For many years, this Legislature stuck it to labor royally. It was their fault. All right. When labor got a chance, they stuck it to business royally in 1974, but let's now have a more balanced approach with common sense and reason. Maybe this isn't the best, but I think it's a step in the right direction. Let's try it and I speak in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

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

There was some discussion earlier about what was happening in other states of the United States during the time that we were debating 234 and 235 and I'd just like to indicate that I have some figures. During 1975 and 1976, I have a list of some states which made no changes during that period of time, no changes during that period of time in their workmen's compensation laws and yet, their workmen's compensation insurance premium rates went up dramatically. During that period of time in Arizona the rate went up 29.7%, California - 43.7%, Colorado - 21.6%, Connecticut - 32.2%, Delaware - 65.9%. Again, that's 65.9% during the same period of time we've been debating on and on and on here with no change in workmen's compensation laws. Florida - 79%, insurance... workmen's comp. insurance rates went up 79% in the State of Florida during 1975 and 76 with no change in the law. Georgia - 35%, Idaho - 33.9%, Kansas - 45.1%, Kentucky - 46.2, Maine - 57.1, Minnesota - 40.2, Oklahoma - 50.5, Rhode Island - 57.4. There were a lot of changes in insurance rates in 1975 and 1976 and one reason is that the insurance industry lost its shirt in 1974. I'm in possession right here on my desk of a full-page ad from the Chicago Tribune, September of 1976, wherein Traveller's Insurance Company stated, stated for the record in a full-page add that they placed in the Chicago Tribune during the previous year, the insurance industry lost four billion dollars. Now, they had to recoup that



somehow and I congratulate them for waging a very effective propaganda war to blame us for their, for the recoupmnt of their loss. I think they're very smart to do that. But the point is that workmen's comp. is not all the bugaboo that we hear about. There perhaps needs to be some changes made, but I'm not sure this is the Bill to make the changes on. There's a very serious concern that House Bill 853 as it now stands as it is now amended will remove the floor, will remove the minimum benefit level in the area of permanent, partial disability. The effect of that is that if I am right and I think I am and I can defend my position, that benefit levels at the lower end of the scale or injured workers receiving permanent, partial disability payments can become lower than they were in 1973 and 1974 in Illinois when we had one of the worst workmen's compensation laws in the whole country and absolutely the worst among all the industrial states. So if we take, want to take a chance on what can happen to our injured people in this state, we can vote for this Bill. If not, we can hold this Bill down with less than 89 votes and pass House Bill 1205 which is in good shape, which makes significant cuts in workmen's compensation, and which is the way the State of Illinois ought to go."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

E. Steele: "I believe Mr. Schuneman has the answer to that previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer. Maybe we'll wait until Representative Willer returns. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

E. Barnes: "Just a point, Mr. Speaker. I think that many people that are speaking on this Bill, some of us are trying to follow it and believe if the Gentleman has any answers to any questions that he has not answered directly on the debate, he can answer it when he's closing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

E. Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker just pointed out and sought to point out that in the State of Florida there's been a 79% increase in the past year or two, in the State of Minnesota 40% increase. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have shown that in



many of the industries of Illinois there's been not a 40% or 80% increase, there's been a 200%, a 300%, a 400% increase in the costs of meeting the workmen's compensation obligation passed here by this Assembly two years ago. I quoted last night, A.O. Smith - 300% increase and they do their own self-insuring. This is not an insurance rip-off. This is an actual statement of cost increase. American Steel - 400% in their actual self-insured costs. Another question that was raised, what industries are leaving the state? Owens Illinois of Alton, Illinois, has permanently laid off nine hundred employees in the last three months and those employees one of the main reasons given was the fact of the high workmen's compensation costs here in Illinois as compared to fourteen other states where they have fourteen other plants. Now, here is a case of Owens Illinois with their main plant in Illinois, with a flagship of their entire industrial, corporate operation, reducing employment while they are increasing jobs in the fourteen other plants. We are actually not ripping off here, we are running off jobs from the State of Illinois. And I say to you that as I've travelled around our district, I've heard many people of both parties say that something has to be done about this workmen's compensation problem. Here is that opportunity to translate words and promises into action and I say, let's vote for this good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to address myself to this Bill and the situation that we find ourselves in. We discussed this a little bit, I did with some of my colleagues in a caucus last night, but I think it's good for us to review where we came from and how we got in this place. How'd we get Senate Bill 234 and 235 last year? It's very simple and I think we need to go back and look at that. Many of the Members here have been on the floor of this House for many, many years and we got to that situation and into that position, I know in the years that I spent heretofore, simply because it was impossible for years and years and years to provide meaningful and needed changes in our workmen's compensation laws in the State of Illinois. There



had been a so-called agreed Bill process and that agreed Bill process regrettably had degenerated into the kind of a situation where it was dictated by one person and one person who controlled the votes in the other House of this General Assembly and most of the votes from year to year in the Judiciary Committee of this House. where these kind of Bills went year after year after year. That person would set in the Senate corridor on the Senate gallery or he or his representative in the House Judiciary Committee and just simply dictate the results of Bills to make needful changes in workmen's compensation laws that had not been made. Illinois was far, far, far behind all of the rest of the states in this Union in the kind of benefits and protections that it provided in this field. When there came a change, it then came with a rush and we got House Bill or Senate Bill 234 and 235. Perhaps our experience in some degree has indicated that there are excesses in House Bill 234 and... or Senate Bill 234 and 235, and the situation we now find ourselves in because it was the first time there was an opportunity to really do something meaningful. And we also at the time had guidelines from the Federal government as to where we should go in this field and we went for the very first time. There was so much gall built up in the throats of many of the Members of this Body and in the working people throughout the State of Illinois that it went with a rush and you know how it went through here. Now, I say perhaps there were excesses. We have had complaints from businessmen throughout this state and from industry and I think perhaps there are some excesses. And the labor forces in this state have recognized that and they have come here with compromises to try to take care of some of those areas in which we appeared to be in excess in those Bills. Last year, we took care of the major ones. In fact, we took care of the ones in which we saw time after time after time after time in publications that were put on our desks and sent to our offices. And as soon as we passed those Amendments last year, what did we hear? They were not meaningful, that wasn't really what they were looking at, that was not really an important part of workmen's compensation or the related laws which we passed in 1975. Now, we have come back and



are addressing ourselves to other things that are said to be excessive in the workmen's compensation law that we now have. And we have that kind of an Amendment that was somewhat agreed to, I was given to understand by many of the business people and certainly by labor. And labor has made many concessions on this Bill to try to give us something that would be meaningful and would correct what are said to be excesses in this law. But what are the complaints? Let me ask you, what are the complaints that we hear from businesses throughout our districts? Those complaints do not relate to the benefits. Those complaints relate solely and only to premiums, get our premiums down. That we'd very much like to do. You'd like to do that on both sides of this, on both sides of this rotunda to reduce those premiums. I have, pardon my expression, a gut feeling that Illinois is the victim of a huge conspiracy in regard to premiums on insurance for workmen's compensation in this state. I think that there has been an absolute conspiracy to be sure that Illinois premiums are as high as they could possibly be. We were going to have increases in our premiums whether we passed any changes in workmen's compensation laws or not. My good friend and my ballot-mate from the 51st District has just indicated to you what has happened in all of the other states or many of them in this Union. Illinois was faced with the same consequences. It was a coincidence that we had the opportunity for the first time in years to change workmen's compensation laws at the same time that the insurance companies had huge losses in their profit margin. Now, let me say they say they have losses. Now, that doesn't mean they were dipping back into their capital investments and if they lost investments during this time, they have losses in their profit margin. And what do they look as their profit margin? It is a percentage of the value of their capital investment and their capital investments have not had real increases. They're like all of the rest of us. They're like the farmland in this state. They're like your residences in this state. They have had inflated increases over the past few years. Yes, they had increases in what they had to pay out because there was also inflated rates for hospitals, inflated rates for doctors. Rightly



so because everything they had to buy, every service they had to provide has also inflated in its value so that what they had to pay for under workmen's compensation had gone up. And then comparing what they had left over out of their premiums in comparison to their inflated value of their capital investment, their capital, their profit margin had decreased and so they used 234 and 235 to say this is the reason. Not because we haven't kept up with our profit margin but simply because we do not have the profit margin that we had before percentage-wise compared to our capital investment. And consequently, we have to have huge increases in that profit margin and that's just what the businesses in this state have been paying for. Let me tell you something, let me ask you something else. Who do you individually hear from? Do you hear from the small and medium sized businessmen in your community? And rightfully so, their premiums have gone up. Those are the victims for years and years and years of the manner in which the premiums are applied against businesses in the State of Illinois. The huge businesses in this state in the area of benefits to labor have stuck it to the medium-sized and the small businesses time after time and then have used them to complain to make changes to get benefits for the largest industries in the state. Now, we need our large industries. They're vital industries. They're industries we need people to work in but we need the small ones, too. We are trying to provide some changes here that will meet the objections of our small businessmen and our medium-sized businessmen, but we're not going to get those premiums down. I would venture to say that if the premiums in Illinois decline, it's only because of a continuing conspiracy to manipulate the premiums of the insurance companies to try to give credence to what has been said over the last couple of years. This is a serious situation. We now have a Bill coming up, an Amendment on another Bill that is agreed to by much of business and certainly by labor. Let's make those cuts. Let's do those things that are needed in this area. But let's not at the same time kill workmen's compensation and kill benefits for the laboring people of this state. Let's do what we can do now. Let's do the best that we can do on that.



But let's not reduce those benefits as in this Bill to the point where labor for the working man suffers. Sure, there are excesses. There has undoubtedly been spurious evidence brought into various cases. People are people and there are some of them that will bring false claims..."

Speaker Redmond: "The time has expired, Mr... Representative Leinenweber. Timer is on."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly. I think I can answer the Lady's question as to the person who loses a leg. Under the present Act, a person is entitled to for temporary, total disability, that is when he loses a leg and he's in the hospital or he cannot work, he's entitled to, for temporary, total disability, entire period, two-thirds of his weekly wage. Assume three hundred dollars, he's entitled to two hundred dollars per week. Now, currently under the existing law, he also is entitled to two hundred additional weeks after he goes back to work at the same weekly wage rate, two-thirds of the weekly wage rate, which would be two hundred times two hundred dollars or forty thousand dollars. Now, one of the changes in the proposed House Bill 853 would first of all, not touch the temporary total disability, but to adjust the partial disability. That is, the benefits for the period of time when the worker goes back to work and is earning, once again is earning a salary, to 75% of that figure which would be a hundred and fifty dollars per week for thirty thousand dollars for the loss of a leg below the knee. There's additional compensation for loss of the leg above the knee of, I believe, twenty-five weeks. And if it involves the hip there's still additional compensation above that. So, the theory behind the reduction of 25% of the permanent, partial disability is that we're looking for a way to cut benefits cause the only way you're going to be able to reduce premiums or to hold the line on premiums is to reduce the amount of money paid out in benefits. If you increase the amount of money paid out in benefits, you're obviously going to increase premiums no matter how you cut it. But if you want do it and this is one area when the guy is back at work, when he's earning his salary, that is felt that this would be an appropriate area to



make some adjustments. On July 1 all those benefits go up also. So I think that would answer the question as far as I can see that it's the... only in the situation where the person is able to return to his work and once again bring home the paycheck that was felt that in order to make some adjustment in benefits paid that in order to reduce premiums. So to answer the previous Gentleman's question, will this reduce premiums? Well, nothing will reduce premiums unless you reduce benefits. The Bill doesn't do that. The Bill, however, does reduce the amount of benefits that we've paid in the future under the present law."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard a lot this morning about plants leaving the state and there's no question that some have. My area in the Quad Cities has been a little bit more fortunate. The Bi-state Metropolitan Study recently showed that during the last, the Illinois side did not lose the plants and in fact, they had gained more jobs and industry than the Illinois or the Iowa side. However, I don't know if that will increase or not. We look at the rate increase, we've heard pros and cons on that. It's similar to two years ago. Some of the freshman are not aware of how many percentages and statistics we heard when we were voting on the original workmen's comp. Bill. During this last election if we have to discuss politics which I think we should rise above on this and act more like statesmen and think of what's good for our constituents and forget about the election, but during this last election my Republican opponent and I went around the district and we both suggested and urged that they have an Agreed Bill. We're no experts, we're not workmen's comp. experts. It's something that not many of us know that much about in detail. In fact, some people thought that with a workmen's comp. case you could also sue civilly. We've pleaded, we've begged, we've asked that an Agreed Bill come before us but evidently that's not possible. We have been studying this Bill 853, we've been studying Representative Mautino's 1205. I've exchanged my staff analysis with Republicans and looked at their staff analysis. We've discussed it, we've worked on it. We've



tried to come to a conclusion as to what would be the best Bill. This morning we've had an Amendment added to 1205 changing the differences, changing the difference in premiums possibly and the benefits for the injured worker. A good faith effort was made by Representative James Houlihan earlier this morning to give us some time to consider these changes and compare these two Bills. I, for one, had hoped that you would recognize him, Mr. Speaker, and allow that motion to be put. I again would ask that we be given more time to look over these, that we get more facts. I don't want to be rushed into this. I don't want to be voting blindly again on any legislation. I think we need more study and I would hope that you would recognize Representative Houlihan. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes; thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm only asking for time to reply to Representative Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer. Representative Willer, you're being responded to."

Schuneman: "I think that Representative Leinenweber has done an excellent job. I only want to emphasize once again that under House Bill 853 since that Bill will take effect some time after July 1, which is the date on which the escalation of benefits will take place, that the permanent, partial law under 853 will not be less than it is now. It will, in fact, be more. Now, under House Bill 1205 as amended, the increased... the benefits will increase and escalate by 33%, but there has been an additional 20% benefit built into that Bill. So in effect, you're raising workmen's compensation benefits again in House Bill 1205. I don't think that's been pointed out before, but that is a definite distinction between these two Bills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if one of the Sponsors would yield for some questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Mudd: "I'm going to ask a few questions that I'm confused on because I'm not as qualified as some of the others in the industrial area and I know that you certainly are. It's been said that businesses



are leaving Illinois and that we're having a problem in Illinois holding business because of the two Senate Bills that passed here a couple of years ago. Now, I have maybe a way to measure that that's logical to me that doesn't seem to be too logical to some of the other people in the House. Could you tell me because I know you have these figures what the unemployment rate was in the State of Illinois in 1975 and 1976?"

Tuerk: "Well, in '76 it was somewhere in the vicinity of 8%, '75 it was under that figure and I don't know what that figure is."

Mudd: "What is the current unemployment rate in the State of Illinois?"

Tuerk: "6%, 6.5, somewhere in that vicinity."

Mudd: "Are all these companies that are leaving Illinois taking their people with them? What, how come we've got a lower unemployment rate in the State of Illinois than we had in the last two years if this is what's driving the businesses out of the State of Illinois? Where are these people going that are being displaced by these businesses that are moving?"

Tuerk: "I don't know where these people are going. All I know is there have been businesses who have closed their doors because of various factors, one of which is the workmen's compensation issue."

Mudd: "All right, I would agree with that statement that that is a factor."

Tuerk: "I don't think on this floor of the House I've said to anybody that the workmen's comp. law has driven people out of this state, that in and of itself. What I have said on many occasions that this, the passage of 234 and 35 has been a very high contributing factor to businesses losing business because of the high cost of business. And therefore, they find the business climate much more beneficial in other areas than they have in the State of Illinois."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. The timer is on."

Mudd: "The other day, the Department of Business and Economic Development came into Appropriations I. There were several questions asked the Director of that Department and pursued in depth at that meeting, Committee hearing. One was, do you think that the remarks and the campaign put on by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce



and the Illinois Manufacturers Association has been detrimental to bringing new industry into the State of Illinois? He admitted that it was causing serious problems of trying to bring industry into the State of Illinois; that campaign. On further cross-examination, we asked him if he felt that sometimes these campaigns are carried on so that they would not, the present industry in the State of Illinois would not have a depletion in the expert work force that we enjoy in this state? He had to admit that that was a possibility. And I think if you think about it, it is a possibility. Last year, I introduced a Resolution on this floor asking because of the President of the Caterpillar Tractor Company felt that there was many, many factors in our laws in the State of Illinois that was contributing to problems in the industrial area. Not just workmen's compensation, not just unemployment compensation, but many factors which we personally in the State of Illinois have control over. E.P.A. laws, our laws in Illinois prevent us from even distributing our coal and being used in this state. It had a definite impact on utility rates that we addressed ourselves to in another Bill by Representative Marovitz. It's crushing the industry. It's hurting them just a lot worse than these two Bills are, but I appreciate the fact that we should do something in this area. And you know what the ironic thing that happened last year when I introduced a Resolution on this floor for a Special Session to do with the economy of the industrial area, the business community of the State of Illinois, the Republican Party opposed it. Now if you think a little bit, you can understand why they did. There was an election coming up. There's many things that we can do to help the business in the State of Illinois. But we're going to pass one Bill and say this is the panacea that's going to really bring business back to its feet, really going to help them. We can carry on a big campaign. The Republicans saved the state again. You can now come in, but I wonder what they're going to tell them when they pass this Bill and there isn't any change in insurance rates. It's going to be pretty evident then that what they're saying is not coming about. I think we've got to address ourselves to fifty or sixty things to help business in the State



of Illinois and this is just one and I hope we don't rush into this one. We get a good Agreed Bill between the Democrats and the Republicans, not labor and industry, but the people on this floor that are responsible for the business community in this state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

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

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

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 108 'aye' and 8 'no', and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had a considerable amount of debate regarding House Bill 853 and now is the time that your votes will be heard all over the State of Illinois. I hear a cry, I heard a cry by businessmen and by all people of the State of Illinois that they need some relief. We don't say that the Bill we have right here is perfect in every respect. We can't get up and say that this Bill is going to drastically reduce premiums. We can't say that because this Bill is reasonable. This is a Bill that doesn't hurt the injured workers to the degree that you have heard some of the previous people say. Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, the net effect of this Bill is that you stop some of the escalation that we wrongfully passed here in the 79th General Assembly. Wrongfully, I say to you it was wrong because in July of this year, we are going to increase benefits overall by 133%. In July of 1979, the current law calls for an increase to 166% across the board. And in July of 1981, it calls for a further entry of 200%. Now, we've heard a lot of talk about some of the benefits on an amputee. I want to tell you the bottom line of all of that is that if a man's leg is cut off today and versus a man's leg cut off in July of this year after the escalation goes up, the net effect is still an 8% increase over the benefits of what that man receives today if his leg is cut off. So are we cutting benefits? No, we're recognizing that through the cost of living and increased expenses that those



benefits are still increased. Is this an antiunion vote? Gentlemen up there in the gallery, are we voting or working against labor? You bet we aren't. Is this an antilabor vote? You bet it's not. Because this is a vote that recognizes that the value of business and the solidarity of business in this state is something that must be recognized and maintained. How many letters have you gotten? I've gotten well over two hundred letters on the issues of workmen's compensation crying for relief. We are trying to give that relief. This, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the Roll Call that's going to be studied all over this state. This is a Roll Call that business is looking at and saying what are the Representatives of this state trying to do. I ask you to solicit and give your favorable vote for business, for all of the people of this State of Illinois. We need your help. They're crying for your help. Put a green on this vote. Vote 'yes', vote 'yes' for all of the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs, to explain his vote. Timer is on."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

I just wanted just to say this, that this Bill, 853, is a Bill that comprises four or five Bills that was in the Labor and Commerce Committee. And not one person from industry or business testified in favor of it because we were negotiating, we were meeting, we're continually meeting. We met as late as last Monday and if you want to panic and pass a no-good Bill like 853 and ruin any other chances of a compromise between labor and industry and the Manufacturers Association, then go ahead and do it, but don't come crying because we are negotiating. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan, to explain his vote."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had my light on to debate through the entire debate. I had hoped that we would be able to postpone this consideration so that we



could deal with the substance, but I can see from the Gentleman's remarks who closed, Representative Daniels is more interested in politics. He's more interested in running around with a Roll Call. He's more interested in making a political issue. I've worked with business leaders and labor leaders from my district and I'm trying to help business. I'm trying to help our Illinois climate, but I'm not interested in campaign..."

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

Ryan: "Well, the Gentleman is clearly out of order, Mr. Speaker. He's not to use a Member's name in debate to begin with. That's a violation of the rules and he's not explaining his vote. He's giving a campaign speech."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought you were going to introduce the Mayor of Kankakee. Proceed, Mr. Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Minority Leader doesn't want these things said. I can understand why that side of the aisle doesn't want the issue addressed, why they tried to close off debate time after time and only did it after there was a weariness and Members had their Bills going to be killed. I personally think that Representative, who closed, put his finger on the issue. This issue's going to come back time and time again. Do you know why? Because there are some Members who want to put politics above government."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'yes' vote, I computed the benefits under this Amendment and the benefits under the current Act. My calculations show that a man making four hundred and fifty dollar a week under the current Act would get five, fifty thousand, six hundred and twenty-five dollars as a benefit for losing a leg above the knee. My calculations under this Amendment show that he would get fifty thousand, five hundred and forty dollars. I think this indicates a stabilization of the rates for workmen's compensation. I think this is something we need at this time, something that would benefit to all of Illinois. I vote 'yes'."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman, to explain his vote.

The timer is on."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard a lot of rhetoric about why the cost of increase in our workmen's compensation and the small businessman crying for relief. What hasn't been brought before this Body is that the small businessman when he has an insurance package, there is also included in that liability. We haven't discussed this one bit about the cost of liability insurance in the small businessman's package. This is where the problem lies. Not in workmen's compensation. I worked for a large company and I have said many times that this does not affect a large company to a great degree and it's true. It doesn't. But it does affect the small businessman and the small businessman is affected by the liability insurance because it's openended. It's openended. And before Senate Bill 234 and 235 was passed, what happened to the people that was injured after a given time? I'll tell you what was happening to them. They were placed on public aid. That's where they went. The taxpayers footed the bill when it should be... the injured people should be supported by the industry. I think we need changes, but I don't think we need changes at the expense of the injured worker. And the biggest problem in workmen's compensation is fraud. And industry will not face up to the fact that they ought to prosecute the people who... (microphone turned off)."

Speaker Redmond: "Time. Representative Deuster, to explain his vote.

The timer is on."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly, I think all of us are human and all of us are capable of making mistakes and the hardest thing in political life or public life is ever, is ever to concede that you made a mistake in any subject. I know the temptation is, we have had a lot of loud and noise oratory on this subject of where we made mistakes and we must find some way out of the problem. It's convenient to either blame the Democrats or blame the Republicans or the insurance company or somebody else, but this is not a partisan issue. There were Members on both sides of this aisle who voted for these changes



in 1975 that brought about the problems, sincere Legislators who thought they were doing the right thing. But I think everyone in their hearts knows that some change must be made and I know a lot of 'present' votes up there are really people who wish they could vote for this but it has been polarized and partly because of the part injection of partisan suggestions here, but also because of the reluctance to admit on any of our parts that a mistake has been made. I think also another error here is we say this is a business issue. It isn't. We have townships, we have schools, we have just everybody, it cuts across the whole society affected here and I think that it's time for those on the yellow up there to buck up and say, look we all make mistakes. Let's correct this one. Let's go on green so we can go back to our districts and say we've done something to help resolve this problem. I urge more... (inaudible)."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley."

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

As the previous speaker said and was said earlier on this House floor, in some political speeches by some Members on this floor, let's go back to our districts and say we've done something. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I submit to you that we are going to do something. If we pass this Bill, we're going to put workmen's compensation back into the stone age. We have as late as last night, Mr. Speaker, worked out some significant changes in the workmen's compensation law. At 1:30 last night or this morning, there were Members of this House represented by both business and labor, by both people that were interested in the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, working on significant changes that are now incorporated in House Bill 1205.

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the bottom line of this Amendment #7 on 853 is you are going to hurt the small working man in the State of Illinois. That is not our intent. and our intent is to bring down the premiums. Mr. Speaker, I suggest a 'no' vote and hope that people on both sides of this aisle that are interested and have supported labor and business cast a 'no' vote on this issue, Mr. Speaker."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Chairman, as many people in here that wish to see business prosper and do not want to see labor completely killed off in our state, we're disappointed in this result. I don't get up to really explain my vote on this because it doesn't appear this Bill's going to pass, but I do get up to call upon the leader of labor in this Legislature, Representative Hanahan, and ask you if you would please before the end of this Session ask to suspend these rules and let's pass the strongest regulatory laws possible on these insurance companies. If you're sincere in your comments, I cannot help but believe that there'll be a lot of Republicans that will go with you. I do personally feel that the insurance companies are ripping us off. We know they haven't given us the facts, but I would hope that maybe on one of these other Bills, Representative Hanahan, you could see your way clear to somehow as even a short-term effort do something to reduce these premiums because when you go into your towns and you talk to the fellows running the service stations and they're going out of business, they really are. So let's at least see if we can accomplish something along those lines before this Session and work together on something that's meaningful to business."

Speaker Redmond: "It is suggested that the Member who spoke in debate do not seek recognition for explanation of votes. It's contrary to the rules. Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, it seems to me that this vote reflects what it ought to reflect - that there are many people who are yet undecided as to the effect of this Bill. We asked questions last night and I don't think we got answers. We want to see some changes here that are fair. We want to see some changes that are made by agreement. Now, last evening after the action on this floor I know that certain lobbyists made calls throughout this state harassing people who weren't willing to support this Bill. But we got no answers last night as to benefits. We still didn't get any specific answers today as to the effect on the minimums, the effect on the little guy. If we're going to do anything



with this piece of legislation or any piece of legislation, there's got to be an agreement, there have to be some answers. We can't polarize this issue or nothing's going to happen. And I would hope the people who have lobbied the Bill would go out and seek a compromise or we're not going to get anything to help business. And many of us are willing to do that, to come here, to compromise, to seek some changes. And I hope that would begin today and not go back to the polarization that occurred last night by some of the business people who left this floor and left the gallery with the opinion they had to have it all one way or no way."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue and I respectfully ask whether or not the Bill gets sufficient votes that the Roll Call be preserved. I'm not explaining my vote, I'm just asking... making a request of the Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Whatever the rules provide will be done."

Friedrich: "Well, I'm asking that the Roll Call be preserved regardless, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't think it's the custom, but whatever the rules provide, whatever the Body out there by motion does is, I will be guided by. Representative Schuneman. He spoke in debate. Representative Wikoff, did you speak in debate?"

Wikoff: "No, I didn't, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, explain your vote. The timer is on."

Wikoff: "To explain my vote there's been a lot of comments about the insurance companies ripping things off. I'm not defending the insurance companies but I'm voting 'yes' because if this was such a lucrative business for the insurance companies, they would not be refusing to insure contractors and they would not be cancelling contractors who have not had claims. It has to be something other than a rip-off as many people say. If there was money to be made, the insurance companies would be clamoring to write this kind of insurance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Williams: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House. I am voting 'aye' on this Bill and I will also vote 'aye' on 1205. I'd just like to point out that I represent the largest industrial area in the State of Illinois. In fact, my own town of Franklin Park, I think, is the second largest in the state. I, too, have received two or three hundred letters but I'd like to point out an issue here that has not been brought out. And in the last two or three weeks here, we have constantly here passed legislation from all the taxing bodies in the State of Illinois to give them an increase actually in their levy without a referendum in order to pick up the added premiums. In my own town, actually our premium has gone up about 300%. I have letters from every school district, every park district, the sanitary districts, and for that reason I will vote for this and 1205 and any Bill that is going to give some relief here to municipalities. I just wanted to let you know the bottom line on all these levies in every municipality is the taxpayer. And I will vote for this and for 1205."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have sat here quietly and listened to a great deal of debate. I, too, like most Members of this House have had a number of calls from people who are hurt by the increase in premiums for workmen's compensation. I come from a rural area. We don't have big industry much in the 38th District, but we have a lot of small business people. And they're calling me and they're writing me and they're saying I'm going out of business. I can't stand the increases in these costs. Now, we talked here today about helping small people. That's what we're trying to do, Mr. Speaker, with a 'yes' vote on this Bill is help small people. All of us pay taxes, even the working people pay taxes, pay a great deal of taxes and we need to help them because our public institutions are paying these added costs. There is a need for change. I would ask that we get some more green lights up there. We know that in this Bill it's been stated that benefits do go up, they do not go down. Let's don't hold off and fool ourselves and think by voting for Bill 1205



that we can do the job. That Bill takes away with one hand what it gives with the other. That's been pointed out. Let's get some more green lights and do the job. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote.

You know, this is indeed a very perplexing issue. In fact, my grandfather used to always say that figures don't lie but liars can figure. This indeed proves it, I think. Unions can tell us that insurance companies are indeed making a big profit and they can prove that point. Pay outs have only been 51% of the money taken in. Industry is telling us that that is not true because if it was, why are insurance companies then cancelling and not selling workmen's comp. anymore and that is likewise true. I don't know, I think really what the entire problem is that the Federal government has set up guidelines and it says that every state must meet them. The problem is, no state is meeting them including Illinois. The question is how much is each and every state going to do to meet these Federal guidelines and standards. Some are doing a little and some are doing nothing. I don't know what the answer is. I know I've got many, many small businesses in my district that are saying they've got to have some help in comparison. I know of no other way but try to give them what little help we can and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else desire to explain his vote? Representative Miller. Timer is on."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I harken back to a Bill we had up last evening. As I recall, it was the Police Surveillance Bill and I recall my... the distinguished Member of the 53rd District getting up and pointing to all the 'present' votes on the board and all those who weren't voting and he challenged us to get on or get off. And I return that challenge to Mr. Stuffle and everybody else here who's 'present' or not voting to get on or get off."

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



you rise?"

Schuneman: "Could I ask for a poll of the absentees, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes, Caldwell, Capparelli, Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Collins as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Epton, Ewell, Huff, Emil Jones, Kane, Kornowicz,

Kosinski, Mann, McAvoy, McBroom, McPike, Nardulli, Satterthwaite,

Sevcik, Stearney, and Wall."

Speaker Redmond: "86 'ayes' and 54 'nay'. Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you rise? On this question..."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, can we have the Roll Call on this preserved, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the custom, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 85, 86 'aye' and 54 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority... Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Put it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration."

Daniels: "We would like a copy of the Roll Call, Mr. Speaker, as you've afforded the opportunity to many people, Mr. Hanahan on the other side when we had some of their Bills. We want a copy of this Roll Call and we're asking the Chair to please recognize that request."

Speaker Redmond: "Whatever the custom is will be done and I don't... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, under the rules, you have the discretion to take Bills under similar subject matter in consecutive order. I would ask that you follow that discretion and go to House Bill 1205 which has the similar subject matter."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 1205. Mr. Walsh, it's improper to, impolite to talk with your mouth full."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1205."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Speaker, I could not possibly match your poor manners. Talking with my mouth full is nothing compared with what is going on here. Mr. Speaker, this Bill was amended about an hour and a half ago. Now, you know very well, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill cannot be



...cannot be called at this time. It must be called tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "If you'll be very... Representative Walsh, if you'll just have the manners your brother, Richard, has, why I think that we will satisfy your problems. There's a motion been filed with respect to House Bill 1205. Read the motion, Mr. Clerk. I Clerk may call on you again, Mr. Walsh, be careful, Representative Kane."

Kane: "I believe you've... the order of business before the House now is House Bill 1205, You've already called it."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there's a motion on it... I'm going to put the motion with respect to 1205. Will you read the motion, Mr. Clerk? Representative Mautino's motion. Read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move that House Bill 1205 be brought back from Third Reading to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment." Signed Representative Schuneman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I may have missed something. Will the Clerk... the Clerk read... that is not my motion, Mr. Clerk. My motion is to... 35..."

Speaker Redmond: "To suspend the rules..."

Mautino: "...to suspend Rule 35(c) so that we can hear House Bill 1205 at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've already read a motion, Representative Schuneman's motion, and that's the motion before this Body. And I think you ought to call it."

Speaker Redmond: "I have called House Bill 1205 on Third Reading, and I am recognized Representative Mautino with respect to a motion."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "And his motion... his motion is leave... if you'll be quiet now... the motion is that leave be granted to hear House Bill 1205 today on the Order of Third Reading inasmuch as it was amended earlier in the day. And that motion takes 107 votes."

Ryan: "...But, Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, I think the motion's proper; and I think the Roll Call should be taken. Representative Ryan,"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion that was read by the Clerk was a



motion that's filed by Representative Schuneman. That's the motion that's before this Body, that's the motion that should be called."

Speaker Redmond: "I called Representative Mautino's motion, and the motion was to suspend the rule to consider House Bill 1205 today. And that motion is in order, it takes 107 votes. And the question is on the motion. Those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that I was clear in my hearing that the Chair went to House Bills, Third Reading, on House Bill 1205. And, therefore, there was no necessity for motion for that purpose. You play that tape back. The Chair went to House Bill 1205 on Third Reading. No motion at that point was necessary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, the rules are very specific that a Bill cannot be heard on the same day that it has been amended. And that was...that objection was raised by Representative Walsh. And in order to circumvent that motion of Representative Walsh, Representative Mautino filed a motion with respect to suspend that rule. And I think it is perfectly in order."

Barnes, E.: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that our rules also provide in the last week...in the last 72 hours of Bills being heard on final days of reading that those...those rules do not prevail. We have did it...precedent in this House time, time, time and again that Bills that are on Third Reading that are moved back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment within 72 hours of the ending period that has been set by the deadlining that those Bills are exempt and heard on that same day. That's the precedent..."

Speaker Redmond: "If that is the...if that is the rule, that will be the ruling. Mr. Parliamentarian. What rule is it? You'll give us the number of the rule, Mr. Barnes?"

Barnes, E.: "...Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Parliamentarian would take a look...the point that I was making is...the point that I was making is it has been always the practice of this House on the last week, last 72 hours of Bills to be heard on a final date that that rule requiring a Bill to lie...to...requiring 24 hours for a Bill to



lie on the desk, to lie on the desk without a Third Reading hearing has always been...been waived. That's the precedent of this House, we've always carried that out in the seven years that I've been here. And that we're changing that precedent at this point. It will be the first time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, I beg to disagree with you.

In previous Sessions there has been an Amendment to rules that provided what practice would be followed in the last 72 hours. Now, I just want to emphasize and reiterate, I personally want this Bill called, and I would like to put it to a vote; but you adopted rules, and I believe that I am bound by those rules. Unfortunately, the rules require the procedure at least in judgment. And I'm not going...it's a government of rules and laws and not a government of men. Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, included in those rules, I believe, is the latitude that's allowed the Speaker to go to a similar Bill of similar nature with the same...with...with the same subject matter. That what's involved here. I believe the rules prescribe that the Chair can do that within the latitude of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "And I did that; but objection was raised by Representative Walsh that the Bill had been amended today; and, therefore, it couldn't be heard. And Representative Mautino moved for the suspension of the rule. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you so ruled that way, then the proper situation for Representative Walsh is not to object but to appeal the ruling of the Chair. And he didn't do that. This motion is mute."

Speaker Redmond: "In my...in my judgment, Representative Mautino's motion should be put. Representative Mudd...Mudd, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mudd: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know for my own satisfaction does the Chair intend to hear all Bills on Third Reading, which have not been heard for the first time before they pursue any Bills on Postponed Consideration?"



Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Mudd: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Unless the...unless the Body would guide me differently and by their vote instruct me to do something else. But that's my intention. Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hadn't intended to rise on this particular motion, but it's been pointed out to me..."

Speaker Redmond: "For what purpose do you rise? Pardon me, that was ...Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, excuse me, Representative Houlihan, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "Your name was mentioned so proceed."

McBroom: "As my seatmates here know I injured myself day before yesterday. I have an opportunity to get in the hospital now to be checked. I'm not taking a powder, I'm not hiding, but I must go now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And my switch will be locked."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative McBroom, we all hope successful conclusion. Well, I'd like to point out the situation we're in. Since the House did not choose to move ahead with my motion to postpone the ...Mr. Speaker, can I have a little bit of order?..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Houlihan, J.: "...Since we did not postpone the rules with regard to the deadline, and since we have not passed this Bill and haven't had adequate time, House Bill 853, adequate time to review these, it is the Republican side of the aisle that is going to kill any kind of reasonable conversation about Workmen's Compensation. That's on your back, Representative Ryan, your back, and your team and your Governor. And that's wrong. And you and the lobbyists for business can continue to harrass..."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, in terms of a point of order, I believe we have a motion before us. Let's conclude the motion, hear the Bill or not hear the Bill. 12 o'clock Saturday is fast approaching. You've



indicated your desire to have the Bill heard. The votes are there or not there. And let's proceed properly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will you please poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman's requested a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Adams, Anderson, Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Bennett, Bluthardt, Boucek, Bradley, Caldwell..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Catania, Collins..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Cunningham, Daniels, Corneal Davis..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Deavers, Deuster, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Edgar..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Epton, Ewing, Friedrich, Gaines, Geo-Karis, Griesheimer Hoffman, Hoxsey, Hudson, Dave Jones, Keats, Kempiners..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Kent, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Lauer, Madison..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Mann, Lynn Martin, McAuliffe, McBroom, McCourt, McPike, Nardulli, Peters, Polk, Porter, Reilly, Rigney, Ryan..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as 'no', and I want to explain my vote and respond to the Gentleman from Cook on the other side of the aisle. I vote 'no', Mr. Speaker, because the Democrat side of the House has had an opportunity to give some relief in the areas that we've spent on here this afternoon and this morning. Now, they want to make their press releases and put them out and take credit for some token concession that..."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, are explanation of votes available on a poll of the absentees? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me that in his judgment it is



is...if hasn't explained it before..."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Madison: "Is it not necessary then for the individual to confine his remarks to the...to his explanation...to the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is right."

Madison: "Well, would you so advise the Gentleman, Mr. Speaker?"

Ryan: "Jesse, if you'll pay attention that's what I'm doing. That's the problem with your side of the aisle, they don't usually pay too much attention. That's exactly what I was doing was explaining my 'no' vote. My 'no' vote is because you folks on that side have refused to give relief to the businessman of the State of Illinois and now you want to go back to 1205 and give some token, token relief so you can all put out your press releases so you can make the folks back home think, think that maybe you've done something that they want you to do. And that's why I vote 'no', and I'll continue to vote 'no' until we get some meaningful legislation passed here."

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

Lechowicz: "It's all right now."

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

Madison: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Madison: "To the prior speaker, the relief that I seek for business is about the same amount of relief that your side of the aisle gave to welfare recipients on a 5 percent cost of living increase."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan. On this question...take the record...oh, you haven't finished yet? Proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Simms, Stearney, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Sumner, Telcser, Tuerk, Wall...that's not Wall, I'm sorry...Walsh, Wikoff and Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 93 'aye' and 14 'no'. The motion fails. House Bill 858. On the Order of Priority of Call.



We're not going to break for lunch. And Representative Ryan will you explain what the program is for the evening?"

Ryan: "Well, at this point I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to have a Republican Conference as soon as it's possible. And as I understand..."

Speaker Redmond: "What I meant was respect to the evening meal."

Ryan: "...As I understand, you're going to buy dinner for the chamber this evening. As usual they're not listening see. I said we're going to buy dinner for them this evening, is that right, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah. Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Ryan, I'm not going to accept that lobbyist money. This is an important issue. We've ask to postpone it to consider it realistically. And now you're going to buy us dinner, that's out of order, like all of your other comments."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. House Bill 858."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, what about my conference?"

Speaker Redmond: "When do you want to go?"

Ryan: "Right now is fine."

Speaker Redmond: "How long?"

Ryan: "Half an hour, 45 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested that we recess for half an hour. Representative Barnes objects. Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and the Minority Leader, I have asked and requested consistently now for yesterday evening and this morning to have Senate Bill 486 called. I would appreciate it, I've been over to the Senate, the Senate will be leaving about 2:30. They said that they would receive that Bill, that is, the deficiency for the Department of Public Aid. And I would solicit from the Speaker and from our Minority and our Majority Leader, if we could move on that Bill and move it over to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "He did bring that to my attention earlier and it's an oversight. Senate Bills, Third Reading. On Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 486."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 486, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Gaines, Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was thoroughly debated yesterday on Second Reading. And this is to enable the Department of Public Aid to pay Bills that have already been obligated. This is not future money. This is for services rendered to the public aid recipients by the hospitals. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on...shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative DiPrima, get ready. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Peters, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. I know this is going to pass, but less my 'no' votes and maybe those 'no' votes of the others there are misinterpreted. It is again not a vote against the concept of public aid, but it is a vote against an ever and ever...ever-increasing public aid budget, over 50 percent of which includes medical cost and no opportunity to get a handle on that medical cost. That is why my 'no' vote is there, for the medical end of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye' and 29 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 318, Representative DiPrima."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 318, a Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Veterans Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this appropriation is for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Veterans Affairs. And I would appreciate an affirmative vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? It's an emergency supplemental appropriation so that the Republican employees can get paid. 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 132 'aye' and 2 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 340. This is the last one. Representative Hoxsey."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey. Wait a minute, we've got the wrong number up there. 340."

Hoxsey: "Yes...Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 340 also appropriates \$2,100,000 to the Department of Corrections to supplement appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30th. The overcrowding of the penal institutions in the State of Illinois is a serious problem, which we are beginning to address with a Bill. We, the Legislators, continue to impose laws with stricter penalties, which means we have to make provisions for more inmates. The opening of the Joliet reception and classification center and the Menard minimum security unit, due to the significant increases being experienced in the adult population accounts for \$600,000 of the Department supplemental request. This is new operating funds. An additional \$1,500,000 is required to meet standards set forth in court orders for bedding, mattresses, pillows, pillow cases, sheets and so forth and clothing. The total amount of the supplemental request is \$2,100,000. I ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "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. 142 'aye', 3 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Representative Ryan, how long do you want your conference?"

Ryan: "About 30 minutes in 118, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "What time do you want to get back? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, before we break I have two procedural matters. One, leave to suspend the posting rule, Rule 18. I inadvertently left Bob Winchure...Winchester's Bill, House Bill 1033, leave so that Bill can be heard next Tuesday in Appropriation's I. And also 1861 was taken off that list to extend the deadline May 21, Helen Satterthwaite now has a companion Bill, leave to put that back so that...we can extend for two weeks the deadline on House Bill 1861."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the first Bill, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "1033, leave to suspend the posting provisions."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Use the Attendance Roll Call.

Representative Sharp, for what purpose do you arise?"

Sharp: "Mr. Speaker, Representative McClain and I would like to have leave to have our votes changed from 'yes' to 'no' on Amendment #1 to House Bill 951. It won't change the outcome of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have...does the Gentleman have leave. That was McClain, Sharp and Matijevich, is that correct?"

Sharp: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Use the Attendance Roll Call. Now, Representative Ryan has requested a Republican Conference, Room 118. It would seem to me that...2:15?...we might as well break for lunch as long as it looks like...it looks like you'd better stoke up, and I think we'll scrub the idea about feeding you in the..."

Ryan: "Well, I'd be glad to feed everybody but Representative Houlihan, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that was going to come out of my pocket, and I'm not really a lobbyist. So...2:15. Five minutes perfunct to...what have you got...messages from the Senate. 2:15."

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

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Bills #3, 103, 112, 172, 229, 231, 310, 349,



415, 416, 4150, 463, 507, 523, 524, 549, 613, 631, 640, 647, 686, 694, 699, 702, 715, 724, 766, 816, 843, 917, 1013, 1040, 1069, 1137, 1163, 1168, 1169, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1196, 1225, 1281, 1329 and 1367, passed by the Senate May 19, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles in the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Bills #621, 623, 624, 649, 653, 663, 666, 668, 669, 675, 679, 681 and 684, passed by the Senate May 19, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles in passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Bills #689, 691, 695, 700, 713, 717, 730, 732, 733, 738, 743, 744, 745, 746, 751, 756, 773, 788, 791, 792, 793, 794, 801, 803, 804, 805, 824, 819, 826, 834, 844, 847, 849 and 868, passed by the Senate May 19, 1977.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 584, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 689, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 695, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act in relation to maintenance for special funds in the State Treasury. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 788, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 791, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 792, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning establishment and regulation of trusts for pooling of the risks for certain financial losses of not-for-profit corporations exempt from taxation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 794, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Highway Advertising Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 803, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Auditing Act. First Reading



of the Bill. Senate Bill 804, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Auditing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 805, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Auditing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 844, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 847, a Bill for an Act changing the terms of office of Director of Financial Institutions. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 849, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 868, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 463, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 631, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 640, a Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Madison County. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 647, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 686, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 694, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 699, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 702, a Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1163, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Chain of Lakes Fox River Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1225, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Securities Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 621, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 649, a Bill for an Act to provide for emergency medical personnel for mer...for employment and training of such personnel and for emergency communications in coal mines. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 675, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Insect, Pest and Plant Disease Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 679, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Egg and Egg Product



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 681, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 684, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employees Group Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1329, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to butter substitutes. First Reading of the Bill... further business. The House now stands in recess until 2:15."

Doorkeeper (Emery Koehler): "All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and Members please be in their seats...Representative Tipsword's in his seat...without his apple pie. That's where the pie is. Houlihan's in his seat in a little better humor for a short while. Agreed Resolutions. Give them to Lechowicz. Give the Agreed Resolutions to Lechowicz. Agreed Resolutions. Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 264, Kelly. House Resolution 265, Tuerk. And House Resolution 40, J. J. Wolf."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 264 by Representative Kelly honors Mr. Steve Milen, who who is 83 years of age, and was...received the golden citizenship award by the mayor and village board at Midlothian. House Resolution 265 by Representative Tuerk honors Robert H. Michel, the U.S. Representative from the 18th Congressional District for serving his 10th term in Congress. House Resolution 266 honors the..."

Clerk O'Brien: "266 isn't agreed, I don't think."

Lechowicz: "...Oh, I'm sorry. How about 40?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint 40."

Lechowicz: "House Joint Resolution 40 by Representative Wolf honors German-American Day in the membership of that fine community. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 266, Kelly. Committee on Assignments."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. Representative
James Houlihan. Mind your manners."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I filed a motion, and I'd like leave to
have House Bill 455 recommitted to the Committee. It's a motion I
gave to Chalkie."

Speaker Redmond: "What Bill... into Interim Study. Is that your Bill?"

Houlihan, J.: "Interim Study. I have filled out the appropriate slip
to have it committed to Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you the hypen... or are you the hyphenated Sponsor?"

Houlihan, J.: "I'm sort of the second half of the Telcser trio."

Speaker Redmond: "Is it... is it the four or the half? Representative
Geo-Karis has observed that there's some question about whether
you two Gentleman know which end is which. Is there any question
about that? Does the Gentleman have leave to put House Bill 455...
Representative Houlihan, Houlihan, James."

Houlihan, J.: "Well, I spoke to Chairman Pierce, and also that is the
Committee which I'm on. So I would so move."

Speaker Redmond: "Is leave granted? We'll use the Attendance Roll Call.
Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, there are three Bills I'd like to move to table
to help clean things up here. First is House Bill 77."

Speaker Redmond: "Where are they? Will you tell me that?"

Deuster: "Oh, gosh."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I mean what order are they?"

Deuster: "Well, let's see. I think on Interim...okay. Oh, well, 251
is on the Calendar, House Bill 251. Come to think of it the others
automatically died. House Bill 251."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, wait a minute. 251 has already been
sent to Interim Study."

Deuster: "Fine, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "And you don't have 30 more? You've really..."

Deuster: "Not of mine, maybe I can find..."

Speaker Redmond: "...you sounded pretty exciting there for awhile. Still
the same old Deuster... Representative Totten."



Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Are you ...are you going to...is it your anticipation that we'll have a Fall Calendar at all?"

Speaker Redmond: "There isn't anything in the rules for a Fall Calendar; and the only thing in the rules is for Interim Study."

Totten: "Have you given it any thought? Has there been any discussion on the Fall Calendar at all?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "We'll address that situation in the fall."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Lechowicz: "I told him that we'd address that situation in the fall."

Speaker Redmond: "The answer is that it hasn't been brought to my attention and we haven't given it any consideration."

Lechowicz: "No."

Totten: "After everything I've done for you?"

Lechowicz: "It doesn't even...it doesn't even compare."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave to be recorded 'no' on House Bill 853. I had an excused absence this morning for a funeral."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Wait a minute. Oh, that's right. That Roll Call was not preserved."

McPike: "Good."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. I've got something here. On Speaker's Table on the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 717 for which Representative Hart is recognized."

Hart: "Thank you very much. This is the appropriation to the Capital Development Board for the repair of the roof at the Appellate Court in Mount Vernon. The Senate Amendment requires that the Bill... the appropriation be spent in fiscal '77. I'm also advised that the reappropriation will occur in the '78 C.D.B. budget. And this has been cleared with the Court Administrator's Office. And I would move for the concurrence with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 717."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten,"



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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Specifically, what does that Amendment do that we're asked to concur?"

Hart: "Requires that the expenditure be made in the '77 fiscal year."

Totten: "That's Amendment #1?"

Hart: "That's a Senate Amendment, page 16 of the Calendar."

Totten: "I see that, but the Amendment isn't on page 16."

Hart: "Well, that's all right. It was circulated the other day. And it's on the...we took it out of the record because Representative D. Houlihan had some questions about it. Those were resolved. And the Senate passed the Bill 49 to nothing with the Amendment."

Totten: "That would mean that this money would all have to be spent before June 30th?"

Hart: "It would have to be contracted before June 30th; and if not, it will be reappropriated. I don't know, you know, this is the Senate's way of doing things. But I...Roy Gulley, Court Administrator, said that he understands and agrees with the Amendment. So..."

Totten: "Okay, I accept it. All right, no questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 717. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye' and 3 'no'...Representative Peggy Smith Martin desires to be recorded as 'aye'...122 'aye' and 3 'no'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 717. Oh, Senate Bills, First...Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2404, Catania, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2405, Lauer-Deavers, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Comptroller. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2406, Shoerberlein-Tuerk, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Commission on Labor Laws. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2407, Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of



Registration and Education to the Administration of the Illinois Geologist Licensing Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 858. Representative Ewing is recognized."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 858, a Bill for an Act relating to security interests. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a series of law revision Bills. This one adds a substitute modern language to the security interests along with other phrases, such as chattel mortgages, to Chapter 8, paragraphs 29 and 53, and other related chapters of the Illinois Revised Statutes. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "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 116 'aye' and no 'nay'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 860. Oh, that's in Interim Study, is that correct, Representative? 862."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 862, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, this is another one of the Law Revision Commission Bills that's set up to harmonize and coordinate Section 64.3 of the Civil Practice Act with the Supreme Court decision. The second sentence of 64.3 of the Civil Practice Act is amended as follows: 'In rulings on the motion the court shall lay the evidence; and then having considering the credibility of the witnesses and the reasonable inferences to be drawn from the evidence as if no further evidence were to be introduced in the case'. Now, this is straight from the Supreme Court decision on the matter. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? On this question there's 131 'aye' and no 'nay'; the



Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed...189. Representative Giorgi, we've already had the Agreed Resolutions. Representative Lechowicz substituted for you. Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you arise?"

Giorgi: "You used a very evil substitute, Mr. Speaker. Did you skip over 963 for some reason?"

Speaker Redmond: "Over what?"

Giorgi: "Over House Bill 963. Was that next to it or called on my name?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I didn't have it on my list here."

Giorgi: "Was it on a priority or not?"

Speaker Redmond: "What happened to 96...oh, I guess that was Dan Houlihan's Bill."

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir, but I'm fiscal Cosponsor and he...asked me to handle it."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, I didn't know that. 963, that's the reason that we skipped over it. I didn't identify you as Dan Houlihan."

Giorgi: "That's right, Sir, the Irish and the Italian have a lot of trouble."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 963, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 963 allows Judges that have been State's Attorneys or Assistant State's Attorneys or public defenders to buy into Judicial Retirement by paying the prevailing wage they would've paid had they been a Judge at that time. So I ask the support of the House to allow these people to buy into the Judicial Retirement."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Judicial Retirement has to be the biggest cushion going, even better than the Illinois General Assembly Retirement. I wonder if the Sponsor will tell us how much this will lower the funding of the Judicial Retirement Fund, which I think went from the best funded retirement fund in the State of Illinois, somewhere around 70 percent down to about 30 to 40 percent after the last judicial pay raise? How much will this increase the underfunded part of



the Judicial Pension Fund, Representative?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker... or Skinner, to the best of my ability, I don't know how many State's Attorneys have become Judges or Public Defenders have become Judges. It might be one, it might be 20; but whatever it is, they have to pay for whatever time they...they purchase up to, I think, 4 years of pension time. And if they purchase that pension time, they have to pay what they would have paid had they been a Judge at that time for them. I don't know... I don't have any idea. And there can't be that many people because the Public Defender's system has only been with us half a dozen years."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if I might address the issue. As far as we know, this is a give away and we vote for it, I guess it's okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "I want to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Edgar: "Representative Giorgi, are there other pension plans where a nonelected official, I mean, use your time as a nonelected official to buy into an elected position type pension plan?"

Giorgi: "I think...I don't know, Edgar, too much about reciprocity among pensions, but I happen to know that...I think we can do it in the General Assembly pension. And...but the reason this is sensible is because it's a natural progression for a Judge to come out of the State's Attorneys Office or the Public Defender's Office because we seem to want our professional State's Attorneys and Public Defenders to become Judges because they're cognizant on problems you find in the courtroom. They're generally around the courthouse and they're known to the Judges, and that's the natural progression. And we amended it to full-time people only, my aide tells me."

Unknown: "I've got a conflict."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Giorgi, you did answer one of my questions,



I guess. You say it is now amended to cover only full-time employment in these offices?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Ma'am."

Satterthwaite: "What is the condition under which they buy in their time? Do they pay the employer and the employee's contributions both?"

Giorgi: "Both. And at the..."

Satterthwaite: "Your resource person there is shaking his head the opposite direction."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question?"

Satterthwaite: "We...we have a question still pending, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "They make a full contribution of what they would've paid had they been a Judge then with interest. And then they only pay the interest of the employers part from the day they would pick up."

Satterthwaite: "Not the full employer's portion as we would've required for the buy-in for Constitutional Convention funds? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ebbesen: "Yes, I didn't catch what Representative Edgar was asking; but I didn't hear your response of what I thought he was asking about...these are appointed people, the...talking about the Assistant State's Attorney, Public Defender or Assistant Public Defender, is that correct?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Ebbesen: "That is correct. Well, you know, I want to speak to the Bill..."

Giorgi: "The State's Attorney is elected."

Ebbesen: "...okay...the Assistant State's Attorney, usually they are appointed."

Giorgi: "Well, that's because some have ascended to a Judgeship as Assistant State's Attorney."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to this Bill..."

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I...I think it was indicated that these



would have to be full-time. But in any event, as I understand this, talking about normal cost, there's some normal cost to this, and it's only the unfunded accrued liability that concerns me. Did you have an impact statement on that also. I don't believe I heard the Amendment, I don't have it in front of me, but this system has been already...it's been already indicated by Representative Skinner was one of the best funded at one time and has now dropped appreciably to the point where it's probably in the vicinity of about 29 or 30 percent, based on 100 percent. And I think this is just an expansion of something that will establish a precedent that will overflow into other systems. And I certainly would encourage everyone to take a very close look at this before they ever cast an 'aye' vote."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the staff says it would cost \$100,000 in accrued liability of the pension fund."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 50 'aye' and 65 'no'; and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost. 1189, Cunningham. Out of the record. 1205. No, out of the record. 1206, McClain."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1206, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, out of the record. Oh, Representative McClain, 1206."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1206, you've all had a lot of mail on. It raised the minimum salary for teachers. Actually it does three things. It raises the minimum salary that I've now amended down. It raises the increment level for Bachelor's Degrees plus years. And it raises Master's Degree plus years. And the third point it does, it provides for a uniform advancement of teachers on salary schedule, where one exists. I'd like to say a couple of things if



I could. A lot of people have come to me saying, 'Well, this is against my philosophy that we are mandating minimum salaries'. I would suggest to you that we do the same thing for our county officials; but also I would suggest to you that we've done this for teachers in 1969. We had the minimum for a Bachelor's Degree, for instance \$6,800. Well, \$6,800 is still the minimum from the 1969 law. And if you were to take inflation since 1969, that minimum now is really \$3,975. So since we passed that 1969 Act providing that the minimum be at \$6,800. Inflation has reduced that to \$3,975. I'd like to suggest to you also that since my Amendment, much because of Bill Walsh and Harlan Rigney, Mr. Tipword's complaints, I've amended down the minimum salary now. Whereas, before it used to affect somewhere around 6,900 now will affect 4,600 teachers. Wherein, before it would've cost local systems a total for the entire state of \$5.5 million; now would cost local systems \$3,235,000. I would also suggest to you that since we do have the minimum and it really is the policy decision of the Legislative Branch, and we have made that policy decision in 1969, that I would recommend to you that by all rights these teachers have a right to have an increase in minimum. That are... there are many school systems that are paying this minimum. And you can't expect quality teachers to give of their time when they only make \$6,800 or a little bit more. I'd also like to suggest to you if I could that we ought to increase this minimum because what we're forcing young teachers to do is to pick up second or third jobs, much like a laboring man had to do a few years ago, 10 years ago and 20 years ago. Those people had to pick up two jobs also. Teaching jobs, as many of you are aware, requires a great deal of time, not only in the schools, but also preparing at night. By letting these young teachers now pick up a second job they're not giving the kind of quality education that you and I have... expect of teachers. And I think by increasing the minimum, although I still think \$9,200 is deplorable, increasing that minimum to \$9,200 might help a teachers stay a full-time teacher and not pick up a second job. I'd urge your 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Anderson. Anderson on 1206."

Anderson: "Well, I hadn't planned on speaking on this, but I arise in support of this Bill. If you look at the...we were just on two Bills for Workmen's Compensation and the average weekly wage was 2...\$205 a week at 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week. That's \$5.12 an hour. For a teacher right now, the minimum, non-degree, is \$3.40 an hour. Figuring 176 working days of 8 hours a day. Now, with a B.A. degree, \$3.86 an hour. With a Master's Degree, \$4.14 an hour. This is what the minimum is right now. And the state's weekly average is \$5.12 an hour. And I think it's time we raised these minimums. This is a good Bill. Support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a couple or three questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hoffman: "Representative McClain, can you give me any idea how many districts would be affected by this change? In other words, we have a thousand plus school districts in the state. Do you have any idea how many districts would be affected?"

McClain: "Gene, my computations were by a number of teachers and not by school systems. I think in all frankness, if I can be totally frank, I mean, it's going to have an affect on most systems because of the increments, as you are well aware of. However, on the minimum salaries it has an affect on just 4,687 teachers. I mean I'm trying to be totally frank."

Hoffman: "You don't know, all right. You don't know how many districts that affects? But you know it affects that many teachers. All right, what is your...what's the estimate of the cost to the local school districts to raise their salaries to the minimum as well as have the application of the increment apply?"

McClain: "All right, if I can handle that, in the original Bill it would've cost local school systems for the minimum salary \$500...\$5.5 million. Now, since the Amendment that Bill Walsh and Harlan Rigney urged me to adopt it'll cost local systems \$3.2 million. Now, on the increment



question, there's no way that I can answer you on increments because it's almost impossible to get all the contracts and salary schedules of all thousand plus school systems and to be able to compute them on...on increments..."

Hoffman: "Okay, would you agree then that...that we could round that to about, my estimate is about \$4,000,000 when you get into the increments? Where...now, the question is, where do you suggest that these school districts get this money? Where do you suggest that the school districts that are planning on..."

McClain: "For one thing...for one thing, they're going to get increased state revenue this year. Your Governor is going to give them \$75,000,000 distributive funds for education. That money ought to go into future salaries. But I think real frankly, Gene, the key issue here is that a salary of \$6,800 for a person that goes through college and then teaching our kids is lousy. And I don't see how anybody...I mean, if you want to challenge the increment, I think maybe you can have some arguments. But I don't see how anybody can challenge the minimum salary."

Hoffman: "...All right, how...how would this Bill affect already entered-into contracts? The number of school districts that have entered into contracts already, and these school district, how would their contracts be affected by this Bill if the increments or whatever it they happened to be to meet those standards? How would that affect contracts already entered into?"

McClain: "Excuse me just one second if you would."

Speaker Redmond: "Answer the question, Mr. McClain."

Hoffman: "Mr....Mr. Sponsor?"

McClain: "Okay, I'm just seeking a little legal guidance to this."

Hoffman: "Okay."

McClain: "Yes, statute would prevail over the contract. So that if a school system had a teacher that they were paying, a beginning teacher, \$6,400 and we passed this...this law...\$6,900...and we passed this law, that would be so. They would have to increase their minimum to \$9,200. But I think real frankly, Mr. Hoffman, that they ought to increase the minimum \$6,900 or \$7,000 for a



minimum salary for a Bachelor's Degree...we're stealing them."

Hoffman: "I would hope you felt that way...you wouldn't have sponsored the Bill. Let's move on to the next question and get away from the minimum. Let's talk about the application of the increment steps that you have in the...in the program. Now, is my understanding correct that these increments would apply regardless of what the starting salary in the district happened to be if they had a starting salary? For example, in my own school district we have a starting salary of 10.6. That these...these increments would have to be applied against that 10.6 or would they be applied the state minimum, the new minimum?"

McClain: "They would be applied according to the minimum of the school system. But even then a ma...a Master's Degree plus 13 years, if you're staring at 10.6, that would mean that mandated by this legislation they'd have to pay at least \$15,000. And I would suspect your school system, a Master's Degree plus 13 years is paying over \$15,000 for that teacher."

Hoffman: "Are you aware of the impact that this type of a program has on experienced teachers who transfer their residency that, in fact, experienced teachers who transfer residency for one reason or another find it practically impossible to get a job. And I...you know, my point is that I don't think this is in the best interest of boys and girls in the State of Illinois. Let's go to the new language. The last point I want to make. Exactly what does this new language mean. It says, 'When a step salary schedule is in effect in a school district, all teachers in a district must progress through the applicable step in a uniform manner'. Now, what is meant in terms of uniform? You mean in terms of dollars or in terms of percentages in a...in a schedule?"

McClain: "All right, Mr. Hoffman, that's really a...a moral type part question, as you're well aware of. First of all, if they have an increment level like what we're mandating here or more, that would mean every year everyone would have to progress an a uniform rate at that increment level. No teacher if he was an organizer for a union, or if he was an outspoken teacher, or if he refused to do



extra duty could be penalized by not receiving at least that increment mandated by this legislation or by that increment schedule. Everybody would have to progress. Now, the second point, which I think is your legitimate concern, is what about the outstanding teacher who has done a superb job and should receive extra remunerations. There's nothing in this legislation which would prevent a school board to give a bonus or a monetary stipend."

Hoffman: "All right, what...then what do you mean by a step? Does a step mean to you as you interpret it to be a chronological year or a year of successful teaching?"

McClain: "Well, you know, as you are well aware of, it's a step year ...the step salary schedules that I've seen them, it's every year there's a...there's an increase in that step schedule."

Hoffman: "All right, let me...let me just make some comments in reference to the Bill then. The last comment that was made in reference to steps, that's left up to local interpretation of what steps mean. It may be chronological experience, it may be years of successful teaching. What this last Section of this Bill does is a new language in this law does would effectively prevent local boards of education and teachers associations from negotiating anything other than a uniform program. Many school systems have programs such as the one that I happen to be associated with where people are bumped extra steps because of outstanding service to the boys and girls in the community. And I think that's really what...really what it's all about. Let me point out three or four facts for you in my concluding remarks. This...this Bill is going to affect according to the I.E.A. study by the I.O.E. looking at 1976-77 school year: There are 432 districts in this date with B.A. beginnings below the \$9,200. There are 517 districts with M.A. beginnings below \$10,300. As we indicated the cost will be in the neighborhood of \$4,000,000. This is one of the clearest examples of the General Assembly imposing a mandate on local districts without providing the funding. We're only going to provide them somewhere in the neighborhood of 41...or 93 percent of full funding as it is. Let me give you some specific



examples what this is going to do to some school districts. In the Liberty Community School District over in Adams County it's going to cost them an additional \$35,000. Ridge Farm an additional \$50,000. Tamoroa an additional \$22,000, over schedules already agreed to. Jamaica, \$21,000. Spring Valley, \$20,000. Kankakee, \$32,000. Champaign, \$32,900. Effingham, \$61,257. They've already agreed on a...on a schedule. Marion estimates their amount of a \$117,000. Trico Unit, \$26,000. Canton, \$37,000. On...here's a panhandle which can hardly get along, \$79,000. And I have others here that I'm not going to read. Where are they going to get the money? Obviously, we're not going to give it to them and their own property taxpayers aren't going to pay for it either. There's only one place they can get this money. And that is from other teachers. Last week we passed House Bill 904 out of this House, which required a hearing, which by the way was binding on local board, for teachers who were layed off because of reduced enrollment or reduced resources. Now, here we come with House Bill 1206 which guarantees that teachers are going to be layed off so... they can pay those teachers that are left. Now, not only is the additional language in the uniform progression to the salary schedule unclear, but it's another example of the efforts to intrude in local school board teacher decision making. Let's let the people work out their own relationship. In effect, what's happening here we're being used as a negotiating tool to pressure this Bill. Now, my opposition to this Bill is not because I think teachers aren't worth what they're being paid, I'm opposed to it because it-interferes with local teacher board relationships. In no way can this Bill be construed to be in the best interests of the boys and girls of the State of Illinois. And, therefore, in the long-run it's not going to be in the best interests of the teachers and should not be supported."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, it's now 3:11 and exactly 50 seconds. And 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 McClain to close."

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

I don't see how in the world anybody can be against a minimum salary of \$9,200 for a qualified teacher, certified teacher, teaching our kids. Right now it's \$6,800, which is equal to \$3,675 according to the inflation rate. \$92,000 minimum if that teacher...if that school system took a minimum of \$9,200, and a lot of school systems will, as their minimum, that would mean a person with a Master's Degree and 13 years would have...would only be making \$13,600. The point being, if we don't increase this minimum, what we're doing is relegating poor districts, districts that are not paying their teachers the minimum wage, we're not giving those kids the quality education. Every year I hear people saying, 'We're giving too much money for education. When I was the 89th vote, people came up to me and said that teachers are making too much money. And here it is the minimum salary \$6,800, and there are people saying that that's all right and that's the way it ought to stay. The real issue is that a teacher making \$20 or \$22,000 wants to make sure that next year he makes a \$1,000 increase, while the guy at the lower level of the schedule with no critical clout in the school board and the school system receives a minimum increment. The issue is very clear that people...the young teachers are starting out...the ones that are very dedicated have the greatest rapport with the kids are being paid pitifully and resting on your vote today as to whether or not they receive a decent wage. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "The clock...the clock is on."

Walsh: "...you didn't have to tell me that...the Sponsor made a couple of inadvertent, I'm sure, errors in connection with his presentation. Where was that I supported the Amendment and urged the adoption of the Amendment. That is not accurate, Mr. Speaker. I opposed "



the Bill from the very beginning. The Sponsor was very generous in permitting the Bill to be taken from the Short Debate Calendar, and I appreciate that action by him; but I had nothing whatever to do with the Amendment. Another representation that Mr. McClain made was that this is not anything new that we provide for minimum and maximum salaries for other units of government. Mr. Speaker, teachers are the only employee of any unit of government that we treat in this fashion. We do nothing whatever about park district superintendents, about sanitary district engineers or about any..."

Speaker Redmond: "Time is expiring."

Walsh: "...or about any...this is a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned in debate..."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Proceed."

Walsh: "...or about any of the multitude of public employees. Teachers for one reason or another are special. And I suspect that reason is that the Members here have for many years been leaned upon by teachers unions and are far more interested in the teachers than they are in the boys and girls. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, this is a...this is a one-third increase in the minimum. As has been pointed out there will not be a corresponding increase in state aid. There is certainly not a corresponding increase in revenue from real estate taxes. This is ill-advised totally, Mr. Speaker. We should repeal the law which provides for minimum salaries. We should not be increasing it. And I'd urge your opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, the real issue is not whether or not these teachers are paid enough. Because they aren't in many districts. And the real issue isn't whether or not it ought to be a local issue. Because the same people who say it ought to be bargainable are unwilling to support a collective bargaining Bill. The only real issue is whether or not we should force the cost on the school district at this time. And I very reluctantly have to say that we ought to be voting in the red on this Bill for that reason and that reason only, and not consider the other arguments to the contrary



because they don't hold water."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Schneider to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It always amazes me that we can talk about minimums for any number of groups during our course of a Session, including one the other night for waitresses. And it seems to me that if we're willing to trust people in the classroom, we're willing to say that you're entitled to a living wage. We're willing to trust you with our children on the essentials of your growth, including intellectual as well as emotional, but don't ask us for too much money. It's interesting that Representative Stuffle points out quite accurately. This is the kind of stuff that doesn't belong in the statutes, but absent the collective bargaining legislation that we need so desperately to resolve these problems locally. This is the way we're going to have to do it. I don't think these requests are out of line. I've worked for a long time as a teacher and have had the good fortune now of being able to have two professions and survive financially. But for those people that are left downstate who are on a salary of \$9,000 or \$10,000, you know how tough it is to survive. You know how tough it was and you know it's so tough that we voted out \$44 a day out of this House. I don't see any reason why we ought to oppose minimal standards across the board from any districts. And I think it's very difficult for me to stand here and say to put the teacher in the classroom who is the least qualified, because that's what you're going to get because they're going to go into insurance. They're going to go into other professions because the livelihood of teaching is not financially rewarding."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I'd better tell my colleague on the other side, many of those other downstate teachers are coming...my county; but I think this is a matter for negotiation between the teachers and the school boards."



I know the one union, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, have a list of Bills they are approving. They don't have this on their approved list. And I think maybe we shouldn't try to have too much government to govern. We have enough of it as it is. And I'm not against the teachers. I was one myself."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Sharp. The timer is on."

Sharp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I can remember about 9 years ago when I started teaching, the school district that I went to work for had minimums that were above the minimums that exist now, \$6,800 for a Bachelor's and \$7,300 for a Master's. But yet I feel in my district, the 49th District, I received letters from many teachers who state that their minimums are in this area of \$6,800 at this date. They're asking for help. They cannot exist on the salaries that they are receiving from the school districts right now. Many of these same districts have no collective bargaining agreement. They take what they're offered, like it or not. You know, it's strange, we expect the highest quality, the highest standards, everything else from our teachers. We want the kids to have the best education possible. Well, let me tell you the only thing that we're doing with low salaries for teachers in this state is we're driving..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Davis, Jack, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request to explain my vote."

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

Representative McClain, have you explained your vote once? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my negative vote on this issue, I think that I could not do it more succinctly than Representative Stuffle did it previously. We cannot put an additional burden on our local school districts regardless of how justifiable the cause might be. There is no doubt that the teachers deserve to have a larger minimum salary than we now provide for in our statutes. There is also no doubt that we have a



greater obligation to our local school districts in our statutes than we have provided for them in hard dollars. When we as a Legislature, when teachers as a body, whether they are organized or unorganized, are willing to explain to the people of the State of Illinois that we cannot expend more dollars than we have in state revenue, then I will be happy to go along..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Deuster: "Not to explain my vote, but simply to say that I would like to be recognized to request a verification in the event that it gets up there. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 87 'aye' and 72 'no'...Representative McClain."

McClain: "Sir, I wouldn't do this, but it's 87 votes, would you poll the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Let's poll it anyway if you don't mind, Sir. I don't..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Boucek, Don Brummet, Conti, Epton, Katz, Kornowicz, Mann, McBroom, Meyer, Nardulli, Stearney, Telcser, Waddell; Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave I'd like to place this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1222. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized at this point in time to present a motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not yet."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1222. It's now 3:20 on May the 20th."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1222, a Bill for an Act to provide for additional Judges for the Circuit of Cook County. Third Reading of the



Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1238, E. M. Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1238..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1329. D. L. Houlihan. Representative Beatty."

Clerk O'Brien: "...House Bill 1329, a Bill for an Act increasing the salary of Judges. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a judicial pay raise request recommended by the Supreme Court of Illinois covering all of the Judges in the State of Illinois. It would be the first time that they would have received their...an increase in salary since 1974. Salary increase would take the Supreme Court from \$50,000 each to \$62,500. The Appellate Court from \$45,000 to \$55,000. Circuit Court Judges from \$42,500 to \$49,500. Associate Judges from \$37,000 to \$44,000. Since the last time the Judges have got an increase, their increase has been eroded by inflation. As you know, Judges' income is limited and the way in which they can earn income is generally limited to their salary as set out by the standards of the Supreme Court. The only way that they can generally get in the other income is by teaching. And so we put these people in a position where they are restricted as to their income and we really should give them adequate income. Judicial salary should be maintained at a level which will attract qualified lawyers to the bench and which will enable us to retain the most qualified members of the present judiciary. The Supreme Court recommends that the General Assembly favorably consider increasing judicial salaries to a level approximating the recent increases in the consumer price index. And that was...that's what these changes do. The total cost of this is slightly over \$5,000,000. Any questions, I'll be glad to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? Representative Johnson. Please, some order. It's pretty noisy."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 1329. And to simply state that in this



year or maybe any other year when we talk about the priorities that the State of Illinois has, and as I said before and as many other Members of the House has said before, we go to the Children and Family Services, we go to the Public Aid, we go to the schools and the various other departments of the state and say we don't have enough money to pay you. We don't have enough money because we're not either fiscally able to do it or we're not willing to raise taxes to do it. And those are both good reasons to resist increases for those areas. And yet we can go to the aristocracy of this state, and by the aristocracy I mean the Legislature, I mean the Executive Department, and I mean the Judiciary, and say that we're going to give you this kind of increase. Now, I don't know how hypocritical the other Members of this House think it is, but I think it's absolutely hypocritical as can be when we say that we can't afford this, we can't afford minimum salaries for teachers, we can't afford, and I don't believe we can afford, a 5 percent welfare increase, and we can't afford the various other priorities of state. But we're willing to pay people with 1977 dollars \$62,000, \$55,000, \$49,500 and \$44,000 for filling positions of that nature. Nobody objects to the fact that we need good people in government. I think we have good people in government; but we can...can't afford to live by a different set of standards that we expect other people in our economy and in our society to live by. And when we set this kind of example, and we set the kind of example that we set before when we increase our own benefits here in the General Assembly, then it's good reason that people come to us and say the government is separate from the people...really don't reflect or the government really doesn't reflect the people's wishes. To the average person, a salary increase of this nature or an absolute salary of this nature is absolutely astronomical. And I think the people who vote for this kind of Bill ought to be prepared to be branded with good reason as hypocrites by the voters in the next election and by the people over the course of the next two years."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."



Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Johnson has said it all really. I would just point out one extra thing. When we talk about we must pay Judges high salary to compete with what they could earn in a law firm, I would point out a Judge has absolutely no overhead as do the lawyers downtown in the way of rent, help. A Judge, everything he gets, he keeps. And he doesn't even have to worry about clothing bills. So I think this is outrageous, and I urge everybody to defeat it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think all of you remember earlier this Session we passed out a Pay Commission Resolution. And it's my understanding that the Governor will be acting on this...appointing the members of the Pay Commission very shortly. He has just sent down to the Minority Leader's Office for his recommendation. And I'm sure if he has not already done so, he will be doing the same with the other people involved with the appointment process. Passing this Bill now is premature. We, as a Body, said earlier this Session, 'Look, Governor, appoint the Pay Commission to look into the salary levels which might be necessary to have good people remain in the various offices, whether it's the Judiciary, the Legislature or the state officers. This piece of legislation why...while it may or may not be warranted at this time is as a matter of fact...matter of fact premature. Now, I would like to see what that Pay Commission has to say. Their findings will determine in my mind what I will do regarding pay increases if any for any Judges, Legislatures or state officers. And so I would hope that House Bill 1329 does not receive enough votes to pass."

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

Friedrich: "Mr....I'll explain my vote, if you want to put it on the board."

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

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



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

Friedrich: "...Wait a minute."

Beatty: "Representative Friedrich, excuse me. I just want to say a few words; and that is, that the Consumer Price Index since 1967 has risen 73 percent, whereas, the Judges' salaries over this period has only increased 40 percent. While Representative...on the other side and the Leadership indicated that it is premature to vote on this Bill, it is subject to the deadline. And, therefore, I suggest that the Members do support this Bill. And if during the time it's in the process, and if it gets to the Senate, the salaries can be adjusted along with what the Commission finds should be a suitable salary. I know that much of the objection to a pay raise for Judges is due to the fact that we received \$20,000. And a Member will say to himself, 'Why the hell should they get \$50,000?'. Well, I don't think that you are necessarily related. We should give the Judges their due. And when it comes time to our salary increase, we should also give ourselves what is adequate. Now, if the...if the Commission finds these salaries are not in line, then let them adjust them; but let's keep the Bill alive so that these men can get consideration. They're limited to their income as what they earn. They can't earn any other money any other way. The Federal Judges recently got substantial increases and these Circuit Judges should also be given consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 45 'aye', 71 'no'; and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost. 1346, Representative Shumpert."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1346, a Bill for an Act in relation to revocation or suspension of the authority to do business in Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shumpert."

Shumpert: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What 1346 does...detrimental Business Practice...Practice Act. It permits regulatory agents to investigate business entities



subject to jurisdiction whatever, a final disposition of an action in Circuit Court indicates that the business entity commits a detrimental business practice. It provides penalties for the violator in this Act. I'd certainly appreciate an Affirmative Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone standing in opposition? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Telcser: "I think I'm opposed, I'm not sure. If a business has been found guilty in a Circuit Court of doing something wrong, what's the purpose of investigating it any further once they've been adjudged guilty?"

Shumpert: "Well, I think that the licensed agents should have a right to look into the matter and investigate."

Telcser: "They have it already, don't they?"

Shumpert: "No, no, no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "It's just like regulatory laws regarding liquor licenses. They go into court, and after the court, they're still before the regulatory agency that regulates their licenses. It's the same thing."

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

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Shumpert: "Sure."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Simms: "Representative Shumpert, is it not true at the present time the Secretary of State and the Attorney General's Office already have this authority?"

Shumpert: "No."

Simms: "The Attorney General's Office or the Secretary of State did not have the authority at the present time?"

Shumpert: "They do not have the authority. That's why I introduced this legislation."



Simms: "Well, it's my understanding that the Attorney General's Office and the Secretary of State both have this authority. And that, frankly, that the Attorney General's Office has the division that does this type of work for the state. And this is just duplicative of this type of effort. In addition, as a corporation, the Secretary of State in the State of Illinois has those powers, Representative Shumpert. And I would suggest that this legislation, in speaking to the merits of the Bill, is nothing more than duplicating efforts...or establishing another agency that is already covered under the existing Illinois law, where the Secretary of State has the authority in the area of the...of corporations. And the Attorney General's Office already has the authority to go into this type of situation. And, frankly, this is just a duplication of state services. And for these reasons I would be in opposition of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The prior Speaker is wrong again. I have to say it for him, he's very consistent. If he simply reads the fiscal note, it will say to him that the Office of the Secretary of State is not currently authorized to engage in the regulations and the investigative activities proposed in this Act."

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? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A number of witnesses have opposed this Bill, and rightly so. This is merely another tool on the part of the state to harrass business. And if you want to continue driving business out, this Legislature has done an awful lot to do that, this is another nail in the coffin. And I would certainly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 79 'aye' and 55 'no'. Representative Shumpert."

Shumpert: Postponed Consideration..."



Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1353, Representative Shumpert. Out of the record. 1354. Representative Van Duynes, for what purpose do you arise?"

Van Duynes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I really rise reluctantly because I know the answer to me that has been along with these kind of introductions. But this is my first introduction in my two years in the House, and I would like to really take the privilege of introducing my little kids from Park School in Joliet, Illinois. And they are with Mrs. Dorothy Schreider, Marilyn 'Marweis', Art McKay and their principal, Ed McKay. Mrs. Brummet and Diane's aunt, Mrs. 'Moser'. They are represented by me, and Leinenweber and Davis. And thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "1354."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1354, a Bill for an Act authorizing peace officers to organize and collectively bargain. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle."

Doyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1354 creates the Illinois Police...Peace Officers Arbitration Act. It provides for collective bargaining between peace officers and their public employers and for arbitration in order to settle disputes. It requires compliance of collective bargaining agreements and finding of arbitrators. It prohibits strikes by peace officers, also any work 'plaque' orders. And I ask your full support of this Bill. It passed out of Labor Committee 13 to 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, can we take photographs if the red light isn't on? There's some people in the balcony taking photographs."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that happens to be part of the Democratic P.R. staff. And they want to get a good picture of the Speaker."

Telcser: "That's fine, but put the red light on though."

Speaker Redmond: "The last one he had was too fat. The question is,



shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I noticed from the Digest strikes aren't permitted. And I just wonder if the Gentleman could explain his vote in two areas. One is, is there any provision for resolving disputes other than...just arriving at an impasse. And secondly, is it possible under this Bill for a employee organization to enter into a provision or agreement which would mandate that all Members of the State Police Department be members of the same organization?"

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

Doyle: "Arbitration Board would handle the disputes. And it doesn't lock them in under one organization."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90...102 'ayes', 15 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Doyle: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1372. Representative Greiman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1372, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to divorce. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill might be properly called the 'Truth in Ending' Bill because it deals with bringing truth into the divorce process. House Bill 1372 provides that a couple, a man and wife, who have agreed to resolve their problems, who have made a property settlement, who have resolved any custody problems, can agree by a stipulation in writing that they need not have the customary grounds for divorce. In Illinois, the grounds are such goodies as striking, extreme and repeated cruelty, infecting the other spouse with venereal disease, conviction of a felony, habitual alcoholism, habitual drug use, mental cruelty. Fault, always fault. Terrible things to lay on people that just have decided that they can't live together...have just decided that is time for them to have an end to it. Now, it's not...this is not a no-fault in the sense that



no one can decide by themselves that the marriage is over and go out and get a divorce. You must have the parties agreeing. We're talking about two adult people who have decided that the marriage is over. There are people in here sitting in this room that have more or less suborned perjury. I mean the lawyers who are sitting here. When a client comes into our office, we read them what I guess you'd call...we read them the act, and we say, 'Well, Mrs. So and So, this is what we're going to have to have in order for you to get a divorce'. And we say, 'Well, has he hit you?' 'No'. 'Well, has he committed adultery as far as you know?' 'Well, no'. Well, we'll keep going until we find one. And pretty soon we start talking about mental cruelty. And pretty soon we start looking for grounds when, indeed, it's really just coffee ground...coffee grounds that have made this marriage dissolve. And people who are adult people who can make decisions for themselves should not have to go into court and commit perjury. Not being able to live together, wanting a divorce--remember now this only applies in those situations where they have made a resolution of all of their other problems--they should be able to go into a court and not lie. They should be able to go into a court without having to go to another state and take up some phony residency. This Bill brings indeed truth in ending in divorce. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Will the Gentleman yield for some questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Porter: "Now, I agree with everything you said. Does...I didn't hear whether this replaces the other grounds in the statutes. Are you repealing those grounds?"

Greiman: "No, no, no. It's compatible with the other grounds. Where there are grounds, they can be used, of course. But this is a situation where the parties have come to an agreement either before or after the suit has been filed and say, you know, we'll stipulate as to the divorce itself, as to the cause of action."

Porter: "Would you...would you then in the pleadings in the first



instance simply plead...what's your pleading?"

Greiman: "I think the pleading would be that the parties have stipulated as to the grounds for divorce. And...yeah...it would just be a stipulation as to the grounds."

Porter: "That there's no need for grounds."

Greiman: "No need for grounds, yeah."

Porter: "So that you wouldn't need to plead any of the other grounds, you would just plead this."

Greiman: "You wouldn't...right, right. You would not have to plead any of the grounds. Now, very often, I suppose, we'll have grounds that are...where the suit is commenced alleging grounds. Later on there'll be an Amendment to the complaint amending it so that there is a stipulation as to no...no grounds."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while there are a lot of other things that certainly need to be done with respect to the Divorce Act, to end some of the real abuses and problems that we've had with it, I think this Bill is certainly a step in the right direction. It takes out all of the nasty things that people have to say about each other whether they exist or not today. It takes it to a slightly higher plane than it would be otherwise. And I would certainly urge the Members to support Representative Greiman's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Representative Greiman, would this...this decrease your exorbitant charges for a divorce?"

Greiman: "My charges since I'm down here are so minimal that my...my wife and children aren't complaining."

Kosinski: "I think this takes out some of the problem of no-fault divorce. This may be a good idea. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor will yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ewing: "This has no effect on property settlement or child custody?"

Greiman: "Right. You know, the pragmatic handling of a divorce case is,



I think, Tom, that if you couldn't...if you hadn't resolved those problems, you wouldn't enter into a stipulation."

Ewing: "But theoretically under this you could stipulate to a no-fault, no-grounds divorce and still have the court decide the custody and the property settlement?"

Greiman: "You could do that, yes. Yeah, you could enter into a stipulation if you wanted to, yeah."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak to this Bill. I think maybe it's an answer to the no-fault problem, at least a temporary answer. I think it would do a great deal to reduce perjury in our courts and maybe make all of us attorneys a little more honest that handle some of these very simple divorce cases where, in fact, there is no grounds under our statute except that one party has to go in and call the other one black. And so I would certainly urge a 'yes' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Greiman, would the effect of this Bill create and affect out of court settlements for divorce?"

Greiman: "I think that probably it wouldn't change, you know, with out of court settlements. We're talking about maybe 99 percent of the cases end up being default matters or tried as agreed matters anyhow, Jesse. It's only a very small percentage. So that it would encourage...it would encourage a settlement, but I think it would also realistically appraise how a divorce case is actually handled. You know, the grounds...most lawyers don't pay much attention of parties to the grounds anyhow. They talk about, you know, what one party has, what one party can get, and that sort of thing. That wouldn't be changed."

Madison: "Is there anything, Representative Greiman, in your Bill that requires that both parties be represented by counsel?"

Greiman: "No, nothing that requires they both be represented by counsel."

Madison: "I raise that question because in the stipulation side of it, Representative, I see a lot of situations that have ended up in



divorce where only one party was represented by counsel. And I'm afraid that some party in an emotional situation might agree to some stipulations that they otherwise would not have, and not being represented by counsel may find themselves, if you'll pardon the language, screwed."

Greiman: "Yeah, that could happen under our present system. I mean, I've seen those cases too, Jesse, where a guy...the law suit is filed. The husband says, 'Am I in any trouble?' Maybe the wife's lawyer say, 'Oh, no, you're not in any trouble'. And he doesn't appear, he doesn't file an appearance. And whamo, you know, he gets it in the neck. But that's under our present system, you know, people have to be vigil and stubborn about their rights. This wouldn't affect that one way or the other. As a matter of fact, this would make it...in order to have a stipulation you would have to come in, you would have to talk, you would have to have a document in front of them. So that I think it may be better for him. He may be, in fact, more responsible about responding, and he could be 'cheated' also, of course."

Madison: "And then my final question, Representative, is although you're making a provision for...for divorce without having to find fault, the fact of the matter is that my wife couldn't divorce me for being down in Springfield so much unless I agree to it, is that correct?"

Greiman: "I would say that's correct."

Madison: "Thank you."

Greiman: "And so...I mean, I don't know what your wife feels about it; but I think that's right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "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. Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Well, merely that this is the action of two people who are consenting to develop their lives the way they want to. They're of age, they're intelligent people. They have...it only happens



after they have resolved all of their other marital problems. And I would..."

Speaker Redmond: "No taking of pictures up there. Oh, that's our own guy."

Greiman: "...and I would ask that the Truth in Ending Bill of 1977 be enacted. Thank you."

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

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, nobody has spoken against this Bill, and I think you ought to look at it and think twice. There's no provision in here for a cooling-off period. All you have to do is you...a couple of people have a fight, go into a lawyer's office the next morning. Fill out a form, file it with the County Clerk, and the marriage is over. There is no requirement even for a hearing. No consideration of the children. No...no need to even allege in the agreement or stipulation that there's been an irretrievable breakdown or that there's been a failure of the efforts to reconcile. If you have...if you believe in the sanctity and significance of the family and want to protect children, you ought to at least assure yourself that there's going to be a court hearing, and the people have at least come in and said, "We tried to work this out and it didn't work out". This sort of a Bill should really have a cooling-off period in it, and also it should be clarified to provide that there be a hearing. I think that you ought to look at the Bill. Think about it carefully. And I urge a 'no' vote on this proposal."

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

Mugalian: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just did what the previous Speaker suggested we ought to do because I was curious about how the Bill worked. It's really very simple, and there is, in effect, a cooling-off period. The consent...the stipulation cannot be filed sooner than 60 days after the commencement of the action. And all this Bill does...it does not affect the divorce statute itself, except to add an additional ground, which in this case



consists of a mutual consent signed by both parties. So I think it's a sensationally good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. If this isn't no-fault divorce, I don't know what it is. I would urge all the Members to vote against it."

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

Greiman: "To the last couple of speakers, this isn't no-fault divorce.

No-fault divorce is when one party without any fault can decide if the marriage is all by him or herself and go out and end the marriage. That is not the case here. This Bill merely reflects the realities of divorce law today. And that's all it is. And as far as the cooling-off period, it is in the statute. And if Mr. Deuster had asked me in debate, I would've answered that question. And not only that, a court, a court has to file a decree. This isn't something where you go and you sign up. A court has to...and that decree is done by the court. The court decides it. There has to be an agreement. The agreement must be fair and equitable. Nothing is changed in the law as far as that, nothing at all. The grounds are merely changed. And it's not a no-fault divorce in the customary sense. It is a good Bill. It should be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate what the Sponsor of this piece of legislation is trying to do; but in explaining my vote, I think it is our duty as Legislators to preserve the American families in our home and to keep them together and not make it too easy to break up these homes. I think that we have a public trust and I urge you all to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just in case some of the people didn't hear because of the noise level in the House at the time, a previous Representative explained that we're just adding by this Bill another criteria, and that is, mutual consent. It's all over. They've agreed. There's a cooling-



off period of at least 60 days. Who's kidding whom? This is probably the most Christian thing you can do. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner to explain her vote."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question for the Sponsor. My light was on from the beginning. And this is why I'm voting 'no' because I still have questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Proceed, Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "I am still at loss as to what or how you would clarify the difference and what would happen to the children in this situation where there is no fault."

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

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that in..."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on the explanation of votes. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "...in explanation of my vote, I think some of the comments indicate a lack of understanding of the realities of this situation in Illinois. The practical effect of the passage of this Bill is to eliminate perjury from the Illinois courts. I doubt if there's an attorney in this House or anybody in this House who could give me one example in the State of Illinois over the last 10 years where two people who wanted to get divorce, went into court and had their divorce denied. All he had to do was go into court and lie, and make up stories, and make up grounds that are completely baseless. And I think if they're talking about preservation of the family and support of children, the best thing in the world we can do is to not force the parents to go in and allege mental cruelty when it doesn't exist and not force the children--and there are people that have their friends read the paper where it says their parents were divorced based on some imagined ground. The real effect of this is simply to implement what already is impracticality, without all the problems and without all the negative affects. And I think that if we want to suborn perjury and encourage perjury, then we ought to...then we ought to vote against this. But if we believe in preserving the basic stability in society..."



Speaker Redmond: "Time has expired. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "At the proper time, I'm going to request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "A point of order. Mrs. Sumner's was asking for a question. You allowed her to ask the question, Mr. Greiman. And you did not allow Mr. Greiman to answer..."

Speaker Redmond: "We were on explanation of votes and she had one minute, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I wonder if I can get an answer on one question because that will determine my vote. And the question is..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "I haven't had a chance to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. And in the course of my explanation I wanted to answer Mrs. Sumner's question. This Bill has nothing to do with the question of child support of what happens to the children. That is up the court in any divorce proceeding. This is solely limited to the question of the grounds for divorce. As it now is they go through certain procedures. All this says is that if the parties decide that they want to agree that there should be grounds for divorce, then the court would enter such an order. But the court at the same time would retain jurisdiction with regards to the children in precisely the same way that they now do. If a man goes in and files now a complaint, the wife can come in and stipulate that it be heard as a default matter. And that is the way this would go. The difference is that under this Bill a person would not have to come in and go through these allegations, which hundreds of thousands of people in Illinois are forced to do in order to get a divorce even though they are playing games in doing it. This is a mature way of handling the problem, but it does not divest the court of one iota of jurisdiction to determine all of the rights of the woman with regard to the question of alimony or the rights of the children as a result of the dissolution of that marriage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

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



think I've handled quite a few matters of domestic importance like that. And I can tell you right now the prior speaker is absolutely right. A child has less of a stigma on that child when it finds that the...the parents are dissolved by a mutual consent, rather by having some...the nine grounds already allowed. And I think we'd better think of how the children feel in the future. I'm not in favor of divorce unless it's absolutely necessary. I try to reconcile them with those children particularly. But I think we'd better face the facts of life. And I think we're just avoiding it very nicely. If they both agree, that's when...if there's a divorce. And I'd like to be permitted to vote 'aye' because you closed off my switch."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff. Can you open the board without dumping the Roll Call?"

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason that I'm voting for this Bill is because it allows for one eventuality that no one has discussed. I don't think there's a...I don't think there's a divorce lawyer in here who will deny that 90 percent of all divorces, even whatever grounds they use, they're mostly transitory basis. And every divorce case at one time tries to find..."

Speaker Redmond: "Time is up. Dump the Roll Call. We'll give everybody a chance to get on. And please vote only your own switch. There'll be a verification. And it's still 4 o'clock on the 20th. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I did have my light on from the beginning, but that's irrelevant. This is not a bad Bill. As a matter of fact, to Senator Sangmeister's no-fault insurance Bill, I proposed an Amendment which did exactly this. This has nothing to do with no fault in the sense that everybody understands the term. It's still... all it provides is is...the parties who desire...one of them desires to get a divorce. That party cannot get a divorce for a no-fault reason unless the other party agrees, which does lend a measure of protection that other no-fault proposals do not give. This is



a good proposal or I wouldn't have sponsored it last term to...an Amendment to the Chicago Bar Association, Illinois Bar Association's no-fault proposals. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representa...Representative Huskey. Just to dispel... the plans are that we'll work late tonight and work tomorrow. I don't know where the rumor gets around that we're liable to be going home today. Unless something happens that I don't know anything about yet. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. I was beginning to think that you couldn't see this far back. But one thing...one of the reasons I am voting for this Bill, I see so many lawyers standing that it could be a conflict of interest if they took another stand. And...and it makes me feel real proud to see so many lawyers giving up fat fees to support this Bill. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am voting 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 34 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1390."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1390..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act in relation to the establishment of a health and physical fitness program under the Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked at the proper time that I be recognized to verify that last Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "We had dumped the Roll Call and I cautioned them not to vote, I thought that took care of it, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I just wanted to call your attention, I asked you...I think we've always responded to a request for a verification, but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I had...I had dumped the Roll Call and I cautioned them not to vote."

Bradley: "...obviously we have different rules for different Members."

Speaker Redmond: "1390. Representative Deuster."



Deuster: "I know everyone's anxious to move along, too; but I had my light flashing for the very same purpose, to request a verification. And we had a dumping of the Roll Call on that, and I just think to pass over Representative Bradley, who had already requested a verification, is just improper. And you're..."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the...let the Journal...let the Journal reflect Representative Deuster's comments in the matter. 1390, Representative McBroom...McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like leave to hear House Bill 1390 and the companion Appropriation Bill 1391, which is also on Third Reading, together."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative MCPike, does he have leave? Hearing no objections."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1391, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1390 creates the Health and Physical Fitness Program under the Governor, and House Bill 1391 appropriates \$35,000..."

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

Madison: "Excuse the interruption, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is this not one of the Bills that's exempt because it has a companion appropriation?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

McPike: "Yes, this Bill is exempt, and it was exempt until the appropriation caught up with it, and the appropriation now caught up with it."

Speaker Redmond: "That made it unexempt. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding based on Representative Matijevich's motion that the exemption moves the date back for those Bills that had companion appropriations. I was not aware that when the companion appropriation caught up with then it was unexempt. And I'm asking if this Bill was a part of that list. I think it was. If that is the case, I would suggest that we could



move on to other matters, in all due deference to the Sponsor, that are not exempt. And we can always come back to his Bill next week without hurting them at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Madison is correct. It is on the list that Representative Matijevich did present. However, let me suggest for your consideration, Mr. Speaker, and that of Representative Madison, that there are a number of Bills on that Calendar and it seems to me that many of them are of an extremely noncontroversial nature. And in fact, what we would be doing is aiding the process and allowing them to be heard, rather than calling attention to the fact that they're on another list and prolonging their hearing. A number of these just as you well know in our Committee came out with a unanimous vote and there should not be problems on the floor, rather than giving the Clerk and everybody else problems in keeping track of what they are...for your consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well, to continue, House Bill 1390 sets up a Health and Physical Fitness Program under the Office of the Governor. House Bill 1391 appropriates \$35,000 for the program. Again, in 1956 with President Eisenhower, every President since then has had a program for health and physical fitness. Different Presidents have emphasized this to a different degree. And President Kennedy probably emphasized more than anyone else. And he urged the states to set up a mandatory program in the schools; 43 states have since followed suit. Shortly after that, Kennedy, President Kennedy also encouraged states to voluntarily encourage physical fitness among age...all age groups. Unfortunately, he was killed shortly after this and the program was not revitalized until 1968 under President Johnson. Some states have followed suit, and have set up programs to encourage physical fitness among all groups. House Bill 1390 addresses itself to this problem in Illinois. It sets up a council of 50 recognized athletes under the Office of Governor to participate in and to help sponsor local sporting events to



encourage participation. And it sets up an 11-member Health and Physical Fitness Advisory Committee consisting of 4 Members from the Legislature and 7 members from different professions that are interested in physical fitness. These will advise the Governor on what types of physical fitness programs to support and which ones to sponsor. I think it's a good idea. I think by spending a very small amount of money, we can set into motion a preventive medicine physical fitness program that will pay for itself tenfold over. And I would ask your support of this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's my understanding that the Governor has now a Commission on Physical Fitness, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

Hoffman: "...Mr. Sponsor?"

Speaker Redmond: "McPike."

McPike: "Yes, that is correct. And I worked with the Governor's people on this to incorporate both his ideas and mine into one program. And it was through his Amendment that we amended the original Bill and he is in full support of this. The Department of Public Health testified for this in Committee and he supports this to my knowledge...wholeheartedly."

Hoffman: "Well, I'm glad he let you know about it because he hasn't said anything to us."

Speaker Redmond: "So what's new? Anything...anyone in opposition? Repre...the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'...the question is, shall these Bills pass? Representative Byers to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask Representative McPike if Members of the General Assembly would be under this...to take the physical fitness test and what the standards would be and how many of us might be able to pass that. I do think this is a good Bill, and knowing the athletic endeavors of our Governor and his



support for it. I would certainly hope we would get the 89 votes to pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'ayes', 43 'nos'; and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are, hereby, declared passed. 1399, Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1399 amends a portion of the Illinois Banking Act, which was enacted last year. Enforcement of that law as it now stands..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me."

Abramson: "...that was enjoined in the Circuit Court of Cook County in a suit file by Northern Trust and Harris. The Bill as amended corrects the problems of the current law. First, it clarifies the definition of customer when the bank is acting as a...in a fiduciary capacity. Second, it makes the Act applicable to both national and state banks. And third, it provides that a bank must mail to a customer a copy of a subpoena summons, warrant or a court order requiring disclosure of account information unless otherwise provided by court order. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Banking Association, the Attorney General, Cook County State's Attorney and Secretary of State's Office. I urge your favorable consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1399, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Abramson, this Bill was passed in the last Session in the Seventy-ninth General Assembly. If I understand your Bill, you're repealing that portion that requires the service of a subpoena. Can you explain to me why you feel this repeal is necessary?"

Abramson: "Originally, the Bill was introduced as a repeal. The Section"



that...that I'm putting in now does eliminate the requirement that the person be served with a subpoena before the account record is disclosed. The reason for that is there is 8 other laws in Illinois that require banks to disclose account information without the customer's prior service of...with a subpoena, like the Illinois Garnishment Act, provides that..."

Madison: "Well...just a minute, I'm sorry. Maybe I'm reading the Bill wrong. As I understand it, it re...it repeals the requirement of a subpoena served on a depositor before the financial institution can release information to the State's Attorney. Now, I don't think that's what you're talking...am I reading this wrong? You said before it could be closed. There is an Amendment on here?"

Abramson: "Yeah, Amendment #1."

Madison: "What does the Amendment do?"

Abramson: "It requires that the bank mail a copy of the summons, warrant, court order to the bank customer when disclosing informa...account information."

Madison: "When disclosing account information?"

Abramson: "Yeah."

Madison: "Does it require that mail be certified or registered mail or...?"

Abramson: "Just mail. I think customers have a better chance of getting things by regular mail than certified mail. You get the yellow tag in the mailbox and you figure it's not worth the trouble to go down to the post office. My experience...and I do represent a bank...indicates that serving by mail has been a more effective...effective way of doing this."

Madison: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Abramson: "Yeah."

Hanahan: "Representative, right now if the I.R.S. wanted to look at your financial records in a bank they need nothing at all, nor... nobody has to notify you if they want to audit your checking account, your bank accounts, savings accounts or any of other...your financial loans or any of your records that are held in a bank, outside of



getting into your safety deposit box, I think that's about the only thing that you've got protected right now. Would by this Bill... would this in any way make the bank notify the depositor or the person doing business with the bank...would it make the bank notify them that somebody is, whether it's I.R.S. or anyone else, looking into their records?"

Abramson: "Okay, the law as it stands now...the Internal Revenue Service is not required to do that. Under this law, there is a subpoena, warrant or court order issued to the bank by the Internal Revenue Service, they would at least get notice by mail..."

Hanahan: "Well, yes, that's the important question because I want to support this because I know this happens. The I.R.S. though in my ... because I've gone through the audits with them...absolutely use no warrant, no notification or anything, they walk into the ... a bank and they identify themselves, and then ask to review records of certain depositors or certain people who have loans or collateral or what have you up in or cosigners of notes. Would ... would this in some way at least allow, even though there's no warrant for these records, would this in some way allow a depositor or a person doing business with the bank get notified that somebody is doing that?"

Abramson: "That's the intention of the law."

Hanahan: "Well, I'll support it then."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Abramson: "Yes."

Madigan: "Mr. Abramson, would you explain the difference between this Bill as amended and the Bill that was adopted during the last Session of the General Assembly?"

Abramson: "The Bill has...there's three significant changes, the ones I went through in my introduction. First of all, the problem as to who is the customer in the first...in the first Bill that was passed last time, when the bank was acting in a fiduciary capacity. They didn't know...who had to be served, whether it was the settlor



or...or the beneficiary of the trust. This clarifies that, that it's the settlor or the person that created the trust relationship that gets served. The second significant change is that this makes it both applicable to both state and national banks. Okay, in the suit filed by Harris and Northern, they alleged that it was unequal protection of the law having state banks only required to do this. Okay, this makes it applicable to both state and national banks. And the other requirement that we were changing was a prior services subpoena versus mailing a copy of that to the customer."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Madigan: "...Mr. Speaker...today before the State's Attorney can gain access to your records at the bank, you as the depositor must be served with a subpoena."

Abramson: "Not exactly. Understand...the way the law stands today, the State's Attorney has to make an attempt to have you served. Okay, he has to send the sheriff out at least once and then he can go ahead and require the...get a court order and have the bank turn over the information."

Madigan: "And what requirement do you propose?"

Abramson: "I propose that the bank...or the customer actually gets more protection if when the bank is served with the subpoena to produce the account record that they mail a copy to the customer. That way the customer can go in and proceed to have it quashed or whatever and have notice of the action."

Madigan: "Well, would it be possible for them to obtain the records before you receive the notice in the mail?"

Abramson: "Just as likely as it is now. The sheriff can right now go to drop the subpoena off at the customer's house and pick up the records at the bank. This...I believe affords the same effective amount of...of notice to the account customer."

Madigan: "Would you be amenable to further amending this Bill in the Senate and..."

Abramson: "I sure would."

Madigan: "...in order to provide further protection to the depositor?"



Abramson: "Yes.. I'd be glad to work together with you on that."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? 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 135 'aye' and 3 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1406."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1406, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Bill that I think, even though there's some people who have not supported some of the Amendments that I've introduced for the Minimum Wage Law, this is one that I think possibly most Members could consider supporting. First of all, it really affects only two categories of work on the exemption of time and a half after 40 hours. It does not affect because the law as written in past few years ago the hotel and motel and custodial employees' exemption and the food service employees' exemption because they automatically self-destructed as of May 1, 1977. This...House Bill 1406 specifically applies only to the restaurant employees that right now have to work 46 hours in a work week before they come under the provisions of the Act that apply to have them receive time and a half. We're talking about the employees that in most cases are and can under the existing law, and this will not affect that, will still only receive up to a \$1.15 an hour. And right now their exemption is up to 46 hours a week at \$1.15 an hour. That...if we change this law...if we adopt House Bill 1406, those employees would be allowed to be paid a grand total of \$1.725 an hour for after 40 hours in a work week. We're talking about making those restaurant employees that work in food...in the food service industry equal to, under the provisions of the law, with the cafeteria and the other kinds of food service employees, who now must do...receive under the law time and a half after 40 hours. There is a difference. It's an unfortunate difference. It is in the law. And House Bill 1406



would address themselves to that difference. It would...it would allow them to get the grand total of \$1.725 an hour after...after 40 hours of employment. In the second provision of the Bill, motion picture employees after 45 hours would receive...would receive...by now receive time and a half. It would bring back in line what all other employees in similar occupations, and they too have an exemption on the amount of money per hour they receive up to \$1.95 an hour for those who are full-time students and less, they would receive time and a half after 40 hours. So really we're not talking about a lot of money, we are talking about some inequities in the base on wages for employees at the bottom of the economic totem pole. And I might point out that we're talking about employees that do not even make enough money to exist above a poverty level. And I'll try and answer any questions on the Bill. These are the only two categories that this Bill affects."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin."

Martin, L.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Martin, L.: "Representative Hanahan, you just stated that through the Amendments you now only have two categories. In other words, that counties and cities that have employees, whether it be the police or fire, that work clumps of 42½, 43½ and 47½ hours, and are not subject to overtime provisions, this would not be covered in this Bill?"

Hanahan: "Representative Martin, you must be reading the wrong Bill. This is House Bill 1406."

Martin, L.: "I'm reading it."

Hanahan: "Well, this only concerns itself with restaurant employees, restaurant employees, and motion picture employees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin."

Martin, L.: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise reluctantly to oppose the passage of this Bill. Last Session of the Legislature when the minimum wage package was put together, the



exemption was part of the agreement at that time to give the exemption as Representative Hanahan indicated to those in the restaurant business and those in the motion picture business and the hotel/motel management. And this is the agreement that was worked out at that time in exchange for their support for the Minimum Wage Bill at that time. And now the next Session of the Legislature, a year later, we find that this exemption is now trying to be eradicated. Let's be very practical and very honest about it. These are businesses that deal in the very low margin of profit. And this is only going to eliminate jobs, or the other extent, this is going to be passed onto the consumer in the restaurant industry and to the individual that participates in both the movie or the motion picture show. These costs are going to be passed onto the taxpayer or jobs are going to be eliminated. And some of these jobs do require that the individuals do work longer than the 40 hours and the time limits that were allowed for overtime were 45, 46 hours for restaurants and 45 hours for motion picture service. And I would suggest that the present law is adequate. And there is not the need for the change at the present time. So reluctantly I oppose the passage of House Bill 1406."

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

Hanahan: "Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the Gentleman reluctantly opposes this because the fact is that...that cafeteria employees working in food service, employment right today...right today under the law of Illinois get time and a half after 40 hours of employment. The restaurant employees do not. The oddity to that kind of philosophy is the restaurant employee generally is receiving a \$1.15 an hour, where the cafeteria employee is generally receiving \$2.30 an hour. So it's just on a reasonable basis the cafeteria employee is going to get time and a half at a rate of \$2.30 an hour. That's the law. That's...we're not talking about that. We're talking about people now who only receive approximately in the main \$1.15 an hour, that after 40 hours in employment that they can receive the grand total of \$1.725 an hour. My God, you know,



we're talking about people truly at the bottom of the economic ladder. You talking about fast-food service, and you talk McDonald's and all the rest of them, they're already covered under the federal acts. We're talking people that could use this kind of job protection that only in the Legislature, and let me tell you something, only the Legislature to grant because no union is going out and trying to organize those kinds of employees because they're...they're in too small of units to expend the kind of monies necessary to go out and protect them. So what has really happened, and most union contracts around the state the restaurant employee is receiving time and a half after 40 hours, it's the other employees who are being exploited because of quirks in the law did not include those employees from coverage after 40 hours for time and a half. It did include the identical, almost identical, kind of worker in the food service industry, the hotel and motel industry, they're all going to receive time and a half after 40 hours. Just the restaurant workers are being paid \$1.15, and they would like time and a half after 40 hours of work in a work week. And I urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill...Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, would he yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huskey: "Is it true, Mr. Hanahan, that a restaurant employee works mostly on tips...his largest part of his salary comes from tips; where the cafeteria employee does not...and motel employee do not receive tips, isn't that true?"

Hanahan: "Yes, this has nothing to do with the gratuity. This is the hours of labor that a person works. So if a person is working for \$2.30 an hour or \$1.15 an hour, is what we're talking about in giving...in granting them time and a half after 40 hours."

Huskey: "But isn't the \$1.15 an hour a base, is a base on his rest of his wages is to come from tips, and that's kind of a false figure, that \$1.15. Isn't that more or less the..."



Hanahan: "No, that's...that's the actual salary payroll. I'll show you a payroll check calling for \$1.15."

Huskey: "But...well, I don't disagree with that, but isn't the base salary of this particular person that's working for the \$1.15 an hour..."

Hanahan: "Yes...but nobody gives them...nobody give them another 50 percent higher level because they've worked more than 40 hours on a gratuity. That is the...that is really the problem here. Nobody tips more because they...the waitress or the waiter work more than 40 hours. So the gratuity doesn't make up..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien, for what purpose do you arise?"

O'Brien: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't think we should interrupt them right in the middle..."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll go along with moving the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "...Okay. Are you ready for the question? Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Well, I...I think I've closed already."

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 98 'aye', 45 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1413."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1413, a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of a fair labor minimum wage in the employment of the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, basically, this is an Amendment to the Minimum Wage Act that would bring into conformity that at anytime the federal minimum wage goes up or down, we would automatically go to that standard of a base minimum wage. The fact is I know that many Members here have said to me privately and



publicly they're tired of hearing about minimum wage. They wished they didn't have to face the issue every time they're in Session. I'm giving you an opportunity here now in the adoption of House Bill 1413 to once and for all get away from the question of whether or not we should adopt a higher minimum wage. I'm willing to gamble along with the country that the base wage of this state would be identical to what the Congress of the United States establishes. And I'd like to point out that it is a principle of our trade union movement, that American workers, whether they belong to a union or not, must not be compelled to work for slave wages. In the richest nation on earth, and noth...anything less than a decent living wage is a slave wage. I would just say to you that today the families, the workers earning less than \$2.92 an hour are living in poverty. And there are 10 million workers in the United States earning less than that poverty wage. They work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year at lousy, dismal jobs; and they still can't earn enough money to get out of poverty. Now, these aren't people on unemployment, these aren't people who are on welfare, these are workers who are working at \$2.30 an hour. Many must turn to welfare, food stamps and private charitable institutions to keep their families together. There...that is a tragic...tragic commentary on American govern...on the American priority. When we allow people to earn...to work for \$2.30 an hour as its base wage. I would suggest to the Members of the House that this burning question of how much a person should have as a base wage should not necessarily be debated only in Illinois. It should really be reflected in the economy as a whole around the country. I have amended this Bill at the request of some opponents really to the concept that we continue to have the exemption for the young, the under 19 year olds, to have the provision that they have a different floor on their wages of \$1.95 an hour. This would only protect those workers who are working presently at \$2.30 an hour. It will continue to be at \$2.30 an hour; but whenever the Congress of the United States feels that either that wage is too high or too low, we would automatically without our intervention



be able to set by this standard, by the federal standard, our minimum wage. Therefore, we would not have to debate this issue every year or every two years. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on this burning issue."

Speaker Redmond: "No, that's previous...Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I rise in opposition to this Bill and strongly so. The former speaker has mentioned things we're getting away from under the provisions of this Bill. Well, I'll tell you one thing I think we're getting away from and that is getting away from responsibilities that we should have as state government. The responsibility of conducting some of our own affairs as we see fit to conduct them without being tied like a tail on a kite to the Federal Government. And every time the Federal Government moves or jumps or does something, the State of Illinois does the same thing. Now, the Speaker knows full well that the Carter Administration has already promised George Meany and some of the other labor bigwigs a rise in this minimum wage. He knows that, and he knows it'll make it extremely easy if we simply go along tied to the...tied to the Federal Government in this respect. But I feel that we would be abrogating responsibility we have, at the same time I will admit that generally the state minimum wage does reflect what the Federal Government does. But there should be...there should be some...some debate...there should be some discussion...there should be some ri...raising of the consciousness at the state level as to what is happening in this minimum wage question. And I urge you, my colleagues, if you think anything of your own positions and responsibilities as State Representatives to resist this temptation to become simply vassals of the Federal Government. I think there's a hardly a day goes down here, but what we aren't faced with that temptation. And I would urge you to resist it. And this isn't even to argue against raising the minimum wage. I don't happen to feel in all cases it's necessary. But it is to say, let's be State Representatives. Let's



keep some of the...some of our power at the state level, at the state level. Let's not surrender it and yield it to the...to the almighty thinkers, and the seers and the peers of wisdom down there on the banks of the Potomac. I think we would be striking a blow, my colleagues, for independence and sovereignty of our states if we resisted and voted 'no' on this motion...on this Bill of Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would agree with Representative Hudson in his comments dealing with the states' rights and the sovereignty of the states to preserve itself. But I also suggest that Representative Hanahan in this legislation indicates he wants to tie it to the federal level; but he's trying to get the best of both worlds. Because in this exemption, under his legislation, he exempts out those under 18 years of age and make it applicable to the State Act, which happens to be \$1.95 as compared to the Federal law, which is \$1.85. So really he's trying to get the best of both worlds. But let's be very pragmatic about this legislation. You can very well have a very...Congress in the United States that runs rampant without responsibility and drives the minimum wage up to \$3.50 or \$4 an hour at one crack. And the State of Illinois then would be obligated automatically to follow suit. And look what...the damage, the potentiality that this could do to the economy of our state. I suggest that Representative Hudson's comments are right. We should preserve the state's rights. We should remember what's in the 10th Amendment to the United States Constitution that gives us the state's sovereignty. Let's not give away those responsibilities to the individual Congress of the United States that very basically is dominated by a very liberal faction of this country, that's predominately influenced by the labor bosses in our country. And for this reason I think that responsible Legislators in order to preserve the integrity of their own office and the responsibility that the people in your district elected you to preserve the responsibility of the Illinois Legislature as a sovereign body and not



to abdicate our responsibilities to Washington, that we vote 'no' on 1413."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to remind you that it was not too long ago that Congress passed a rule whereby their own pay raises would be done automatically unless someone objected. Is this that type of thing? I think it is. I think we will be really reprimanded from the people of our...constituents in our district if we allow this to be an automatic thing. We should keep track of it. We should watch it. And we should vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one of the great tragedies in the last few years has been the loss states' rights and states' sovereignty. Here we are embarking on legislation which says that Illinois is willing to give up the control of a vital matter and let the Congress take the responsibility. Well, Congress is so far removed from the people anymore that they have no responsibility and they have acted very irresponsibility. And I, for one, am not willing to give up what few rights we have left to run our own business in Illinois by passing Bills of this kind. There's no reflection on the Sponsor or his intent to give working people a good wage; but to give up that right with this Legislature is something I'm not willing to do on this or any other matter. And I intend to continue to oppose it as long as I can."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer, are you seeking recognition?"

Okay. Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some people say the minimum wage can't be higher because that would damage business' confidence. Frankly, I'm concerned with the confidence, the health and welfare, and the well-being of low wage workers who must spend every dime they earn on food, clothing and shelter for their families. As a matter of fact, I can't think of a better boost to



the confidence of the intelligent businessmen than the 10 million American workers with more money to spend in the marketplace. Until now what some people have been saying to these workers is, business will feel better if you are poverty stricken. We hope you will recall that the Chamber of Commerce in 1938 said, and I quote, 'A 25 cent minimum wage would lead to economic ruin, unemployment and inflation'. What are the facts? Well, every time the minimum wage is increased, employment has increased. Minimum wage workers aren't...are the victims, not the cause, of inflation. Minimum wage workers didn't sell the grain to the Soviet Union in 1972. They didn't raise the price of Arab oil. They didn't raise the interest rates. They didn't plan the economic mess this country, this state is in. But they have to live with all those decisions. What are we doing? What we are doing here today is...is reaffirming what Franklin Roosevelt once said 40 years ago, 'Any business that depends for its continued existence on the payment...and a decent living wage should not continue to exist'. And the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who already have much. It is whether we do enough for those who have too little. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're talking about people at the bottom of the pole, the people who have to exist. And as far as tying up minimum wage to any other standard, I challenge those Members who think that this is unfair, that maybe we ought to tie it to Legislators' salary, maybe we ought to tie it to the Legislators' increases in their per diem, maybe we ought to tie to the judicial salary or maybe to the Governor's salary. So that when those salaries goes up that the minimum wage goes up accordingly and we won't have to worry about Congress. But none of you have the guts to take that kind of standard. I say to you that the very minimal thing if you want to avoid to continue debate on what a decent wage is in Illinois. And that we...we should not continue to argue about things that we're going adopt automatically without very little debate. And that is, the federal standards of what our floor on wages should. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."



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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman on the other side who just harangued us in...and harangued yesterday and again today, suggested that Presidents Nixon and Ford are responsible for the atrocious economic conditions that we find ourselves in. Well, I happened to read, I think, in yesterday's paper, perhaps the day before, that the distinguished Director of the Federal Reserve Board, Arthur Burn, put that responsibility directly on President Lyndon B. Johnson. So I'd like him to put that in his pipe and smoke it."

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

Skinner: "Well, the Representative from my district speaks to the people at the bottom of the economic scale. I would suggest that we here in the Legislature should address ourselves instead, at least on this Bill, to the bottom of the election returns of the 33rd District, those of the Democrats in the 33rd District at least last time around. Now, in Representative Hanahan's own self-interest all of his friends should be voting 'no' so that he'll be able to get some additional headlines every two years when...or perhaps every year that the...the Federal Government, which is obviously dominated by the Democrats, raises the minimum wage. If we pass this, he's going to be missing headline after headline after headline, which he may not have the Workmen's Compensation Bill around to make. This Bill may be the only thing he has going for it. Besides, President Johnson, I think, was the one that made the first grain deal with Russia, not President Ford or President...what's his face who preceded him?"

Speaker Redmond: "Nixon, President Nixon."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It amazes me that a man will get up and move the previous question and be the first one to explain his vote and make a speech about the Bill. I want to explain my vote, though, and generally I have



supported Minimum Wage Bills; but I can't support this one because it provides that all employees of the age of 18 or over shall be covered by this Bill automatically under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. We have made exceptions in the past and just... the Bill before this, as I recall, made an exception for restaurant workers, people who work as ushers in movie houses; but this would remove those exceptions and it would include all people of 18 years and older. And I think that that distinction is significant and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 58 'aye' and 62 'no'; the Gentleman's motion...this Bill having failed to receive the Consti... Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Yes, thank you, Speaker, I wanted to explain my vote. I wanted to vote 'no'. I don't whether it's too late or not. To me..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? Hearing no objections, she will be so recorded."

Sumner: "...to me it would much better for our youths to be able to get a job at any price for the summer months or for part-time after school, rather than no job at all. This lets them free to create more of our problems with vandalism and crime. So why not let them work just so that they are busy doing something and do grow up to be fine young men, rather than getting into trouble. Thank you."

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

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the vote that I didn't get to make because I didn't get a response to my light even to enter into debate. But the vote that I would've made had I had a chance to make it after I explained it would've been a 'no' vote simply because...not in opposition to a minimum wage, but, Ladies and Gentlemen of the...of the House, I would like to remind you that a 'yes' vote on this is just abdicating some of our own responsibility. And if we're going to carry this to the fullest extent, why don't we just adopt one complete ordinance which says that the Federal Government shall decide everything we do here and



then we can go home and we don't need to be standing around here fiddling with all of this. I think that it should be proposed as an Amendment to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 59 'aye' and 62 'no'; this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost." Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the time having arrived, I, and Representatives Walsh, Hart and Kane should like to move pursuant to Rule 72 that Subsection G of Rule 35 of the rules of the House of Representatives be suspended until May 26, 1977. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we make this motion with great fondness and respect for the Speaker, and very appreciative of the discipline that he has instilled within the House of Representatives. And we make the motion, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, appreciating the statement that the Speaker has made repeatedly that the will of the House will prevail. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are confronted with an inhuman task. As of this morning there was a total of 222 Bills on the Calendar--29 at Short Debate; 136, Third Reading; and 57, Postponed Consideration. All nonexempt. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are not an assembly line, nor are we a slaughterhouse. We are a deliberative Body. Some of us, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, think we are...where we are at because of deadlines. And, frankly, if I had my way, this motion would be to eliminate the deadline. However, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do think in fairness, not just the Members of this House or the Members of the Senate, the Executive Branch, but in fairness to the people of the State of Illinois, we should allow ourselves more time in which to consider the Bills that we do have, and specifically each of us to reconsider the posture that we have relative to the Bills on the Calendar and also to allow the Leadership time in which to review the procedures that we are following so that we can bring about an expeditious but deliberative disposition of the Bills on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion.

Contrary to his statement, I think that we have done an excellent job of considering all of the Bills which have been introduced during this Session, both at the Committee level and now on the floor. During the last two weeks, we have moved along very well. During the first few days of this week, we were considering an average of 60 Bills a day. And unfortunately, we have been slowed down somewhat because of the controversy surrounding the issue of Workmen's Compensation. But I think that we have passed over that hurdle now. We are in a position where the debate on House Bill 1205 in all likelihood will be rather short. We will move the Bill out and over to the Senate. And aside from that particular issue, there really is no issue of any great import on this Calendar that's going to take a great deal of time. We have the remainder of this evening, many hours this evening that we can consider Bills. We have all of tomorrow. And if we were to proceed from this point until the close of business tomorrow at the pace that we maintained at the beginning of the week, which was approximately of 60 a day, then we'll be able to consider all the Bills which remain on the Calendar. And I wish to refute the Gentleman's statement that we have approximately 136 more Bills to consider because several of those Bills are exempt because they are Appropriation Bills with companions. And the Speaker's memorandum dated May 20th that I'm reading states that there are approximately 110 Bills, which require our attention between now and close of business tomorrow. If for no other reason, I think this motion is premature. There are several hours left today, there are several hours left tomorrow. If we reach a point late tomorrow afternoon where quite apparently we are not going to be able to consider all of these Bills, then I say let's consider your motion again; but there's many hours left. The mood of the House is not raucous now. We're proceeding very orderly and very efficiently. And I suggest you withdraw the motion and see what happens for the remainder of the evening. And if you refuse to withdraw it, again, I renew my opposition to the motion and request a 'no' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the speaker and in opposition to the motion. The position we find ourselves in now was conceived and brought to term in birth by the 177 Members sitting in this chamber. And until the Committee structure in this House is strengthened, or until Bill limitation indeed becomes a fact, or until the physical size of this Body is reduced, let the end results of our own folly haunt those who do not have their Bills heard by midnight tomorrow. I support the deadline theory; and I oppose this motion. And I hope all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will also support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much. I...I feel that one of the reasons why we got along so well this week was because we went home last weekend, took a couple of days off, relaxed with our families, and came back fresh and willing and able to work. Now, tomorrow for reasons probably peculiar to many of us, there will be people that cannot be here. We have imposed an arbitrary deadline of May 21st on ourselves on getting out these House Bills. I think it was good that we had the deadline to keep some pressure on so that we would work towards that. But what...what is fair to the Members who have Bills who happen to have high numbers because the Legislative Reference Bureau got clogged up in the last minute and couldn't get the Bills out, and so they couldn't get their Bills heard. And they're going to be down the line. What is fair to the people who have important Bills on Postponed Consideration, who have maybe amended them or are going to amend them to satisfy some of the objections that were heard on the floor when they were debated the first time. What is fair...more importantly to the people who...who requested these Bills or who are affected by these Bills who may for reasons that are completely uncontrolled by the Sponsor and other Members are going to lose this legislation. Why should we punish ourselves by working until midnight or so tonight, getting up and working until midnight tomorrow night only to meet a deadline imposed arbitrarily, as I say, when we could go



home tonight, come back Tuesday or so, work through Thursday, complete the work that we have to do deliberatively, and then go home for the Memorial Day weekend and come back fresh and ready to attack the Senate legislation. So I think it's orderly, sensible, comfortable, decent thing to do, to go home and spend time of the weekend with our families and get away from this very controversial, very tense situation for awhile, and come back and work hard next week and get it done."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

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

We already have 5 deadlines built into our rules. The effect of this motion will be to add another deadline. We're heading towards tomorrow night. And if we set some other date certain, it just adds another deadline. Now, those of us who are really honest with ourselves, and not only look at our own Bills, but other Bills that are on the Calendar, recognize that the people of the State of Illinois will little note or long remember as one of our former Members once said, 'Anything that we do the next couple of days one way or another'. And so for those two reasons, I stand in opposition to this motion in all due deference to its outstanding Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we go home, we will only extend these Bills for a complete week next week. No matter what happens, no matter how late, tomorrow it ought to end. For most of these Bills they're going to die in the Senate like hogs in a slaughterhouse. We know it, and the freshmen will be here to see it. After that, they're going to be modified by the Governor to suit his taste and to adapt to the Republican philosophy or vetoed out, right? So in the final analysis, we ought to stick with our rules, stick with our Speaker. He set them, he set the pace, he's guiding the ship. Let him take it this far. After they leave here, God help them because no one else will."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker..."



Speaker Redmond: "...What's your point?"

Matijevich: "Point of order. The motion isn't debatable. So I think we ought to get to it."

Peters: "...Let us get to the motion then, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my comment. I am in opposition to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The ques...the question's on the Gentleman's motion. Now, I think we should have a clarification. Would you read the motion again, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. Pursuant to Rule 72, I move that Subsection C of Rule 35 of the rules of the House of Representatives be suspended until May 26, 1977!."

Speaker Redmond: "What does that mean? Until May 26th? Is that what... is that what the rule says? Is that the exact language? So what is meant by that is midnight the 26th, is that correct? Well, it now expires on the 21st, and the motion is that it expire on midnight the 26th. Representative Wikoff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wikoff: "A parliamentary inquiry. Does this take...how many votes does this take?"

Speaker Redmond: "89. 89. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the motion indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I rise in support of this motion. Mr. Speaker, I think that we should extend this deadline. Now, this deadline, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than another rule of this House. And we summarily suspend every rule that we've got whenever it suits our needs. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important rules that we have in this House is a 6½-day posting rule to allow the public to react to the Bills that we introduce. And, yet, whenever it suits our needs we will suspend that rule and lock out the public from any involvement on Bills that we have in order that they can be heard expeditiously. If we can...if we can suspend that rule, there's no reason under the sun that we can...we cannot suspend this one. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in terms of...in terms of having this deadline



tomorrow night that all we're doing is giving ourselves enough time to hear Senate Bills. My reaction is damn the Senate because that's what's going to happen to our Bills when they get over there."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 30...40 'aye' and 114 'no'; the Gentleman's motion fails. 1440. Representative Kozubowski and Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1440, a Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, is that correct? 1556."

Clerk O'Brien: "...House Bill 1556..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait until the new Speaker gets here."

Clerk O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, after picking on John Matijevec for the last couple of days, I reluctantly get up to ask leave of the House...I was on an important mission this afternoon and I didn't get a chance to vote on House Bill 1354."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection? Representative Conti wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Lucco wants to have leave to be recorded 'aye' on the same Bill, 1554. Representative Collins 'aye'. Mrs. Geo-Karis 'aye'. Representative Shumpert 'aye'. Representative Stuffle 'aye'. Representative Mahar 'aye'. Mr. Anderson 'aye'. Representative Kucharski 'aye'. Just got to go a little slower that's all. Who? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In all deference to all of the Members, I think most of us were here. That Bill was not heard that early. We're here debating various issues. I supported Representative Doyle's Bill; but I think that if the ones that were sitting here with Representative Doyle on that issue, since that is the issue of some controversy, we're willing to sit here and vote at that time, I would object to all of this climbing on board now that the train has left...has left the train station."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Objections have been raised, House Bill 1556. We took it out of the record. House Bill 1556, Representative Steczko."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1556, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to judgments and decrees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczko."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1556 amends an Act in relation to judgments and provides for a court order short redemption period of 60 days on abandoned homes. This House Bill can do much to stop erosion of our neighborhoods by extending the rise of unsightly abandoned homes that serve as a catalyst for various kinds of illicit activity and declining property values. It received the unanimous vote in the House Judiciary I Committee; and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "We passed a Bill out the other day which had a 30-day redemption period for abandoned homes. Would you explain to me what the difference is between this and that and why this Bill is necessary?"

Steczko: "This Bill provides for a 60-day redemption period for one; but even more importantly it provides also for a separate determination. After a foreclosure sale, there will be an investigation, and the mortgage lender then will go into court and say a home is abandoned. And then the court will so order a 60-day short redemption period."

Friedrich: "I thought the other Bill provided for a court order before you could..."

Steczko: "Yeah, this one also calls for an investigation by the sheriff, which the other one didn't."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczko."

Steczko: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just close by saying I feel that this Bill will afford protection to both the mortgage



lendor and the residential mortgage holder. It's a good Bill. And I would again encourage a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1556 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131...132 'ayes', 5 'nays', 6 recorded 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1566, Representative Stanley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1566, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill to help the working men and women of Illinois. And what it does it amends the Election Code to increase the voting hours, instead of 6 to 6, 6 to 7 o'clock p.m. And I just want to let you know that the last time in 1957 the current law from 6 to 6 was enacted. That's 20 years ago. And substantial changes have taken place in our Electorate since then. Let me give you some examples. In 1957, the year that we changed the Act from 6 to 6, there were approximately 4,100,000 working men and women in Illinois. Today there is slightly over 5,000,000 working men and women. I think everyone knows the transportation has changed substantially. A number of men and women commute into various cities and out of various cities to their place of employment. 6 o'clock I think has put an unfair time limit on when they exercise their franchise. And let me say this, Illinois, I think, we consider a very progressive state. But there are 34 other states in this great country whose voting hours extend past 6 o'clock. Illinois and 5 other states are the only ones in the Union to close their polls at 6 o'clock. Let's just look to the north and take Wisconsin. Their polls are open from 7 o'clock to 8 o'clock a...p.m. And Iowa to the west, they're from 7 o'clock to 9 o'clock p.m. And Missouri just across the line, they're open from 6 o'clock to 7 o'clock. There's been some question about the relationship of polls being open late to vote a turnout. And just let me give you a few brief



examples. In the 1976 Presidential Election here in Illinois 59.7 percent of the voters voted. In Iowa where the polls are open until 9 o'clock 63 percent voted. In Minnesota where the polls are open until 8 o'clock 70 percent voted. And in the east in Connecticut where the polls are open until 8 o'clock 62 percent voted. I think it's time we ended this disenfranchisement of those commuter votes, those voters that work away from home. And I would ask you for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think in 12 hours you provide enough time for anybody who really wants to go out and vote. And not only that, the Gentleman who sponsors this Bill does not give up to any indication that he favors giving Clerks more money. If this were put up to the vote of Election Judges, they would overwhelmingly vote against this Bill. The Election Judges have a tedious job in 12 hours. They work long hours. It's monotonous; and I'm telling you they deserve more money actually for the amount of work that they put in in that day. I think that 12 hours is long enough, 6 to 6 is long enough. Let's not keep changing laws. We've got the laws on the books that we've had for many years, 6 to 6. And let's keep it that way. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Jack Davis."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill, only I don't think it goes quite far enough, frankly. I think probably Mr. Stanley should've added in an Amendment on Second to make Election Day a holiday to allow everybody a chance to vote, and maybe the necessity for an extra hour would not have been necessary in the State of Illinois. However, I would go a step further and probably add in another hour. And I'm really somewhat amazed and mystified that Representative Hanahan didn't pick this one up as a vehicle for time and a half or double time for Election Judges in the State of Illinois. So I would urge an 'aye' vote for my good friend, Roger Stanley. And I think it's a good Bill;



and I think we ought to give the working man a break. So please when it comes time for a Roll Call vote let's vote 'aye' on Roger Stanley's good first Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed ... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stanley, to close."

Stanley: "Let me just say this in regard to Representative Matijevich's comment about the Judges. I think it's important for everyone to keep in mind that better than 85 percent of the counties in Illinois today have either vote-o-matic or punch card machines. That's 90 percent of the Illinois electorate. And I really don't think we're imposing that much of a hardship on the Judges in asking them to stay one hour. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on the basis that this is a Bill to help the working men and women who travel substantial distance...places for their jobs. And I think it would substantially increase the voting turnout here in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1566 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson, to explain his vote."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, in Sangamon County 10 or 15 years ago, they used to count ballots til about midnight. Then they had the vote-o-matic. Now, those Judges are done 7 o'clock, 8 o'clock. I don't think it's too much to ask that one of those extra hours be invested in the people so that they can vote. We don't pass election laws for the good of election Judges. We pass them for the good of the people. In Committee...in Committee there was objection raised right out in the open that this might allow some Republicans to vote in the suburbs who don't vote now because they have to take the trains home. That's not what this Bill does. This Bill and by the way, those Republicans, those executives, John, they can



get the vote...those wealthy Republicans, they find a way to vote. This is a Bill that will help many of those working people who downstate have to drive 50, 60 miles to the plant, many of them are Democrats. This allows them to vote. This is a good Bill for all parts of the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a very bad Bill. We have a very difficult time right now trying to get...if you've read the paper just a couple of days ago, you'll see where the Republican Party needs some 500 and some odd Judges in Cook County. The Democratic Party is in the same shape. And if you continue to raise the hours, we're going to have more problems with less people voting on elections."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll yield my time since it's already passed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'ayes', 32 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1571. Representative Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1571, a Bill for an Act in relation to consumer protection creating the Office of Consumer Advocate. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill creates by statute the Office of Consumer Advocate in the State of Illinois. Presently, we have a consum..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please...that was my error. Are you back on?"
Marovitz."

Marovitz: "...Presently, we have a Consumer Advocate under the Governor's Executive Authority; but there are no statutory powers known to a formal recognition of his status in the State of Illinois."



And this Bill would give him those powers and that formal statutory recognition. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1571 pass? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Now, under this proposed Consumer Advocate Office, what would be the length of term?"

Marovitz: "Six years."

Ewing: "And that is appointed by the Governor?"

Marovitz: "Appointed by the Governor."

Ewing: "And it is confirmed by the Senate?"

Marovitz: "Confirmed by the Senate."

Ewing: "How does the Consumer Office presently work?"

Marovitz: "It's presently under executive order of the Governor; and it is appointed by the Governor. I don't believe there's any consent powers in the Senate; but there are no...is no statutory office or powers...it's not a statutory provision and this would make it such."

Ewing: "He serves at...at the will of the Governor then now, he or she, whoever may fill the office?"

Marovitz: "That's right, they could kill the office."

Ewing: "Fill the office or kill the office?"

Marovitz: "Well, they could diminish...they could eliminate the office if they wanted to without this. And this would...this would make it a statutory office within the State of Illinois."

Ewing: "Okay. One last question. Why was the six-year term chosen over a four term, which would correspond with the Governor...the Governor's elected office?"

Marovitz: "I think it was chosen precisely so it wouldn't correspond so that there would be some independence with...for the...for the advocate in representing the interests of consumers throughout the state so it wouldn't be...political positions."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill? I think it's...it's very



interesting here that we have a proposal to have a six-year term and make what is in effect a cabinet level position or administrative position nonaccountable to the executive. I couldn't think of a much poorer way to administer a seat. I'm sure that we wouldn't want to do that with other agencies of state government; and I wonder why we want to set that type of precedent with consumer advocacy. I think any Governor today, if he's at all smart politically, is going to have to be aware of the consumer and of the consumer problems. And yet I would...if any Governor should want to have those people answer both to him and not independent, I'm sure that nobody wants a completely independent administration."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's two things I'd like to say. First of all, we as Representatives of the people of Illinois are...are just automatically ombudsman for the people of Illinois from our districts. Second of all, the Governor of this state now has a Citizens' Action Office already to put in his budget. And I don't see the purpose of adding some more tax money for some more boondoggling when we don't need it. That's what we're here for to take of the complaints of the people in my district. And I speak against this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Reed."

Reed: "Representative Marovitz, can you tell us about the structure of the Consumer Advocate's Office?"

Marovitz: "Well, I can answer any specific questions you like. As far as the structure goes, that'll be up to the advocate. I'm not sure exactly what specifically you're referring to."

Reed: "Well, I...I'm curious as to whether under the office...under the Consumer Advocate where there would be regional field people out who could, in turn, reflect back to that Consumer Advocate the problems of the consumer, whether we're building an agency or are we building an office for one individual?"

Marovitz: "No, there will be field people to handle complaints and be in a community. It...it...the budget so reflects. We have an office now, I believe the budget is in the neighborhood of \$35,000."



There are people working in that office taking complaints, people in the communities dealing with those complaints. And I think this is probably the way the Advocate Office would operate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have every respect for the Sponsor of this Bill; and I think that he is certainly well intended in what he's trying to do. But I have this observation to present to the Members of the General Assembly here and that is this, that if there is one thing that the consumer needs to be protected from, it would seem to me to be those things that government does that take more and more money out of his pocket. And as we add tier after tier, and layer after layer of what can be essentially useless governmental operations it's costing a tremendous amount of money. And as these costs go up in government, inflation spirals and the consumer is finding that he has very little value left in the value...in the money that he has in his pocket. And in a sense we are by escalating cost of government, which I believe this Bill will do, this is but the initial step of another Bill, another agency and it will devalue further the value of every consumers job..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Hudson: "...and I would think that we would be well-advised if we want to protect the consumer, for heaven's sake, protect him from some of the things that we...that we do that adds to the size and the cost of government. This is the best thing that we can do for the consumer. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the last speaker reminded me that some of us or one of us forgot to introduce the Ombudsman Bill this time. Do you think you'd help me to suspend the rules to introduce the Ombudsman Bill, Mr. Hudson?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the previous question."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed... the previous question has been moved. Representative Marovitz to close." All those... have all voted who wished? The question is, "Shall House Bill 1571 pass?"

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say one...I'd like to answer one comment that was made in closing. The advocate would serve at the whim of the Governor. And he could be removed at any point for any reason that the Governor so desires. And so that would solve that particular problem. I think one of the reasons that we find that there's a need for this is we look around and we see that various interests, whatever those interests may be, have lobbyists here who have the time and resources and power to get their points for their various pieces of legislation across to all of us in the Legislature. There is no one presently, statutorily, around to represent the interests of consumers. This would give consumers a representative in government to look out for their interests if there's a problem, as I've just discussed with the Assistant Minority who's the Chairman of the Office. I'll be happy to give my word on the floor of the House to amend the Bill so that the term will be concurrent with the appointment of the Governor two years now and four years hence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1571 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I opposed this legislation last year because it's in the wrong department. We have a very excellent Consumer Protection Division in the Attorney General's Office. And it would be much cheaper to add an advocate there where there's already a staff, investigators and everything else, than creating a new bureaucracy under the Governor. I said it last time and I say it again, that this is a duplication of effort. And if Representative Marovitz is really sincere, he'll next year put it in the Attorney General's Office where it belongs."



Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Fortunately, the arguments have already been made; but if I may put a trailer on what Representative Gaines said, the Attorney General's budget is now on Second Reading. And if the Sponsor thinks that the Consumer Fraud Division needs more...more 'umph', he's quite capable of putting more dollars in. And I would certainly be willing to support that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 62 'ayes', 95 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost. House Bill 1576, Representative Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1576, a Bill for an Act to require legible price markings on food products. Third Reading of the Bill."

Marovitz: "Well, now we've got an easy one and all my friends on the other side of the aisle can support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment please. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Jones: "The lights are all on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The what? Oh. And it won't be on. Please proceed."

Marovitz: "This is the Price Marking Bill which we debated the merits and demerits of the other...the other day. This would mandate that the prices on grocery items would have to be conspicuously marked on the grocery item itself. There is nothing more conspicuous than having the price marked right on the product. And I think that consumers, shoppers ought to be able to see what they're paying for what product. This would protect consumers against unscrupulous merchants who might post a low price on the shelf, but program the computer with a higher price. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, this is another Bill, I believe, that would



require us to protect the consumers from this so-called protection make-work increase price inflation making legislation. Currently there is no requirement that each and individual item be marked. Many of them are, many of them are not. This is the way it ought to be. If you want to go to a store and have every individual item marked, I suggest you go to the manager and demand that they do so and tell him you won't go there. I don't know why we ought to interfere into the normal market relationship between the customer and the store owner has existed for a number for a number of years just because someone has an idea that the consumers would be better off because someone of them apparently want to have the price marked on every single item. I think that's ridiculous. I think it's going to raise prices, no question about it. It's going to require more employees. There's a very low profit margin right now in most stores. And this will decrease it and force an increase in prices. If you have any feeling at all for the beleaguered consumer; then I suggest that you vote 'no' on this bad piece of legislation which has been around for a number of years."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I fear that if we pass this Bill something might happen to the Sponsor's previous legislation in the Senate. Because by passing this Bill there will be no need for a Consumer Advocate Office anymore. We will be acting in its place. It has been suggested by some that this in fact a sexist Bill because it implies that housewives are stupid. And in the spirit of the hour, I would ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know you've heard me say this over, and over and over again. I don't know how often this Bill is going to come up. The women of this state do not want this. I have talked to them. I have talked to many women. This is sort of topic of conversation. They know it will raise prices. They do not want it. They do not need it. Vote 'no'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, well, on the other hand, I would like to speak for the men of the State of Illinois. Beginning...beginning with my own husband. For eight years now he has done the primary marketing for our family. Ever since I've been down in the Legislature. He delights in this. He is Chairman of the board of a...of a very sizable company. He's a businessman, a very competitive person. And he is very proud of himself. When he cans...finds a can of peas that's still marked 39 cents, when maybe the price has gone up to 49 cents. And they still have to sell it to him for 39 cents. But if that price were just on the shelf, then he would not find these marvelous bargains. He says that many times its prices are only on the shelf...other shoppers move the cans of things around and get things mixed up. He likes to be able to total up things he's shopping as he goes along so that he knows when he gets to the check-out counter how much he has spent. He's a good shopper, he's a competitive shopper. He also talks..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "If the Lady will kindly bring her remarks to a close."

Dyer: "...thank you...he discussed this with the store manager of 'Dominique's' and he agreed with him that it benefits the consumer to have a price on each can. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think to...to the Bill that the shopper should be allowed to do competitive shopping in the aisle rather than at the check-out counter. And that if you get to the check-out counter and you just have to take a few items out because you didn't bring enough cash, you can see on the can or the item how much the price is and take it out of the cart and leave it on the side. I urge you to vote green."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Wikoff: "There are some stores, I believe, which have a policy of not pricing each individual can of baby food. I assume that this



legislation, if it is passed, is going to require each of the little jars to be so labelled. Is that right, Mr. Sponsor?"

Marovitz: "I'm sorry, I'm sorry. If you'll repeat the question, I'll..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly repeat your question, Sir?"

Wikoff: "Sure. There are some grocery stores that do not price each individual can of baby food because of the size of them and the sheer numbers of them. Is...if this legislation passes, it would require each can...each jar of baby food to be individually priced?"

Marovitz: "That is correct."

Wikoff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, you may. Please proceed."

Wikoff: "I would...I would urge a 'no' vote on this if for no other reason it's going to raise the price of baby food because the... and I'm sure that nobody has any intentions of creating a monster such as this...because the costs are going to be passed onto the consumer. And the consumer is going to have to pay for it. And these normally are the younger families that do not have the funds that they can come up with it at times like that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's two things I do when I go shopping with my wife. One, is I push the cart and the other one is I pay the bill. Those are the two things I do. Now, my wife takes the papers, goes through all of them, and she takes this in and clips out those ads. And I've heard her complain so many times, she has the paper, and they've advertised the one price. And she says, 'Well, this thing is not on here'. It ought to be on there. I think this is a good Bill, a very good Bill. When they advertise one thing, they ought to put the price on there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed... the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook,



Representative Marovitz, to close."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, is it proper for myself, as the Sponsor, to yield my closing to the previous Sponsor of this Bill, Representative Kelly, my closing time?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, you may. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, to close."

Kelly: "Thank...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Representative Marovitz, my other colleagues in the House. This matter has come before this Body on several occasions during this Session, during earlier Sessions. However, due to the subject matter, particularly with the freshman Legislators, Representative Marovitz and I did distribute an article which is known as 'Coming soon-computerized check-out counters'. This refers to an entire system of computerized check-out systems which are going to go into retail grocery chain stores throughout the State of Illinois, and for that matter, throughout the United States. Now, one of the provisions which the retail industry are planning to do is to remove the prices from the items which are being placed for sale. In this article it's very fairly pointed out the plusses and the minuses on this computerized system and on price markings. And I'd like to refer you to the very last paragraph on the drawbacks of the price marking system, which says that, 'Consumer advocates are especially critical of the proposal to eliminate item pricing'. Such a move they say would make price comparison more difficult. Furthermore, they fear that unscrupulous merchants could post a low price on the shelf but program the computer with a higher one. Moreover, the detail grocery receipt you'll get with this system won't be of much use if you can't check it against prices on the items. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a consumer Bill, it's a poor person's Bill. And it will not increase the cost as it was pointed out by price markings because right now price marking is a reality. But in short order, the food industry are planning to remove these prices. And I think one of the most important things that we should be concerned about as a Body is that there are going to be over 20,000 retail clerks, mostly young people, who are going to be



unemployed if we do not have a mandatory price marking law in the State of Illinois. Now, in this Bill, and in referring to some of the questions made earlier about the baby food having to be priced, there are provisions in here which exempt certain items that are to be priced. Any item under 20 cents, there are certain provisions for small items to be exempt from price markings, fresh produce does not have to be marked. There are exceptions. And also any grocery store that sells less than \$500,000 a year in gross receipts would be exempt, which would take out your ma and pa, your small grocery stores. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good proposal. It's one that the women do support contrary to what my colleagues have said, because I've taken many surveys. The housewives do want mandatory price marking. I ask for your favorable support, Representative asks for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1576 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's... let's call this what it really is. This is labor's response to the greatest advancement in retailing in years. Now, the prices under the present system that we pretty well know, that is, going through a cash regis...going through a cash register operated by a young lady or young man. The price must be marked on the container or else that person checking out could not possibly know what price to ring up. The advancement is that there is scanning equipment, and there are a few stores in this state that are using it. The scanning equipment checks people out much more rapidly, much, much more rapidly than the cash register. Each item does not have to be handled. It is simply directed through this equipment that picks up the price and indicates it in the same way that a cash register does."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo, to explain his vote."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise in support of this



legislation. There's no question that the computerized price marking system is desirable. However, the one thing that it will not do is allow a person to comparison shop. I think that it's a worthwhile factor that's...has a dampening effect on inflation to allow persons to comparison as they...as they walk down the aisle selecting their various commodities. I rise in support of this Bill. It's a good consumer Bill, it's a very necessary thing. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had intended to ask some questions of the Sponsor, but unfortunately didn't get the opportunity; but I do have some comments in explaining my 'no' vote on this matter. I think that most of those people who shop price, are able to find out the price. There are many people in this country from all economic levels who don't shop price, they just pick up the items they want. I believe if we vote for this Bill, we're going to raise all of these prices. Another item that I'd like...another point I'd like to make is that years ago we had to check the meat market scales to be sure the butcher didn't have his hand on the market...on the scales. I think we can do the same thing with these new automatic check-out machines. And finally, I think that the press should have a big heyday with the picture that comes to my mind of one of the proponents of this..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I just want to point one thing out. With the advent of the computer and the computer terminals, the prices that remain in the memory of the computer can change just as fast as the programmer can enter new prices. And you can have prices that go all over the ballpark during the same day. I urge you to vote green."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're correct, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keats, to explain his vote." Keats."



Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you'll take the record, I won't say anything. Are you going to take the record now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, there are a number of people that want to explain their votes."

Keats: "Okay, well, there's one little kicker in this Bill that we haven't discussed and it's been overlooked. This Bill, and it was not I'm sure the intent of the Sponsor, gives a blatant government assistance to one particular marketer. There is an Amendment that was added to this Bill in Committee that excludes one particular store, all of its competition is hired, they will have to raise...or is covered, all their competition will have to raise their prices. But this one store is excluded. A classic example of the government by accident interfering in the market benefitting one competitor at the expense of another. We are blatantly unfair, accident or not, it is unfair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Very briefly, all of these arguments about this...whether or not this will raise the price in the marketplace is just...just plain and simple hogwash. Whether or not the prices are did by hand or did by machine will have no bearing onto what you pay when you go out of those turnstiles. And we all know it. The difference is you will be able to see before you get to that terminal how much you are paying for that item that you have in your basket. That's all that's hear. It will simply be there's another added function for that stock boy or that stock clerk. He won't get paid another red cent. It will not cost you another red cent for that item no more than what it would've cost in the first place. So all of that about the rise in price because the pricing on the item is just plain hogwash."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "No, Mr...Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that in voting 'no', you know, it's just like Representative



Kent has said, we've seen this same piece of legislation in so many forms, and shapes and sizes, I would think by this time we'd almost demand that it take 107 votes to be...to pass. However, I'm sure that's not the case; but...but I can't help but agree with what Mary Lou Kent has said. I, too, have checked with--not the same ladies that she has--but they don't necessarily want this.

It's been indicated that in order for those people who are at the cash registers to give you an accurate tally of how much money you're spending for the convenience of those people there. And it's a necessity those prices have to be marked. We don't have to mandate anything; and I would encourage everybody to get off that red...or green side and get over on the negative side of this Bill. It's a terrible piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, any of you who have recently been in a grocery store at the time when elderly people on their fixed incomes are doing their shopping are likely to see the situation where someone has picked up the item, get to the check-out counter, and have to then determine which of those they are going to put back because they don't have enough money to buy them all. Those people deserve to have their packages clearly marked so that they can make a reasoned adjustment to what they are able to check out that day before they go to the check-out line, and have that itemized account. I think we need to continue to assure that people know what they are paying for each item. And I urgently urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines, to explain his vote. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "I was wondering when his vision was going to pick me up. Now, when I was with the Attorney General's Office Consumer Fraud Division, one of the things that made me so popular with the people in my district and elected me was that I exposed the fraud in one of the major chains that wanted to put this kind of system in. And it was...they were not marking their cans. And when people



got to the check-out counter, they told them the price of anything they wanted to tell them it was. And they had no argument about it. And that's why I'm here now because I know the people in my district want them marked. And I want to support Representative Dyer because when I shop I shop just like her husband shops and so do my buddies. In my district, husbands and wives both work and he can take care of shopping. And most men have to when they get down to the end look at the cart and see what they got in there because a man's picking up more than what you have money for. If they got kids..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holewinski, to explain his vote."

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

I don't know why there's so much concern over...over this Bill.

I think it's a fairly straightforward piece of legislation that will simply allow a shopper to make an intelligent decision about the kind of money they're spending before they reach the cash register. I...I've heard from people in my district, contrary to some of the comments that I've heard, people are concerned about this, people are unhappy about the depersonalization in many of the shopping areas and the difficulty with making decisions about how much money they're going to spend. I think it's a...this is a reasonable approach. It's not going to increase cost, but will allow the consumer to be...to make a reasonable and informed decision about purchasing. And I would urge those who have not voted to cast an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to make a couple of points. First of all, we've been told the computers will take care of everything and that we should trust the computers. Any of you who've ever had to fight with a computer over your master charge bill or your bank americard bill on a monthly basis understand how grueling and frustrating it is to do that. Think of what you're inflicting on your constituents forcing them to do



this once a week when they go to the supermarket. I'm afraid they won't thank you for it. The next point is, that we've been told that savings will be passed along to the consumer. I'd like someone to show me one shred of evidence that a supermarket has ever passed a savings along to a consumer. I suggest to you that if they have any savings, it will go in the pockets of the supermarkets shareholders and they won't go to the consumer. Next, is we've been told we have free choice. We can shop at stores that have a system we like. Senior citizens and poor people without cars don't have that choice. Please vote 'yes' to protect the senior citizens and the poor people..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to expose a conflict of interest. I purchase groceries every week and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, first I would like...if they were foolish enough to give this 89 votes... to ask for a verification. Then I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Friedrich: "100 years ago we had the Industrial Revolution, and there were cries, 'Don't go to mechanized equipment, don't go to assembly line production, you'll throw everybody out of a job'. Nothing could've been farther from the truth. Never have more people been gainfully employed at better salaries and had a better standard of living than the working people in this country. I never cease to mar...to marvel at what I see when I go into a supermarket. There's nothing comparable to those supermarkets in the world, the variety of food, the packaging, the service you get, and all of these things are available no where but in America. And they've been made possible by the free enterprise system which has devised a method of distribution in sales and packaging. I can just say this that if you impose standards on these people who are really



trying to give good service and good food and take care of the peop..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, rule consumers on this...is to give people who want to buy a choice and the only way we can give them a choice is to give them different kinds of stores to buy in. This Bill if it passes will mandate that every store have exactly the same kind of cost structure and nobody is going to have a choice. If someone wants to...to buy in a store that has marked goods, then they can go to that kind of store. If they want to go another kind of store, like Aldies here in Springfield, then they can go to that. Someone was saying that people who are poor and old cannot go to that kind of store. Well, let me tell you when this Bill or a very similar kind of Bill included Aldies, who was it that contacted us? It was the poor people, it was the old people..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mrs. Reed and I are voting 'no'. I presume the reason she is is because we have in Grayslake, Illinois a very popular food store, the Parkway Foods. And that...that businessman has invested \$80,000 into a scanner. Now, all we need to do is to go back home to Lake County and say the Illinois General Assembly has passed another...another foolish law, and you're going to have to scrap that \$80,000 investment you made on behalf of the good people of Grayslake. Now, it is true that if for some reason the people of Grayslake don't want to go in there where they have the scanner, they can go somewhere else. But I happen to believe they want to go there. That's the finest store in that community. And in the event that Representative Friedrich does not seek a verification, I will because this...this involves some real monetary investment by the business community in my district, And I urge more 'no' votes and I vote...I urge those of you who might have..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Harris, to explain his vote."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most of us know that grocery stores and chain stores operate with less than a 1 percent profit. It's been said that it cost \$80,000 to place this in some stores. If they're operating at 1 percent profit, I'd like for some of you to come to southern Illinois and the people, the aged people, with shopping lists. They know... they need to know the price of each can. They have \$15 to spend for groceries for that week. I'd like to see you come down and see the people with food stamps. They need to know the price of each and every item. Therefore, I ask for a few more green votes up there on that board."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, to explain his vote."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've heard it said here in explaining our votes that many of us reflect our districts, what goes on in our districts. Now, my fine colleague from the 9th District has had this Bill on three or four occasions in the past. This Bill has been publicized in the district that I come from; and I haven't had one single letter for or against this particular measure. It just seems to me that there's a great number of people who are not too much concerned about this. We talk about anticipating. We're anticipating the fact that something may be going to happen one of these days. Well, it hasn't happened. And I don't think we should react to it because on the basis of what is been... what has happened here if this Bill, when originally it was introduced by Representative Kelly, had caused a great deal of concern and I got a lot of mail on it, I certainly would've reacted to that. On that reason I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, to explain his vote."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My district-mate, I think, is to be commended for the introduction of this legislation because one of



the points that has not been brought out is that we have this kind of protection in Chicago. And it's worked very well. And it does...in no way does it necessitate the elimination of the universal price marking. In the stores I go to we have that. It's able to speed up the process; so we also have prices on foods so that the individual can make sure that the computer is doing the accurate job. So I think this legislation is consistent with the kinds of advances in technology that we've been seeing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I think some of the Sponsors of this Bill has failed to recognize some of the dilemma that we're in in Cook County. Do you realize that National Inc. closed all their stores, 70 stores in Cook County? Do you realize that they lost over \$5,000,000 last year. So we're...it's a consumers' Bill, yes; yes, it's a consumers' Bill because it's going to close all the food stores, maybe save one where they can stay in business in the mono...have the monopoly on food. So this is actually a Bill to continue to put the food chains and the people that...the competitive market of which our country was built on out of business. So, therefore, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Mr...I'm a Sponsor on this Bill, and I certainly have an opportunity to speak on my own Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you a hyphenated Cosponsor? All right, that's all right. We'll get...we'll let Representative Marovitz explain his vote. No, he did not, he did not explain his vote, Representative Walsh."

Marovitz: "I have not explained my vote yet, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get back to you, Dick."

Marovitz: "There is no exemption for one store on this Bill. We both tried to work with the people. We had opponents of this Bill so that ma and pa stores wouldn't be adversely affected, so that the Aldies stores would not be adversely affected. We tried to work with those people who came to us and want to compromise and we did



May 20, 1977

172.

compromise on those areas. For the benefit of those people as well as keeping the consumers in mind. If this Bill doesn't pass, what's going to happen is those stores that are marking products today are going to cease and desist from doing this, fire the employees that they have that are doing this and go to the system where no one is going to know what they're paying for until they get that slip at the check-out counter. I don't think we need people...people fired from their jobs... And I think that we need to know when we're shopping...and every shopper isn't as well advised as others. We need to know what we're..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of you who are voting green apparently weren't listening when Representative Kelly was explaining that unless this law were enacted there would be 20,000 young clerks that would lose their job. I would ask you from where will the salaries come to pay these 20,000 unnecessary persons if this law is defeated? It'll come...you know...it will have to come from the price of groceries. Most people now think that the groceries are too high, except Representative O'Daniel from our district. If you want to lower groceries, vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, his name was mentioned in debate."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I appreciate an opportunity to respond because I, in fact, have some facts I'd like to bring forward. First of all, Representative Marovitz and myself are not opposed to computer check-out counters. There are certain advantages to these computer check-out counters..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Kelly: "...they speed up the procedure in a grocery and they also help on inventory. In fact, the return on the inventory alone would make up enough to pay for these computerized equipment. Now, there is a real important personal fact I'd like to bring in here. If you walk around a grocery store with a cart, you just start walking

around and start placing items into that cart. At the time to get from the beginning of the store to the end of the store you won't have any idea how much you have in that cart. And in response to my colleague from the 9th District, Representative Mahar, I had...I had sent out a...a notice to my constituents asking for their opinion in a poll whether or not they favored or opposed support of a mandatory price marking. 93 percent of those responding said they favored mandatory price marking. So it..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 88 'ayes', 72 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'; the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Please poll the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks...request a poll of the absentees. Representative Deuster, do you want to shut off your mike? Thank you. You got it on again."

Clerk Hall: "Bradley..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Please proceed."

Clerk Hall: "...Breslin, Epton, Kornowicz, Mann, McAuliffe, Meyer, Nardulli, O'Brien and Stearney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, please put this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1576 will be on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1583, Representative Flinn. The Gentleman in the chamber? Take it out of the record. House Bill 1604, Representative Levin." "Take it out of the record"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1604, a Bill for an Act amending Sections of the Nonprofit Health Care Service Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take this Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #5, Levin, amends House Bill 1604 as amended in



the title and in the first line of Section 1 by deleting '5,77 and 13' and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin.

Amendment #5."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1604 is a...amends the Blue Cross Law with respect to requiring certain cost economies to be undertaken by Blue Cross and certain changes in procedures with respect to complaints. Amendment #5 was worked out with Blue Cross and makes the Bill acceptable to them. It addresses itself, the requirements that data filed by Blue Cross with the Department of Insurance be made available to the public by expressly excluding trade secrets and proprietary data. In addition, it eliminates two other provisions that mandate that the department do what they currently have the authority to do. I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

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

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1621, Representative Mulcahey."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1621, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Mulcahey: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Situation...teacher retired is employed in the school system for two years. At the end of that two-year probationary period the teacher is released for one reason or another. This particular Bill would just allow that teacher to have a hearing with the Board of Education as to the reasons and the causes of why they were dismissed. In the final analysis, the final determination rests indeed with the local School Board. It just gives that teacher his or her day in court if she...he or she so desires."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1621 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all...the Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."



Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Doesn't this also provide that if the finding is that the...it was an error and so on that there has to be restitution of the teacher and...for a full-time loss?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "No, Sir, it does not. It does not."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1621 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the whole philosophy of the tenure law that locks teachers into a life for...into a job for their life is that for two years the schools have a chance to look them over. And if they aren't qualified teachers that live up to the standards, they can dismiss them. That's the whole beauty that the proponents of tenure argue that the schools do have two years to look them over. This Bill would really minimize that. And I think that it's bad and I urge more 'no' votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I think the last speaker is in error. In fact, what this Bill does is give the person who's about to be tenured some rights. And it prevents any arbitrary and capricious action against him in denying tenure. A person is looking for his livelihood when he goes into teaching. When he reaches that second year, it's the most important time when he needs a hearing on dismissal. And I would urge some more green votes on the board."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey, to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "Just take the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are



105 'ayes', 35 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1638, Representative Skinner. Would you kindly record Representative McLendon as 'aye' and Representative Robinson as 'aye' on the last Roll Call."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1638, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, House Bill 1638 raises the authorization for the Illinois Housing Development Authority by \$300,000,000, from \$500,000,000 to \$800,000,000 total. The Illinois Housing Development Authority builds basically subsidized housing in cooperation with the Federal Government with various Federal Government agencies. And I'm involved in this because there's a senior citizen housing project in Crystal Lake that's about next on the line to be funded at the time they ran out of money. I presume that a number of Members know about this agency because the projects, as I look over them, are spread throughout the state. We have received an annual report recently which is, if my colorblind eyes see it correctly, red, blue and white. That may jog some of your memories. These are revenue bonds, not general obligation bonds. They...this housing agency has one of the better bond ratings of housing agencies in the United States. This will allow the agency to go for about a year and a half we estimate, perhaps a little longer. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to try to answer them. If not, we can vote on the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1638 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 129 'ayes', 4 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1641, Representative Wolf."



Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1641, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act of General Not for Profit Corporate Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have spent a few dollars this Session. Here is a chance to put some...a small amount back in the Treasury and maybe to help pay for our increase in our district office expenses. The filing fee for annual reports has not been increased since '68 and the fee for late filing hasn't been changed since its implementation in 1944. I have a memorandum here from the Secretary of State's Office, which says the cost of processing documents obviously has increased since these dates and equipment, et cetera. And 'neither' suggests an increase would be exorbitant. It would raise approximately \$133,000."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Representative Madison...from Madison, Representative Byers."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Byers: "Representative Wolf, who would be paying this profit corporation? Who does this affect?"

Wolf: "I didn't hear you, I'm sorry."

Byers: "Is this corporations in the State of Illinois that you would be rasing this on?"

Wolf: "Not For Profit Corporations, would increase their annual report fee, which was presently \$2 to \$5 and for the last 40 some years the fee for late filing has been \$1, we'd increase that \$2 to \$3."

Byers: "What's the names of some of those types of companies that would be under this?"

Wolf: "The names of some of them?"

Byers: "Yes. Can you give some examples?"

Wolf: "Yeah, like Carp Unlimited...the fishing club that I belong to wouldbe one that would be affected. Any Not For Profit Corporation that's registered in the state."

Byers: "Okay. If I could address the Bill, I don't..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Byers: "...okay...I don't know that we should increase this fee for these corporations that are not for profit. That's just going to cut down on their amount of money they have. And I would oppose this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "\$2 to \$5, right? The..."

Unknown: "Political organizations, I think, are also not for profit."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...The Lady from Cook, Mrs...Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Pullen: "How often are the filings done?"

Wolf: "The filings are done annually."

Pullen: "So that this would be an increase of \$3 per year?"

Wolf: "Yes."

Pullen: "What are the administrative costs involved in handling not for profit corporation filings for the state?"

Wolf: "I wouldn't have the foggiest notion."

Pullen: "Do you have the foggiest notion whether the current fees cover the administrative costs?"

Wolf: "I would say, no, they don't because if it's been that way for all those years, and if it was sufficient in 1944 to cover the late filings, obviously in 1977 it's not. Also they have to start proceedings with the Attorney General's Office once for disillusionment, once they become late, and which is a lot of extra paperwork. So I would think that a \$2 penalty increase is not exorbitant."

Pullen: "So would you agree then that this is not a revenue-producing Bill so much as trying to cover a little bit more of the cost that are far exceeding the current fees?"

Wolf: "It could be considered that."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1641 pass?"

All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines, to explain his vote."



Gaines: "I've already explained my 'no' vote. And I wish to answer one of the questions asked by Miss Pullen. The...when he was referring to the Attorney General's Office, there's an extra fee charged by the Attorney General's Office to get reinstated if the Attorney General has to expend any money processing those papers. So this would not go to cover that kind of cost."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished?. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'ayes', 10 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1642, Representative Yourell."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1642, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1642 creates the Conservation Commission to administer to the Department of Conservation. The Commission will be composed of 5 members appointed by the Governor, no more than 2 of whom may be of the same political party. The Governor shall appoint at least 2 persons to the Commission who have a minimum of 10 years professional experience in the field of ecology, biology or related natural science. Commission members shall serve staggered six-year terms. Members shall also serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. The Commission shall select from its membership a Chairman and a secretary. The Commission shall meet regularly at least once each quarter. The Commission members will be as I've indicated appointed by the Governor with the advice and the consent of the Senate. The Commission shall appoint and fix the compensation for a Director of Conservation to serve at the pleasure of the Commission. The Director shall be a person with at least 10 years of professional experience and who is not a member of the Commission. The Director shall, with the Commission's approval, and...without regard of the Personnel Code, appoint such



assistance in employees that the Commission considers necessary at rates of compensation fixed by the Commission. The reason for the introduction of this legislation is that the Department of Conservation in the last 9 years has had 6 Directors. Those of you who are interested in conservation and the environment in the State of Illinois know if you've travelled extensively in the pursuit of those activities that the Department of Conservation has not been the model of efficiency and have not at all times been able to conduct long-range planning and development of the... of the natural resources in the State of Illinois. And this is exactly what the Bill intends to do. And I'd be delighted to answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He'll yield."

Meyer: "Representative Yourell, you indicated that the Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the membership and serve at the discretion of the Commission?"

Yourell: "That's right."

Meyer: "And in state government do you know of any other setup where they don't serve at the discretion of the Governor?"

Yourell: "In the State of Illinois?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Yourell: "Or in other states?"

Meyer: "No, in the State of Illinois."

Yourell: "No, I do not."

Meyer: "Do you feel that... obviously you feel that it is good policy."

Yourell: "Well, I would suggest to you in answer to that question and reply as... as honestly as I can that this is not a new program and not a new concept, and has been the model of experience in other states, notably Missouri, which of course if a great state for sportsmen. And they have had a very successful administration patterned after this exactly. And they are the model after which this legislation was patterned. You know, I would suggest to you



that, although it doesn't...hasn't happened in Illinois, the present Director of the Department of Conservation, Mr. 'Kenney', when he was a Con-Con delegate proposed this very same proposal in the...in the Convention. And, Mr. 'Kenney', the present Director, is not opposed to this legislation."

Meyer: "One more question. You indicated that the Commission is going to set the salary?"

Yourell: "The Commission will set the salary of the Director, yes."

Meyer: "Well, what if the Legislature doesn't agree with this?"

Yourell: "Well, the Legislature through the appropriation process will, of course, have the ultimate say and the determination as to what that salary shall be."

Meyer: "Again, I ask you in the State of Illinois are there any other Commissions that set the Executive Director's salary?"

Yourell: "Yes."

Meyer: "What...what Commission?"

Yourell: "All of the Commissions, as I understand it, sets the Director's salary."

Meyer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could address myself to this..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Meyer: "...Representative Yourell said that the Department of Conservation has had a number of Directors in the last 30 years. Quite frankly, Governor Walker couldn't make up his mind who he wanted to have Director. This is a bad Bill. We feel that the Governor... Governor Thompson is doing a good job. Let's see what happens with Director 'Kenney'. I think this is a horrible Bill and it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to be understood as saying that Governor Thompson is doing a fine job. I believe that there are two differences of opinion on that. But I don't believe that we need to concern ourselves about that because I am sure that the citizens in this state in their wisdom will elect a Democratic Governor next time. And I would like it so...I would like to see it so that that Governor elected by the



people can administer the affairs of the state. And I do think that the proliferation of the Governor's powers and having Commissions to administer the Executive Branch of government is bad from several points of view. First of all, I've never known any Commission that could administer anything well. I believe that's what a Governor's for. That's why we have a Speaker of the House. That's why the people elect a Governor. And I think it is a great mistake to take away from that Governor both the power and the responsibility to administer the Executive Branch in Illinois. I know that the Sponsor of this Bill is genuinely concerned about problems that have occurred in the Department of Conservation. But I don't think that the solution to that problem is to create another Commission, Committee or what have you. It is to elect a Governor to hold him responsible and to have him...affairs of the state officials."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close? The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Catania: "Representative Yourell, the historic monuments in this state are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Conservation. How would this new arrangement provide for administration..."

Yourell: "Would you back up, please, I didn't hear the first part of that?"

Catania: "The historic monuments in the State of Illinois are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Conservation. How would this provide for administering of...for the costs and preservation of those?"

Yourell: "I can't answer that at this time because, as you know, there is a Commission for it to consider the consolidation...or the reorganization of state government. And I had the opportunity yesterday morning to speak to that Commission in the Centennial Building relative to the reorganization of state government. And they were very impressed with the arguments that I proposed because they kept me there and asked many questions relative to that. Now, I don't know what this will hap...what will happen to the...to that



activity that you mentioned if the reorganization of state government continues. I did...I do know that one of the things they want to in the reorganization is place the Department of Mines and Minerals in the Conservation Department or the Commission on Conservation and also the E.P.A., the Pollution Control Board and the Water Resources. And I objected to that because I didn't think those agencies that they mentioned briefly to be combined or reorganized into the Department of Conservation were compatible one with the other. If you'll recall some years ago we had in the House a Standing Committee called the Agricultural and Environmental Committee. And nothing ever got out of there that was worthwhile simply because of the incompatibility of those two things. But to be specific about your question as to the historical monuments, I know that you're anxious to hear this, I don't know."

Catania: "So the answer is we have no idea of what would happen to historic monuments under this Bill?"

Yourell: "Yes, I have no...no provision in the legislation presently to do anything to change the department except the restructure. If they're there now, I would assume they would stay there."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Polk, Representative Schisler. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this legislation. As you know, we had comparable legislation two years ago that came before my Committee, the House Agricultural Committee. We did not pass it. We had hearings all over the State of Illinois. The consensus of opinion from those that testified before our Committee was that this would be good legislation. And those people came from Missouri where this program is successful. They came from Kentucky where it's successful. All of the...the Illinois Wildlife Federation and most of the hunting and fishing clubs and groups that I have come in contact with in the State of Illinois support this legislation. And I think that we'd be doing well by...to pass it. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1642 pass? All



those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this is a Bill whose time has come. I indeed drafted a similar Bill based upon the Bill that Representative Schisler referred to from the last Session and didn't see fit to introduce it simply because I think Representative Yourell and Schisler hit the nail on the head. As a downstater, I think we should speak to and support this piece of legislation. It's time for a cleanup in the Department of Conservation. I think this would do it. It would bring about more public input. It's a good Bill and it deserves a green light."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd, to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote. I chaired the Committee that Representative Schisler spoke about and we met all over the State of Illinois. Now, that Bill that was drafted by Senator Donnewald and Representative Bradley addressed itself into separating the Department of Conservation into two divisions. One, it would take care of fish and wild...fish and game, and the other it would take care of the interests that Representative Catania addressed herself to. It was the consensus all over the State of Illinois that while we felt that the Department should not be divided, that there should be a Commission established with the powers outlined by Representative Yourell to guarantee continuity of conservation projects throughout the state. And I assure you that it was overwhelming, the support, throughout the state for this type of a Commission with this power. And I would offer for your consideration that this would, in fact, take this particular department from underneath political reign... and give it to the people. We've got a large investment in it. It's a department which takes a great deal of planning for long-range plans. And I think that this is the answer. I think this is the result of those hearings. And I would ask that everybody support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich,



to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, someone once said that a camel is a horse put together by a Committee. And that's about the way it works. You can't pinpoint responsibility by a Commission. Now, I'm not... I don't know what's so political about the Department of Conservation. It's all of the people under... that are under the merit system and all of the drawings for deer permits and so on are done by lot in the open in front of everybody. I haven't seen any indication that there's a Republican advantage or a Democrat advantage; but at least the person who's running it is responsible to Governor's elected by the people. And we ought to keep it that way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, two years ago conditions were bad at the Cook County Jail. So what did we do? We took away from the Cook County Board, we took away from the Sheriff, the authority for operating the jail and gave it to a Commission. Things got worse. And last week we passed a Bill giving back to the Sheriff the authority to operate the jail. A few years ago things were bad at Cook County Hospital. We appointed a Commission and now we've got the highest paid salaried person appointed working for the Cook County Hospital. I don't think things are any better. We should not operate government by Commission.. The proof is in the pudding, and it hasn't been very tasty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "I don't want to take anymore of the time of the House than is necessary; but I would like to reply to some of the statements that have been made by individuals. And I think that the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm...that's my mistake, Buz, I'm sorry."

Yourell: "...statements that were made certainly argue for the passage of this legislation. As I've indicated to you, the present Director of the Department of Conservation is not opposed to the Bill. I



haven't heard of the Governor opposing the Bill. The Governor will now be allowed to appoint 5 members to that Commission, instead of just the Director. And I've indicated to you that the Illinois Wildlife Federation, the largest sportsmen organization in the State of Illinois, is in favor of the legislation. The Hospital Commission that was mentioned before, and it's not working, certainly can be changed. And if this doesn't work, it can be changed. What I'm saying to you simply is, that the Department has had considerable troubles through the years, evidenced by the fact that we've had 6 Directors in 9 years when we should've had 2 or 3 at the most. And so I have no fault with the present structure of the Department of Conservation, except that it does not lend itself to long-range planning and the development of facilities in Illinois. It just can't happen. We who live in the northern part of the state have a difficult problem with our lakefront when we have thousands and thousands of boaters, for example, trying to get in the lake on the weekend, and we have 2 or 3 ramps operating. So we do need long-range planning and this is the only way that can come about. And I certainly appreciate the time that you gave me to present this argument."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin, to explain her vote."

Martin, P.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting for House Bill 1642 for a Conservation Commission because I'm hoping that with this Commission that we'll be able to have much larger and better fish. As a fisher-person in this state, I know what it's like to sit out on some of the lakes around and the little fishing ponds, and we have very tiny fish running around. And I'd just really like to see something done, you know, other than the small head catfish that are here and there, you know. Maybe we can get some large buffaloes or some other kinds of fish that we like to enjoy eating, you know. As long as they are big, nice large fish and they're plentiful all over this state, I would appreciate it. And I would certainly hope that there'll be a lot more green 'ayes'...green votes up there and keep me in mind. Thank you, I"



making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1594, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Business and Economic Development. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1724, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. First Read... Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Fair and Exhibition Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cigarette Tax Act... Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2376, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Little Calumet River for Flood Control Coordinating Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2377, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Parent Education Assistance Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2393, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Labor. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, asks leave to have...bring back House Bill 107 from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of Amendment. Is there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 107 on Second Reading. Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm knocking everything off the desk. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Bill 107, it makes some changes that was made in House Bill 106. So this is the corresponding appropriation. What it does is makes the appropriation to the Illinois Department of Public Health, instead of the Council for Family Practice. And House Bill 106 that we passed out there was a change from the Council so that we had eliminated that aspect in House Bill 107. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 107. All those in favor



Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady kindly bring her remarks to a close.

Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 'yes', 71 'nos', 8 recorded 'present'...Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Postponed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks to have House Bill 1642 on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1686, Representative Stearney. Take it out of the record. House Bill 1703, Representative Totten. The Gentleman asks the item be taken out of the record. House Bill 1787, Representative Brady. Representative Brady...objects... Let's go to Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If there's a lull here ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's no lull. We're just going to go onto Second Reading."

Barnes, E.: "...Well...no, I mean, I wanted to ask you before you went to Second, I have a Bill, House Bill 107, on Third that I'd like returned to Second for Amendment if possible."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...til we get through over here."

Barnes, E.: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What is that, 107, Gene?"

Barnes, E.: "107."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Barnes, E.: "It has an Amendment that has to go on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right...read them. How many...what page, Jack? Page 2, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bills, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 951, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 962, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Governor. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 966, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1593, a Bill for an Act



signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed...Amendment #1 is adopted. Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian, on House Bill 767 asks leave to bring that matter back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, Second Reading. Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the appropriations for the Land Resources Management Study Commission. What the Amendment does is line...is line item what was a lump sum appropriation; and I ask that Amendment 1 be adopted, which is merely a line itemization of the original appro...appropriation. There's no other change."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves adoption of Amendment #1 to 767. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', the opposed...the Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. Now, we revert back to the Calendar of Call. Is Representative Brady in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1812, Representative Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1812, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retailer's Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1812 has the unanimous Sponsorship from both sides of the aisle. And Illinois is one of the only major industrial states which fails to provide broad tax exemptions to industry for the purpose of manufacturing and processing machinery. Therefore, Illinois industry faces a competitive disadvantage when compared to other industrial states which do encourage manufacturing through tax policy. House Bill 1812 is an attempt to provide the kind of tax exemption to Illinois industry, including agriculture, which would surely result in a business expansion, more jobs for working people and a healthier economic climate. For those who may think this is a big business Bill, let me give you a few interesting statistics. Illinois Manufacturer's Association has 5,700 member firms. Of these, 4,000 employ 100 or less persons; of these 4,000 small firms, 2,100 have 25 or less



employees. We should encourage all industry, large and small, to expand by providing sales tax exemptions to them when they purchase a piece of machinery or equipment which will be used in manufacturing process. The history of tax incentives to business show that expansion always follows the incentive. The highly respected Taxpayer's Federation has indicated the impact on sales tax revenue may be \$30,000,000. The Department of Revenue has estimated about \$50,000,000. However, the kind of industrial expansion provided by House Bill 1812 will increase business profits, purchasing and employment opportunities which will produce ultimate revenue to the state far in excess of the temporary loss. The Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development recently sent a letter to all of the Members, which states that many of the companies contacted reported being visited regularly by industrial development teams from competitive states who feel that Illinois has become vulnerable because of its controversial business climate. Illinois to be specific is an increasingly popular target for raiding parties from other states. This was contained in a letter by Donald L. Duster, the Director of the Department of Business and Economic Development. And that we did receive a report that this Commission went and visited 189 firms in the state, and they primarily interviewed...interviewed the president and the board chairman; and the primary purpose was to identify and assist companies interested in expansion within Illinois. Of the...70...57 companies were considering expansion, 17 were looking exclusively out of state, 40 were looking at other states as well. And, of course, the most prevalent attitude was that Illinois is anti-business, has a deteriorating business climate, and the General Assembly is disinterested in the needs of the Illinois businessman. Some of the comments that were made by the industry were that, 'I would move everything out of Illinois if I...I could'. 'Illinois is asleep when it comes to industrial development!... I just located 2 new plants out of state. There are just too many negative factors there. Another one is, 'The Illinois Legislature is working against business'; another is, 'The South is winning the new Civil War for



business expansion and relocation! 'We just might go over to the other side!'. Also is a letter from the Office of the Governor of the State of Kansas. And it says, 'The week of June 27th, a number of our state's business leaders called the Kansas Cavalry will be in your area. We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you or person in charge for long-range planning to discuss the advantages of Kansas as a business location'. There are approximately 25 states that have a tax incentive for manufacturing. And this is the kind of legislation, which ought to have the support of our Governor and all Members of the General Assembly; and I would urge your support of House Bill 1812."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "Representative Terzich, what do you expect this will cost the state the first year in reduction of the sales tax?"

Terzich: "The estimate from the Taxpayer's Federation, as I mentioned before, would be approximately \$30,000,000; and this would not be an immediate loss because we don't know how many companies would be expanding their business or buying additional machinery for expansion purposes. It ranges, I mentioned, between \$30 and \$50,000,000 from the Department of Revenue."

Ewing: "Now, what is included in your Bill, machinery for manufacturing plants?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Ewing: "How about automobiles?"

Terzich: "That does not include rolling stock."

Ewing: "Does it include farm machinery?"

Terzich: "It includes farm machinery."

Ewing: "Yes, was that put on in an Amendment?"

Terzich: "It was Representative Rigney's Amendment."

Ewing: "And that's all farm machinery?"

Terzich: "That's correct."



Ewing: "Do you have any idea how many millions of dollars the farm machinery are sold in this state each year?"

Terzich: "That would be an additional cost of approximately \$5,000,000."

Ewing: "Do you anticipate that this would add to our economy in any way that this loss would ever be made up?"

Terzich: "It would certainly be a big step forward. In my entire time in the Illinois General Assembly, this is the first time that we've made a gesture towards the business community to attract more business and create more jobs in the State of Illinois; and the same feeling is extended by your Governor Thompson."

Ewing: "Do you...one last question...do you know...has the Governor taken a position on your Bill?"

Terzich: "Yes, I understand that he was out in New York to talk to business people to come out and expand in the State of Illinois so I would assume he would be."

Ewing: "But specifically you don't know that he has? That he specifically said he's for House Bill 1812? I hear voices. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like very quickly to speak to this Bill. I would probably be one who would be anticipated to rise in support of any Bill which would aid business and our sagging economy. I have the greatest respect for the Sponsor of this Bill; but I feel that it's just unbelievable that we could consider passing a Bill which could cost us from \$30 to \$200,000,000 in lost revenue. And then to add insults to injury, because the farmers cry, we decide to put the farm machinery in there. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we pass a Bill like this, where we're going to take the sales tax off of farm machinery, you're going to put your small towns out of business. There are many small towns who really need the sales tax from the sale of farm machinery. And I think this is a very bad Bill. I think that the idea is great; but I think it needs to be part of an overall package, and this is no way to do it...amend it. Thank you..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to congratulate and commend the Sponsor of this Bill."



I think this is an excellent piece of legislation and would certainly hope that it would have the unanimous consent of the House. And I would hope that we could all vote green on it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The ques...the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, to close."

Terzich: "Yes...yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I sincerely plead that House Bill 1812 is a very, very timely Bill. We do need to attract business. We do have to change our climate in the State of Illinois. Also 1812, I think, is the start that will show business that we want them in the State of Illinois, that we've got the people, the resource and the government that's going to back up all the people, whether it's the working people or the business people. We go together. We need House Bill 1812; and I would urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1812 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thanks a lot for waiting long enough to get this Roll Call up here. This is one of the biggest rip-offs that we've ever seen in this state. We can't give one-forty-eighth to the income tax to parks and to recreation; but we have the same people voting for this and supporting this who were opposed to the changes that we wanted to make in the Workmen's Compensation Bill. This is a fix. It's absolutely ridiculous. Here we go taking \$30 to \$200,000,000 away from this state. We're already committed on funding of the schools, funding of the hospitals, funding of medical care, and obviously, there's been interest groups that have put this together to take advantage of the rest of the people of the State of Illinois. And I'm ashamed and embarrassed



to be part of this group tonight with this going on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this. I really don't. And the worst thing of all is to stand here and listen at our Minority Leader, that guardian of the state's revenue, that person that's sitting at the gate to watch the state's purse, stand here and say this is a good Bill. This is a rip-off. A good Bill? That's male cow manure. This is a bad Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller, to explain his vote."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me?"

Miller: "I would like to change my vote from 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All you've got to do is flip your switch."

Miller: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought it wasn't working. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'ayes', 40 'nays', 9 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have a reputation in this House of having any Bills that are rip-offs. The previous speaker should know where the hell his Bills come from. And if I believe in a piece of legislation, I believe it's for the goodness of the people of the State of Illinois and not any specific group. And I resent the remarks from Representative Hoffman or anyone else that questions my integrity on a Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I never used that man's name once. I never mentioned him once. I never questioned his intentions. I questioned the intentions that went on behind it; but nothing to do with him. He's a good man, he's a respected Member of this Assembly."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 18...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of hot tempers here. I move we adjourn for one hour for dinner, come back at 8 o'clock. Let's clam down and recess for one hour for dinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me just...let me just have your attention for a moment please. Let me just have your attention for one moment please. Let's just relax for a second. Thank you very much. We...it's the intent of the Chair that if you're hungry kindly order some food. We'll be here for awhile. We've got a little more work to do. I appreciate the hard work that everybody's put in. So we'll go to House Bill 1820."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act to amend the Lobbyist Registration Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Here's a Bill that will settle everybody down, I think. This...this is the Amendment to the Lobbyist Registration Act: The Bill was worked over very conscientiously by Subcommittee of the House Executive Committee; and subsequently, voted out of the Executive Committee by a vote of 23 to nothing. What the Bill does is extend the requirements of the current Act by requiring a more detailed disclosure of the kind of money that is spent in the work of influencing legislation and in influencing Executive Branch decision making also. The purpose of the Bill is to allow the public to get a better picture of the kind of money that's spent to influence legislation and administrative action. Currently, the Illinois Disclosure Law is appraised to be relatively ineffective. In Illinois last year, there was some \$70,000 disclosed by all interests totally under the current Disclosure Act, while states much smaller, such as Maryland, had disclosure of nearly \$2,000,000, and New York somewhere around \$3,000,000. The Bill also includes certain prohibited activities; activities that should not be engaged in, and generally seeks to address some problems that I've seen before...the General Assembly, such as misrepresentation of



true interests. The fiscal note that was supplied by the Secretary of State's Office, who is the current enforcer of the Act and will be the enforcer under this Act, indicates that there will be no additional costs in the implementation of these requirements. I'd be happy to answer questions, and ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1820 pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 9 'nays', 9 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1843, Representative James Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1843, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ladies and Gentlemen, let me just point out to you we have 28 more Bills left to go through Third Reading. And at the rate we're moving, we should be able to get it done quite easily this evening. So, if you want, in turn, order your food now, hopefully we'll be out of here by 10 o'clock. House Bill 1843, Representative James Houlihan. Did you read the Bill, Clerk? Okay. Jimmy?"

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1843 was amended by Representative Greiman; and I'm in agreement with his Amendment. I think it addresses the problem which we have been trying to deal with in terms of absentee ballots. It insures that there will be a delivery of those ballots and that ...that ballots will be counted. I think it's a reform measure which would assist us in a greater accountability. And I would like to yield to Representative Greiman for a brief explanation of the substance of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and Representative Houlihan as well. 1843 may be the very last time



that we will have an opportunity to make sure that every vote cast in the next election and the elections to come will in fact be counted. It provides, as I've indicated before, a requirement on the County Clerk to send out ballots within 2 days after the application is received. It requires him to deliver the ballots to the precincts as he has done in the past. And it states that in the event that there are undelivered ballots, they will be counted in very careful procedure, counted with the customary watchers, counted with the customary challengers. This is affecting suburban Cook County. It's interesting that I'm a Democrat and I'm offering this Bill. It'll help my area, I live in Skokie and Lincolnwood, but suburban Cook County is Barrington, is Northfield, is Palatine, is Palos, et cetera, Wheeling. Those are not traditional Democratic areas, those are areas that are Republican by and large, those are areas, because I think all of us believe, and I mean this, I think every man and woman in this House believes that if a citizen takes the trouble to go and cast their vote, to get an absentee ballot, that that vote should be counted. This is the last vehicle to make sure that we do not have 5,000 votes uncounted..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from..."

Greiman: "...there's another...there are other concepts. It's not a matter of ego with me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...The Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Greiman: "...pass it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Houlihan."

Skinner: "The primary Sponsor? No? Yes, that one."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Yes, what time are you buying dinner? Where?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Schlickman, do you have any...do you have a question, Cal?"

Skinner: "That's my question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."



Unknown: "Cal, come over whenever you want and I'll take care of it."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've been told that this Bill is better than the present practice; and I will admit it does appear to be a little bit better. But we all know, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that something was going to pass this Session with respect to the counting of absentee ballots in Cook County, the county of which was a disgrace and embarrassment last November to the incumbent Cook County Clerk. A Bill is going to be passed, he wants it to take the monkey off his back. But why don't we be honest with the voters in suburban Cook County? Why don't we allow their absentee ballots to be counted in their local precinct polling place where there are sufficient controls to insure that they are to be counted? They're going to be counted correctly, truly, so that the voters will determine how an election result should be. Leaving it with the County Clerk under this Bill is superficial response to a problem and it maintains the control that he now has, which has not been the kind of control that insures honest elections! I urge a 'no' vote."

Unknown: "Have all voted who wished?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

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

I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. To call it superficial may...may pay it too much service. It's a bad Bill. It's a simply disguised attempt to keep things just as they are in Cook County, and as Representative Schlickman said, takes the monkey off the back of the one who blew it in the last election. The office did not function properly, it did not count the ballots. And so what does this Bill do? It just gives it right back to him. Now, if there was a sincere desire on the other side of the aisle to solve this very bad problem, we had a solution. Representative Pullen had an excellent Bill, which we all should have rallied behind, which we could have solved the problem of getting everybody's ballot counted. Let's not fool anybody. Let's...let's not pretend that we're making a change, when in fact all we're trying to do is sweep things under the rug and cover up for an administrator



who failed in the administrator's office. Let's beat this bad Bill, let's go back somehow to Representative Pullen's concept. We could put that on this very Bill; but that was the solution, not this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1843 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan... Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you. Just...in closing, Mr...the first Gentleman to speak in opposition has apparently not read the Bill at all. It provides for the counting in the precinct of the absentee ballots. We have 50,000 absentee ballots, 45,000 was delivered and counted in the precinct. And this will be...these now will be counted under this ballot...under this Bill. It provides only for the counting of undelivered ones. As far as the other concept is concerned, that would've proliferated it among 30 different election officers. And without any assurances, undelivered ballots would've ever, ever been counted. This is a good Bill. I resent the fact that I...that there's a suggestion that I am simply disguising anything. I believe in this, it's a very important Bill to my district, to everybody's district, everybody who believes that every vote, every last vote should be counted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan, to explain his vote. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge a few more green lights. I believe that this Bill addresses the problem. I'm not suggesting that there wasn't a difficulty in the election process. We're trying to improve the election process. I think this is a reasonable effort. And I think what we need is some more support here to guarantee that everybody who votes gets their ballots counted and cast in a proper fashion. I hope that there would be a few more green lights on this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, to explain his vote."



Katz: "Well, very briefly we passed a Bill a few minutes ago to give people an hour or more to be able to vote. These are people we're talking about now who have in fact voted, and the question is whether their vote is going to be counted. It seems to me that that's a very basic right. This is the last Bill that can assure that right. In our suburban areas, the fact is that most of the votes that are cast are basically Republican votes up to this point. And I would certainly hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would seek that all...to see that all of those votes, whether Republican or Democratic, are counted and to vote for this...the only possible Bill that is going through this Session to enable those votes to be counted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't see how this assures anyone of anything. We thought in the past that the voters were assured of having their votes counted. We found they were not. Now, this...under this Bill, that the ballots would continue to come in late and be delivered late, delivered to the wrong polling place. We'd have the same problem we have now. I think we're better off leaving things as they are than to try and adopt this. I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, to explain his vote."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support my 'aye' vote in favor of this measure and commend Representative Greiman for the fine job that he has done in this area. I think that all of us recognize that the question of absentee ballots in suburban Cook County is a problem that should be dealt with by this Legislature. It was a matter of major concern and major political importance during the last general election and something that we ought to address ourselves to. There were several proposals introduced before the Elections Committee. The Committee reported out one proposal by a Member from the other side of the aisle, that proposal was subsequently amended, and then this



proposal was added as an Amendment to this Bill. So that the misgivings that we hear expressed from the other side of the aisle, I suggest you are only sour grapes because the Sponsorship of this Bill is Democratic and not Republican. There's nothing inherently wrong with Mr. Greiman's proposal. It's a good proposal. It's an intelligent response to the problem, an intelligent rational approach to try and provide an orderly, intelligent fashion to bring the absentee ballot to be counted properly. And I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this reach 89 votes, I'll ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I listened to the debate on this particular Bill, I sort of get the feeling that we're in the battle of 'Pride of authorship'. And we really shouldn't be here. It seems to me, we're not talking about pride of authorship. In my Congressional District, we had a congressional race that was...that was determined by less than 200 votes. It had to go all the way to the Congress of the United States. It had to go all the way to the federal courts and what not. And only 200 votes actually separated the 2 contestants that ran for Congress. It would seem to me that as I look on the other side, I think that no one on this side of the aisle probably has sided with the other side of the aisle on Election Bills more than I have, you know. And sometimes I've gotten some of you swimming in on my side of the aisle. I must tell you then that if it's pride of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebesen. You, well, you're done. Your time is up. Would you put on Representative Jaffe so I can hear what he's saying? Please, yes."

Jaffe: "...Mr. Speaker, I don't think I spoke 20 seconds: I think..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, I'm sorry, Sir. We have a timer up here and it's

..."



Jaffe: "...Might I suggest that perhaps your timer may be wrong; but let me just conclude my remarks by saying..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb...the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen. Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sandquist, to explain his vote."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm over on the Republican side, and I know that what happened in the last election was bad, and it was bad because the County Clerk of Cook County didn't carry out his duties. The Board of Election Commissioners in Chicago, they counted all of their ballots. Now, I think there may be a better way of doing it; but I do know this, I do know this...that what happened before should not happen again. The people who cast their ballots should get them counted. And they're mostly Republican votes that were... that were not counted last time. And what this Bill provides, it may not be perfect, but it's a lot better than what we have now, and it means that the ballots will be sent out to the polling places to be counted. And those that are delivered and can't be will still be counted down in the County Clerk's Office where both sides can have people watching. And, therefore, because it's better than what we have now, I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, there's a feature of this measure that I don't think has been mentioned yet and I think it's important to do so. This Bill really tightens up the procedures and requires the County Clerk to send out the absentee ballots within 2 days after receipt of the application for same. In addition to that, it really puts the Clerk in a fishbowl and requires them to be very diligent because it requires the daily posting of all applications for absentee ballots. This is about as a full...full-proof measure as the mind of man could devise. I suggest we just solve this problem by passing this Bill out. Thank you."

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



wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan, asks for a poll of the absentees. No, there's 89 'ayes', 54 'nays', 9 recorded as 'present'; the Gentleman asks for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Bennett, Bradley, Catan...Deavers, Domico, Epton, Griesheimer, Hudson, Johnson, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Lauer, Madison, Mann, Lynn Martin, Nardulli, Peters, Polk, Rigney, Schoeberlein, Stanley, Stearney, Waddell, Wikoff and Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Totten?"

Totten: "Well, just for the verification, Mr. Speaker, that's all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan, James."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I think it's obvious that we could have enough votes for this Bill; but there is a slight absence...a number of Members are not here. And I will take this out and put in on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman puts House Bill 1843 on Postponed Consideration. 1843. That's what I said. House Bill 1851, Representative McCourt."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1851, a Bill for an Act to grant public employees the right to organize and bargain collectively. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Collective Bargaining Bill for public employees. It's a reasoned attempt to combine an equitable management labor bill of rights for collective public employees bargaining. The Bill is applicable to all state employees, to all city employees in cities having a population of over 40,000, to all county employees in counties over 100,000, to all school districts and to all special districts contained wholly or partially in counties having a population of over 100,000. Public...a Public Employees Relation Board is created consisting of 3 full-time members appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Senate. The Board reviews the appropriateness



of a bargaining unit. Professional and nonprofessional employees shall not be in the same bargaining unit unless a majority of employees in each group votes to be included. This Bill guarantees employees the right to organize and bargain collectively and establishes the duties to bargain between public employer and the exclusive representatives. It also protects basic management rights such as to hire, promote, assign, transfer, demote, suspend, discharge or retain employees. It permits the public employees the right to bargain for such things as a dues check-off system, maintenance of membership agreements and an agency shop clause. This Bill protects the employees' right not to have to join a union by prohibiting a closed shop and by permitting the employees to contribute a sum equal to dues to another union, a minority union, or to a charity. The board...a board...it establishes the Bureau of Mediation, to mediate grievances or contract disputes upon request of either the public employer or public employee. One feature that I call to your attention, it has a final law for a binding arbitration required for police, fire, correctional personnel, essential court personnel, mental health and any unit of employees whose strikes are deemed a direct threat to public health, safety or welfare by the courts. Such groups cannot strike. Strikes also are prohibited by public employees during the period of a contract agreement and also unless notice of intent to strike is filed 21 days prior to the commencement of a strike. I believe we passed here House Bill 2, this Bill is a much more equitable Bill for both employer and employee. And I believe it should be sent to the Governor so he has a chance to decide which measure is most equitable."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle. Excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen, the people in the aisle over here on the left-hand side, would you kindly be seated and give the Gentleman some attention."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, would the Speaker yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."



Stuffle: "Representative McCourt, with regard to Section 701 of House Bill 1851, does not Section B of Section 701 affect tenure as it applies to teachers both in downstate teaching and in Chicago?"

McCourt: "I'm sorry, I didn't get that, Representative."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you repeat the question please?"

Stuffle: "Does Section 701(b) affect tenure as it exists now in the current statutes in terms of the City of Chicago and downstate as it's provided for in Section 34...in Article 34 and Article 24 of the School Code?"

McCourt: "Is that Section B of Section 701?"

Stuffle: "That's correct. Where it says hire, promote, assign, transfer and retain employees, and wherein, it says that it shall not be a bargainable issue because this is what called inherent managerial policy in your legislation. Does that affect tenure?"

McCourt: "It would not affect tenure because that would be something that they had already contracted, it was already in a contract."

Stuffle: "Well...okay. Second question, on page 22, it stated that nothing in this Act prohibits an employer from discharging or otherwise disciplining an employee to participate in a strike. Doesn't that say that the employer can discharge anyone who strikes whether or not he had cause to strike or otherwise?"

McCourt: "Well, that could be appealed."

Stuffle: "Third question. Just above that in the preceding paragraph the term 'unlawful strike' is referred to. Is that term defined anywhere in the Bill?"

McCourt: "1201(f) defines that."

Stuffle: "Okay, I would like to speak to the Bill briefly, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Stuffle: "I think that Section 701 clearly flies in the face, not only of the right to bargain, because it totally defines managerial policy to eliminate virtually everything other than wages, and even some conditions that ought to be bargainable. I think it flies in the face of the tenure rights now in the statute. And I think it gives carte blanche to the employer to fire anyone without reason who participates in a strike for any reason regardless of cause and



would urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Would the Gentleman...would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Hanahan: "Where in this Bill, House Bill 1851, do you help protect the craft divisions of unit determination of our building trade and our traditional craft trade alignment in public employment?"

McCourt: "Well, I see nothing in the Act, the way it's presently written, that interferes with their ability to be represented as a...as a unit."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

McCourt: "Oh, and maybe one...one that I should mention is that there is a grandfather clause in this. And any existing labor contracts are protected, and any bargaining units that now exist would be automatically grandfathered in."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to speak to the Bill, Representative Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Hanahan: "I generally hate to get up and oppose the philosophical position on any person because I know Representative McCourt really has come to grips with a major issue in his party..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The timer is on."

Hanahan: "...For him to...for him to have even introduced such a measure is commendable. My biggest problem is not the philosophy of House Bill 1851, but the exact wording of 1851 that flies in the face of the very basic trade union principles that have to be addressed by law to protect those craft divisions, not by a grandfather clause, but by complete statutory language that protects the divisional units that are employed in the public employment. For example, to allow the board to determine that we will now have a unit of a total school board employment as the bargaining unit and allow the majority of the employees to determine who their representatives should be will completely negate that 9 painter, that 3 janitors, that 2 teamsters that may drive school buses, the 4 cafeteria workers



that may be outvoted by 150 teachers in that given area that the board under the language of House Bill 1851 would allow to be determined as one unit. I'm sorry that I have to oppose the Bill. It is not that bad of Bill, Representative McCourt, and I say that sincerely. The concept of it, the philosophy, but I cannot in good conscience allow this Bill to go out without standing in opposition because what it would do would reverse the trend of protection against the individual minority member working in a public body from being swept up by any union, whether it be Teamsters, or Service Employees, or A.F.S.C.M.E., or teachers or any organization, nurses or even members of the Bar Association from being swept up by a ruling of the board where the statute does not protect that kind of ruling. So for that reason, and not for that reason alone, but for one of many reasons, I have to oppose your Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed ... the previous question has been moved. No? Okay. Why don't you just hold that for a second. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Robinson: "Mr. McCourt, doesn't this Bill include a right to work provision that will apply to public employees?"

Stuffle: "It does in that the employee does not have to join a union as a precondition to employment. But if he...if...if he does not join the union he has to give the equivalent amount of the union dues either through the minority union that he might be a member of or to a charity that would be approved by the representative union."

Robinson: "Well, even in right to work states I've never heard of a provision where a person has been required to make a contribution



to someone else. I think that first of all this is another example of public employees being second-class citizens. They ought to have the same rights and privileges of other people who work for a living. The Public Employee Bill that we've already passed does that. This Bill is not only bad for public employees, but I believe that it's the first attempt to actually have right to work for a significant amount of working people in Illinois. And if we have it here, we'll have right to work everywhere within the next few years."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Wikoff: "Jim, is this presented in any way to be somewhat similar to, oh, a State Labor Relations Board? Anything like the National Labor Relations Board?"

McCourt: "There's some similarity."

Wikoff: "That can't be good then...I'm sorry. I must oppose it, but I won't take too much time doing it. I've had too much experience with N.L.R.B., and that has been a fiasco from..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt, to close."

McCourt: "Well, I must admit publicly that at one time I was..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for one second."

McCourt: "...I was not completely sold on the idea of Public Employees Collective Bargaining Bills. But I realized that when House Bill 2 came out of the House this time..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is closing. Representative McCourt, please proceed. Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "...all right...I won't take up anymore time of the House. I'd appreciate your favorable vote. I do feel this is a good Bill. It would give us equity both to the emplo...public employer and the public employee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1851 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'."



Hanahan...Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?
The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, to explain his
vote."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm really puzzled
to see why many Members on the other side of the aisle, their
reasons notwithstanding, aren't really voting for Representative
McCourt's Bill. I had always thought that the Members on the
other side were for workers' rights and collective bargaining and
giving people an opportunity to sit down and talk unified and
collectively with their employers about their salaries and working
conditions. I urge the leader on the other side in the labor
movement, and I know there are a number there, talk about how
sorry he was that he couldn't support this Bill. And I'm really
not quite sure about his rationale or his reasoning. It seems to
me that if one believes in the principle of collective bargaining
he ought to support this Bill. Because you know full well if it
gets over to the Senate, it's going to be amended, it's going
to be changed. Many things are going to happen to it. And we
will be seeing it back here on our side of the aisle. There are
only a few votes...affirmative votes on the board at this time
for House Bill 1851. There ought to be a lot more. I think the
Sponsor has worked very hard on the Bill. He's been very..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen,
to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we can turn that board around up
there. It's...we've still got..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished?"

Ebbesen: "...Now, just...Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm trying to help you."

Ebbesen: "Well, I just think it's good legislation and it's just been
indicated here by Representative Telcser that it is good legislation.
He's worked long and hard, and it's an opportunity for those who
believe in the public employees having the right to bargain collectively
for working conditions, and wages and fringe benefits. Here's
that opportunity. And I think it's excellent legislation and merits



a green vote. I'm sorry to be taking...time of the House. I apologize."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Scratch it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 28 'ayes', 99 'nays', 17 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is declared lost. House Bill 1853, Representative Mudd."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1853, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another merely Bill. All it does is provide that...for membership dues be deducted from teachers' salaries and other school employees' salaries. I'll answer any questions that may be put to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of the Bill respond to a question? He indicated earlier that he would."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "What...what was the...what is the purpose of changing the present statute for membership dues and professional organizations to organizational dues, payment and contribution?"

Mudd: "What...what this does, Representative, it gives the same right and benefit to some public employees, such as teachers or school board employees that are enjoyed by every other employee of private industry in that it allows them to contribute to, say, the United Fund or to some organization that they wish to contribute to that they belong. And I think it is one that is simple to...to put together as far as the School Boards are concerned, where are the checks are done by a computer. And I think it's a simple request and should be honored."

Hoffman: "Let me...do you have a copy of the Bill?"



Mudd: "Yes, Sir."

Hoffman: "All right. I would address your answer to lines 12, 13 and 14 where it says that 'Dues request of teacher and the membership', and we say 'dues, payment or contributions payable by such employee to any employee labor or professional organization. How do United Fund contributions get into this? Because you'll notice if you look at the wording it specifically provides for dues, payments and contributions to any employed laborer or professional organization."

Mudd: "I would imagine that contributions are made through those professional groups and that as part of their...when they have deductions they make large contributions through their organization, which is part of the payroll deduction."

Hoffman: "Then this wouldn't apply to contributions that they would individually make to the United Fund or to the Cancer Society or some organization other than their labor or professional organization, is that correct?"

Mudd: "I believe that they...they would have the right to...this... this particular legislation, Representative Hoffman, is strictly permissive. It has to have the written authorization of any employee in order to have it deducted from his payroll check."

Hoffman: "It is not permissive upon the board, though, right?"

Mudd: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "It's mandatory that the board deduct it. Let me get back to my question. In your judgment, reading the language of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Hoffman: "How many minutes do I have, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You have 2½ minutes left."

Hoffman: "I have 10 minutes. You haven't even started the timer. You haven't even started the timer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I understand that.. You've got 10 minutes to do it."

Hoffman: "Are you...are you suggesting that I used up 7½ minutes?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I didn't say I goofed up anything, Representative Hoffman. I'm saying you've got 2½ minutes to close."

Mudd: "If you'll give me the highlights, I'll try to answer your



questions."

Hoffman: "Well, I disagree with the Speaker in terms of the timing. I would disagree with his watch wherever he has it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's right here."

Hoffman: "But the...the statement...the Bill reads specifically that the dues, and the payments and the contributions have to made to an employee labor or professional organization; and I don't think the description of United Way, or Cancer or any other group...qualifies."

Mudd: "Point of order."

Hoffman: "Let me...let me make an observation..."

Mudd: "I'll withdraw that statement then."

Hoffman: "Okay, fine. Let me...let me make an observation. My observation is that frequently on this floor, of course we get involved in what I like to refer to as selected truths, the key word in this Bill, in my judgment, is the word 'payment'. Because dues are already in it and we have said 'payment and contributions to any labor or professional organization'. And by including all employees, we avoid specialized coverage. Now, just recently the Federal Election Commission provided that there could be no reverse checkoffs for political contributions. By that we mean that you can't collect the money and only get it back if the ...if the member of the organization asks for it. You have to have that out front. A number of affiliates of some of the National Labor Organizations have run into difficulty in some of the courts regarding their checkoff provisions for political contributions. And so it would appear to me to be at least, just for your edification, that the real purpose of this legislation is to attempt to get around a problem which one of the profess...one of the organizations faces in this state now because they collect as part of their membership dues a contribution to be used for political support or political funding. And it would appear to me that this would be an effort to get around that so they can continue the reverse checkoff procedure and be covered or be protected by statute in case our State Election Board ever followed



suit as far as the Federal Election Commission is concerned. With that explanation, you know, it seems to me that this legislation as it now stands has been effect since 1973. I think the purpose for the change is very obvious. And, of course, you have to use your own judgment; but I thought it was important that you at least have one individual's perception, who happens to be a member of that organization, on what they're trying to do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I think there's some misunderstanding here. First of all, I'm not a member of that organization; but I would like to say that the checkoff in this, again, is permissive. Secondly, the payments would have to be made to a labor or professional organization basically as they are now. There would be no direct multitude of contributions drawn out to go to this, that, and another thing. They would have to go that way. Third, the federal activity that Representative Hoffman refers to in no way, shape or form affects the state, state legislation or the groups involved here at all. The argument was made earlier we ought not to capitulate to the Federal Government. We don't in this case. All this Bill does is expand to employees of the School Board as opposed to just teachers some rights that teachers already have and spells out that the contributions or payments for dues, et cetera, go to the organization, not to a multitude of other groups."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Telcser: "I'm not really quite sure about the answers he gave Representative Hoffman and Representative Stuffle. Where does it say in the law now, Repre: will you yield for a question, Representative?"

Mudd: "Certainly."

Telcser: "Well, where does it say in the law now that you can't do this? What Section do you cite of the law that says you can't do this?"

Mudd: "Well, there's...there's no Section in the...in the law that says..."



Telcser: "What Section...what Section did you say? I didn't hear you."

Mudd: "...you can't do this."

Telcser: "What Section? I didn't hear what you said. Will you get some order in the chamber, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stop badgering the witness."

Telcser: "I'm not bad...I can't hear. Could you get a little order?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll try to get you some order. Ladies and Gentlemen, would you kindly give Representative Telcser some attention. Please proceed, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "I asked the Sponsor of the Bill if he could tell me just where it is in the statute that it says the board can't do what he wants them to do permissively in his Bill, House Bill 1853."

Mudd: "Representative Telcser, in no...nowhere in the Bill does it say that he can or cannot do it permissively; but we do know that no deductions can be made from any employees check unless they have permission to do so. That's the law. But what is...this provides that...changes from teachers to employees, which means all employees who are employed by the School District. It just...it broadens the base and allows it for all employees."

Telcser: "Well, Representative, I don't think you really answered my question. I mean, I don't know why you need the Bill. From what you just explained to me, it seems that based upon the answers you've given the previous Members we don't really need the Bill. And that's the answer I'm trying to find out from you to decide how to vote."

Mudd: "No, Sir, the Bill provides...the law provides now deductions will be made for teachers. This changes it to..for deductions to be made by..."

Telcser: "What law...what Section...what law? Federal law?"

Mudd: "No, state law."

Telcser: "What Section? Where? The Election Code?"

Mudd: "No, we're not amending the Election Code."

Telcser: "Isn't this the Election Code?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you care to address yourself to the Bill, Representative Telcser?"



Telcser: "...how much time do I have, Mr. Speaker? I've only used a couple..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The timer is on."

Telcser: "...Oh, okay. Well, I'd like to...I'd like to address myself to the Bill when I know really what the Bill is supposed to do."

Mudd: "Okay, Mr. Speaker. I think that it's obvious that they're trying to confuse the issue here, and the Bill is very simple in language. It outlines what it's supposed to do."

Telcser: "I didn't hear what you said, Representative."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, if you'd give him some attention..."

Telcser: "I'm sorry, I apologize. Well, I still don't understand why you need the Bill, is the point of the question."

Mudd: "Would you agree then, Sir, that you need a Bill to allow teachers' deductions be made?"

Telcser: "I don't...I don't..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison on a point of order. What's your point?"

Telcser: "...I don't think you need a Bill to pay dues. I don't understand that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I think the point of order is that there's a dialogue between these, and I think it's out of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. Representative Telcser, would you kindly address yourself to the Bill? If you want to make comments on the Bill, please proceed."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I had a few more questions to ask, and I, frankly, although I don't question the sincerity of the Sponsor, I really don't think that the answers were true to point, nor were they..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you very much."

Telcser: "...nor were they succinct enough..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1840..."

Telcser: "...Hey, hey...10 minutes isn't used up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...I'm asking you, do you have any additional questions or comments on the Bill?"



Telcser: "I'm going to talk to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Telcser: "Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm sorry the Gentleman wasn't able to succinctly answer my questions because I don't really think that we need House Bill 185..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I guess your time is up. House Bill...the question is whether House Bill 1853...it is set...it is set. All right, it goes up to 9 minutes, it was set for 9 minutes. This here timer. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield my time to Representative Telcser."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any other questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is...the question is whether we will move the previous question. All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, explaining my vote, this is a very simple Bill that would permit members of a union, who want their dues to be paid by checkoffs. It would permit the employer to...oh, this is still the motion. I'm sorry, I thought you had reached the explanation of vote. I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 82 'ayes', 70 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'; the previous mo...the motion fails. Representative Collins, do you want to speak now? There are no flashing lights...to anyone who wants to speak. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, as is provided in our rules, I yielded my time to Representative Telcser."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stuffle, fine. He accepts. Representative Stuffle. Oh, he said Stuffle. Stuffle accepts, that's all right. All right. Stuffle doesn't have anything to say. The question is, shall House Bill 1853 do pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those



opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Peoria to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that...it's hard to see why they've tried to confuse the issue here. All we've done is try to present a piece of legislation that extends the privileges not only to teachers, but all employees that work in a school district. And I think it's a simple privilege to extend. And I don't see why it should receive so much misunderstanding. And I appreciate the votes up on the board. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Bill to authorize Boards of Education to permit employees who voluntarily want to check off their dues for unions to be able to do so. There are literally millions and millions of union members in the United States, 99 percent of them have their dues checked off by voluntary checkoffs: It requires the consent of the employee. And if the employee doesn't want to consent, then the dues aren't checked off. But it does permit where the employee consents a simple way to pay union dues. We do pay other things around here by check off. It is a commonly used form. It is found throughout the whole labor management field in the United States. There is not much to do about it. And I hope we will have a few more additional votes so that we don't have any problems passing this simple, but useful Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan. George."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "At the appropriate time we will. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to explain my vote by simply saying not only is the Bill not necessary, not necessary, but the key as the prior of speaker said, is payment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of order...excuse me, a point of order has been raised, you've spoke in debate. You...the question's...the



Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen. Okay. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Schuneman: "As I understood the Sponsor of this Bill, he indicated that this was not a mandated program; but as I listened to the dialogue between the Sponsor and Representative Telcser, I gained the distinct impression that this is a mandated program. But it's mandated as far as our school districts are concerned. Now, I think we've mandated entirely too many costly programs for school districts. And this is one which could cost the local taxpayer perhaps more than any mandated program we've ever passed before. The implications, the long-range implications of this Bill are serious, and they work contrary to the interests of the local control of education. And I'm voting 'no' on this Bill and I urge my colleagues to join me in that vote because I think it's the responsible vote for anyone who's interested in the local control of education."

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

Martin, L.: "Yes, as the next building representative for the Educational Associations, I think I would look carefully at any legislation involving them; and hopefully, vote for the teachers of my district. Nonetheless, I might add that local districts now have the option to do this and in progressive local districts, and I'm sure Rockford is one of them they do. Now, to mandate a state-wide lo...a program when there is no necessity, when there is other legislation that covers teachers, seems to me rather strange. As Representative Katz so well pointed out, this is already available. And so those who would, I think, want to support teachers, who've had experience in that profession, might look with interest and with a little bit of suspicion at this kind of legislation. It is my belief, and I think I'm one of few who were members and representatives of this association, that such legis..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, to



explain his vote."

Collins: "No, Mr. Speaker, I just want to request a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 44 'nays', 10 recorded as 'present'...George, you'll have your verification...we have...if you want...just waiting for the script to come out of the machine...Representative Mudd asked for a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees and hopefully they'll all vote 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Bradley, Daniels, Deavers, Domico, Epton, Ewing, Giglio, Huff, Jacobs, Kane, Keats..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, would you kindly record Representative Huff as voting 'aye'?"

Clerk Hall: "...Kornowicz, Lauer, Mann, McAuliffe, McBroom, Meyer, Nardulli, Schoeberlein, Stearney, Van Duyn, Von Boeckman and Waddell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, would like to be recorded as 'no'. On this question there's 101 'ayes', 44 'nays', 10 recorded as 'present'; the Gentleman from Kankakee has asked for a verification. The Clerk will please proceed with the verification."

Clerk Hall: "Anderson, Antonovych..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Everybody's in their seat except on your aisle."

Clerk Hall: "...E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Bennett, Birchler, Boucek, Bowman, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Brummer, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Doyle, John Dunn, Edgar, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jaffe, Jones, I mean, Johnson, Emil Jones, Katz, Kelly, Kempiners, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Madison, Marovitz, Peggy Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous, Peters, Polk, Pouncey, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schneider,



Sharp, Shumpert, Skinner, Stanley, Steczo, E. G. Steele, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tip sword, Vitek, Willer, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewall, Representative Von Boeckman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Von Boeckman: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Von Boeckman: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, for what purpose do you seek recognition?...oh, then shut it off...thank you. Any questions of the affirmative vote? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ewing: "I don't believe I'm recorded on this. Please record me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Ewing: "...Vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'no'. Are there any questions of the affirmative vote? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan. Ryan."

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a few. Representative Beatty?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Beatty? He's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Birchler?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Birchler? He's in his chair."

Ryan: "Brummer, Representative Brummer?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Ryan: "I've got him. He's in the back."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Ryan: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Capparelli? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take him off the Roll Call. Any further questions?"

Ryan: "Representative Darrow?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's in his chair. No, that's Yourell.
For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Telcser, seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Telcser: "Would you vote me 'present', Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'present'. Any
further questions, Representative Ryan? Please proceed."

Ryan: "Representative John Dunn?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Farley? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I can't see back there. Is the Gentleman in the
chamber? He's right here."

Ryan: "Representative Garmisa?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Harris?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Hart?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hart? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take him off the
record."

Ryan: "Representative Dan Houlihan?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Dan Houlihan? How is the Gentleman
recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Kindly remove him
from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Jaffe?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there...on the floor here. He's here. Any
further questions?"

Ryan: "Certainly. Representative Johnson?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Johnson? Tim Johnson? He's right there."

Ryan: "Representative Kozubowski?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Leverenz?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Lucco?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in the aisle. We're all here, George."

Ryan: "Representative Peggy Martin?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's in her chair."

Ryan: "Representative McGrew?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's behind you."

Ryan: "Oh, yeah. On the right side of the aisle. Representative Molloy?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Nardulli?"

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

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave him that way."

Ryan: "Representative Sharp?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sharp? He's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Steele? Everett? Oh, yeah, he's here. I see him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Ryan: "Representative Terzich?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Terzich? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Ryan: "Representative Kucharski?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kucharski? Where's he at?"

Ryan: "There he is, I see him. Representative Yourell? Is he over there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he is."

Ryan: "And how about the Speaker, is he in the chamber?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Speaker?"

Ryan: "Yeah, the Speaker."



Speaker Lechowicz: "He can be out here in 2 seconds. Do you have any further questions?"

Ryan: "The Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Ryan: "Representative Chapman?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Chapman? Representative Chapman? How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Lady is recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Lady in the chamber? Take her off the record."

Ryan: "Representative Edgar?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Edgar? How is the Gentleman recorded? He just walked in. He's right there. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, seek recognition?"

Wolf: "I can't see the board too well, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Wolf?"

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

Wolf: "Change me to vote 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Shuneman, seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Schuneman?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Schuneman: "Will you change me to 'present', please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "So recorded. Do you have any further questions, Representative Ryan? None? Representative Ryan? Turn him on, please."

Ryan: "Representative Flinn? Is he in the chamber?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in the...yeah, he's in the back. And Van Dуйne's back. He's want to...no, he...how's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "Van Dуйne? The Gentleman is recorded as voting...as..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Not voting."

Clerk Hall: "...not voting."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'."



Ryan: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any fur...okay. Representative Davis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Davis, J.: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'present', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's so recorded, Representative Stiehl, the same request? From St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "No."

Stiehl: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'aye'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Hoffman: "Vote me 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you change my 'no' vote to an 'aye' vote, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Ebbesen as 'aye'. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Now, this is going to be a long day; and we have a long day to follow yet... and I would identify the actions of the minority party as dilatory. I realize they want to push us to the wall to midnight tomorrow. That Bill that they don't like relating to collective...to workmen's comp. is going to be dealt with. Now, I'm one of the Members who sometimes votes with that party; but if they keep screwing around, they're going to lose me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you...are you recorded, Representative Schneider? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will you change my vote to 'aye', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Would you kindly put Representative Giglio



back on the Roll Call as 'aye'. My good friend, Henry Klosak, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Klosak: "Change my vote from 'aye'...from 'nay' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Simms, I'm going to leave you at 'no'."

Simms: "Change me...change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Simms as 'aye'. Cimball as 'aye'...Campbell as 'aye'. No, no, no, we're not going to take another Roll Call. Kindly record Representative Deuster in what position?"

Deuster: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And Representative Abramson as well."

Abramson: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's go. What is it? Come on. Let's go, Clerk.

Hi, Ralph. Kindly record...okay, we'll take care of that...here give it to me...on this question there's 107 'ayes', 39 'nays'.

10 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Okay. House Bill 1871, Representative Greiman."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1871, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Lobbyist Registration Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

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

House Bill 1871 is similar to a Bill that we passed out about an hour or so ago. It amends the...and expands the Lobbyist Registration Act. It provides for registration of lobbyists and one additional thing that may be of interest to you. It provides that agencies of state government must also make...must also make a registration. I'll be glad to take a Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "If we've already passed one Bill tonight, what's the need for passing another one?"



Greiman: "Well, what I just say, Jake, is this, this has a provision that is somewhat different. Also this is more expansive, a little more expansive. It goes to the next step and requires people who are paying the money to the lobbyist to file an application. But this Bill requires agencies of state government to tell us how much they spend to lobby us. And I think that's an important thing for us to know."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Friedrich: "When you speak of \$250 per month to influence legislation, are you suggesting the person who spent \$250, is that indirect buying dinners or is that in buying gifts or is that just paying his own room and board?"

Greiman: "No, that would be, you know, a direct expense, you know. For example, some people have law offices or public relations offices. It would be money that was...that was directly spent like for that."

Friedrich: "You're saying that everyone who's down here as a lobbyist representing some organization or company or anything, they have to report every nickel and dime they spend for office, and pencils and pencil sharpeners and..."

Greiman: "They've got to report their expenditures over the threshold, right. That's right."

Friedrich: "Well, I would like to speak against the Bill."

Greiman: "Sure, be my guest."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait, wait, excuse me just for a second. Could we give the man some attention, please? Please proceed."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my opinion, and I...a considered opinion, that the group that are so-called lobbyists, and some people think that's a dirty name, I don't happen to think it is, play a very important role in this legislative process. The Members of the House and Senate are important, of course. The



press plays a role. The lobbyists play a rôle. I was told when I first came down here to attend the Committee meetings because the people who appear here in behalf of different agencies...tape interference...does that count against my time, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I don't know where that came from or how it happened. I want to apologize to you. Pardon me? I think it was Phil Collins to tell you the truth. That's Mr. 'Sunset'. But let's just have...where's that coming from? You know, this is a pretty serious situation, and I would hope that you would give the Gentleman your undivided attention. And Representative Friedrich, would you kindly continue?"

Friedrich: "May I go back, Mr. Speaker, because my train of thought was interrupted a little bit there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Friedrich: "Let me say that in my opinion those people who are called lobbyists, and some people think that's a dirty word, I don't. I think they're people who come down here, most of them are experts in their field. Some of them on union matters, some on manufacturing, some on chemistry, and almost everything you can think of. The people who come here are experts in their field. I was told when I first came here to be sure and attend Committee meetings because you'll hear testimony at those meetings by experts. Now, I don't want to do anything that throws anything in the way of a legitimate lobbyist who comes down here representing a group to testify before a Committee or talk to Members of this General Assembly. Many of them represent hundreds of people who can't come down here on their own, they do speak for those people. And I think this is harrassment of those people that I think are an important part of the legislative process."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten.

Totten. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is...to move the previous question...

all those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed...the 'ayes' have it...the Gentleman from Cook to close on House Bill 1871."



Greiman: "To close, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...have a Roll Call: Go on."

Greiman: "...I...oh...to close, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not meant in some disrespectful way to lobbyists. I think lobbyists are probably an important part of the process, perhaps they're the fifth estate. And I think that we should listen to them often. I think they have valuable things to give us. But I think people want to know where...who's financing the informational avenues for government. I prepare, I don't know about you, but I have to file an economic statement, I have to file a campaign disclosure in detail. People apparently want to know, you know, who is it that's paying the freight. Now, that's all this Bill does. It says, who is paying money to influence laws. That's not a bad thing. That may be a good thing; but let's find out who it is. Why... why would we possibly protect lobbyists more than we protect ourselves? That makes no sense. This Bill is a good idea. It's a good concept. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1871 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The timer is on."

Byers: "I think that this Bill, along with the other Bill that we passed, go a long a way in tightening lobbyists disclosure laws in the State of Illinois. When the State Medical Society only said that they spend \$35 and all the lobbying they do down here, I think it's a disgrace. And I think it's time that these laws are tightened up. And this Bill is another one in the step in the right direction. We could find out, for example, how money was spent to beat the Bottle Bill or how much money was spent on generic drugs or some of the other things. And I think it's a good thing. And I think we should support this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, to explain his vote."



Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. I think the Sponsor should be commended. He's very serious about the passage of this Bill. There have been some abuses in the Lobbyist Registration Act. But I think we're aiming at a very serious problem, and I think the abuses in the past administration, when Governor Walker used to have people floating around the state lobbying on a special interest legislation for his own concerns, I think this is something that should be exposed. And I commend Representative Greiman for trying to expose the Walker administration's efforts."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "What particularly appeals to me about this Bill is that it directs attention, not just at the groups that we know ought to be around here, namely the private groups, but for the first time to take a look of all of this legion of state employees who spend their time trying to persuade us of what ought to be done for the agencies. Now, they've...ought to have a chance, I guess, to be able to do that, but we ought to know how much these state agencies are in fact subsidizing people who are spending their time lobbying us. And the whole idea of including them under a Registration Act, not to prohibit it, but so that we have some knowledge of just how many people are so involved and how much money it is costing the taxpayers is really an excellent proposal. And I commend it as really as Mr. Simms might say a really good Republican proposal. And I hope we'll have some votes in favor of this..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin, to explain her vote."

Martin, L.: "To use the stereotype, if a so-called conservative from Winnebago can support a so-called liberal from Cook, may I assure my side of the aisle this one of the truly good Bills to come through this Legislature this time. And that on both sides of the aisle this should have unanimous approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you very much. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, to explain his vote."



Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm voting 'aye' for this Bill, although I did have quite a few questions about it. And I...since I'm beyond the time to ask questions, there are... address myself to the Bill. Knowing of the sincerity of the Sponsor of this piece of legislation, I feel very confident that if this Bill goes to the Senate, and it looks like it will, and he'll work closely with some of the Members on our side of the aisle and on his side, I might add, who do share these concerns and want to tighten up certain portions or area of the Bill so that enforcement would be equal and be understandable to all the members of the public. So I'm still going to vote 'aye', even though I know that the Bill still needs a few Amendments here and there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell, to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to change any of the votes up there, but there are sure a hell of a lot of hypocrites in this place."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, to explain his vote. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I looked at the analysis on this Bill, and because of the quick cut-off we didn't get a chance to ask some questions in terms of the reference to photographs and if it covers administrative people who are in fact on the...on the state payroll. It seems to me like, you know, there are some rather significant questions that we haven't had a chance to ask on this and that we should've had an opportunity to. But recognizing the quality of the Sponsorship of the Bill, and recognizing that probably of all the Members of the House, he is more out front of...on most of his positions than many other Members of the Legislature and he's out front in a lot of other ways too...but..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly address yourself to the Bill, please. Oh, I'm sorry, your time is up. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, to explain his vote."

McAuliffe: "Well, I'd like to explain my 'no' vote, Mr. Speaker. This



is another silly Bill that has had no demand from the public... I haven't got a letter, I got 2,000 letters this Session, and I didn't get one letter asking for this kind of a Bill. It's just a lot of silliness."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey, to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know of a number of people that are on the state payroll that shouldn't be there, too. And if we don't quit being so dilatory, maybe we ought to start talking about them a little while."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 'ayes', 19 'nays', 13 recorded as 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1886, take that out of the record. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to be recorded as voting 'yes' on 1820."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, you're so recorded. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk, for what..."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, could I please be added to House Bill 1820 as an 'aye' vote? I was off the floor, and I'm Cosponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Hearing none, you're so recorded. Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, while I was out of the chamber my switch was voted 'no' on House Bill 1812, and I wanted to be recorded as 'aye'. And I would ask leave that be done."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? On 1812, so recorded. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Well, Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker, I was in the room talking with the Sponsor of 1638, I'm a Cosponsor of that Bill, can I be recorded as 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, it will be so recorded. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, I was unvoted on House Bill 1812. Could I be



recorded as 'aye', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? There's been objections raised."

Hudson: "From...Mr. Speaker, he said from now on. That didn't include me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Objections have been raised."

Hudson: "Oh, come on, Lou."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hearing no objections, record him that way. Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, could I have the courtesy of the House to...to be recorded as an 'aye' vote on 1354. It does not affect the outcome."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1952, Representative Marovitz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1952, a Bill for an Act relating to retail and installment contracts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment please. For what purpose does Representative Boucek from Cook seek recognition?"

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded with leave on House Bill 1641 as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hearing no objection, it be so recorded. Marovitz on 1952."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which just clears up an ambiguity in the law and puts some clarifying language into the law to allow for side notes to be used in paying on retail installment sales contracts. A side note is a note that's taken out at the same time and in addition to the down payment. Because the individual may not have enough money for the down payment, there's a side note taken in addition to that on which no interest is charged. There's an ambiguity as to whether or not that was permissible in the law. We clarified it and we put that language into the section of the Motor Vehicle Installment Sales Tax. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you failed to recognize me when you recognized others. I would like leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 1812..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Huskey, let me point out to you as to the others, objections have been raised. The Clerk has informed me that the items have already been completed as far as in the Clerk's Office. Everyone who has sought recognition and asked to be put on those Roll Calls objections have been raised and they will not be recorded as such. Anyone to discuss 1952? The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Are you saying then if someone borrows some money, they sign a note for it; then they can sign another note, too? I don't quite understand your Bill."

Marovitz: "This is...Representative Geo-Karis, this is used in the purchase of automobiles where somebody puts a down payment down but they may not have enough for what the down payment is for that particular automobile, they can sign a side note, which will...which will be paid off. And then the monthly payments, which are in the original contract won't begin until the side note has been paid off."

Geo-Karis: "Well, will the monthly payments reflect the fact for example if you have \$1,000 down on a car, and then you give another \$1,000 by...in the collateral note, that's \$2,000. Let's say the car is worth \$7,000, and will the balance of \$5,000. Will the interest be on \$5,000 or on the \$6,000?..."

Marovitz: "No, there's no interest on the \$1,000 signed note."

Geo-Karis: "...Okay, thank you."

Marovitz: "In that it's clarified in the...in the...in the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Representative Marovitz, a side note...now, who is... who makes a side note? The automobile dealer? Or the bank? Or the finance company? Or who is making a side note? I haven't heard that term before."

Marovitz: "That's...that is a term that is used in the industry by the automobile dealer and the finance companies. They can be taken by either one of them as long as the provisions are that no interest is paid on that side note. So that the contract will reflect that."



Kelly: "In other words, in other words, the automobile dealer themselves make the loan and not a financial institution then?"

Marovitz: "They can make the loan. It is usually a financial institution which is connected with these automobile dealers that make the loans."

Kelly: "So there is, in other words, on a side loan a bank or some other loaning institution that is backing up this second loan?"

Marovitz: "Well, it's usually a finance company. No, no, dealer is going to take a side note unless it's backed up by something. The individual would not be able to purchase the car unless they had... unless they had the sufficient down payment. This allows him to purchase the car while still protecting the dealer... And the business... the business people are the ones that came to me and told me about this ambiguity in the law. I'd ask for..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Anderson: "Still this side note. You say it has to be paid off first?"

Marovitz: "The side note will be paid before the monthly payment begins. And there is no interest paid on the side note. So that they will not be paying the side note and the monthly payments at the same time."

Anderson: "But...but, Bill, let's say that the car is worth \$5,000. I have a \$1,000 down and a side note for \$500. My interest doesn't begin even though maybe I'll have the money for 3 months before I pay that \$500 off?"

Marovitz: "Your int...yeah, you don't...your interest doesn't begin until you pay the \$500 down. And then your monthly payments begin and you pay interest on the remaining...well, on your example, it was \$5,000, \$1,000 down, \$500...it'd be \$3,500."

Anderson: "And the car dealers are in favor of this?"

Marovitz: "They're the ones that came to me and asked me to put this in."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Marovitz: "Because they tell me that they can't...many people come to



them for...to buy a car and they can't get the car unless they provide them with this kind of service."

Anderson: "Well, it sounds like a real good deal. And I think I'll support this Bill."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative...I'm sorry...the Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker. I'm surprised at this Gentleman introducing such a Bill. He claims he's a consumer champion. This is the biggest rip-off for the poor people who can't afford a car that I've ever heard of. A second loan, a loan for the down payment. That's just the way to steal some more of the poor people's money. I think we'd be foolish to pass such a Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me first say that I think Representative Marovitz, as in all of his legislation, is very sincere, very dedicated, and I also want to say it's a distinct privilege to serve the same district as Representative Marovitz does. And he's one heck of a guy for a Democrat. But, Representative, would you yield to some...would the Gentleman yield for a couple of questions?"

Marovitz: "I'm waiting for the bus, Art."

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

Marovitz: "I'll always yield to you, Arthur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he indicates he will."

Telcser: "Representative, why is this only for cars? What if someone wants to buy a piano or some furniture, why can't..."

Marovitz: "We also...it was originally intended to put...to be put in the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Act. We also put it in the...in the other Act, the Retail Installment Sales Contract Act. So it is okay for pianos."

Telcser: "All right, now you say that the side note is a non-interest bearing note."

Marovitz: "Correct."

Telcser: "Well, then the person who makes the...who is selling the car or



who holds the paper, does that interest rate stay the same?"

Marovitz: "Yes."

Telcser: "Well, then how does the person who is accepting the side note as collateral for the down payment make their money? How do they make their profit if there's no interest?"

Marovitz: "Okay, well..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's have a little order in the chamber please."

Would the Gentleman up here sit down? Alan, I know you've got all your Bills passed. Please proceed."

Marovitz: "This...the need for this Bill, Representative Telcser, is that if the individual did not take a side note they wouldn't be able to get the loan in the first place because they didn't have enough down payment to get the car. So it's an advantage to the businessman to get to...to get the individual to purchase the car. It's an advantage to the buyer because he's getting the car, otherwise he would never be able to...to be able to have enough money to purchase an automobile because he doesn't have enough for a downstroke."

Telcser: "All right, but my question is, if I'm going to give you the money and take back a side note that doesn't bear any interest, how do I make my money?"

Marovitz: "You make your money on the interest for the remainder of the contract.."

Telcser: "Yeah, but what if I..."

Marovitz: "...and these side note payments are shorter term payments."

Telcser: "...but what if I want to go into the business of secondary financing of side notes. I don't have the car, I don't sell the car, but I want to just handle side notes."

Marovitz: "There is no people like that. Usually what happens is the car dealer has their own finance companies."

Telcser: "So are you saying the car dealer handles the side notes plus the front end money?"

Marovitz: "Frequently the car dealers have finance companies with which they're affiliated,"

Telcser: "But, Representative, it still seems there are 2 concerns I have



One, that the interest rate may go beyond the...usury rate..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for one second. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan, seek recognition?"

Houlihan, : "Mr. Speaker, I believe Representative Telcser is being dilatory. And I'd like to save the Body..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't think so, he's still had his time. Please continue, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "...Mr...."

Marovitz: "Representative Telcser, if I may just clarify for a moment, this practice is going on today in...in all businesses in dealing with automobiles, and I'm not saying all, but in many...many dealerships, and we're just putting this language in to clarify that this is something that was left out of the original statute."

Telcser: "...Well, Representative, does...would your Act comply with Regulation Z?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Y."

Marovitz: "I really don't know what Regulation Z is."

Telcser: "Regulation Z is the federal law about interest rates and..."

Marovitz: "No, I don't believe it does. That's federal."

Telcser: "...but the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Luft."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman...it was two-thirds. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, the previous question requires two-thirds, does it not? And I just wondered how you...could tune your ear so sharply."

Speaker Lechowicz: "In the opinion of the Chair...in the opinion of the Chair, it was two-thirds."

Ewell: "Well, I know, but you can't tune your ears that sharply."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We do."

Ewell: "Well, could we get a Roll Call?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell removes his position on the previous question. The question is mute. The Chair will now



recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, this is a bad Bill and I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're going to vote 'no', right Jimmy? Okay.

Before the question is put, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to concur with Mr. Taylor. Any time you start believing that somebody is going to charge no interest and the first installment is not going to come due until after the side note is paid, this is wrong. It does not add up. It can never add up. And believe you me you're just talking about opening the door to getting some innocent people who don't know the law built into some kind of deal. And if anyone tells you they'll lend you money with no interest, it's wrong."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, I'm sorry, there's a motion on the floor.

Representative Taylor renews his motion as far as moving the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, to close on House Bill 1952."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I hope nobody's getting the wrong idea on this thing. Individuals..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Should we turn on the TV cameras?"

Marovitz: "...I have nothing more to say."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Marovitz: "No, I have nothing to say."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1952 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Champaign to explain his vote. Mr. Johnson. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, to explain his vote. The Gentleman from Cook...pardon me...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most of you fellows, young fellows, wasn't born when...during the Depression when they had the old balloon note, that's what this is, the balloon



note. This is the only way you could buy a car. The first car I ever bought in my life, I had a balloon note on it. It was a little Ford. In other words, I couldn't pay the full amount. So what they did was I paid about \$25 a month for about 3 years, and then the balloon note became due. In other words, it would take you about 5 or 6 years to pay for it. That's what this is. We simply going back. This is nothing new. This is the balloon note, and we had it during the Depression. This is the only way a lot of people could own a car. Of course, I don't think we need to go back to the balloon note. I'm going to vote 'no' on it. I don't think we need to go back to it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. What a difference a day makes. On this question there are 4 'ayes', 129 'nays', 14 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost. House Bill 1958, Representative Brummer."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1958, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment, please. For what purpose does Representative Meyer seek recognition?"

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that we have a new winner of the 'Brian B. Duff Travelling Award'..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're out of order. The Gentleman...the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, on House Bill 1958."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, little did I realize I suppose a year ago when I campaigning, I was going to be presenting my first piece of legislation in this atmosphere. I don't know if that's a privilege or not. 1958 is a hold-harmless provision with regards to the operating tax rate and equalized assessed valuations for 1979 fiscal year for school districts which would receive less state aid due to an increase equalized assessment valuation in 1976 over 1975. What has occurred is that school districts outside of Chicago need to file a tax levy ordinance the last Tuesday of September. Subsequently, a multiplier was certified



to them dramatically increasing their...their equalized assessed valuation. They subsequently suffer a dramatic loss of revenue as a result of that. I would respectfully ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Simms: "All right, under the provisions of this Bill, if real estate... if a county prior to the pas...excuse me...prior to the passage of House Bill 990 was under assessed, would they then under your Bill receive additional tax dollars?"

Brunner: "I'm not sure the effective date of 990, but I think the answer is 'yes'."

Simms: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Simms: "This legislation has the effect of really destroying House Bill 990, and the intention of that legislation was to bring the under-assessed counties up to thirty three and one third percentile for assessments. At the same time, bring those over-assessed counties down. This works just contrary to this; and, basically, what this will do for those counties that have been over assessed of thirty three and one third, such as counties as Cook, DuPage, Winnebago, Lake, et cetera, this will cost us a loss in tax dollars through the state aid claims, and through the state aid formula. So the large counties, such as Cook County, Winnebago County, Lake, DuPage, Peoria and those counties that were over assessed, are going to continue to be penalized. And the effect of House Bill 990 will be destroyed. So, therefore, House Bill 1958 serves just the opposite of the intention of the last Session of the Legislature. So if you're from the overpopulated counties, and those counties that were over assessed prior to the passage of House Bill 990, you should vote 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."



Hoffman: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I beg to differ with the previous speaker on the impact of this particular Bill. This has no impact on what is happening under 990. The change in the multiplier and everything else progresses along as it normally does. The real problem that the school districts face that this is addressed to is the fact that they have no control over what happens to the multiplier or the change of assessment after they set their budget in September. And all that we're involved in here is dealing with that particular problem. We're dealing with those school districts who have absolutely no control over what had happened, and the program that was made, and they set it in September, the multiplier comes along in January or February, and their budget is set on the dollar amount. They lose all the local tax money. All this does is deal with...with the state aid that they would...that they would have to pay back against the budget that they've already set and spent. Now, let me be very clear with everyone that's involved here that it's important that this Bill pass. The Governor's Office wants to see us move this Bill on out of the House and get it over to the Senate. And I would encourage your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm only sorry that Representative Brady is not here for this debate. He very strongly opposed this Bill in Committee. And he...the question that he had was, what is the impact of this Bill on the schools of the City of Chicago? So I would ask the Sponsor to yield and to answer that question..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield? Representative Brummer. Brummer."

Brummer: "Well, I think there will be very little impact on the schools in Chicago as a result of this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further questions?"

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I voted for the Bill in Committee with the understanding that I would get some answers in terms of what the impact is for Chicago. I have seen no data. I know of nobody else from Chicago that have seen data. And until I do, I'm going to have to



oppose this Bill. I think that without understanding it fully we could be very greatly injuring the schools of the City of Chicago. We have a very serious debt at this point. We've been hassling over closing early because we don't have the money. And until I know what the impact of this is going to be on making our situation worse, I'm going to vote against this Bill and I'm going to urge everybody else to do likewise."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Brummer's done an excellent job at presenting this Bill. At this time I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, on the previous question."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, it is not proper, as the Speaker knows, to endorse a Bill, to say anything for or against it, and follow that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I haven't said a word on this Bill."

Walsh: "You haven't, but the maker of the motion for the previous question did..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's true."

Walsh: "...and he should not. That was improper. So I would ask that he withhold that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's withheld the motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, then I'll move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed...the 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman on 1958 to close."

Brummer: "Briefly closing, this matter was heard in detail in a special Subcommittee in Elementary and Secondary Education. The Subcommittee consisting of Glenn Schneider...the Subcommittee Members, Glenn Schneider, Gene Hoffman, Woods Bowman, Larry Stuffle and one other individual, I think...I thought I knew the name, strongly recommended this be adopted. The...the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee recommended its adoption. It addresses itself



to a very, very serious problem with...and with regard to the comments made in reference to Representative Brady. He assured me that he was not opposing that Bill this week."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1958 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker; and I would like to congratulate Representative Brummer on his first Bill, it's indeed a fine Bill, and it's going to help all the people of the State of Illinois. And congratulations, Rich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, to explain his vote."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we cut off the debate rather quickly here. I would've like to know how this affects my district as opposed to the other district. Obviously, if we're hold some harmless... someone else has to pay for it. And I don't really know which way this cuts. That was not...didn't have the opportunity to ask that question so I'm a little in the dark on it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson, to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a one-time forgiveness Bill. There's another Bill that will, you know, allow the County Clerk to come in with a new tax levy after the end of January. So I think this is a very good Bill. We gave relief to Chicago last year by reducing their penalty from 1 percent to 1.176. I think we should do it for downstate Illinois, too. And this is a good Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is probably one of the most important Bills that face us. Representative Brummer is to be commended. It doesn't really give anybody anything, it merely doesn't take it away from those school districts who through no fault of their own, as Representative Hoffman said, levy too low a



rate based upon what they expected to be their assessment levels; and when they went sky high, they effectively were cheated on both ends of the ticket at the local level and at the state level. This holds them harmless only."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly does take from other school districts. Those school districts who have been getting the benefit for year, and years and years of increased state aid because of low assessments are going to this time take from the school districts that have been assessing properly. And for the most part those school districts are in the northern part of the state. And to the Gentleman that asked what effect this will have on the Chicago Board of Education, it will reduce their state allotments. There's absolutely no question about it. And it will do it for the benefit of those people who have been, in effect, ripping off these states for years because of low assessments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well, I can't...normally when we have this kind of a Bill we have a computer printout pointing out who's going to get money and who's going to lose it. I was in the Committee that heard this and voted against it. We didn't have that information then, we don't have it now. And I can't imagine those green votes. If it was little lower, I'd ask for a verification. I think it's a terrible...terrible to ask us to vote for something because we know the balloon is so big, and when you take money away and give it to one area, you're going to take it from somebody else. I happen to suspect my area, Lake County, is going to lose; and that's why I'm voting 'no'. And I'm sure there are a lot of other people who are going to lose. And the only thing you're doing here is hoping the Senate is going to dump this and kill it; but don't count on it. It might get through and your schools are going to lose money."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet,



to explain his vote."

Brummet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not an expert on this school formula, but I don't think we're going to cost the State of Illinois anymore money. In my particular school district, it means that the state under this formula, for the simple reason that we just got our notice back what our multiplier was sometime in April, I believe it was, it just means that they're going to take \$500 of money away from us that we ordinarily would have got. So I don't see where it's going to cost any other school district one nickel."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes', 19 'nos', 18 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, passed. House Bill 1977, Representative Yourell. Oh, you want to take --77 out of the record, Buz? Out of the record. House Bill 1978, Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1978, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill:"

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, 1978, is the companion Bill with 1977; and we're not going to call 1977 today because we do have some problems with it. And, hopefully, those problems will be worked out so that we can get to it. I want you to know at the off...off...at the beginning that this is the Yourell-Collins Bill, not the Yourell Bill; and the Election Laws Commission has worked very hard and very long to develop what we now have as a Consolidation of Elections Bill. As you know, for a long time in the State of Illinois there have been many individuals and organizations that have cried...cried out to have a consolidation of elections to provide that our citizens, who do the voting, can be accommodated to the point where voting can be made more easily and at a cheaper cost to the taxpayers. I might say offhand that roughly we feel that from the printouts that we've had that this Bill will save...the Consolidation of Elections Bill will save the taxpayers about \$7,000,000 each year. What it calls for is a schedule of 5 elections every biennium, 1 in the even



year and 3' in odd year. It limits the referendum to any of the 5 established dates. It limits special election to any of the 5. And what it does is in the even numbered years calls for a general primary election. As you can see by the chart, the elections that are called for on these dates that I'm going to mention are details. And in the even numbered years the general primary will be now the third Tuesday in March. In that same even numbered year there will a general election in November, then in the odd numbered year there will be a consolidated primary held on the second Tuesday of March. In that same odd year there will be a consolidated election the second Tuesday in May. Then in November we take care of the nonpartisan elections. And also this provision's made for judicial elections and the retention of judicial candidates. I would be delighted to answer any questions that you might have relative to this legislation. It's been a long time coming. I have to give great credit to the Cosponsor of this Bill, Representative Collins, who has worked really longer and harder than I have to develop the legislation. And if there's any questions, you can certainly direct them to Representative Collins or myself. And I will yield now to Representative Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

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

I can add little to what Representative Yourell has already said other than to urge your support of this Bill, which comes out of many years of effort within the Elections Laws Commission and which many of you provided input. We..I think we have finally come up with a consolidated schedule of elections in this state which makes some sense. We've all heard from people throughout the state crying about going to the polls every other week. As Representative Yourell said this probably and should result in great savings, dollarwise, for the citizens of the State of Illinois. Or, I think, even more or as important is the convenience of the voters. They're tired of going to the polls, not knowing where to go to the polls many times. Now in 5 elections over every biennium, we will be able to cover all elections in the State of Illinois. It's a



reasonable schedule which has been hammered out in a spirit of compromise. There is little opposition remaining. And I would urge the Members to support his good Bill. And I would solicit the questions of the Membership for either...directed towards either Representative Yourell or myself."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor, Mr. Yourell, yield for a few questions? Buz, is this the Bill that would require the township elections, school board elections, special elections, park district elections, cities and village elections to be run by the County Clerk?"

Yourell: "For the most part, Representative Bluthardt, but not entirely."

Bluthardt: "Not entirely? Where is the exception?"

Yourell: "You still have the local electoral boards that...that have been established by statute, and the petitions have to be handled by the...by the local clerks, the municipal township clerks, as well as, as I indicated before, the formation under the present statutory provisions for the electoral board that will rule on any object... petitions or any other objections."

Bluthardt: "Well, that has nothing to do with the actual operation of the election on the election day, does it, Buz?"

Yourell: "No."

Bluthardt: "No. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak against the board. I am a member of the Election Laws Commission, but I've been very effectively wiped out from the...being invited to attend these meetings that have resurrected this Bill that wasn't any good 2 years ago, 4 years ago and 6 years ago. In fact, it has not changed substantially in the 10 years they've been trying to put it together. And I'll tell you why it hasn't changed. It's because it's not workable. It is not workable because there's no way that you're going to be able to consolidate these elections, divide your precincts, have your overlapping precincts into townships, into school districts, into park districts, into the various other districts, tax laying districts. It's almost impossible to work. Now, we've heard that it will save money. It's not going to save



any substantial amount of money. No way in the world will it do that. I may even cost you some money, cost your local government money. The biggest objection, however, is that it effectively removes control of elections from the cities, villages, townships, park districts, school districts, and takes all that authority out of the local government's control and puts it into the hands of the County Clerks. And I'll tell you what, I live in Cook County, I have nothing especially against Stan Kusper, but I don't want my elections run by the County Clerk of Cook County. And I don't think you'll find very many municipalities that...who do want their elections run by the County Clerk of Cook County or the County Clerk of any county. It's just not a workable plan. It ought to be defeated. One other thing I wanted to say, and that is that...that this Bill has come through...it kind of sneaked on it. It didn't have the hearings and the debates in Committee that it should have. Very few people know about it. The Municipal League and other...the Township Clerks have not been aware of its movement. And I think that it's a shame that it should come up at this eleventh hour for consideration because it's going to have a profound affect on the entire state, and it's going to cause other confusion for a long time. I don't think the Bill is workable at all, and I would urge that you defeat it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to some questions? Mr. Yourell?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "I have...oh, okay. To give you an example of my...my precinct has 2 municipalities plus an unincorporated area. It's got 2 fire protection districts, 3 library districts and a number of other special taxing districts it it. How would you, when the average citizen came in to vote on election day, determine in which elections that citizen would vote?"

Yourell: "The scheduling of elections is taken care of in the Bill. You're referring, I suppose, to the different precincts involved in different elections where those statutory or jurisdictional problems



arise when precincts are split, and some are in one township and in one municipality and perhaps in another municipality?"

Kempiners: "No, I'm referring to my own precinct, where I live in the Village of Crest Hill, my precinct has territory that is in the City of Joliet and areas which are in unincorporated Troy Township. We are in the Lockport Fire Protection District, except most of Troy Township, where my precinct is located, is in the Troy Township Fire Protection District. But because I'm in the Village of Crest Hill I am in the Lockport Township Fire Protection District. How are we going to know when we go in to vote...of the special taxing districts, most citizens just don't know which ones they reside in. What protection do you have in this Bill?"

Yourell: "Well...well, there is a start-up problem of course with that area; but when there are precincts under the vote-a-matic system, I don't think this will present a problem. The answer, of course, is the retention of the registration lists so that those individuals who have to vote in different...in different jurisdictions will be addressed by that issue to those jurisdictions by the registration list."

Kempiners: "Has...has there been any...in this Bill has there been any attempt made to, for example, put onto computer and to either state-wide or allow the County Clerk and provide for the funds for the County Clerk to itemize the parcel so that the Election Judges know when the person comes into vote which taxing districts...elections they will be voting in?"

Yourell: "Well, they would proceed...the County Clerk would proceed in the same manner that he...that he does presently in determining those registration lists and the jurisdiction where those registration lists are valid. I can't tell you about the money that you referred to; but, again, this is as I indicated a start-up problem and will have to be addressed when the system goes into effect."

Kempiners: "Well, there would have to be a cost involved with this for the...the counties then. Would you be able to estimate what that start-up cost would be?"

Yourell: "No, no, I can't. Perhaps Representative Collins might have an



idea as to what that cost might be. I can't answer that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Kempiners: "Well, I'd like to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, pardon me."

Kempiners: "...I'd like to address the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Kempiners: "I think that the concept is a good one, and I support the consolidation of elections; but we have a basic threshold which the Sponsors will admit we have not found a smooth way to overcome, and that is, how do we identify in those precincts where there are multiple jurisdictions where the voter...in whose pri...in whose elections the voter is going to vote. I know where I live, I know which taxing districts I'm in; but let's face it. I'm unusual for an average voter. I'm involved in politics, I know which taxing bodies that I can vote into; but even I at times have shown up in special district elections at the wrong polling place. And we've had to a lot of work to find out which was my correct polling place. And I would support this Bill if the Sponsors had some way to overcome that immediate threshold. I don't think we can throw this onto the County Clerk without giving them a solution to the problem. And I believe that solution is going to cost some money; and we ought to know what it's going to cost if we vote for the Bill. I reluctantly am going to vote 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Would the...would Representative Yourell yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will, he will."

Simms: "Buz, I have 3 questions. I'd like to support the Bill if you can...all right, when we run...when Members of the General Assembly run, will at the same time partisan municipal elections be held at the same time?"

Yourell: "If you'll...if you'll look at the chart, Tim, you will see that there is a...and if Lynn will put her arm down...you'll see that in the November election in the even numbered years you will



have the national offices, the state offices and the county offices and judicial nominations."

Simms: "Okay...okay, so then the municipal...municipal offices, whether they're partisan or nonpartisan, run in the odd numbered years. Is that a correct statement?"

Yourell: "That hasn't changed."

Simms: "Okay. My second question, in any way, Representative Bluthardt spoke about the election authority, does this disrupt the policy at the present time with allowing cities to have their own Board of Elections?"

Yourell: "They can...they can have their own board of elections in the cities that have them presently."

Simms: "Okay. And my last question, under your legislation does it still allow for a special writ of the governor to call a special election to fill Congressional vacancies?"

Yourell: "Yes, it does. That...that problem was addressed as recently as yesterday. And we have made provisions for that."

Simms: "Okay...thank you, Mr. Sponsor. I would like to speak in favor of this Bill. As the Bill is amended, I think it solves the problem of many of the Legislators. I think this is legislation that's long overdue. And I will be voting 'yes' for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "I'm having a little of the same trouble as Representative Kempiners was. In the township that I'm located, there is a city and 2 villages, 4 school districts, a fire protection district and none of these are coextensive with the precinct. In addition to that, the high school district goes into 4 counties, still is not coextensive with the precincts in those counties. Now, who's going to figure out which ballot go to which precinct; and which people in the precinct get which ballot? I'm a little confused."

Yourell: "Well, again...again, I have to remind you that this is a start-up problem. But other states have handled it. And the Judges



of Election with the registration list will, I am certain, be able to insure the jurisdiction of each of those split jurisdictions that you referred to."

Friedrich: "Wouldn't it require a complete revamping of the registration system in each county so that you would have each voter as a resident to indicate which of the...these districts he was in, which school district, which township, which city, which village, which fire protection district for each individual voter?"

Yourell: "I can say, again, Representative Friedrich, that they would have to know that on the registration record what precinct and what jurisdiction the voter happens to be in. And that is the way it's handled in other states."

Friedrich: "And if he were in 10 different jurisdictions, he would have...that'd all be noted on his registra..."

Yourell: "It is the function of addresses, and addresses alone, to determine the jurisdiction and the County Assessors are aware of that. And I don't think that causes a significant problem that ...that seems to be the case here."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti, you're so little I can't see you. You used to be bigger."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1978 ... is the Bill that we're on...it has the companion Bill, House Bill 1977. And it definitely centralizes the administration of the election in primarily in the hands of the County Clerks. Now, I don't think maybe we understand that some of these municipalities have different precinct jurisdictions than your national elections or your county elections. You're going to cause mass confusion; and unless you're a Committeeman or unless you're the head of a municipality that you know that you have different districts and different boundaries, this is really going to cause mass confusion. And you talk about voters staying home, they...it takes them 6 years to know where they're supposed to vote or how they're supposed to vote or how are we going to control some of these municipalities that have double jurisdictions or double precinct lines. I can't



understand how so much was put into this without getting into detail, finding out just what problems it would cause in Cook County especially."

Yourell: "Is that a question, Representative?"

Conti: "No, that's not a question, That's a fact."

Yourell: "Well, I'd like to respond to that question if I may. And I have said to you and to others that have raised...posed this question that administratively it does present a problem; but when you mentioned the voters, I would suggest to you that from the voter's view it will...a voter will not have to go to more than one polling place to exercise his right to vote. That in itself is a significant improvement. One team of experienced, trained Election Judges will become familiar with the new concept and certainly will prove to be efficient. It will end multiple recurring referendum for one. Local officials who have been rejected in the polls will not be able to repeatedly hold refernedums within weeks of each other as the case is today. All referendums will be held in the regular polling place at regular elections; and I believe sincerely that there'll be better participation and less confusion and certainly less frequent elections and special elections. And I think that's what the voters of Illinois are looking to us for to make it easier for them to vote and certainly to save tremendous amounts of money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Conti: "Yeah, I...".

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, I shut Representative Conti off, I guess."

Madison: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just forgot to mention one other thing too. That under Chapter 46, Article XIII, now you can't consolidate your elections the way it is. So I don't know why you even need this Bill. We have consolidated our municipal elections with our



... general elections, and asked our school boards to do so where the boundaries, where the precinct boundaries are not different. And where they weren't different, we are doing that now. So I don't know why we need this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Yourell: "Yes, I'd be delighted to. Why don't you direct your next question to Representative Collins?"

Madison: "I'll be happy to. I'll be very honest with you, I'm completely confused so maybe you or Representative Collins can tell me, are you aware of any political subdivision or taxing districts that cut across precinct lines?"

Collins: "Yes, Sir, Representative Madison, we're very much aware of this. And this is something that is going to be part of the task before us when we pass a consolidated Bill to draw a common precinct line. This has been one of the major stumbling blocks in the evolution of this Bill. We now are satisfied and we have been told that all of these...that all of the information necessary is in the existing tax indices and that we would be very...we would be able to draw common precincts with the assistance of these indices and with the computers available."

Madison: "Well, is it your hope then, Representative Collins, that as opposed to trying to work out this complex mesh...mechanisms for these elections under existing precinct boundaries, you would force or you would create a situation where taxing districts or political subdivisions would have to draw a common precinct boundaries?"

Collins: "Well, I'm afraid there would have to be some...precincts where people would have to be given different ballots; but the point is that in the information that can be provided from the tax rolls, when the individuals comes to the polling place if they are in the split precincts they will be very...easily discernable what ballots they are to be afforded."

Madison: "All right, my final question is where there are split precincts, would it be necessary for an individual to go to 2 different polling



places?"

Collins: "No, no, that is part of the thrust here. We want to avoid what is now the case where people have to go to different polling places. We want everybody to go and vote in one polling place."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich,"

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I am not a Committeemen, therefore, I move the previous question."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I there is some confusion being created on the floor here that should not be. Rather than more confusing elections, we will have less when people go...know where to go and when, less time to go to the same precinct and be afforded the ballots to which they are entitled. As I explained to Representative Madison just a few moments ago, this is...can be easily done through the use of our tax indices. Now, much has been made about the powers of the municipal authorities. I should point out that this Bill doesn't make any changes other than to say that an election shall be conducted in conformance with the Election Code. Municipal authorities will still receive the petitions of the proper candidates, they still will have their local canvassing board. Reference was made to House Bill 1977, that has been pulled out of the record and so is not something that should be a bugaboo here because the very point that has been made is one that we are wrestling with at...at the time...at the present time. We have had, and I'm rather surprised as Representative Bluthardt, because he has forgotten the many years of hearings that we have had not only in the Elections Committee, but in the Election Laws Commission, where I chaired a Subcommittee on this very subject, and he serves on that Subcommittee. We not only notified everybody of the pending legislation, we invited every...every interested group into testify before us,



including the Municipal League, the County Clerks, who are in favor of this Bill I might add, Municipal Clerks, anyone that was interested was invited to come in. Some did, some provided great input, others did not. I must say the Municipal League showed a noticeable lack of cooperation, something that I was highly critical of them for. Be that as it may, they would...they would not provide any input and so we have to proceed without advantage of their expertise. I do say, and Representative Yourell has made it quite clear, we are open to suggestions for change. We don't want to disturb any authority or any prerogatives of municipal authorities that we can leave...left untouched. We recognize the importance of those; but we do recognize the importance of a consolidated schedule of elections. People want to go to the same place and vote, they don't want to be going every other week. Here we give them the opportunity in a very easily understandable schedule to vote only a certain number of times over a two-year period to vote in the same place, to save...to save money for the people in the State of Illinois; and to vote conveniently when they do. I think this is a good Bill. It's been hammered out in a spirit of bipartisanship over a ten-year period; and I hope you will agree with us. And now pass this Bill so we can finally bring some sense to our election schedule in this state."

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

Bluthardt: "No, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now, wait a minute. It's a personal privilege. You know what that is."

Bluthardt: "My name has been used in debate by my good friend, former roommate, Phil Collins. I want to first of all defend the Illinois Municipal League. They came out and flatly said they opposed the Bill as it presently exists. And I don't think that that's being uncooperative, I think that's passing the message as to where they stand. You know, Phil has a great way of always attacking the Illinois Municipal League like he attacks lawyers and a few other



people. And he's often wrong when he attacks because, you know, just if you don't agree him then you're not cooperative. And that's ridiculous. This Bill will not save the taxpayer money, it will create other confusion, as I said before. This Bill is opposed by not only the Illinois Municipal League, but the Township Clerks and the Municipal Clerks. It's opposed because it takes away all authority, and don't be...don't be fooled by the statements that they will still handle the petitions, they will still have the Electoral Board of contests, they will not. They'll do the perfunctory work of handling petitions, but the actual elections, the printing of ballots, the conduct of the entire election will be by the County Clerk and the local government loses its authority and its influence and its ability to run any election whatsoever, be it a referendum, be it a general election, be it any matter of policy. They lose all authority in the operation of government insofar as it affects the conduct of the election. This is a bad Bill, it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I would like to mention two or three reasons that I am opposing this and I am casting a 'no' vote. It was mentioned that all referendums would be held at once. Can you imagine trying to pass a group of referendums in any locality at the same time? It's hard enough to pass one. The local units of government will not be able to control their own decisions as to when they might best offer a referendum for bond issue, revenues, whatever it might be. Mayor Conti said that they had made consolidations on elections, I think that's fine on any place that wants to, but let's don't mandate it for everyone else. One other thing that I think is very important, the people running for public office could very easily get caught up in a very controversial dispute on one of the other units of government that was running. And you know, we all get associated with things such as that whether we want to or not and it could have a very serious and disasterous affect on any individual running for a local office."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 1978. Representative Matejek and I had introduced a similar Bill and left it in the Elections Committee Interim Study Calendar when this Bill got out. If we look at the situation that occurred last April in our area, I think you'll see why this legislation is desirable. Within a period of one month, we had municipal elections, township elections, school board elections, park district...park district elections. Really confusing for the voters. In school board elections, you may be forced to vote in a grammar school district in one school and travel 2 miles to vote in another school board election that's being held the same day. I think it's time to end the confusion, to encourage participation. And I encourage...and I urge an 'aye' vote for House Bill 1978."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, after listening to all these proposals and everything, I believe..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Byers: "...I believe that this Bill can work. First thing I think we need to do is consolidate some of the elections that we have. The people become confused and they don't know, for example, where they go to vote or when they go to vote or what they're voting for. And I think this will address attention to them. Another reason I think that this will be a good Bill that many times certain elected officials try to pass bond referendums on rainy or snowy days or whatever. And then if it's defeated, they bring it back. And this will limit the times that they can offer elections. And I think most voters are very discouraged because these issues keep reappearing. This way they will have to concentrate and conduct them at the one time, and I believe that this will be a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

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



I'm voting 'no' on this Bill. I would like to mention one thing that I don't think has been mentioned before. And that is the importance of the timing of special referenda. I can think of my village, for example, which recently passed a referendum to approve the sale of bonds for the installation of a new water system. The timing of that referendum was a very, very important matter. And if we had had to carry that over to some stipulated..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

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

Speaker Redmond: "To explain his vote."

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

To explain my vote, I certainly agree that we should consolidate elections. But it's incredible to me that they've been talking about and studying this program for about 11 years and we're still being asked to pass this Bill and still to work out the details sometime between now and December of '78. The most important details of all, just exactly how we're going to conduct these elections. What part the City Clerks and the Township Clerks play. They want to know. They're important and they must be considered. But we can't tell them. And that's important. Before we pass this Bill, we have an opportunity to see just exactly how the precincts are going to be drawn, how the mechanics are going to be dealt with. Now, in Committee a very important Bill like this had a very fast shuffle. It took about 2 minutes to pass it, when it should've had a lot more work on it. This type of Bill should not be presented to us until we've had an opportunity to see just exactly how it's going to work. And I will vote...I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "...body is for this Bill except the people. There's no subject on which your constituents, if you're from suburbs or downstate, are more agreed than on this. And if you don't believe me, poll them. Your local officials may be against this, but the people are for it."

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



record. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like leave to have included as Cosponsors on this legislation, Representative Giorgi, who had a similar Bill, Representative Matejek, and also Representative Harris, and Representative Dawson, and Representative Steczo and anybody else who wants to get on."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 37 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1991. Representative McClain."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1991, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1991 was called in House Revenue Committee by the Minority Spokesman as the most reasonable of any of the Bills presented in front of Revenue Committee on this matter. What it does is it amends the additional grant provision of Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. It increases the minimum grant under the program from \$50 to \$75. What we're doing here is helping out the lowest income senior citizen, rather than the highest income senior citizens. There are...the cost factor is somewhere around \$1,625,000. The only people receiving a full \$25 increase in grants are those people making less than \$1,250 a year, which I think is...is the intent of this legislation. I know \$5...\$25 might not seem very much to most of us when we get per diems of \$36 a day. However, to a senior \$25 could be Christmas, and it's very important to them. I would ask for a favorable vote."

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



123 'aye' and 15 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is; hereby, declared passed. 1995."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1995, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Migrant Labor Camp Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, I guess I missed one here; but take 1995. Take it. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "1993, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies..."

Speaker Redmond: "1993, pardon me."

Matijevich: "...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1993 is an Act to prohibit oil producers and refiners from operating retail service stations. When the fuel crisis came upon us some years ago, it was very evident to me that the company-operated business had no trouble with fuel allocations while the independently-owned stations were discriminated against; and in fact, there were many who were forced out of business at that time. I did some research to find out in the State of Maryland at that time the Governor created a special Committee to look into this matter, and he found...his Committee found the same conclusions that the company-operated stations did in fact have no problem with fuel allocation. And in that state they recommended legislation very similar to what I have introduced here. The exclusion of producers and refiners is a reasonable means, I believe, of preserving competition and preventing monopolistic control of marketing by a few major oil companies. With the advent of self-service gasoline stations in Illinois, this legislation becomes even more important. Because the major oil companies are taking aim at a greater control in monopoly of the retail market. With that control will eventually come price control, and the consumer gains will soon evaporate. I want to say that the Amendment I've placed on it makes this very close to the Maryland Bill; and I had the help of Representative Gil Deavers, Representative Geo-Karis, Ed Kucharski and Cal Skinner, and I appreciate that help. And I think we have a very good Bill here, and I think it's a good consumer oriented Bill. And I'd appreciate your support."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1993, a Bill for an Act to prohibit producers and refiners of petroleum products from operating retail service stations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, on the surface this may sound like a good Bill; but it's really a bad Bill, which would stop an oil company and many independent jobbers from owning and operating stations they own. Actually not many stations are operated by the major companies, they're operated by jobbers. And when you drive into a Shell station, that isn't necessarily operated by the Shell Oil Company it's probably operated by the jobber who operates over an area. This is just another move trying to get the government to move into business when it can't run its own affairs. Now, what the Sponsor has not told you is that a Bill like this that was passed in the Florida Legislature in 1974 and was promptly declared unconstitutional. In Maryland the Circuit Court did the same thing. The State Supreme Court overruled the lower courts, and an appeal is planned in the United States Supreme Court. Actually, the larger oil companies now directly operate only about 100 stations out of approximately 9,000 stations in the whole State of Illinois. I don't see how you can consider this as a takeover of the little guy. Because the stations that you and I drive into almost all of them are operated by jobbers and not by the major oil companies. So the issue that's been raised here is completely phony and it should've never been introduced. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that some of the Members would read the Bill and, specifically, the definition of 'major distributor'. That means a distributor of relatively large proportions in terms of fiscal receipts, personnel and distributions. What is the...let me ask the Sponsor a question, what's the Amendment say?"

Matijevich: "It changes it to 'producer or refiner', not the major oil



companies, Harry."

Leinenweber: "That would include the Clark Oil Company?"

Matijevich: "I didn't hear you, Harry."

Leinenweber: "That would include Clark?"

Matijevich: "I still can't hear you. What...what..."

Leinenweber: "Would that include Clark Oil Company?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Would it include Checker Oil Company?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Sir. Oh, I don't know about Checker. They...No, I don't think Checker is a producer."

Leinenweber: "In other words, it's...the dividing line is between is between one who refines his own gas. What if he does both? What if he refines..."

Matijevich: "Producer-refiner means a person, corporation, partnership or association which either produces, refines, blends, compounds or manufacturer motor vehicle fuel and other petroleum products."

Leinenweber: "...Well, I would suggest that's a pretty broad definition. You'd probably throw about 90 percent of the...the petro...the gas stations out of business. This, as Representative Friedrich, pointed out, this is going to not increase competition, it will gravely decrease competition. And it will benefit only those who are the least efficient, will greatly raise prices. It's in line with the...the...looking for Cosponsors...what they've been trying to do to the gasoline industry to prevent efficiencies from taking place and to increase price of the product for whatever reason they may have in mind. I would suggest however that your voters back home will not look kindly...anymore kindly on this than they ought do on any other type of scheme that raises price of the products that they have to buy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think the points that Representative Leinenweber has alluded to and some of the others that have been made in the course of analysis of this are important as far as the application of this particular Bill is concerned. I think more important than that is just the philosophical



question of whether we have the right as the Legislature or any Legislature has the right to encroach on the private sector to the extent that this Bill does. And I believe that the philosophical implication of saying that we have a right to control this or any other industry that's not a monopoly to the extent that we do in this Bill really means that there's just no limitations at all other than our own whimsy about how far we're going to extend the regulation of government into the private sector. And if what people want to do is to not only toddle along, but run very quickly towards a complete control socialistic economy, this is exactly the kind of Bill you ought to vote for. But if you still believe that the private sector and free enterprise have some viability, then I think this petroleum company divestiture Act is the kind of thing that absolutely ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, a lot of things flying around here that aren't true. Let me explain a little bit. The distributor is totally eliminated from the Bill. It's a producer-refiner who controls the oil from the well to the gas tank. And what we're doing is trying to get him out of that business and putting that little guy on a corner station back into the business. Let me give you an example, American, Mobil and Shell currently do not run any gas stations in the State of Illinois other than under their own name brand and through lessees. But the only reason they haven't opened their own stations under other brands is the fact that Illinois hasn't had self-service; but they currently have self-service and you watch them move into it. Let me give you an example of the subsidiary brands that Marathon has; Checker, Speedway, Consolidated, Bonded, Gas Town, Mile Makers, Super M, Pilot and Pass Point. Now, there's no way the consumer can know who owns what gas station and who's controlling the price. Another fallacy is that the...the price can be controlled. That is absolutely false because the Federal Government now tells the maximum amount that you can charge for a gallon of gasoline. Another thing you've got to look at is the revenue produced. If the refiner controls it



to the retail, and he's refining it in Louisiana and shipping it to Illinois to one of his subsidiaries, sure you're going to get the motor fuel tax and the sales tax, but you're not going to get any income tax from that corporation because they'll sell into this state at whatever price that they have to to eliminate any state income tax. It is a good Bill. It protects that little guy. And if you want to be in the hip pocket of the big oil companies, that's fine with me; but I think you ought to vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, if we are to encourage small business people, we should support this Bill. There's no reason why the producers have to maintain the gasoline stations. I know for a fact that the smaller distributors have been coerced by some of the bigger companies to go ahead for the self-service gasoline stations because eventually they want to put them completely under control of some of these big companies. Now, there's no question in my mind that this is a Bill that will help the people, will help increase business and increase more possibilities for people to be in business, rather than make it just one little 'hickey' ...monopoly as it presently exists. And I urge the support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

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

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

Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll just respond to a couple of the questions quickly. The main one where Representative Johnson questioned whether we as a State Legislature have any business legislating in this area. Let me give you a quote out of the Maryland Supreme Court decision, which their highest court, which they upheld the constitutionality, and the quote it, 'The promotion of the economic welfare is a legitimate interest of a state, and it has long been recognized that the states have the



power to pass legislation to promote competition by preventing monopolistic activity in restraint of trade. That says it all, and that's really what I'm trying to do. And as I said, it's all the more important because of self-service gasoline. And I solicit your 'aye' vote."

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

Johnson: "No, this is not to explain my vote, this is a point of personal privilege. My name was mentioned in debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead."

Johnson: "Representative Matijevich completely misconstrued my comment. I had no question about the legal right of the state to regulate business in this particular area. I had...the question that was raised and the point that I made was the policy decision that we make. And what I simply said was that we talk about driving business out of the state, we talked about that in the course of debate of Workmen's Compensation and a number of other issues. This is a classic example where government bureaucracy and regulation is driving business out of the State of Illinois. There's no question about the legal right of us to do it. I do have a question about the policy decision of our deciding to do it. And that was my point."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis to explain his vote. The clock is on."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise to explain my 'no' vote on this for fear of having to be cast in the role of peeking out over a hip pocket, which is patently untrue. However, a lot of questions remain unanswered, like the Secretary of State's regulatory powers in the Bill of regulating voluntary allowances, rental agreements and of portion of fuels. And I have to agree with Representatives Leinenweber, Johnson and Friedrich. It's another in a long series of intrusions of State and Federal Government into private industry. I urge a 'no' vote."

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



Huskey: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask some questions of the Sponsor. I didn't get a chance. One of the questions are I notice in his Amendment that he has the word 'blend'. Well, I notice in several gas stations that I pull into...I like blended gas. So I go to the pumps and tell them that I want 90 blend or whatever the blend may be. Now, what...this Bill is going to put these people in the category of producers because they're blended right at the pump when they put it in your car. So, therefore, this little man pumping gas in my car automatically becomes a blender so he's put out of business and cannot sell gas or put gas in your car. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm will have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner for some purpose..."

Skinner: "Well, anybody who believes the oil industry is an example of a free enterprise system probably also believes the tooth fairy doubled the price of gasoline during the oil crisis. I would suggest that vertical integration is as much a monopoly as horizontal integration. And what the Federal Government did by consent decree to the movie theatre...to the movie industry by ripping the theatres away from the producers in 1948, we can..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Anybody else. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, when the big lotteries were down here in the last couple days, I decided to get in touch with my local service station man, and he says that the local service station people are scared to death because they know that these oil companies that have been squeezing them already are going to squeeze them out of business, take over their stations and make them self-service. And if you're interested in keeping your local full-service station available, you should...you should put some green lights up there. And in the inner-city, the corner...full-service stations are about the only corners where ladies can safely catch the bus. And there's a lot of problems...and also the economics. You're going to be putting thousands of people out of work with these self-service



stations, these big companies are going to hold them."

Speaker Redmond: "The timer is on, Sir. Representative Kucharski. The timer is on."

Kucharski: "First of all, I'd like to say there has been a precedence set 35 years ago when the U.S. Supreme Court made a ruling prohibiting a certain industry from wholesaling and retailing its product. Second of all, I'd like to know why a certain oil...major oil company will charge its own stations less to buy the gas than they will charge the independent service stations, which independent service stations would then, therefore, charge the consumer more for the money...more for the gas. And third and last reason, why is it that I get two different answers where one major oil says that they own 170 service stations in Illinois, and they'll come down here and testify and they'll tell you that they have 14. Who's lying to who?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Madison: "Not to explain my vote, Mr Speaker, to simply ask if you would prevail upon the Members to stop that incessant whistling."

Speaker Redmond: "I think your request is very timely. Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am struck by a couple of things. First off, that as a downstater and our old country boys that from time to time uses the Tollways, Standard Oil has a monopoly on the stations on the Tollway. And they have the highest prices and the poorest service that I think I've ever encountered. The second was the classic examples that we who from time to time teach economics use about monopoly and price fixing, is that Shell Oil is one who whenever they do not feel that they have the proper share of the market immediately start a price war. And after they have driven all of the little people out, they then hike the prices and gig the consumer. And I think this is a very well-advised Bill. And I think that everybody should be voting green on...on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 68 'aye', 71 'no'; the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed...lost, lost, lost, lost. 1995."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1995, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Migrant Labor Camp Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that we reverse the Roll Call on this from the last Bill, 1952. Is that motion in order?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was the score on that one?"

Marovitz: "You wouldn't believe it if I told you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that the Brian Duff Award?"

Marovitz: "I'd like to give my time for an opening remark to Representative Telcser on this Bill, one of my Cosponsors."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "...See if I can win the award...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1995 simply extends the law to cover housing for all classes of migrant housing, whether it's one family or more, one migrant or more, as opposed to the current law."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, wait, some people have a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Telcser: "The Bill simply covers the...the definition of migrant housing to cover one more or one family and up as opposed to the present law, which covers only larger migrant camps that cover, I think, 10...10 individuals or more."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Telcser: "...effective upon becoming law."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ewing: "What does the law...what does the law provide if you have one migrant family? What are you required to do under it?"



Telcser: "Illinois law sets certain standards, Representative, for housing for migrants. You know, floor space, I don't recall, but I think maybe, window area and those standards cover housing for 10 people or more. This Bill will reduce this to all migrant housing in effect."

Ewing: "What is the need to reduce this down to 1 migrant worker?"

Telcser: "Because the...the people who looked into the migrant housing question, and I was not a Member of that Commission, it might have been Representative Marovitz' Commission, felt that the migrant housing of all kinds really needed upgrading in Illinois and realling didn't fol...really didn't provide for at least a minimal standard for human beings in which to live who come to Illinois to help us harvest our crops."

Ewing: "Do you have any idea how many would be affected by this? How many do we have that go down to 1 migrant family?"

Telcser: "I couldn't tell you how many would be affected, Representative, but I know when I was interested in this area some years back we had, as I recall, the figure was 20,000 people came into Illinois every season to help pick our crops. I have no way of knowing, however, how many of those people would be housed in some of the larger camps, such as, Joan of Arc, who had a larger campsite, as opposed to how many might be in the smaller housing units. I couldn't answer your question."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Telcser: "Yes, I will."

Peters: "Representative Telcser, as I...as I read this great innovation that you have voiced on this Assembly as a part of your continuing effort to destroy the State of Illinois, is it correct or do I read this correctly that my aunt who happens to have one individual living on the farm, kind of taking care of the place, all of a sudden becomes under the Migrant Camp Act with all of this nonsense that these regulations require for the farmers? A separate bath house, is she going to have to put in a separate bath house for this



guy? A separate room? A separate laundry room for the one guy that lives there?"

Telcser: "Well..."

Peters: "I know of your great interest in this, and I'm sure there's lot of migrant workers in your district who are looking to you for direction on this."

Telcser: "...Well, Representative, where is your aunt's farm located?"

Peters: "Down...down yonder?"

Telcser: "Where down yonder? Where? Where?"

Peters: "It's near the land owned by Representative Marovitz."

Telcser: "Well, Representative, let me answer you this way, every year in Illinois thousands of people come to harvest our crops. They provide a good part of our state's economy and contribute to that economy. They ought to have decent housing."

Peters: "Representative Telcser..."

Telcser: "And I assure you, Representative, the standards are minimal.

It may be nice to make some jokes about private baths and tiled floors or carpeting or whatever, but let me assure you if anyone would visit some of the migrant camps throughout this state I think you would recognize that minimal housing standards ought to be met. I have seen migrant housing in some parts of this state where 7, 8, 9, 10 people are forced to live in one small room. Now, that's all we're asking, is some decent housing for people who come to help us with our economy. And knowing your aunt, as I do, Representative, knowing what a fine woman she is she would want to have the finest housing available because I know, just like you, you always welcome everyone with great hospitality and you want everyone to enjoy the same standard of living which you do."

Peters: "...Representative Telcser, you just wore out your welcome.

If I might address myself to the Bill, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Peters: "...In somewhat serious kind of a thing. I was not jesting, Representative Telcser, but in fact I was reading for the Bill and that situation in fact does exist. My aunt does have an individual



who does live at the farm. And the Bill does provide...the Bill does provide a separate bath house, one for each sex, if this man should happen to get married, separate toilets and separate laundry facilities. Now, this gentleman just happens to live on the farm. Now, if she is going to be required to do this, I would expect that this would be an extreme hardship for her and she would probably have to tell the guy to move; but I'm sure that you in your wisdom could come up with another program to find small housing for him someplace which will only cost the state another \$50,000,000."

Telcser: "Well, Representative, I surely can amend the Bill in the Senate so that if it's a married couple it won't count."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise? If your compatriots wouldn't stand...I probably would've seen you. It's against the rules their standing up. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Daniels' by so seldom that they did crowd around here a little bit. Mr. Speaker, seriously on this Bill at one time we had thousands of acres of strawberries in the area where I live. We were dependent on migrant workers to pick those berries, and they came in by the hundreds to pick those. And we provided employment for them for three weeks every year. But the requirement of the Department of Health kept getting higher, and higher and higher, and we solved the problem. We plowed up the strawberries and planted soybeans, and then sell them for \$8 a bushel. And the migrant workers went on to Chicago and got on public aid. Now, you just keep on raising these requirements and you won't have any problems with migrant workers because you won't need any."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Telcser to close."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in closing let me simply repeat the people who come to Illinois are the only ones who will pick these crops. No one else wants to do the work. These people are decent, good family people who come to Illinois to make a living, to work. They don't come up here to, as many of you say on various other Bills, to get on programs or get on public aid. They're here to do stoop, hard labor that nobody in this House would do. And I've seen them work. They come to Illinois from the southern part of this country to work, they come with their children, they come with their families. They're good decent people. There are housing laws throughout this state, zoning laws in every city. So everybody can have a decent place to live, and that's all they want, and they're entitled to it. You can make all the jokes you want, but Illinois crops have to be picked. These people do it with stoop labor, they do it, they get paid by the basket, by the bushel. And they're entitled to a decent place to live. You ought to be for this Bill. It's a good Bill. It's for people; we serve for the poor and down-trodden. And you ought to support this Bill and quit making so God-damn many jokes about human suffering. Vote 'yes' on 1995."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In behalf of the 177 migrant workers right here, who live in a small room, who have a \$10,000,000,000 crop to pick, I think we ought to vote against this Bill."

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

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Trying to explain my vote and why we should vote for this Bill, I don't think I can do it any better than this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the whole 44th District I don't think there's a single migrant worker;



but, Art, you've convinced me with your passion, with your intensity and with your irrefutable logic. I'll vote 'aye'."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'yes' vote, it is a deplorable sight to see the migrant worker in the conditions. When we're driving down Route 51, and when we...in Representative Giorgi's car and his windows are clean and we can see out..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'aye' and 48 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1997. 1997."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1997, a Bill for an Act to prevent the City of East St. Louis to establish, operate, maintain and lease foreign trade zones and sub-zones with the corporate limits. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Youngue."

Youngue: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1997 is a request from the City of East St. Louis to the General Assembly of the State of Illinois to enact enabling legislation that is required by the United States Foreign Trade Board of the Department of Commerce before...which the City of East St. Louis wishes to file an application to establish a foreign trade zone and sub-zone within the corporate limits of East St. Louis. 1997 merely will provide the authorization for the city to apply to the United States Department of...of Commerce. Basically, the... in the United States Foreign Trade Zones' operating public utilities ...they're operated by a qualified corporations that are given grants of authority by the Foreign Trade Zone Board. Ordinarily, foreign goods coming into the United States must within 5 days have duties paid on them. In foreign trade zones, however, these goods can be stored and they can be assembled and they can be manufactured. Therefore, offering employment opportunities and storage opportunities for people who live in the United States and people who live in East St. Louis and an opportunity for businesses to assemble these goods here in America. And it will...we feel it will



help us to create a more favorable business climate in East St. Louis. And we ask for your favorable consideration of this matter. The City of East St. Louis is ready and able to establish the zone if permitted to do so by the Foreign Trade Board. And I thank you for this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong. I thought for the application for a foreign trade zone had to be made by a municipality and not by the City a firm who was authorized by the municipality. And I also thought, and maybe this has been done, that a feasibility study had to be made and submitted along with the application to the Foreign Trade Zone Board for such a thing to become a reality. I...as I say, maybe I'm wrong, but I think this Bill may have the cart before the horse; and if Representative Younge would enlighten me, I'd appreciate it."

Younge: "It is...the City of East St. Louis that will be making the application, and it is prepared to go forth with the application to the United States Foreign Trade Board of the Department of Commerce. And...but it is necessary first for there to be enabling legislation passed by the General Assembly permitting it to do so. And that's all we're doing here, we're permitting it to make an application."

Collins: "Well, now wait a minute, I think the way I understood it, and I think I misunderstood you, I believe that the city has to authorize a firm to make application. I don't think the city itself can make..."

Younge: "I...yes, I checked that specifically, Representative Collins, the city itself can make the application. I have checked the federal rules and regulations and I have verified that with the City Attorney and the city can make the application...it's supposed to do so."

Collins: "...I think you're wrong, but I can't say with any great authority. I hope you'll check it because I do believe you're in error."

Younge: "Yes, I...I...this came up specifically in Committee, Representative Collins, and a public corporation has to make the application."



And one word used in the definition under the Code of Federal Regulations is a municipality, that is, one form of public corporations. And it came up, and I checked it. And I'm satisfied that the city can go forward with this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "No..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been silent since my outburst this morning; but I've watched for about 2 hours now the Republican side of the aisle delay, stall, harass. I've seen Representative Telcser defeat a Bill, pass a Bill, make fun of it, only for one reason. So that we can't move in a reasonable fashion to discuss the Workmen's Compensation issue. I think that's wrong. I think again my motion would be in order to postpone the appropriate rule. And I think if that side of the aisle continues their havoc, we're going to have to listen to another one of Art Telcser pious speeches about the order of the House. And we all want to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close. 1997. Does anybody desire to speak on that? Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, very briefly this is a good Bill. The Sponsors worked very diligently, very hard. It represents a woman who is making every effort to feed her family, the people of East St. Louis. She is doing everything within that's within reason, she has tried to do it with the state help, she's tried to do it with state agencies, she's now even going to others to the degree that we're even trying to do it through foreign agencies. It represents an earnest attempt by a person to solve some of the grossly, grossly problems that exist in the City of East St. Louis in terms of employment. It's a meritorious Bill. It doesn't have any real opposition, and it does deserve the support of every Member of the House. And we would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I arise in



opposition to House Bill 1997; and I think that at least two points are worth making as far as my personal consideration of this Bill is concerned. First of all, it appears from the analysis and my knowledge of applicable federal and state regulations that this Bill if enacted into law by the House and Senate and signed by the Governor would be in direct contravention of federal law. And also in making my deliberations in these particular kinds of issue, I try to rely on the expertise of other Members of the General Assembly and people who...who can provide useful input to me in making my decision. And in this particular issue I've had a chance to speak with the likes of Representative Abramson, Representative Telcser, Representative Simms, Representative Deuster and Representative Totten. And I think the input that these people have provided me, and their insight and their knowledge of the law and the applicable federal and state regulations here involved would lead me to believe that this is a Bill that certainly ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized after the Roll Call on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Is that agreeable, Mr. Speaker? I don't want to speak on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recognized after we're finished with this Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

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

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

Younge: "I ask your support for this much-needed, enabling legislation for the City of East St. Louis."

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

Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote on this, this is extremely complicated issue. And the City of East St. Louis is trying to subvert to a certain extent what has been the practice."



But in addition of trying to help East St. Louis, their own City Council, I understand, by an ordinance they have passed are trying to obtain new business industry and other things, have passed ordinances to prohibit city contractors from hiring people outside the City of East St. Louis to do their work. And I think that's un-American and unconstitutional. And for that reason I'm going to vote 'no', and that's reason that I spoke, as Representative Telcser, about the matter, as well as Representatives Johnson and Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote. This is a matter that I have the privilege of being privvy, that is, in regard to applications for...of the kind that is requested here to be made by the City of East St. Louis. The...we have gone into this in the Economic Development Commission in past occasions. We secured one for the area of the port of Chicago. It is true there has to be a feasibility study before the application can be formally made. And the Lady informs me, the Sponsor of this Bill, that the feasibility study has been made. The...she is merely asking for the corporate authority to the city to now make a formal application. It has the area that can serve the whole St. Louis metropolitan area and bring a lot of money perhaps into that area that would come from the Missouri side as well as from Illinois. I see we have enough votes, and I thank the Members of this House for supporting the Lady."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye' and 20 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 2045."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2045..."

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

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put a motion...is...Representative Matijevecich on the floor? Representative Matijevecich, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to point out to you, Representative Matijevecich, that Representative Totten and I have consistently



supported your Adjournment Motions over the protests of Representative Ryan and Representative Telcser. A number of the Members have asked me about my health today. I did go to the hospital. I know that all of you have a great deal of sympathy as far as my physical condition is concerned. In view of that, I move we adjourn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and Representative McBroom, might I implore upon you just to hold that for 10 minutes at a minimum until I have an opportunity to talk to some people concerning one of the Bills and we'll be in a position to announce a program, 10 minutes?"

McBroom: "Fine."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald...Is there any objection to Representative Macdonald being recorded as 'aye' on...what number?"

...Not before we do it...2045, Representative Kucharski."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2045, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to regulate storage, transportation, sale and use of gasoline. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, 2059."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2059..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Clerk O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale on credit and the lending of money. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2083. Representative Laurino."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2083, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2083 amends the Election Code. And really what it does, it's a cleanup Amendment on an archaic procedure that should've been abolished years ago. The County Clerks Association all over the state have endorsed it, and I ask...urge an 'aye' vote."

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



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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Laurino, can you explain to me specifically what this Bill does?"

Laurino: "The lists that are printed...state...are...in registration have to be placed on all the polling places throughout the state 5 days before the election. It's virtually impossible."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this Bill. That Section of the...of the Election Code that this Bill amends; the Section that was put in there for...for protection purposes, Mr. Speaker, the Code now requires that specifically in those areas of...of transient housing where the mobility of those housings are moved for... very rapidly that listings be posted. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that Section of the Election Code is...is amended out, I can just envision, particularly in some of the precincts in the City of Chicago, all kind of election shenanigans going on with ghost voting and other kinds of things that causes the inability to really identify and specify the...the individual who was supposed to be voting and those who are not supposed to be voting. And for that reason, I would solicit an 'aye' vote...a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too rise in opposition to 2083. This was a Bill that we had some problem with in the Elections Committee; and I must confess to an error, we did let it out and without a dissenting vote. And I also will agree with the Sponsor to the extent that the Section that he's talking about may be archaic and may be inoperative to a certain degree. But Representative Madison is absolutely right, this requirement that would require all owners, managers and operators of hotels to file with the board a sworn report giving the names and descriptions of their lodgers prior to the election, this is



the only protection that we may have, the only protection that the Board of Election Commissioners may have as to ghost voting in hotels and lodging houses. The idea will be made that the...that the Bill should be passed because the law has been ignored. Well, that's not a good reason for repealing the law. The law should be enforced. This is a protection in the Election Code, one that we all should desire. It is a protection that was put in there to prevent the use of ghost voting; and I know that no Member of this House would be in favor of this type of illegal procedure. I think the Bill, while may be well-intentioned, I think is a mistake; and I would urge the Members of the House to resoundingly defeat this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose this Bill; but not reluctantly. The only argument that can be made for this Bill is that it causes a little extra work; but that little extra work is necessary to prevent some very old-fashioned, very historical and very famous kinds of vote fraud. This is the only way we have to prevent the use of what is known as 'floaters', transients who...who traditionally in the old days used to vote in double precincts. A very important piece of legislation to watch; and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt. Representative Bluthardt. Would you please sit down, Representative Telcser?"

Bluthardt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Most of what I had to say has already been said. But what we...what is...we've attempted here is to eliminate certain..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, Lechowicz, Meyers, Walsh, please sit down."

Bluthardt: "...certain provisions of the statute that were put in there for a very good reason and after very sad experiences. Those were the experiences of...as Representative Mugalian had pointed out of 'floater' voters coming out of the lodging houses, especially in Cook County. I think it would be a mistake to eliminate those and open it up to the same abuses that we experienced so much in



the past. And I would urge you to vote against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in opposition to this. I have quite a few transient dwellings in my district; and I believe we need this kind of protection. There are...you know, there is a lot of messing around with the elections from time to time. And there have been apartment houses in my district where, you know, five days before the election a lot of names are suddenly scotch taped onto mail boxes. In that way keeping people...being able to make use of ghost voting techniques. In one precinct we knocked 100 names off the poll list just before an election. The people hadn't lived there for years and without this kind of protection. I think we really open the door to some serious election abuses. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Huff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this Bill. I think it's a good Bill. I don't understand..."

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

Kelly: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the motion to move the previous question...now, are we voting on the Bill or moving it? I was in the opinion we were going to let the Sponsor close."

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe your point is well taken. I had problems here...meeting in the office. We did move the previous question. This is the vote on the Bill. The question...the question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Huff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Huff: "...Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to finish my remarks. I think this..."



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "...I think this is a good Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I heard somebody talking about 'floating'. I don't think he even understands the concept of a 'float'. But this Bill here as is so promulgated will prevent 'floating'. That's all I have to say, is very simply that. If you'd read the Bill, you'd see it's a protection against that sort of thing. It should be getting 89 votes right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished?"

Huff: "You're not reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an attempt to defraud the people of the State of Illinois. What I was trying to do was simplify the Election Code by stating that this is a...a costly procedure that is not enforced. The only place that's...tried to be enforced is in the City of Chicago and Cook County, downstate does not enforce it. There is no necessity to do it. There is no means to do it. There's no manpower to do it. There's no reason to have the damn Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 47 'aye', 85 'no'; this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 415, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 416, a Bill for an Act to provide for transfer of state monies for individual and family grant programs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 507, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 523, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 613, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 668, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 669, a Bill for an Act in relation to registration of plumbing contractors. First Reading of the Bill."



Senate Bill 766, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 819, a Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 834, a Bill for an Act to establish policy in the state agencies for emergency consumption analysis on major construction and renovation of buildings. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1069, a Bill for an Act to change the name 'University Civil Service System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1137, a Bill for an Act to create the management in forest preserve districts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1168, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning forestry districts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act for the creation and management of forest preserve districts. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll recognize you in a moment. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention please."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Madigan: "We are now in a position where we have proceeded down the Priority of Call to a point where there are only 11 Bills remaining on the Priority of Call until we have reached the bottom of the list. It is the desire of the Speaker to give all 11 of those Sponsors the opportunity to call their Bills tonight so that they have the benefit of a full Membership. I know that there are some who wish to adjourn right now; but I plead with you please give everyone an opportunity at least to present their Bill tonight and not take their chances on tomorrow. And I would request that if there is a motion to adjourn that you vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Just so you have some idea, the Sponsors of the Bills remaining are Representative Huskey, Representative Dan Houlihan, Representative Joe Lucco, Representative Bartulis, Representative McBroom, Representative Skinner, Representatives Telcser, Ryan and



Peters, Redmond, Representative Ryan, I guess that's...Representatives
Tipsword and Chapman. Those are the Sponsors of the remaining
Bills. 2118, Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion to adjourn and request
a Roll Call. They get beat on it, they get beat on it. I...
we've wasted enough time here today. I move we adjourn."

Speaker Redmond: "Some of us were here all the time, too. The
question's...the question's..."

McBroom: "I was at the hospital, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that we
adjourn. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Repre-
sentative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, may I just point
out to the Member who just spoke. He has my deepest sympathy as
far as being in the hospital; but this House is a far cry from the
Senate, who are quite proud of the fact of being a House Member;
and, in turn, we work. And I strongly recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the
record. On this question there's 22 'aye' and 109 'no'; the
Gentleman's motion fails."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Personal privilege, please."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

McClain: "I would...my inclination usually is to support the Speaker
on these kinds of motions; but I don't particularly think it's
wise. I've continually held and every time that I've talked with
the Speaker that the Membership ought to recess for...for dinner
so that the Members can relax, get a decent meal and come back.
Representative Getty right now is laying down because he's got
high blood pressure. Mr. McBroom, I think, has every right to
put that motion. I think there are cheap shots going around; and
I don't appreciate it. My dad had an illness here on the floor.
We've had deaths here before. And I don't think it's right to
for us to work like that continually. You ought to have breaks,
and you ought to be concerned about the health of the Membership."



Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2118. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2118. A Bill for an Act to provide for the management and regulation of defined coastal zones in the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis."

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point, Mr. Davis."

C. Davis: "This is my 36th year in this General Assembly. When I came here, they had the distinguished Judge Elmer Schnackenberg. I thought he was a great Parliamentarian and a great Speaker and we've had many great Speakers of the House, but I'm going to tell you now, our present Speaker ranks with the greatest Speakers this House has ever had and you can take it from me. He's fair and he's just and he gives everybody a consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2118. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. It's been read and Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This isn't to speak to the Bill. This is strictly a procedural question. Due to the tremendous significance of this Bill, I'd like to ask whether or not the home rule powers are violated. Therefore, whether it would take 107 or 89 votes. Appreciate a ruling. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian informs me the Bill would require 89 votes to pass. Mrs. Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've not been a Member of this Body very long but I've been here long enough to know that Representatives Macdonald and Williams and I are the Principal Sponsors of a Bill that's hardly Consent Calendar material. House Bill 2118 is a controversial Bill because of misinformation, apprehension and because it's a new concept of Lake Michigan shoreline management. It sets up a Federal-state, state-local government partnership to oversee the current and future life of the fifty-nine miles of the Illinois portion of Lake Michigan. In 1972, the President signed into law the United States Coastal Zone Act. The Act was written with the growing recognition of the great resources that are the sea coastal areas and the great lakes."



The fact that economic, recreational use, ecological and environmental concern and shoreline erosion can become major problems calls for positive Federal action. Under the Federal Act, thirty-four states and territories were offered the option of devising coastal management programs to meet their specific needs. Illinois was one of the states given a gubernatorial mandate to pursue such a program for eventual submission to this General Assembly for its approval prior to submission to the United States Department of Commerce for certification of the participating states. That certification is the beginning of the three-way partnership - the Federal-state relationship. The Federal Act requires that we address the basics of erosion, environment, ecology, economic growth and recreation as they specifically apply to the Illinois Lake Michigan shoreline. The incentive is, of course, finding. Illinois, if this Act passes, will receive 1.2 million dollars per year for each of the next five years. Sure, it's the old carrot and stick routine, but it's also a return from the United States government to the State of Illinois the responsibility for our own coordinated management and preservation of our own section of Lake Michigan as well as the return of our own money. Our program must be reviewed and recertified for each of those five years by the Commerce Department to make sure we're carrying out the programs, but the Feds are giving a little, too. Once our management act is certified, any United States activity along our shoreline is subject to Illinois guidelines. The language of the Federal legislation indicates that they are subject to Illinois shoreline management laws to the extent practicable. It's a delightfully debatable statement for the lawyers of the House, of course, but generally accepted by the thirty-four states as meaning that the state's management act would prevail in all cases except in military national emergencies. Now, to the state's local government portion of the partnership concept. Three years of study, public hearings, scientific research and administrative review with the public and the affected municipalities indicate that not only do the municipalities recognize the need for government assistance to solve problems larger than their financial capacity



to handle them, but they are also administratively capable of meeting the state's guidelines. For consistent with the Federal act... intent, Illinois will lose management of the shoreline to the certified municipalities. Minimal state guidelines are the basis for certification to achieve the necessary coordinated effort to combat erosion, provide recreation, enhance commercial development, and protection of the environment and ecological interests that impact Lake Michigan. If a municipality does not choose to be certified, they need not and the state will review permits within the coastal zone only after the property owner has met his municipality's building codes and ordinances. So why all this rhu-barb? If this legislation delegates the state's authority to municipalities, provides the money for administrative technical, engineering and planning costs not only to the municipalities, but through them even to local park districts for a myriad of purposes to enhance recreational capabilities along the shore. The controversy, Ladies and Gentlemen, developed over the establishment of our coastal zone. Once again, the municipalities of the shoreline participated in the determination of what the zone would be. The coastal zone is from the water's edge of the western boundary of the lakefront property, the first thoroughfare or five hundred feet, whichever is closer. Incidentally, any change in the established coastal zone under this legislation can only be made by the certified municipality and the state after public hearings or in the case of the noncertified municipalities, by an act of the General Assembly. Why has all of our program development been done with municipalities? Because with the exception of a quarter of a mile of the fifty-nine miles, the entire area is within the jurisdiction of one municipality or another, excluding, of course, Fort Sheridan, Great Lakes and Illinois Beach Park. They incidently are in the coastal zone under this Bill with the five hundred foot subject to state review should any land modification take place or be considered that would adversely affect the lake. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the thrust of this legislation is totally the preservation of Lake Michigan and its shoreline for future generations. That lake in one form or another serves



the immediate needs of six million people. It serves the economic and commercial needs of the eleven million residents of Illinois. This is not kooky legislation with no purpose. Its purpose is profound whether you live in Waukegan, Kenilworth, Chicago, Decatur, or Carbondale. That purpose is one immense body of water called Lake Michigan and it's our lake. I ask you to put aside the rubbish you've heard about land use and zoning and Federal intervention in our coastal zone. Look at the legislation and even look at your staff analysis. The answers are there for anyone. This Bill provides for a state-local partnership that does no more than preserve the integrity of this valuable body of water. I ask your support of 2118."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I suppose little could be said to improve on Representative Reed's presentation of House Bill 2118. As a Chief Cosponsor with Representative Williams and Representative Reed, I rise in support of this vitally important legislation. And I'd like to emphasize and review several points that she has made. First, the need for the Bill. As Vice-Chairman of Bob Mann's Lake Michigan Study Committee during the 78th General Assembly and as a Member of the Water Resources Commission for four and a half years, I've been privileged to work with concerned people who have joined at many levels of interest to resolve the ever-growing deterioration that faces Lake Michigan shores. As Members of the Water Resources Commission, we had worked with the Division of Water Resources of the Department of Transportation since 1973 to develop a program that would qualify Illinois to participate in the Federal coastal zone management program, thereby, bring much needed help to relieve some of our more acute shoreline problems. The incidents of toxic chemicals, the alarming threat of extinction of valuable fish and wildlife, coastal flooding and bluff recession have cause irreparable damage. Ladies and Gentlemen, drinking water supply and water related matters will be one of the most serious concerns of this decade and we cannot abdicate our responsibility by not taking action at once. We have lost over six



hundred thousand cubic yards of valuable shoreline in less than a dozen years and have sustained twenty-million dollars in property damage along our fifty-nine mile shoreline since 1972. When one considers that six million people depend on Lake Michigan on a daily basis, it is ridiculous to say that we don't have a problem or to suggest that we have adequately supplied answers to our expanding lake deterioration. As one who ordinarily rejects Federal intervention in any form, I find myself in agreement with Congress in the creation of the 1972 Coastal Zone Management Act. It is the direct responsibility of elected officials at all levels to preserve our natural resources and to our Illinois Congressman's great credit, all but one Congressman who was absent, voted for the Bill. Philosophy and partisan affiliation weren't issues apparently in passing the Act because my own distinguished, conservative Congressman, Phillip Crane, joined with liberal and other conservative Congressmen in both parties to pass the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act into law. As Representative Reed has stated, Illinois is the only state of the thirty states qualified to participate in the Federal coastal program that has included local municipalities in its certification and management plan. This Bill respects individual rights by relying on local permit powers, administrative review and last but not most important, in giving the sole powers to change any future boundaries to this General Assembly in Springfield. We have made every effort through detailed, extensive local hearings to communicate and meet criticism of this legislation. We have spent days revising this Bill to accommodate specific objections. This is an excellent Bill and is urgently needed. And I implore you to heed the needs of millions of people who currently depend on Lake Michigan and the millions yet unborn who deserve the heritage that only we can give them. Now, I think that Representative Williams, Representative Reed and I will be happy to answer any questions when that time comes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Porter."

Poter: "Mr. Speaker, could we have some order? This is a very important Bill."



Speaker Madigan: "Would the Membership please give their attention to Mr. Porter? Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to take my full time. I might need it. Obviously, the Sponsor gets to open and close and to explain her vote and it may take a little bit of time, not too much.

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree that Lake Michigan is a public trust for all of the people of the State of Illinois and I agree also that the purpose of this legislation, that is to protect and enhance the shoreline of Lake Michigan, is a salutary purpose. I agree that the Sponsor is a lovely lady and my good friend and she's done a fine job with this Bill and I have no quarrel with her whatever. But none of this is the issue before us. The issue is the contents of this Bill as it was amended by Amendments 7 and 35 which admittedly improve the Bill. The question is whether the General Assembly should enact into law a new bureaucracy acting under Federal and state standards, but statutory and regulatory to take from the local community, control over all land along Lake Michigan shoreline. The issue, of course, is not where the land is located, it could just as well be located in your district as in mine, but whether the local control over land use should be taken away and given over to the state under Federal and state standards. The Sponsors have said over and over again that land use is not the issue and, in fact, was not even mentioned in the Act. Let me assure you that land use is, in fact, the issue and is mentioned in the Federal Act, in the Federal regulations and, in fact, in this Bill. For example, the Federal regulations say the management program must contain documentation by the Governor or his designated legal officer that all existing, projected and potential land and water uses within the coastal zone may be controlled by anyone or a combination of the following techniques. And then later on, they say within the perimeter set forth in the requirement, there is a large variety of tools which the management program could adopt for controlling land and water uses. The Act itself says the management program shall include the following management practices and policies, a planning process that provides for consideration of local, regional



state, interstate and national interest in the coastal zone, the policies and purposes of this Act and the Department's guidelines for land and water uses. So obviously, that is the issue in this case. Amendment 35 which was mine attempts to limit the scope of the Act by stating that all the power that is intended to be taken away from local government, its permit control over construction and land modification activities within the coastal zone.

Could we have a little attention, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Would the... presumably, would the Membership please give their attention to Mr. Porter and would the Doorkeepers please remove all unauthorized personnel from the chamber. However, Speaker Redmond informed me that the, those vitally interested in this Bill, I presume that's Mrs. Macdonald and Mrs. Reed and Mr. Williams and Mr. Porter and Mr. Keats have been authorized to have certain staff people with them during this particular debate. But aside from those people, if the Doorkeepers would please remove all unauthorized persons from the floor. Would the Members please be in their chairs? Would the Members please be in their chairs except the Minority Leader and his assistant and proceed, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Amendment 35 attempts to limit the scope of the Act by limiting it to permit control over construction of land use modification activities within the coastal zone. Presumably, this means at least that a couple would still be able to go to Gilson Park in Wilmette to watch the submarine races as they have previously without the Secretary of Transportation appearing at the window to ask for a permit. But you shouldn't be fooled it seems to me. Construction and land modification authority in the hands of the state is pretty effective land use authority since almost every use of land except just standing on it involves some kind of a construction or land modification activity. Finally, the authority being taken is land use authority and plainly the Bill takes this authority away from the local government and takes it to the state level under Federal and state law and regulations. The argument that the local government loses nothing is obviously a fallacious argument. The Federal law requires the state to take control. In other states that have miles of undeveloped shoreline or offshore



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

oil potential; there may be some excuse for that. But Illinois with its sixty-three miles of shoreline is totally developed and all within municipal limits. There is no excuse in Illinois. While the Act provides for certification of local communities to carry out the Federal and state standards and rules, this is only as an agent of the state. If the local communities fail to carry out the state management plan, the community can be decertified by the Secretary of Transportation and then the authority, the permit authority that's so important over construction and land use, land modification activity in that municipality is exercised directly by the state. The bottom line of this Act no matter what is written into it is the question of who has ultimate control over land use in the coastal zone. And the answer is, the state. Now, you might think that because the Sponsor represents a district along the shoreline that shoreline district Representatives are generally for this Bill. While I can't speak for the Democrats, I can tell you that six of the seven Republicans in the four districts north of Chicago are very much opposed to this legislation. One of the reasons why is that this Bill despite representation to the contrary has not one penny in it for real help for the erosion problem. The Federal money in this Bill is not for sea walls or breakwaters or riprap or other erosion control devices. The money is entirely for administration of the management program itself and for technical assistance and planning. I repeat, the money is only for planning and management of the land use permit control program itself. There's no money for erosion control, construction or devices. So what we are giving up is the entire local control over land use in the coastal zone in return for money and very much money at that. There's 1.2 million along the whole coastline, presumably about seventy-eight thousand dollars, for example, for Evanston. What we're giving up is entire local control over land use in the coastal zone for administering those Federal and state land use controls and for planning under them. We are giving up a great deal and getting very little. Mr. Speaker, that's simply too high a price to pay. And it needn't be paid. The program was put into place by the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Governor's Executive Order in 1974 and is and will continue to be funded until 1979 by a 100% Federal fund. There is absolutely no necessity to adopt this legislation this year. We have lived without it in Illinois for a hundred and fifty-nine years and taking sufficient time to study it and to come up with a program that does not usurp local control entirely. It's clearly a reasonable approach. In summing up, I want to say that most of the coastal Legislators outside of Chicago oppose this legislation. The Bill is plainly Federal and state usurpation of local control over land use. The Bill has regional planning implications. The small amount of Federal and state money is not to construct ero-sion control devices but only for management of the land use control program and for planning. There is no real help for the erosion problem in this Bill. The legislation need not be adopted this year. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge your opposition to this legislation. If it were in one of your districts, I would not want to impose it upon you and I beg you to withhold your support from H.B. 2118."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, out of courtesy to the Sponsors, could I ask that Representative Williams speak ahead of me as a proponent and I will speak after Representative Williams."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keats, my thought was that you might speak now and I would recognize someone that I know will move for the previous question. Then Mr. Williams could close and then we can go to a Roll Call."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your fairness is, as usual, excellent and I do appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker, yes, it has been said this is one of the most controversial Bills to come before the 80th General Assembly. It is controversial because of the precedent it sets. This Bill gives the Federal government a toehold in Illinois land planning. But this is a very novel toehold. It is novel because of the ingenious approach. These are Federal guidelines that are administered by local officials. Here are your guidelines. Many of you have seen the Federal guidelines



and you can read them on your own to see exactly what they cover. The point being as the Federal guidelines override whatever we do even though they are administered on the local level. Okay, and we now have to deal with the question, if we have these Federal guidelines, we have to remember that local control will be eroded because this is Federal money given because of a Federal Act. And we all know that Federal money has Federal strings called the regulations that I have shown you. And, but I still say at this early point in my talk I want you to remember. If you believe the Federal government has a right to control local land and if you believe Federal bureaucrats are fair and reasonable, then I believe you truly should support this Bill. But if you believe as I do in the importance of local control and limited bureaucratic red tape, then please vote 'no' on this, the Scenic Rivers Bill of northern Illinois. I want to commend the Sponsor of this Bill as being well-intentioned. This Bill is a great idea. It is simply a bad Bill. This Bill was initiated by former Governor Walker. His people held hearing after hearing on this Bill throughout the state. I just wish they had listened more closely to the numerous people who opposed this broad a Bill. Now, let me enlighten you as to why so many people including what seems to be about 90% of my district oppose this specific Bill without in any way opposing the concept it's based on. This Bill does not do what is hoped. The only reason this Bill exists is to get Federal money. The only reason it exists is to get Federal money. And yet, people from the Illinois Lakefront Association have contacted the Department of Commerce and their contacts say that as long as the Calumet River is excluded and if you read the Federal regulations you can see exactly how they refer to contiguous land, there can be no Federal money as long as the Calumet River is not in the Bill. All you have to do is read the regs. to see it. And even if we do get money, I'm saying the chances of getting the money are only 50/50. The Department of Commerce has told some people will get the money, told other people we won't. Even if we get the money, not one dime and let me remind you, not one dime does anything to solve shore erosion problems.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Every penny goes to pay bureaucrats to look at the lake and tell me we've got shore erosion problems. Why, I invite any person in this room to join me and walk through Lake Bluff or other parts on the shore and we can take two seconds of observation and realize we have got some erosion problems. We definitely have them and yet this Bill does not give one dime to solve the problems. Now, again we have to remember certain other facts. If we were to get any money to begin, we would have to say what areas are in the worst shape and what needs help. Number one, the three worst erosion areas on Lake Michigan are Fort Sheridan, Great Lakes, and Lake Bluff. Fort Sheridan and Great Lakes are Federal land. Federal land is excluded from this Act as it is always excluded from a Federal Bill. Therefore, the two worst erosion areas, Great Lakes and Fort Sheridan, are not covered by the Act to begin with. The next worst area is Lake Bluff. Almost all the land we're talking about is private land. You cannot and we should not use taxpayers money to subsidize private land. And so, the three worst erosion areas will not get one penny to help their problems as is true of the entire area. Also, I want you to remember the opposition to this Bill is not simply local. The opposition to this Bill has been throughout the state and petitions have been signed in numerous towns. Here I've got stacks of petitions that you can see and let me read you some of the towns that are opposed to this Bill or have signed petitions. You might recognize the names of towns of yours. Elkhart, Bolingbrook, Calumet City, Rockford, Champaign, Normal, Glenwood, Danville, Glen Ellyn, Urbana, Lake Zurich, Skokie, Berwyn, Oak Park, Broadview, Bradley, La Grange, Lake Bluff, Oak Forest, Winnetka, Kenilworth, Willmette, Glencoe, Highland Park, Lake Forest. No, these are not my districts. Naperville, Homewood, Hyde Park area, Bradley, Rock Island, Palatine, Evanston, Rantoul, Pekin, Glenview, Morton Grove, Decatur, Peoria, Champaign, Park Ridge and dozens more towns. These petitions have been circulated in opposition to the Bill. Could we have a little quiet please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Members just please give their attention to Mr. Keats and could you bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Keats?"



Keats: "I will. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, the last point to remember. The towns directly affected by this Bill have been badgered for three years to support this year, support this Bill. Yet, only one town. I remind you, yet only one affected town has endorsed this Bill and they have been badgered for three years to do so. I believe the fact that only one town has endorsed the Bill and several have refused and come out publicly opposed to it. I believe this speaks for itself. I close by asking my fellow Members of the House to vote 'no'. This Bill is a great idea. Everyone supports the idea, but regretablely, this Bill does not do what is intentioned and I ask you to please vote 'no' on what is the Scenic Rivers Bill of northern Illinois. I thank you for your attention."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, if the train schedule's over, I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall the main question now be put? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Mr. Williams is recognized to close the debate."

Williams: "Yes, and I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had a lot more I was going to say but because of the time I'm just going to wind up in a very short way. I'd like to answer in a little way here some of the comments here from Representative Porter and Representative Keats. I'd like to point as a municipal official I can certainly understand that municipalities... actually, traditionally and quite properly have authority within their jurisdiction and I detect here there's an innate fear on the part of a few shoreline communities that the state would usurp land control over land use and zoning. I see absolutely no fear of big brother in this Bill. Since it is... truly as we have heard here, it is a truly a Federal, state and a local partnership. With the local government and I want to emphasize, the local government having the greatest say so in the implementation of this entire program. And by local implementation it means that there is a greater local involvement in coastal



zone management. It means more attention to local concern. It means that local government will be receiving financial assistance from the state and these monies will be actually passed on through the municipalities and the county, Lake County, to the other units to assist them in, actually in the management of the portions of the Illinois coastal zone within their respective jurisdiction. I'd like to emphasize that the Illinois coastal zone program is the first of the coastal states to involve local government in the implementation and the management of program decisions affecting them. I wish to emphasize also that the protection of our shoreline in a battle against erosion is of urgent importance. Some communities... I don't know if I'm on or not. Some communities have actually tried unsuccessfully to prevent erosion and I compliment them for the efforts that they have endeavored to make. However, by their own admission, they say they lack the expertise and the financial help to prevent it. Erosion is like a contagious disease and the faster it spreads, the higher the cost for protection. It is for this reason that the hazard area has to be defined and all communities contained within the coastal zone area have to have respect for each other. I should think that the municipalities would welcome the engineering and the technical expertise that will be made available to them through the program. I'd like to quote a few words from the Chicago Tribune endorsement here from the other day. And it says, 'There is a good deal more reason to fear what will happen if the program is not approved than what will happen if it is approved.' I could go through a list about ten times longer than the list of towns here that was mentioned here by Representative Keats, but I don't want to make this sound like a train station as I heard. But there are a lot of municipalities that would like this and I urge your 'aye' vote. I'll be ready to answer any kind of questions on it."

Speaker Madigan: "Please be advised that the opponents to this legislation have already stated that if the Bill gets 89 votes, they intend to verify. Therefore, please do not push the switches of those who are not here. The question is... Mr. Porter."

Porter: "I'm sorry to interrupt, but I would like leave to put into the



record an analysis as to how many votes is required simply to preserve it. Can I have leave? It's a written statement. It has been submitted to the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to file that written statement with the Clerk. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The question is, shall House Bill 2118 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have voted 'yes' in the Subcommittee hearing on this Bill because I gave my word to the Sponsors with my right to reserve to change my vote in the final hearing of the Bill. I did ask to go into more research on it and I'd like to point out something. None of the services that our municipalities need are furnished by this, especially by this Bill. They can be furnished by the Department of Transportation at the present time for expert advice on the shoreline protection also the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the E.P.A. and other agencies. And I might tell you that the Federal Act under which this is all based is very controlling. This is a Federal, like state, land use plan. I would not inflict it on anyone else. My two big park districts, Waukegan and Zion, are definitely opposed to this Bill. My Mayors, there's two Mayors who are against this. And I'm telling you right now all this Bill does is add another political boondoggle by the Gentleman who's pushing it who worked for N.I.P.C. and that's Peter Wise who's right over there and this is just another one of those big political payrollers. And this is what it is. A million and a half for what? No building of walls. This is what we need - sea walls. Why don't we wait till 1979 and have this Bill amended so that we'll have those walls implemented in the Federal Act. This is nothing else but advice and management consultation and so forth. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly, I live in the coastal area. I do not feel this Bill is in the best interest of my area and my district. And I might add one thing further. Northwestern University has made a very fine analogy about it and showed that this will preempt home rule whether you like it



or not. Just remember this, Ladies and Gentlemen. I ask you not to pass this Bill at this time."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hudson, to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote and I do so with all do respect to the very fine Sponsors of this proposal, but we all know that the Federal government and certain Members of Congress have made attempts in recent years to gain control of land, to occupy the field of local land use planning and control. So far, they've been unsuccessful but this as has been described before is a very unique way in the backdoor to do the same to accomplish what they have not been able to do, but to do it in another way. I would remind you, my colleagues that George Washington many, many, many years ago suggested that government is indeed a fearsome master. And it must be guarded and it must be controlled and it must be watched or it will like fire consume anything that stands in it's way including the very people that it's supposed to protect. And this is a case in point. Yes, this is big brother government coming in and it needs to be watched. There are two ways in which government can gain control over the lives of our citizens. And one is through the control of our money, our financial resources. And the other is through control of our land. And I will suggest that that is what this is all about and that is what the Federal government is all about. We up in our way have seen N.I.P.C. N.I.P.C. started out as an advisory council. It was harmless. I wasn't going to do anything. But I'll tell you people are up in arms about the control now that N.I.P.C. seems to be operating and this will be another... this will be another... Mr. Speaker, this will be another attempt to do the same thing and it will put the Federal government in control. As the monies come down into the municipalities and into the localities, they will have to meet Federal guidelines and this is where the control comes in. Yes, there is the implication of regional government here and it... there is... Wait till I get in tune with that. Totten, stop it, will ya? There is the implication of regional government here and this will indeed lend it-self to Federal control and make government the fearsome master



that George Washington suggested it could if we don't watch it." I would urge you, my colleagues, to consider very carefully your vote and do not give this attempt at Federal preemption of our local affairs a green light. On the contrary, give it a resounding 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Campbell, to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of my vote, I would particularly like to appeal to the, both the Republicans and Democrats downstate. Let us recognize this legislation for what it really is. It is a land use power grab. It is the usurpation of local authority and this is the upstate Scenic Rivers Bill and I ask each and every one of you to vote 'no' on it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know it's very late. I want to say that the Federal Act was passed five years ago. There is no rush. The Bill that was introduced was in defective form, as you know, and an Amendment had to be put in, a thirty-page Amendment striking the enacting clause, putting the whole thing out. Last week, some of you will remember that I asked if I might have some time over the weekend to look the Bill over and see if I couldn't offer a constructive Amendment to improve it. I prepared such an Amendment but I must say to my colleagues so that you know that some of us are not being obstructionists but we want to be constructive that the Sponsors chose not to return the Bill to consider the Amendment. I'm sorry about that. I... Representative Reed is my colleague in the same district and I respect her efforts and her leadership and her expertise in the area of water resources management. I do have to represent the people that I feel are violently opposed to this Bill in this form. I think that the Bill, as you will notice or looking at the analysis, it's two long yellow pages on our side. If anybody on this floor understands it, you're a superior Legislator.. This Bill does need a lot more work and I want to express in closing my appreciation to those of you who are voting red and yellow and you're not from this district. This is our local



problem up there in a way and I appreciate your understanding of our great concern and your vote is allowing us to at least have an opportunity to shape this legislation into a form that might be accepted. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Luft, to explain his vote."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to comment very briefly on the Federal funds we've mentioned at numerous in the statements here. Our budget in the State of Illinois totalling over ten billion dollars has some two billion, one hundred million dollars of Federal funds coming into the State of Illinois of which we build highways that are gone in about five to ten years. We put people on public aid which somehow they get off and back on within two or three months. We do everything we can and nothing seems to have some degree permanency. I feel we desperately need some program like this to protect our shores. It appears to me after reading the analysis and hearing the testimony that there is some degree of local control. There has been local input. The financing is available and I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that what we do with this money and the product we come with will last much longer than the roads and the bridges and the buildings we are building. I would suggest and hope that we support House Bill 2118."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis, to explain his vote."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to point out that one of the previous speakers addressed himself to the downstaters and indicated that this was a monumental land grab. Well if it is, the people who own most of the land downstate, the Illinois Farm Bureau and the Illinois Agricultural Association, support House Bill 2118. So think about that downstaters and rural area Legislators."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote for one minute."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be brief. I had the privilege my freshman term of serving on the Lake Michigan Study Committee and in five full day-long hearings, I learned an awful lot about the environment and the shoreline. And one thing I learned that what happens at one end of the lake will have serious consequences at the other end of the lake due to the drift. I think



something like this is needed and I knew at that time that we'd get into a conflict between units of local government and the state. But I think if we're going to have a coordinating agency, there has got to be state involvement because we're all in it together."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Katz, to explain his vote for one minute."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I speak particularly at this late hour because I do come from the same district where my colleagues have spoken against this Bill. I think it is short-sighted indeed to view the problem as one of a few owners along the shore of Lake Michigan. Lake Michigan is a priceless heritage of this state and it shall not come again. And it is wholly, really unrealistic to think that the problems of Lake Michigan and the enormous erosion along the shores can be handled on any basis other than a coordinated basis. And indeed the principal beneficiaries of the preservation of Lake Michigan will be the very shore owners now who are very concerned about the effects of Federal involvement. There are many areas where indeed one may question whether the Federal government ought to be in and whether coordination is required. But no one can reasonably believe that it is possible to deal with the problems of Lake Michigan on an internal basis. The Village of Glencoe or the Village of Kenilworth cannot contain Lake Michigan. The problems of that lake will only be solved if all of us work together within the framework of... (microphone turned off)."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote for one minute."

Dyer: "In one minute, yes. I'm shocked at those who seem to think this is a north shore problem or even an Illinois problem. It happens that my daughter is living in the State of Michigan and was working very hard in her own local community and local county there at the stages of public hearings and involvement of local zoning officials in setting up local zoning ordinances to meet the standards in this plan. It's the same steps that are required in this very good Bill. We're talking about much more than the north shore or Illinois. Both parties have been leaders in conservation of great natural resources in our country. In our party, Teddy Roosevelt set aside great natural resources. We should,



both parties should support this good Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote for one minute."

Stuffle: "Some of us downstaters are rather unhappy with the whole concept of scenic rivers in this particular Bill. I think my colleague from the 53rd, Representative Campbell, hit it right on the head. This shouldn't get 89 votes. It's a shot at construction rights and property rights and repairing rights. And if anything flies in the face of home rule, this Bill certainly does."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote for one minute."

Skinner: "Well, that's better than flying in the face of nature which is what Northwestern University did when they built their library on a landfill that juts out into Lake Michigan. Now, for Northwestern University to be against this thing is just incredible because they have probably caused most of the erosion on the north shore."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote for one minute."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I kind of relate this to the pension system. You know, with the unfunded accrued liability in the pension system which goes over six billion dollars, we're talking about today's services and we're transferring the payment for that out ten, twenty, thirty and forty years in the future. This is an area where I think we can address the problem today by something that's right out on the short-term resolving of this problem, address ourselves to this problem right now. And for that reason, I'm voting 'aye'. I think that this particular Bill addresses itself to something that should be done now and it's... yes, that's exactly right, Representative Totten. And for that reason, I vote 'aye', just because Representative Totten is voting 'no'. No other reasons."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay, have all voted who wished? Mrs. Macdonald, to explain her vote for one minute."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I regret that we are in this posture at this time of night with a piece of legislation this important. I would only like to say that this in no way is a northern Scenic Rivers Bill. There is no relationship. This is an intergovernmental cooperative Bill



and the Federal government in it's plans and I would like to read what it says. In Section D of 6 or 5 it says, 'Prior to granting approval of the mangement program, the Secretary shall find that the state acting through its chosen agency or agencies including local governments, area-wide agencies designated under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 on interstate agencies has the authority for the management of the coastal zone according to the management program. Such authority shall include powers to administer land and water regulations, control development in order to insure compliance with the management program and to resolve conflicts among competing uses.' Ladies and Gentlemen, the man from the Department of Commerce who came to testify for this Bill... (microphone turned off)."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote for one minute."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just wanted to point out that there is at least one rather large town along Lake Michigan which is supporting this legislation and that's the City of Chicago. My district happens to border Lake Michigan and while I think a lot of residents in my district don't think this is the perfect solution for preservation of the shoreline, we think it's a reasonable solution and we would like to see enactment of this legislation. I ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 29 'nos', 22 voting 'present'. Mrs. Macdonald requests a poll of the absentees. And then Mr. Keats requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call and would all Members please be in their chairs. Would all Members please be in their chairs. Proceed with a poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Bennett, Bluthardt, Bradley, Capparelli, Chapman, Deavers, Domico, Epton, Griesheimer, Hart, Jacobs, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Kornowicz, Lauer, Madison, Mann, Peggy Smith Martin, McAuliffe, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pierce, Ryan, Schoeberlein, Stanley, Stearney, Von Boeckman, and Waddell."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Von Boeckman. Record Mr. Von Boeckman as 'aye'."



Beginning count is 95. Proceed with a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, E.M. Barnes, Birchler, Bowman, Brady, Brandt, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Catania, Christensen."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, could we have the courtesy of Members returning to their seats and raising their hands? Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Members please return to their chairs."

Clerk O'Brien: "Collins, Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Flann, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Greiman, Hoffman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Huskey, Jaffe, Johnson, Katz, Kelly, Kempiners, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Marovitz, Matejek, Mautino, McAvoy, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Pechous, Pouncey, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schneider, Shumpert, Skinner, Steczo, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Tipsword, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Wall, Willer, Williams, Wolf, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would ask for Representative Ewell."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell. Is Mr. Ewell in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Keats: "Representative Getty."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Getty. Is Mr. Getty in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Keats: "Representative... he's back, excuse me. Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe is on the Democratic side."

Keats: "Representative Klosak."

Speaker Madigan: "Klosak. How is the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Keats: "Representative Kozubowski."

Speaker Madigan: "Kozubowski."

Keats: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kozubowski's in the chamber."

Keats: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kosinski. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Keats: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Keats: "Skip over Representative Laurino. Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Marovitz. He's in Mr. Hanahan's chair."

Keats: "Representative McGrew. No, he's here. Representative McMaster."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McMaster's in his chair."

Keats: "McAvoy."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAvoy is in his chair."

Keats: "Representative Mudd."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mudd is in his chair."

Keats: "Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mugalian is in his chair."

Keats: "He's here. Mulcahey."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mulcahey is... Mr. Mulcahey."

Keats: "Not here, take him off please."

Speaker Madigan: "Is the Gentleman... is Mr. Mulcahey here?"

Keats: "Will you please take him off the record? Will you please quit stalling and take him off the record?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll."

Keats: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative who?"

Keats: "Schneider."

Speaker Madigan: "Schneider. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Keats: "Representative Shumpert."



Speaker Madigan: "Remove Mr. Schneider from the Roll Call. Mr. Shumpert is in the chamber."

Keats: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Steczo is in his chair."

Keats: "Representative Telcser."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative who?"

Keats: "Telcser."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Telcser is in the chamber."

Keats: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich is in his seat."

Keats: "Representative Wall."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wall is in his chair."

Keats: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Willer is in the front of the chamber."

Keats: "Representative Younge."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Younge is in her chair."

Keats: "Representative Yourell."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell is in his chair."

Keats: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Garmisa is in his chair."

Keats: "Darrow."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Darrow is in his chair. Representative Martin."

Martin: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Keats: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keats, please. How is Mrs. Martin recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady's recorded as voting 'present'."

Martin: "Please switch me to 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mrs. Martin as 'aye'."

Keats: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor is in his chair. Mr. Ewell has returned to the rear of the chamber. Mr. Jones. Record Mr. Jones as 'aye' and Mr. Mulcahey has returned... Emil Jones. Record Emil Jones as 'aye'. Mr. Ewell has returned to the chamber. Mr. Mulcahey has returned to the chamber. Mr. Beatty 'aye'."

Keats: "Wolf."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Keats: "With that, thank you very much for your fairness. Mr. Chairman, I believe that's a very honest Roll Call and I appreciate your running it this fairly. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question there are 93 'ayes', 29 'nays'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Harris, I can tell you how you're recorded but it was a verified Roll Call and announced so that we're not in a position to change any votes now."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2186, Mr. Huskey."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2186. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to divorce. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Huskey. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take that... Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I think if you could provide me a little order here maybe I could... Mr. Speaker, I was kind of in hopes that maybe you could provide me a little order, but I will go ahead anyway and... to expedite things. House Bill 2186 provides a new court procedure to collect delinquent child support payments. Presently, when a delinquency occurs, the parent having custody of the child must hire an attorney, having had a petition prepared, file a petition with the court, have notice and a copy served on the defendant, go to court for a hearing, and then again have to prove the delinquency. Under House Bill 2186 in cases where payments of child support will be made to the Court Clerk when a delinquency occurs and continues for thirty days with ten additional days for the Clerk simply to bring the matter to the attention of the court which may then take any action deemed appropriate. The parent who has custody saves attorney fees, court times and the necessity for providing for the delinquency, of the



necessity of proving the delinquency, pardon me. The message would be far more efficient in collecting delinquent payments than we now have. Now, the cost of the administrating of the plan would be covered by requiring an additional dollar for each payment to the Court Clerk. In counties over 3,000,000, payments would be made to the Court Clerk only when ordered by the court. In counties under 3,000,000, payments would be made to the Court Clerk unless waived by the court. The approach of House Bill 2186 has wide support not only from laymen and lawyers interested in fair and efficient and less costly enforcement, but by also by the Court Clerk both in Cook and downstate counties. Mr. Speaker, I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise reluctantly to oppose House Bill 2186. It's a bit like speaking against motherhood, but I think the practical application of this Bill as it's amended and presented to us would for those areas outside of Cook County create a bureaucratic nightmare for us. First of all, this is the only area of the law that I know where the state or some unit of government is not a party to the action where we require the state to be the collecting agency. This isn't the case when you have a judgment against the ...by a creditor against the debtor or any other particular areas, and it singles out this one particular area where the state should be the collecting agency for a private...private litigant. Number two, as attractive as the one dollar additional costs are, I'm not sure that, number one, that meets the actual cost of the administration. But more important than that the net result of it is you're going to require more money to be paid in by people who are delinquent in their child support; and, therefore...or not delinquent...and, therefore, create the more possibility of future delinquencies for people who can least afford it. The third point is, I think, that for State's Attorneys they'd have to wind up prosecuting it; and for the Circuit Clerks who are already overburdened and underpaid and under-staffed, that we're simply adding a tremendous amount



of burdens and additional cost and time and expense and effort due them in an effort to do this additional job that's imposed upon them. And finally as I read the analysis and I...perhaps subject to correction, the binds the court, I guess, subject to a subsequent waiver to do this...the language being used 'shall'. And I just think the net result of this whole thing, we're losing sight of what it's going to mean for areas downstate, outside of Cook County, additional costs are going to be involved in it. And I think what is going to be a negative result for the collection of child support and for the expeditious settlement of these particular kinds of matters. So I would reluctantly, but strongly, urge a 'no' vote on 2186."

Speaker Madigan: "Daniel Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. This Bill had a considerable degree of discussion in the Judiciary I Committee and has been subsequently amended, where, I think, it does...has addressed itself to what would be some of the major problems. The Sponsor has amended the Bill as far as affecting its impact upon Cook County; but it presents an approach which I think is very important, it could be very salutary in these type of cases. It as amended seems to have wide bipartisan support. I think it does deserve that support, and I would urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is Herb Huskey's very, very good Bill that aims to improve the collection of child support payments that are delinquent without costing the parent having custody of the child an arm and a leg in attorney's fees as it is now. I wish that Representative Dick Hart was here to explain for downstaters how important this Bill is to you as well as to those of Cook County. He was so much a fan of this Bill, he felt so strongly about it, that he insisted on an Amendment that broadened its face, rather than narrowed it. I think that you will see that the Bill provides a very easy method without the involvement of an attorney to collect



child support payments. And that's what's necessary in this state to get the payments collected efficiently, promptly and without cost. We have a horrible situation in Cook County, I can't say how it is downstate; but a horrible situation in Cook County to collect child support payments today. The delay after a delinquency is often months before you can even get into court and have one hearing before the judge. This would make the procedure automatic. The matter would be brought automatically to the judge's attention without having to go get a lawyer and without having to spend money on court costs and attorney's fees. I think it's an excellent Bill. I think this is one of the best Bills we've seen this Session and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also rise in support of House Bill 2186. I think we're all very well aware that there is a big problem in the area of child support, and I'm as concerned as I'm sure you are. Now, by having these payments sent to the Clerk, we're going to avoid the...the wife in most cases are going to retain an attorney, we're also going to help the family itself. The children will not suffer if payments are sent promptly. This proposal in my opinion is excellent, and I compliment the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Collins."

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

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

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

And Mr. Huskey is recognized to close the debate."

Huskey: "Well, because of the soaring divorce rate and the rise in 'illegitimate', more and more American children, one of every seven to be exact, now live apart from their fathers. According to a group of women economists, the vast majority of those children have to survive without much help from the absent parent. About 40 percent of all divorced, separate or single women do not receive any financial assistance from the fathers of their children. The



remainder...the remainder. receive help only irregularly and in very small amounts. Either the mothers or society or the welfare system must pick up the bill. Either half or almost half of all fatherless families, including many that were once middle class, remain poor. Now, let me tell you, you...all you that vote 'yes' on this Bill can go to bed feeling much better tonight because you're going to help some child from going to bed hungry somewhere. And thank you very much, I solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2186 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'; the Chair recognized the Gentleman from Christian; Mr. Tipsword. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 146 'ayes', 4 'nos', 1 voting 'present'; and House Bill 2186 having received a Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 2201, Mr. Daniel Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2201, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Personnel Code by authorizing the Director of Personnel to negotiate with employee bargaining units to provide health care for members of the bargaining units. This would be in addition to health care benefits provided for state employees generally. The rationale of the Bill is that in private business employee benefits beyond wages are customarily subject to bargaining. The Bill simply represents a modest extension of that principle to bargaining over public employee benefits. That's all that the Bill does. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Schlickman: "Statutorily, do we allow collective bargaining on any other subject?"

Houlihan, D.: "Statutorily?"



Schlickman: "Yes."

Houlihan, D.: "No."

Schlickman: "Why should this privilege or responsibility or opportunity be granted for just health care benefits as to be distinguished from wages and other conditions of employment?"

Houlihan, D.: "There is presently bargaining for wages."

Schlickman: "Statutorily?"

Houlihan, D.: "Not statutorily as I answered your previous question."

Schlickman: "Don't all state employees receive the same health programs now?"

Houlihan, D.: "My understanding is that they do."

Schlickman: "And wouldn't this possibly result in disparity among state employees? Inasmuch as there's..."

Houlihan, D.: "No more than any other collective bargaining agreement as far as the items that were contained within that agreement."

Schlickman: "...Well, there is a variety of bargaining units within state government, isn't there?"

Houlihan, D.: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your question."

Schlickman: "There is a variety of units for collective bargaining purposes within state government so that we would get..."

Houlihan, D.: "...Executive Order, yes."

Schlickman: "...so that there would be disparity that probably would result from this, not uniformity as presently exists?"

Houlihan, D.: "Yes, generally speaking that would be true. Any time you would have a collective bargaining agreement with one group of employees and not a collective bargaining agreement with another ...with the balance of the employees, there's going to be a disparity."

Schlickman: "Within the Act there's the use of the word 'employing bargaining units', what does that mean?"

Houlihan, D.: "As determined by the Office of Collective Bargaining as being the representative unit to bargain collectively for the employees which would be the subject of the agreement."

Schlickman: "Statutorily have we provided for an Office of Collective Bargaining? Or is that by Executive Order that could be gone by discretion of the Governor?"



Houlihan, D.: "By appropriation we have...of course, it was done by Executive Order and not statutorily written."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman, could we possibly bring the dialogue to a close?"

Schlickman: "At your request, Mr. Speaker, I'll stop; and if I may, I'd like to speak to the..."

Speaker Madigan: "Please, proceed."

Schlickman: "...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would oppose this Bill and do oppose this Bill because it will result in a disparity of health care benefits for state employees contrary to the uniformity that presently exists. Furthermore, there isn't a statutorily established administrative procedure for enforcement of it, and finally, there are provisions...there are terms within this Bill that are not precise...they're not certain in their terms. They are vague and could lead to a lot of problems. I respectfully suggest that on these bases the Bill out to be defeated."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "May I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Terzich: "Would...if they used on the collective bargaining...do you know what the approximate cost is at the present time for the group insurance or health insurance for the state?"

Houlihan, D.: "I have no idea."

Terzich: "I think we passed a few years ago the Bill had started out at \$25,000,000, if I'm not mistaken. Now, the employee contribution is somewhere in excess of \$60 or \$70,000,000. If this dependent insurance was negotiated, would there be any cap on it as to what the maximum cost would be to the state and could it be...could they have collective bargaining which may cost millions of dollars without the approval of the General Assembly?"

Houlihan, D.: "It would be whatever would be agreed to by the Governor."

Terzich: "Just...just the Governor?"

Houlihan, D.: "Whatever the agreement is."

Terzich: "It would give the Governor the authority to act in collective



bargaining and exclude the Legislature from that?"

Houlihan, D.: "It would have to be agreed to by the employees' representative as the bargaining agent and the Governor."

Terzich: "Well, what would be the appropriation process of that?"

Whatever it costs we would just pay or what?"

Houlihan, D.: "The appropriation process, of course, would be the legislative function."

Terzich: "Then whatever the cost would be if it was bargained for we would have to pay regardless if it went up 20 percent or 40 percent..."

Houlihan, D.: "That...that's not true. Whatever the Legislature would appropriate."

Terzich: "Well, then what good would the collective bargaining be if it's whatever the General Assembly would appropriate? Why do we need the collective bargaining, why couldn't..."

Houlihan, D.: "...because the Governor's recommendation to the Legislature as a result of the agreement that was reached as a result of the collective bargaining, and then it's up to the Legislature to determine whether it will or will not appropriate the funds which are necessary."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on the Bill that if we opened up the health insurance on the dependent coverage for a select group of individuals, that I believe that the present cost would be approximately three times what it now costs for the employee, or two times, somewhere in excess of \$100,000,000, that this is going to open up one big hell of a mess for the State of Illinois and put it in the same posture as the pensions are at the...at this time. And I don't see how we can support such a move."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deavers."

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

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

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Houlihan to close the debate."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hour is late and the Bill



in my opinion is minor. All that it does is it's a modest extension of what already exists in other collective bargaining agreements in the private sector. Employee benefits beyond wages are customarily subject to bargaining. That's all that this does. I ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2201 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Robinson to explain his vote for one minute."

Robinson: "I know...one of the people who spoke in debate is a member, I believe, of a public employee's union. They within their own jurisdiction negotiate on their health care contracts. They don't get prior agreement from the Chicago City Council, other locals of that international don't get prior agreement from their City Council. This is the base of the collective bargaining that these kinds of issues are up for debate. When labor, in this case, the public employees and management, in this case, the administrators of state government sit down. This is what House Bill 2, the Collective Bargaining Bill, was all about. These kinds of issues can be brought up between public employees and between the administration of government. There's nothing different about this than has already been going on with unions throughout this state at the local level."

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

The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes', 55 'nos', 6 voting 'present'; House Bill 2201...Ewell, and I, Barnes and Conti 'no'...and House Bill 2201 having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost. The Gentleman requests Postponed Consideration. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration; and my remarks that the Bill was lost shall be stricken from the record. House Bill 2205."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2205, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "I'm ready. Thank you, Mr. Speaker; and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House. Just a few moments ago I heard someone say, 'I'm getting tired'. I want you to know I'm not the youngest guy on this floor; but I've been here all night I'll tell you that. And I appreciate those of you who have stayed and have come back. I don't think it's really fair in spite of all the words I've heard tonight, we're going to be fair, we're going to give everybody a good shot at their Bill. Forget it. I want a good shot at this Bill; and I expect to get it, and I think I will. But I want you to know that everybody feels that every Bill that he has is important. I've had a lot of good ones, and you've been very, very kind. This to me is the biggest Bill that I have had the privilege of having. We had a lot of effort to get this Bill in and out of Elementary and Secondary Committee. You will remember that. I don't need to go into the merits of the Bill. And I think that if you are fair, as you say you are, you won't stand up here and dillydally around for an hour and sixteen minutes like you did on one, two ... two Bills ago. I want you now as far as I'm concerned to give us a good vote. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Old Joe, can you hear me this time?"

Lucco: "What's that?"

Anderson: "Can you hear this time?"

Lucco: "I can hear you, but I just thought maybe no one would get up and speak as tired as you fellows seem to be."

Anderson: "No, we can hold on awhile."

Lucco: "Come on over I'll hang in there."

Anderson: "Joe, Amendment #1 to this particular Bill is now the Bill. Is it the same as 869 which we passed out and you and I voted for the other night?"

Lucco: "I...I vote for 869 as far as I'm concerned 2205 was the first Bill that came out of Committee for collective bargaining for the area of education. As as far as I'm concerned this is the Bill I want on the Governor's desk."

Anderson: "Are they both the same, Joe?"



Lucco: "They are not both the same. This Bill originally starts out by saying, and you know it..."

Anderson: "I mean Amendment 1, is it the same as the Bill?"

Lucco: "...I'm talking about the Bill. It amends the School Code to provide that School Boards may enter into collective bargaining agreements for a period of up to three years. That is not stricken from the Bill. Then the..."

Anderson: "From... "Wait will you... "

Unknown: "Quiet will you please. Can I finish?"

Lucco: "...then comes Amendment 1, which is very, very, very similar to 869, whatever it was, which almost didn't get out of Committee. This Bill came out of Committee because by God we worked on it. And I think it ought to get out of this House and get over to the Senate."

Anderson: "...Joe, what particular Section of the School Code did you amend by this Bill? Was it the duty Section?"

Lucco: "I think you can read that in the beginning of the Bill; but I'll defer that to my colleague over here, Representative Stuffle, who has the answer."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, the insinuation's been made since we put this Bill in..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Anderson...and with leave of the House...and Mr. Lucco, this Bill will be taken out of the record at this time."

Lucco: "Wait a minute, why?"

Speaker Madigan: "Because there's one Bill on Second Reading that must be moved to Third to preserve it for tomorrow. And we'll be right back."

Lucco: "All right, otherwise...and I'm not going home until this Bill gets out of here."

Speaker Madigan: "We'll be right back, Joe. No, we'll be right back. On the Order of House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 951. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker...move..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "...House Bill 951...951 to Third Reading."



Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. We'll now go back to House Bill 2205.

Mr. Lucco. Thank you, Joe."

Lucco: "Thank you. What's next?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Laurino is seeking recognition. Mr. Laurino."

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

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

All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed...the motion fails.

Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, he...didn't answer my question."

Speaker Madigan: "Do you wish to ans...do you wish to answer Mr.

Anderson's question? He defers to Mr. Stuffle. Mr. Stuffle will answer Mr. Anderson's question."

Stuffle: "Representative Anderson, the question wasn't really put succinctly, but the answer is going to be. What you tried to insinuate in Committee was that we amended the Duty Section that dealt with contracts of school districts. And I'm going to read you exactly what this says and show you beyond a shadow of a doubt that this is permissive in the sense that it says that school districts may enter into three-year bargaining agreements, but, alas, they don't have to. The Bill with the Amendment says, 'School districts may enter into employment contracts with individuals or groups of employees in accordance with Article 10(a) of this Act for any period not to exceed three years'. And then it goes on. I submit to you that page 7, lines 15 through 18, states in the Amendment that is what the reference to Article 10(a) is, that they may enter into the agreements, nothing prohibits them from doing so. It is not mandated, period."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill now?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Section 10-20 of the School Code, if you have a copy of it, is clearly the Duty Section of the School Code. Section 10-22 is the power Section. Now, if we pass this Bill--I voted for 869, I think it's a good Bill, collective bargaining--but what we're going



to do is mandate collective bargaining. You're not going to have any chance. The school board will have to bargain. There won't be any election or anything else, it will be mandated. For this reason I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Could I move the previous question, please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question now be put? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed...in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco, to close the debate. You'll do a better job, Joe."

Lucco: "I'm ready."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, go ahead, close the debate."

Lucco: "Before...before we vote. Everybody in here is...as the term is... you're beautiful. You're beautiful, anybody that'll hang in here as long as we have for the Speaker and for each other. I think we're wonderful. And there's nothing else that I can say about the Bill except, I want to reiterate that we did work hard. And if we hadn't gone through what we did to get the Bill out, there may not have been a Bill out of this House. And I think this Bill deserves to get out of here. And that's all I ask, your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2205 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Stuffle to explain his vote for one minute."

Stuffle: "Just very briefly, the Amendment contains the Bill, the Amendment by reference would take in...supercede the contract Section. There is no mandate whatsoever. It's exactly the same in substance and sense as 869. And if you voted for that and can't vote for this, then you're taking positions on the same issue."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mrs. Geo-Karis to explain her vote for one minute."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although I'm in favor of collective bargaining, I'm totally opposed to any



public employee having the right of strike. And that's why I vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Brady to explain his vote for one minute."

Brady: "Pass."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. The Chair recognizes Mr. Ebbesen to explain his vote for one minute."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on this particular piece of legislation, it has a great Sponsor over there who coached high school basketball and I almost feel as though I was at half time when we were down about 15 points. And he's trying to bring everybody back off the floor to win this ballgame. And I'll tell you I would encourage everybody to vote 'no' and he should lose by one point."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 109 'ayes', 31 'nos', 3 voting 'present'; House Bill 2205 having received a Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I disagree with my seatmate. I think of Joe Lucco as coaching the team at half time. They were not 15 points behind, they were 15 points ahead. And he was trying to tell them how to hang onto the lead. Coach, I'm for you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the hour is getting late and rather than prolonging the agony, there's another Bill similar to mine, and I'd like to have leave at this time to send House Bill 2239 to Interim Study Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are you the principal Sponsor?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, I am, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady requests leave that House Bill 2239...be placed on the Interim Study Calendar. Is there leave? It is so ordered. House Bill 2231, Mr. Bartulis."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2231, a Bill for an Act in relation to regulatory agencies in the determination, modification or continuation.



Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. First of all, I would like to have leave of the House to have Representative Love as...Luft as a hyphenated Cosponsor of House Bill 2231."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave that Representative Luft be added as the principal Cosponsor?"

Bartulis: "Cosponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave is granted and it is so ordered, Mr. Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2231 calls for the repeal of over 90 Acts which deal with the regulation of professions, persons, institutions and commercial practices. Further, this Bill calls for the establishment of the Select Joint Committee on Regulatory Agency Reform. Now, this Committee will be composed of three Members from the House, three Members from the Senate and five public members appointed by the Governor...they are: Director of Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Economic and Fiscal Commission. This Select Committee will be charged with reviewing the licensing and regulatory functions enumerated in Sections 2, 3 and 4. at least one year prior to the repeal date stated in the Act. Upon review, the Committee shall recommend continuation, modification or repeal of the function. A report of this recommendation shall be submitted to the Governor and the Legislature for distribution to the Members. Now, the appropriate Committees for both House and Senate upon assignment shall be responsible for completing the review and evaluation required in this Act."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bartulis, is there any opposition to this Bill?"

Bartulis: "I hope not."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is: shall House Bill 2231 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Yeah, 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question



there are 141 'ayes', 1 'no', 3 voting 'present'; House Bill 2231 having received a Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 2241, Mr. McBroom."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2241, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill simply puts a nonvoting member on the Illinois Liquor Control Commission and specifies that that individual must hold a liquor license. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he's ready, willing and able."

McBroom: "I'd be delighted."

Lechowicz: "Is this a shell Bill?"

McBroom: "No."

Speaker Madigan: "James Houlihan. He's already answered."

McBroom: "No."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "What is he supposed to do?"

McBroom: "Representative Totten suggested he would be a taster."

Lechowicz: "Heaven forbid."

Speaker Madigan: "James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative McBroom, I believe that those meetings are open meetings and that Members can sit there and be a part of all the proceedings. I don't see the necessity of this. What is the position of the Governor on this Bill?"

McBroom: "I have no idea, Representative Houlihan. Members of the liquor industry asked me to introduce this Bill. Why they selected me rather than you or Representative Ryan I have no idea."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think is unnecessary, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think the questions have been raised that I wanted to ask."



I couldn't figure out what the guy was going to do."

McBroom: "I didn't hear the question."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had several Bills in the last several years to put nonvoting student members on university and college boards, and a lot of Members of this House support those Bills--I don't happen to--and in consistency with that I won't support this one either. But I don't think it's fair to make light of this Bill in view of the overwhelming support for those Bills."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as Representative Houlihan said, the meetings of the Liquor Commission are open, anyone can go there, whether they're members of public or whether they're a licensee, and have a nonvoting member on there. I think it's a complete waste. And I certainly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor."

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

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

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Mr. McBroom to close the debate. Mr. McBroom. Mr. McBroom to close the debate."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, several people have asked me if I'm sincerely interested in the Bill. I am. I'm not wedded to it. I think it's a good Bill. I think there have been better pieces of legislation introduced, and unquestionably there have been some that were much more ludicrous than this. I think it's a commendable piece of legislation, everyone seems to feel that someone who has some knowledge of a particular subject might be...add something beneficial to the deliberations of that particular group or Commission. And that's the whole genesis of the Bill. It's not a shell Bill, it's not any of that nature. And I'd appreciate your favorable Roll Call. If you don't see fit to do it, why... Ladies and Gentlemen, why that's your option, of course. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2241 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Matijevich to explain his vote for one minute."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Members, you know, we have examining Committees where we have professions, and they can vote. All this is doing is saying that someone who is going to be part of that type of industry who knows about it can be there, a difference of just sitting there as a member of the public. They can participate in the meetings, but they can't vote. And I think that's reasonable."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis to explain his vote for one minute."

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the late forties during World War II I had a Hudson, brand new. It jumped time at the cemetery there in Kankakee. The distinguished... and I was in a pickle, my daughter was down there waiting for me to pick her up at the University of Illinois. And I'm standing out on the road, didn't know what to do...The distinguished Gentleman's father, a blessed Member, not only went out there and picked me up, but he pulled me car into his shop, and said, 'I'm going to send you on down to the University of Illinois and when you get back here you're car will be ready for you'. In solemn token of my appreciation I, hereby, vote 'aye' and ask you to vote 'aye' because he saved a brother in distress."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen to explain his vote for one minute."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief. I see...I don't know what this legislation is all about, but this was assigned to Veteran's Affairs, Registration, Regulation...and I see it was recommended 'do pass' 14-49 and no negative votes. And anything that comes out of that Committee 14 zip has got to have something behind it, and I think I would encourage a red vote. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Brien to explain his vote for one minute."

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't see anything profound with this legislation; but it looks to me like it's Senator...Senator McBroom's first Bill, and I think we ought to support



it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deuster to explain his vote for one minute."

Deuster: "Well many people who've supported legislative Commissions say the nice thing about it is you can have public members serving on the Commission who were recognized and have their expertise there. That's all this does. I see it has enough votes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Satterthwaite to explain her vote for one minute."

Satterthwaite: "I'll wait."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Lechowicz to explain his vote for one minute."

Lechowicz: "I'm not going to explain my vote. All I have to do is read the Digest; and, in turn, I'll ask for a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Katz to explain his vote for one minute."

Katz: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that someone ought to state the reasons against this kind of Bill. I don't like to keep Mr. McBroom from passing his first Bill in the House. We have enough trouble separating the regulators from those who they're trying to regulate already. This is not like a licensing group, it's a regulatory agency. And I assume the next step is that we will be having the electric power companies and the telephone companies sitting on the Commerce Commission, and we've been accused of that already. And so I would only say it's a step in entirely the wrong direction and I would very much think that it's not a step that we ought to take. We ought to try to make very clear that the people who are regulating liquor are not directly connected with them at the time they are regulating."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino to explain his vote for one minute."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In respect to the last speaker, I think you'll find that in the Commerce Commission there are people within that industry that serve on that Commission, as it is the same way in real estate, and the barber, beauty and every other Commission that we have. I think in this area we have nothing but attorneys on that particular Commission. And I think it's extremely important that you have a



person from that particular industry that knows it to at least sit on there and keep everyone squared away. And that's why I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Sevcik to explain his vote for one minute." Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a point of order as soon as you're through here. And I've been trying to be recognized since one minute after 12. Now, it's Saturday, May 21st, and I think we ought to have an Attendance Roll Call so we'll be all set for tomorrow morning."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sevcik has made a good point. Let the record show that we have now entered upon the next Legislative Day. Mr. Sandquist to explain his vote for one minute."

Sandquist: "Well, I did speak on a matter...and this is a matter of personal privilege because the last speaker talked about the Liquor Commission being all attorneys. I'd like to tell you that is not true. When I was on there, two were attorneys and one was not. At the present time, there's only one attorney on there. And all I've got to say is you don't want the one who's making the decisions sitting on there and...when he's part of the game. And he should think very clear about this. This is an important matter, and let's not be carried away. And if Mr. Lechowicz doesn't ask for a verification, I will."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mrs. Catania to explain her vote for one minute."

Catania: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just wanted to point out...to point out that the Dental Examining Committee is all dentists."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 3...43 'nos', 14 voting 'present'; and the Chair recognizes Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "If he wants to poll the absentees fine, I want a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McMaster."

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

Lechowicz, I think we've all put in a long day today, Ted. I think



the problems of whether we should verify a Roll Call at this point in time or not, I really don't think we should. Ted, let's go through the Bills we've got to do. It's been a long day. I'm tired. I'd like to go home, and I know you would too. I would hope that you would not continue with your demand for a verification, Ted."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a liquor industry Bill, and I, in turn, want to verify every positive vote on this Bill. If you're talking about a person being on that board from the industry, and, in turn, saying that he's going to be picked up the expense by the State of Illinois, I want to verify it. And, in turn, if you want to shut me up you may do so, but I feel so strongly about this I'll go through a verification between now and 5 o'clock in the morning."

Speaker Madigan: "Has the Clerk polled the absentees? Proceed with a poll of the absentees. For what purpose does Mr. Davis arise."

Davis, J.: "Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time that we dump the Roll Call and take another one and everybody vote their own switch."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I'll abide by that. If everybody hits their own switch... because I.R.1307, --08 and --09 in this House, and I won't tell you what's happening on those Bills, but I'll be very upset about it. And, in turn, I will go with...everybody hits their own switch."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk will dump the Roll Call. And we will now take a new Roll Call on House Bill 2241. Open the record, Mr. Clerk. The question is, shall House Bill 2241 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 30 'nos', 14 voting 'present'; House Bill 2241 having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Rule 8 provides for a Daily Calendar, which we



do not now have. Mr. Speaker, I now move we adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Madigan: "You are not recognized for that purpose, Mr. Telser. House...Mr. McBroom, do you wish this Bill to be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration? Mr. McBroom, do you wish to poll the absentees?"

McBroom: "No, I'm not going to delay the House any further, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a good Bill, I don't think it's life or death; and just let it go."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2241 having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost..."



Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2246. Mr. Skinner."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2246. A Bill for an Act to prohibit blind Bidding and blind selling of motion pictures in Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, this is a Bill that has to do with your local movie theater owner. Local movie theater owners are forced to buy movies before they are made. They do not get a chance to see those movies. Now, there's some bad things that can result from this practice. One of which is they may book in bills that are not suitable for the community. The second of which is they may be forced to buy a real dog. And they be forced to put up money in front to get that real dog. Often that money is nonrefundable. That's the basis of the Bill. It's called the Blind Bidding Bill. It's a Bill to prohibit blind bidding. It's a Bill to require that the pictures be shown in the State of Illinois to the people who are being asked to buy them. I would be happy to yield to any questions anyone might have. I would be happy to conclude. I would be even happier to go home and go to bed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley."

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

I rise in opposition to House Bill 2246 in that it is an inappropriate area for legislation because it is an attempt to delete contractual terms for motion picture licensing agreements. Distributors compete to have their motion pictures played in the best theaters on the best states. Consequently, pictures must be looked at and booked or I should say booked and not looked at long before pictures are to be available to the Illinois public when it is available in the rest of the country. Motion pictures are financed with proud money on which interest must be paid. The pictures are not bid or sold until they are completed. To do anything before the picture earns money to repay the borrower's investments, would result in over hundreds of thousands of dollars of interest which should be passed on in the rental terms and higher admission prices to the viewing public. I don't think that the



Bill in this form is constitutional, but we don't deal with that question here. I don't think that the Bill the way it's drafted and what it proposes to do is good on a competitive basis for not only the viewing public but on the fact that you have to compete for pictures. I think government should stay out of this area. I think that when we talk about these kind of subjects, we're bringing government into a competitive bidding process which is interfering with that process. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think this Bill should pass so I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We are in violation of the rules and I'd call that to your attention again. You announced this was another Legislative Day. We're in violation of Rule 9 and we should not be here."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich, our real intent is to get to House Bill 2313, sponsored by Mr. Ryan. Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. I was on the Labor and Commerce Committee when we heard this Bill and while the Bill sounds like motherhood and apple pie at the beginning saying you can't blind bid, you've got to listen to the real world. These people producing pictures are putting up big money to produce these pictures and it's a big risk. And what they're asking is for you to share the risk: If you want first shot at the picture, you have to share the risk. If you don't want first shot, if you want to wait six months after the movie comes out, don't bid. That's your business. Don't bid if you don't want the movie right off. If you want it share the risk just like everybody else. In addition, producers bid for screenrights to unfinished stories. The people buy books and it's blind bidding. This is not an uncommon practice in this particular area. It's an exploratory type thing. You take a chance on a book. You take a chance on a script. Well, you take a chance on getting the movie. You can censor local movies. People don't object to that. But I say it's a shared risk and I ask that you not take away from viewers in Illinois the right to see movies right at the beginning. Why should Illinois be given special options? Because



other states front up bid to get the movie, why should Illinois get special deals? I don't think that's fair. We should share the risk. I rise in opposition to the Bill and would appreciate a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one way you could eliminate the showing of a lot of trashy movies is to support a Bill like this. Why should our Illinois motion picture theater operators suffer by having to bid blindly on a picture just because of an attractive title. I don't think it's fair. I think it's a matter of public policy. What this Bill will do is establish a good public policy. I think it's a good Bill. I think we should support it because you're never going to get rid of some of these rotten, trashy movies that go on and on and on whether the poor bidders like it or not. And I think it's only fair to start using our common sense."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question or two. Representative Skinner, I notice that a violation of this new Act would call for a fine not to exceed one hundred or rather, ten thousand dollars or six months in jail. Is this a felony or a misdemeanor?"

Skinner: "Representative Deuster, I'm afraid I'm not a lawyer and that is not a question that I can give an answer to."

Deuster: "All right, the second question, is there any other state in the United States that has this kind of a law?"

Skinner: "Not yet, but the territory of Puerto Rico has passed a similar law."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the objection is worthy but I question the State of Illinois moving in to tell private industries how they must do business, particularly when it's an area where they have the freedom to enter into contracts. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen. Mr. Skinner, to close the debate."

Skinner: "Representative Lucco came over during the debate and told me that his local movie theater owner came up to him after this Bill had been introduced and indicated to him that there were bills that



they had bought that they couldn't even show they were so bad. Now, what we are in Illinois is definitely the front of this movement in the United States. We are a poker chip, a very small, well, a moderately-sized poker chip in a very large poker game. And if you don't think it's large, take a look at the headlines of Variety. The movie producers in this country are scared to death that the movie theater owners may end up getting a little clout in the industry, getting the ability to say 'no', we're not going to take trash just because it's got a good title and a good star. Now, in 1948 the movie theaters were ripped from the production company's control through a Federal court consent degree in the southern district of New York. Is Senator Swanson in the audience someplace whistling? I understand he's a registered lobbyist against this and I hope he earns his money. Now, there are vesti... vestigial, vestigial... I'll get this... vestigial control mechanisms still within the industry. Even though the ownership of the theaters can no longer be in the same hands as are the production, the production companies control the theaters through this practice of blind bidding. In some cases, your local movie theater owner is forced to pay in advance for pictures that are not even produced. For example, ten million dollars has been squeezed out of the local movie theaters for a picture called 'A Bridge Too Far'. That's going to be a hit in October, hopefully. Now, I would like to suggest to one of the Representatives who seems to be so much in favor of competition that that's like asking the local gas station owner to finance the drilling of oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico. I would suggest that it would not be considered advantageous. I would conclude by asking one question. Who among you would buy merchandise before you see it? I would ask those to vote 'no' and the rest to vote 'yes!.."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2246 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote for one minute."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't know too much about this but I tried to listen very carefully over and above the, what was taking place



around me, but, you know, it seems to me that the basic thrust of this legislation is so sound as Representative Skinner has pointed out. You know, it's like trying... you're actually having to go out and bid for something. You don't know whether it's going to bomb out or what it's going to be and I just think that... it's like a fifty to one shot on a horse race and the guy is trying to say, the Representative's trying that, look, let's put this thing on an even keel in which... please... put this thing on an even keel where the individual theater operator has got himself in a posture of being able to stay open, that he doesn't have to spend money that's not necessary to spend to get something that's going to make his operation a financial success. It's good legislation. I think it deserves an 'aye' vote. I would encourage everybody to get on this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote for one minute."

Ewell: "I heard the Gentleman's remark, but I'd like to say a lot of us can buy a lot of pigs in a lot of pokes when we start getting these Conference Committee reports, so I'm going to go along with you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Steele, to explain his vote for one minute."

E. Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to urge a few more green lights up there on this good Bill. I don't think any of us would want to buy a product sight unseen. I don't think we'd want to buy a car sight unseen. We wouldn't want to buy a house sight unseen. And that's the very thing that this Bill is trying to accomplish for the whole community. That a theater won't be forced to buy a product, buy a movie to be shown to the entire community without at least having the opportunity to look it over firsthand. And I think it's a good Bill, deserves your support. Urge some more green lights."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote for one minute."

Dyer: "Yes, I would like to add my 'yes' vote. I hope we get three more. Just think of the slightly shady or pornographic films that could be slipped into a package that a theater is buying blindly. We've passed several good Bills to try to outlaw obscenity and pornography in Illinois. Here's another way to vote 'yes' and



keep movie distributors from slipping in pinko films in a bunch of good ones."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 21 'nos'. Record Mr. Marovitz as 'aye'. Mr. Schneider as 'no'. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, thank you, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to question a quorum and request a Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, you're not recognized for that purpose.

Mr. Telcser as 'aye'. What is the count now, Mr. Clerk? 93 'ayes', 28 'nos'. And Mr. Farley."

Farley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I also as Representative Lechowicz hate to take up the time of the House, but I'd like to verify this Roll Call or have everybody vote their own switch cause I can see a lot of votes up there that shouldn't be there."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mugalian, do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Mr. Mugalian."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Mugalian: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. The Gentleman requests a verification. Mr. Skinner, do you request a poll of the absentees?"

Skinner: "Well, certainly. Either that or a new Roll Call, that's okay."

Speaker Madigan: "Everyone wishes a new Roll Call, Mr. Clerk, so that the Clerk shall dump the Roll. Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation's important enough that I hesitate to even make a suggestion to the Sponsor but like taking it out of the record which we may not get back to and you take that chance. But, Mr. Speaker, if we dump the Roll Call, he still has his opportunity because we haven't taken the Roll Call to take it out of the record because I would kind of feel a little uneasy about the fact that this legislation will pass and, Representative Skinner, it's good enough that I would appreciate it if you'd take your chances otherwise."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley."

Farley: "Well, you know, we're in the middle of a verification of a new Roll Call. The man's out of order, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Madigan: "We'll take a new Roll Call. And the question is, shall House Bill 2246 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I really hate to take the time of the House but in turn, in many areas of my community the people are quite concerned as far as having pronographic films available at the respective theaters. And in turn, yes, it's a very, very hot issue. This Bill will address that very serious situation. And I would hope that the Membership of this House would kindly just take a look at page 1465 of the Digest which really explains this Bill. All it's asking is that the Membership that go into theaters kindly take a look at a movie before it's addressed to the general public. And in turn, this specific Bill should have the Sponsorship and the endorsement, I would say, of this entire Membership. It's one of the most pressing issues that we have and, yes, we do have a review board in the City of Chicago and they take a look at it. And I can't understand why anybody from that area would oppose this Bill. I would hope that this General Assembly would agree with the concept of many of the people of the State of Illinois in saying 'yes', it's time, time in and time out, that somebody be responsible. And in turn, I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Marovitz, to explain his vote."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there are probably a lot of reasons for voting for this Bill and I think one of the overriding reasons will be that I think it'll upgrade the quality of movies that we're going to get. And so many of the young people today are looking at the crap that's on the screen and being affected by it, not only on the TV screen but on the movie screen. If this Bill will do nothing else but upgrade the quality of movies, I'm for it. I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 15 'nos', 9 voting 'present' and House Bill 2246 having



received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

House Bill 2287, Mr. Schneider."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2287. A Bill for an Act to establish a system of merit employment. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. A number of years ago, I was the Sponsor of the County Merit Bill, Civil Service Act. What I'm trying to do now is to replace that with a County Merit Employment Act which gives much more flexibility to hiring practices. It's purely permissive. It affects counties from the ranges of three hundred and fifty thousand to a million. I would solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as those of you who could tell by listening to Representative Schneider's succinct and parsimonious explanation of this Bill that it applies to only one county of which we are both residents. He only has one fault as does the Sponsor of this Bill and we won't go into that fault right now. But nevertheless, there is general support in our county for this particular Bill and I would encourage and appreciate very much as would Representative Schneider and the Speaker, your support of this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 2287 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Speaker votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Ryan wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 2 'nos', 1 voting 'present' and House Bill 2287 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2313. Mr. Matijevich. I'm told that possibly this Bill was on your list of exempt Bills."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this would be a good time there for... that's Minority Leader Ryan's Bill and that Bill, 2313 and 2173 and 583, those three Bills belong on the list whereby we extended the deadline for two weeks and I'd like to ask leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose. Thank you."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevec, would you read the numbers once again for the Clerk?"

Matijevec: "2313, 2173 and 583. I believe 1861 we did yesterday for Mrs. Satterthwaite but if we didn't, include that one. I'm sure we did that one yesterday. But 2313, 2173, 583 and 1861, just in case."

Speaker Madigan: "But, Mr. Matijevec, 583 is presently on the Order of Postponed Consideration."

Matijevec: "That's right, but we want to extend that one for two weeks."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Postponed Consideration?"

Matijevec: "Right, right. Yeah, right. There is a Companion Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave. Is there leave? It is so ordered. Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Representative Matijevec has asked leave for an Attendance Roll Call. We haven't taken one today and in case I died during the night, my heirs won't receive my per diem."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2339. Mr. Tipword."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2339. A Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Health Finance Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that we had some discussion on at the time that it was amended. The Bill came here rather late and the Amendment came here rather late. I'll try to very briefly tell you what it's about and why we need this Bill. One of the basic reasons that we need this Bill is because for many years, we have been paying retrospectively the medical costs of the State of Illinois. And we need as we found in the report that was done by the Fiscal and Economic Commission and the Federal government has also informed us the need to get on a basis of paying prospectively for the medical costs that the State of Illinois purchases. The reason being that when we pay retrospectively as we do now, there is nothing in our law that would in any way encourage cost savings in the medical field. In fact, we do just exactly the opposite. We encourage increases and, in fact, we bring about increases in the cost of medical services. The Department of Public Aid now uses each hospital's



average annual per patient cost as a base rate paid to that hospital in the coming year. Then later as the costs go up, hospitals are permitted to update their rate semiannually by submitting revised cost records. And if the costs go up even higher than that rate, then at the end of the year the hospital has a deficit and the state will help cover it. For example, if medicaid recipients receive 50% of all days of service provided by the hospital, the state would pay 50% of any deficit incurred. So consequently, we continually encourage the increase of medical costs. And in addition, we make the hospitals wait for their money and in time they have to borrow money. And in borrowing that money, their costs go up again. This Bill is an attempt to set a prospective determination of rates. We set up an authority. That authority has the right to review the records of the hospital that is required to be submitted to them, to take into consideration all of the legitimate costs of each hospital and decide rates by facility, not state-wide, but by facility in advance. And then we know in advance what the services we're going to buy from those hospitals do cost. We will also have the faculty then to know from our experience about what kind of services we're going to need over the year and can budget and appropriate accordingly. We then have the money available to pay for these costs as they come up and we do not thereby encourage this increasing cost cycle that we now have in medicaid. It is true that this Bill relates only to the fixing of hospital costs and it's a first step in trying to find a total prospective cost basis. Now, I can go into the authority, what it consists of, how the rates are fixed and what it considers if you wish me to do so and I will certainly answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Just one question of the Sponsor. Rollie, is the Illinois Hospital Association in favor of your amended Bill?"

Tipword: "The Illinois Hospital Association is. I have a letter from them so indicating that and it's dated this morning, May 20, 1977."

Geo-Karis: "Could you read it in the record?"

Tipword: "There are some, I think, some minor language differences yet between this Bill and what they would like to have. They also



have another Bill of a similar nature coming from the Senate which is Senate Bill 1060. In fact, they've asked me to Sponsor it if it gets over here in the letter that I received today."

Geo-Karis: "That's all I wanted to know, if the Illinois Hospital Association is for it. That's all. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I'm really trying to listen. This is a very important piece of legislation and I cannot hear."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this piece of legislation is probably going to be one of the most important pieces of legislation this General Assembly is going to end up voting on. It's going to be important to you because of what it commits this General Assembly and this state to in the future. As a Member of the Appropriations Committee and I regret that Representative Barnes is not here right now to share this discussion because I'm sure he would agree with the views I'm expressing here. As a Member of that Appropriations Committee, we find that one of the biggest problems that we have in terms of the public aid budget is the payments that are being made for the medical part of that budget. Over 50%, over 50% of the two billion plus dollars in the public aid budget goes for medical expenses. There is absolutely no way it appears that we'll be able to get a handle on that part of the budget. Nor does it appear that any means that's coming forth by which we can insure that the hospitals, the physicians, the podiatrists, the chiropractors, the entire health care industry so to speak, is getting a fair share, fair shake at getting paid properly in terms of the bills that they put in. What this Bill will end up doing, in a sense, is acting much the same way as full funding does for education. It's a full funding Bill for hospitals. The bills that the hospitals put in are going to have to be paid at a 100% rate. At what rate? The rate that is set up by this Commission, a Commission that's going to go into operation and set up these rates some two or three years in the future. In the meantime, the hospitals throughout the state have a two year situation in which they can end up raising their rates and which



you and I will have no alternative as Members of this General Assembly but to appropriate the money to pay for these Bills. Some individuals might indicate that there is some competition or no competition between hospitals. But those of you who have been in hospitals, in one or two hospitals as I have this last year, know that for the same tests there's a fifty, sixty, seventy, a hundred dollar difference from one hospital to another. What this kind of legislation will have the effect of doing is equalizing these kind of payments for all the hospitals throughout the state, destroying the kind of competition that exists somewhat, somewhat now in the system. The advocates of this Bill will tell you and honestly tell you and they are right that this Bill will not lower payments. They are hoping, hoping that once it is implemented, it will moderate payments instead of the 18 to 20% rise we're having now, they are hoping for a 9, 10, 11, 12% rise. I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this General Assembly and I regret very sincerely, very sincerely that I have a difference of opinion on this Bill with the administration. I don't happen to think that they are right in this kind of approach. There's other ways to end up handling this thing and I sincerely regret that this Bill is being debated here at quarter to one in the morning when our heads, maybe from the long day we're here, are not as clear as they ought to be. What we're talking about here on the bottom end is an initial outlay of some fifteen to twenty million dollars to get this in operation. And what we're going to end up voting for here is a full funding operation for the hospitals. All of their costs, their malpractice costs, their malpractice insurance, whatever contracts they end up signing with nurses, whoever works in the hospitals are all going to be reflected in these rates. You and I are going to have no choice, absolutely no choice but to pay exactly the bills that the hospitals come in. And when your nursing homes come to you and ask you for help, when your doctors, chiropractors, podiatrists, pharmacists and everybody else comes in and looks for some cash at the end of the rainbow to pay their bills, it ain't going to be there because the hospitals are going to end up getting the majority part of it.



I ask you to seriously consider, seriously consider whether you vote 'yes', 'present' or 'no' on this Bill in terms of how you are obligating this General Assembly and this state in terms of future payments for public aid. I am going to vote 'no' on this legislation. I leave it to you in terms of the debate here and from what has been said on this, for you to determine what you want to do and how you should vote. I thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Republican Spokesman on the Human Resources Committee, I went with Ms. Chapman to Boston to be briefed at a conference, the seminar called by the National Legislative Council. And the H.E.W. made it clear that these rate review boards were in the near future going to be mandated for every state in the Union. And one of the things that this Bill does is sets up computers that will be able to set up criterion by which you can pay bills or not pay bills. The computer will take into it the average length of stay so that if a public aid bill is for a stay longer than the average stay for that type operation, it'd be kicked out and it won't have to be paid. Yes, there's some initial cost but in the long run, this is the only hope we have of joining the national program to put a lid on rising health costs. It is not because of the fact that our previous Governor chose the levels at artificially low levels. Now that he has got it up to what is considered to be the market levels, it is shocking. But if the prior Governor had been honest with us with his budget, we would have been aware of this a year ago and could have started action then. But because he did not do so, we have start behind and play catch-up. So I'm asking you to vote for this measure so that we can begin the long, hard road of putting a cap on medical costs."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know, it's one o'clock in the morning and I just want to... I hope I can get your attention. I'm not going to... Representative Peters has hit the nail on the head without any question. And all I can say is that you're talking about, as he's indicated, full funding."



It's just like the school aid formula. Full funding for hospitals...
tals..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know if you don't have a firm position..."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your point, Representative Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "No, no, don't worry about that. I may just point out that Representative Peters spoke against this Bill. This Bill was... no, Peters spoke against the Bill. And in turn, this Bill was approved by the Economic and Fiscal Commission and he's a Cosponsor."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "That's a good point of order. Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen, continue. It's ten minutes to one. Representative Ebbesen. We'll get back to you. Don't interrupt Representative Ebbesen. I'll be back to you. I think it's rude to interrupt Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "You're so right, Mr. Speaker, especially at one o'clock in the morning. But, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very, very brief. I just think that he's hit the nail on the head and all I'm going to say and I'll be very brief. If you don't really have a firm position on this particular piece of legislation, I would encourage you to take a long, hard look before you vote 'aye' in terms of what Representative Peters has said. You know, let's put it off to a time where there's more, a little more sanity and we've got our heads screwed on a little straighter at some time in the future as opposed to voting this thing up or down at this particular point in time. And I would encourage at this point in time maybe even for the distinguished Legislator who's the Sponsor of the legislation, I have great respect for, maybe to take it out of the record and let's discuss it at some future date like tomorrow or next week sometime. That's my point."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me bring up a point or two in this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword, are you seeking recognition?"



I can't see. There's kind of a big guy between you and the Chair."

Tipsword: "I don't want to interrupt Representative Keats, but I would like the advice of the Chair. I agree that I think the Bill is a very complicated one and I wish we could hear it tomorrow if it doesn't disrupt the schedule too much."

Speaker Redmond: "All right with me. Take it out of the record."

Tipsword: "I wouldn't like to have it on Postponed, I'd like to have it get a hearing. It is the last Bill and it is late."

Speaker Redmond: "I would suggest that we just take it out of the record and come back to this. This will be the first... how did that happen? You will, you will. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we... Mr. Clerk, do you have any programs? And I move that we recess until ten o'clock this morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that we recess until ten a.m. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Those that voted 'no' can stay. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "What time did you say as you mumbled the words there?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ten o'clock."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you and good night. Pleasant dreams. Beddy-bye."



<u>1.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	9:30	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
1		Speaker Redmond	
1		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bills First Reading
1		Speaker Redmond	
2	9:37	Madigan	Excused absences
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Ryan	
2		Speaker Redmond	Committee Reports
2		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Committee Reports
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Houlihan, J.	
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Clerk O'Brien	Continues Committee Reports
2		Speaker Redmond	Introduction & First Reading
3		Clerk O'Brien	Reads First Readings
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Edgar	
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Hanahan	
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Matijevich	
3		Speaker Redmond	
4		Sumner	
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Jones, D.	
4		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
2.			
4	9:57	Hanahan	
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Waddell	
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Clerk O'Brien	HB 951-Fl Amendment #1
4		Speaker Redmond	
5,6		Wikoff	Explains Amendment #1
6		Speaker Redmond	
7,8		Hanahan	Opposed
8		Clerk O'Brien	Davis in the Chair
8		Speaker Davis	
8		Friedrich	
8		Speaker Davis	
8		Huff	
8		Speaker Davis	
9		Huff	
9		Speaker Davis	
9		Wikoff	
9		Speaker Davis	
9		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
9		Speaker Davis	
9		Porter	Table 2 - 9
10		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #10
10		Greiman	
10		Speaker Davis	Table #10
10		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #11
10		Speaker Davis	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>3.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
10		Speaker Davis	
10		Keats	Agreed Amendment
10		Speaker Davis	Amendment #11 adopted
10		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #12
10		Speaker Davis	
10		Greiman	
10		Speaker Davis	
11		Tuerk	Question of the Chair
11		Speaker Davis	
11		Porter)	
11)	
11		Greiman)	
11		Speaker Davis	
11		Clerk O'Brien	
12		Speaker Davis	
12		Getty	
12		Speaker Davis	
12		Matijevich)	
12)	
12		Speaker Davis)	
12		Clerk O'Brien	
12		Speaker Davis	
12		Van Duyne	
13		Speaker Davis	HB 1015
13		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1011
13		Speaker Davis	
13		Getty	
13		Speaker Davis)	
13)	
13		Clerk O'Brien)	HB 1115



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Page	Time	Speaker	Information
4.			
13		Speaker Davis	
13		Leverenz)	Table Amendments 2,4,5
14		Speaker Davis)	
14		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #7
14		Leverenz	Explains Amendment
14		Speaker Davis	
14		Friedrich	Supports
14		Speaker Davis	
14		Leverenz	
14		Clerk O'Brien)	
15		Speaker Davis)	
15		Schlickman)	
15		Speaker Davis)	
16	10:15	Schlickman	Inquiry
16		Davis, C. - Speaker	
16		Madigan	
16		Speaker Davis	
16		Klosak	Motion - HB 2395 to 2nd
16		Speaker Davis	
17		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2395 - 2nd Reading
17		Speaker Davis	Third Reading
17		Leverenz	HB 1034 - Amendment #1
17		Speaker Davis	Amendment adopted - 3rd Reading
18		Mautino	HB 1205 motion
18		Speaker Davis	
18		Matijevich	



<u>5.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
18		Speaker Davis	
18		Schlickman	'Aye'
19		Speaker Redmond in the Chair	
19		Mautino	
19		Speaker Redmond	
19		Daniels	
19		Speaker Redmond	
20		Mautino	
20	10:30	Speaker Redmond	
20		Daniels	
20		Matijevich	Point of order
20		Speaker Redmond	
21		Daniels)	
)	
21		Mautino)	
21		Speaker Redmond	
21		Ryan	Verification
21		Speaker Redmond	
21		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
21		Speaker Redmond	
22		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Call
22		Speaker Redmond	
22		Mautino	
22		Speaker Redmond	
22		Waddell	'No'
22		Speaker Redmond	
22		Huskey	'No'
22		Speaker Redmond	



<u>6.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	23,24,25		Ryan	Questions Affirmative Roll
	25		Speaker Redmond	
	25		Daniels)	Question on HB 853
	25		Speaker Redmond)	
	25		Matijevich	
	25		Speaker Redmond	
	25		Clerk O'Brien	Am #3 to HB 1205
	26		Mautino	Amendment #3
	27,		Schuneman)	
	28, 29		Mautino)	
	29		Speaker Redmond	
	29	10:52	Barnes, E.	Point of order
	29		Speaker Redmond	
	29		Schuneman	
	29		Speaker Redmond	
	30,		Tuerk)	
	31, 32		Mautino)	
	32		Speaker Redmond	
	32		Mudd	
	32		Speaker Redmond	
	32		Jaffe	Support
	32		Speaker Redmond	
	32		Deavers	
	32		Speaker Redmond	
	33		Daniels	Asks 853 be called
	33		Speaker Redmond	Am #3 adopted - 3rd Reading



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 5-20-77

6. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
33		Daniels)	
33		Speaker Redmond)	
33		Bradley	Defer to Tuerk
33		Speaker Redmond	
34		Matijeovich)	Point of order
34		Speaker Redmond)	
34	11:02	Tuerk	
34		Speaker Redmond	
34		Matijeovich	Point of order
34		Speaker Redmond	
34		Tuerk	
34		Speaker Redmond	
34		Dunn, J.	Point of order
35		Speaker Redmond	
35		McClain	
35		Speaker Redmond	
36		Tuerk	Proceeds
36		Speaker Redmond	
36		Hanahan	Motion to postpone HB 853
36		Speaker Redmond	Motion out of order
36		Ryan	Moves previous question
37		Speaker Redmond	
37		Jaffe	
37		Speaker Redmond	
37		Matijeovich	
37		Houlihan, J.	
37		Speaker Redmond	Motion prevails



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

7. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
37		Hanahan	Motion (HB 853)
37		Simms	Move lie on the table
38	11:13	Speaker Redmond	
38		Ryan	
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Hanahan	
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Ryan	Cites Rule 37
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Schuneman	
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Ryan	
39		Speaker Redmond	Simm's motion
39		Walsh	
39		Speaker Redmond	Simm's motion prevails
39		Daniels	
39		Speaker Redmond	
40		Jaffe	Oppose
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Schuneman	Support
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		Hanahan	
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		Walsh	
41		Speaker Redmond	
42	11:25	Hanahan	Oppose
42		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
7.			
42		Friedrich	
43		Speaker Redmond	
43		Hudson	
43		Hanahan	
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Deuster	
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Geo-Karis	
44		Speaker Redmond	
45		Hanahan	Continues
45		Speaker Redmond	
45		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
45		Speaker Redmond	
45		Lauer	
45		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
46		Ebbesen	
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Friedrich	Speaks for Bill
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Houlihan, J.	
46		Speaker Redmond	
46	11:37	Houlihan, J.	
46		Speaker Redmond	
47		Friedrich	
48		Speaker Redmond	
48		Mautino	
48		Speaker Redmond	



8.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	48		Ewing	Moves previous question
	48		Speaker Redmond	Didn't hear it
	49		Cunningham	
	49		Speaker Redmond	
	49		Willer)	Question
	50		Tuerk)	Yields to Schuneman
	50		Speaker Redmond	
	50		Schuneman)	Responds
	50		Willer)	
	50		Speaker Redmond	
	50		Schuneman	
	51		Speaker Redmond	
	51		Byers)	
	52		Tuerk)	
	52		Speaker Redmond	
	53		Geo-Karis	
	53		Speaker Redmond	
	54		Dunn, J.	
	54		Speaker Redmond	
	54	11:55	Steele, E. G.	
	54		Speaker Redmond	
	54		Barnes	Point
	54		Speaker Redmond	
	55		Steele, E. G.	Support
	55		Speaker Redmond	
	56, 57, 58, 59		Tipsword	
	59		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
9.			
60		Leinenweber	
60		Speaker Redmond	
71	12:11	Darrow	
61		Speaker Redmond	
61		Schuneman	Responds to Willer
61		Speaker Redmond	
62		Mudd)	
)	
62		Tuerk)	
62		Speaker Redmond	
63, 64		Mudd	Speaks to Bill
64		Johnson	Moves previous question
64		Speaker Redmond	
65		Daniels	To close
65		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
65		Jacobs)	
65		Speaker Redmond	
66	12:25	Houlihan, J.	
66		Speaker Redmond	
66		Ryan	Out of order
66		Speaker Redmond	
66		Houlihan, J.	Explains 'no' vote
66		Speaker Redmond	
67		Abramson	Explains yes vote
67		Speaker Redmond	
67		Von Boeckman	Explains 'no' vote
67		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>10.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
68		Deuster	Explains 'aye' vote
68		Speaker Redmond	
69		Foley	Explains 'no' vote
69		Speaker Redmond	
69		Greisheimer	
69		Speaker Redmond	
70		Stuffle	
70		Speaker Redmond	
70		Friedrich	Asks Roll Call be preserved
70		Speaker Redmond	
70		Wikoff	'Aye'
70		Speaker Redmond	
71		Williams	'Aye'
72		Ewing	Explains vote
72	12:40	Speaker Redmond	
72		McGrew	Explains 'aye' vote
72		Speaker Redmond	
72		Miller	Explains vote
73		Speaker Redmond	
73		Schuneman	Polls absentees
73		Speaker Redmond	
73		Daniels	Asks Roll Call be preserved
73		Speaker Redmond	
73		Daniels	Postponed Consideration
73		Speaker Redmond	
73		Matijevich	Requests HB 1205
73		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>11.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
74		Walsh	
74		Speaker Redmond	
74		Kane	
74		Clerk O'Brien	Mautino's motion to hear HB 1205
74		Mautino	Motion to suspend rules
74		Clerk O'Brien	
74		Ryan	
74	12:50	Speaker Redmond	
75		Ryan	
75		Speaker Redmond)	
76	12:55	Barnes)	Point of order
76		Speaker Redmond	
76		Madison	
77		Mudd	
77		Houlihan, J.	
77		Speaker Redmond	
77		McBroom	Point of personal privilege
77		Speaker Redmond	
77		Houlihan, J.	
77		Speaker Redmond	
78		Peters	
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Mautino	Poll absentees
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Clerk O'Brien	
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Ryan	Record me 'no'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
12.			
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Madison	Question
79		Speaker Redmond	
79	1:00	Ryan	
79		Speaker Redmond	
79		Lechowicz	
79		Speaker Redmond	
79		Madison	Point of personal privilege
79		Speaker Redmond	
79		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds with absentees
80		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
80		Ryan	
80		Speaker Redmond	
80		Houlihan, D.	
80		Speaker Redmond	
80		Ryan	Republican Conference
80		Speaker Redmond	
80		Barnes, E. M.	
80		Speaker Redmond	
81		Clerk O'Brien	SB 486 - 3rd Reading
81		Speaker Redmond	
81		Gaines	
81		Speaker Redmond	
81		Peters	Explains 'no' vote
81		Speaker Redmond	SB 486- passed
81		Clerk O'Brien	SB 318-3rd Reading



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

13. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
81		Speaker Redmond	
81	1:07	DiPrima	
82		Speaker Redmond	Passed
82		Clerk O'Brien	SB 340- 3rd Reading
82		Speaker Redmond	
82		Hoxsey	
82		Speaker Redmond	Passed
82		Ryan	30 minutes
83		Speaker Redmond	
83		Matijevich	Leave to suspend rules
83		Speaker Redmond	
83		Sharp	Leave of House
83		Speaker Redmond	
83		Speaker Redmond	Sharp - recess till 2:15
84, 85, 86		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
RECESS			
86	2:25	Speaker Redmond	House to order
86		Clerk O'Brien	Resolutions
86		Lechowicz	
86		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted
86		Clerk O'Brien	Resolution-Kelly
87		Houlihan)	
87		Speaker Redmond)	
87		Deuster	Leave to table HB 251
87		Speaker Redmond	Already done
88		Totten)	
88		Speaker Redmond)	
88	2:35	Speaker Redmond)	Inquiry of Chair



14.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	88		Lechowicz	
	88		Speaker Redmond	
	88		McPike	Leave to vote on HB 853
	88		Speaker Redmond	
	88		Hart	HB 717 - S. A. #1
	88		Speaker Redmond	
	89		Totten)	
)	
	89		Hart)	
	89		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
	90		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction and First Reading
	90		Speaker Redmond	
	90		Clerk O'Brien	HB 858-3rd Reading
	90		Ewing	
	91		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	91		Clerk O'Brien	HB 862-3rd Reading
	91		Speaker Redmond	
	91		Ewing	
	91		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	91		Giorgi	Question
	91		Clerk O'Brien	HB 963-3rd Reading
	91		Speaker Redmond	
	91		Giorgi	
	91		Speaker Redmond	
	92	2:45	Skinner)	
)	
	92		Giorgi)	
	92		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

15. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
93		Satterthwaite)	
93		Speaker Redmond)	
93		Giorgi)	
93		Speaker Redmond	
94		Ebbesen)	
94		Giorgi)	
94		Speaker Redmond	
94		Giorgi	Explains vote
94		Speaker Redmond	HB 963-lost
94		Clerk O'Brien	HB-1206-3rd Reading
94		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
94		McClain	HB 1206-3rd Reading
95		Speaker Redmond	
95		Anderson	
95		Speaker Redmond	
95, 96,		Hoffman)	
97,98,100		McClain)	
100		Kosinski	Moves previous question
101	3:10	Speaker Redmond	
101		McClain	To close
101		Speaker Redmond	
102		Walsh)	Explains vote
102		Speaker Redmond)	
103		Stuffle	Explains vote
103		Speaker Redmond	
103		Schneider	Explains vote



5
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

16. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
103		Speaker Redmond	
104		Geo-Karis	Explains vote
104		Speaker Redmond	
104		Sharp	Explains vote
104		Speaker Redmond	
104		Davis, J.	Withdraws
104		Speaker Redmond	
105		Satterthwaite	Explains vote
105		Speaker Redmond	
105		Deuster	Possible verification
105		Speaker Redmond	
105		McClain)	Poll absentees
105		Speaker Redmond)	
105		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
105		McClain	Postponed Consideration
105		Speaker Redmond	
105		Schlickman	
105		Speaker Redmond	
106		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1329-3rd Reading
106		Speaker Redmond	
106	3:21	Beatty	
106		Speaker Redmond	
107		Johnson	Oppose
107		Speaker Redmond	
108		Willer	
108		Speaker Redmond	
109		Beatty	



17. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
109		Speaker Redmond	Lost
109		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1346 - 3rd Reading
109		Speaker Redmond	
110		Shumpert	
110		Speaker Redmond	
110		Telcser)	
)	
110		Shumpert)	
110		Speaker Redmond	
110		Giorgi	
110		Speaker Redmond	
111		Simms)	
)	
111		Shumpert)	
111		Speaker Redmond	
111		Madison	
111		Speaker Redmond	
111		Leinenweber	Opposes
111		Speaker Redmond	
111		Shumpert	
112		Speaker Redmond	
112		Van Duyne	Introduction
112		Speaker Redmond	HB 1354
112		Clerk O'Brien	Reads HB 1354
112		Speaker Redmond	
112		Doyle	Explains 1354
112		Speaker Redmond	
112		Telcser)	
)	
112		Speaker Redmond)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
18.			
113		Speaker Redmond	
113		Leinenweber	
113		Speaker Redmond	
113		Doyle)	
113		Speaker Redmond)	
113		Clerk O'Brien	Reads HB 1372
113		Speaker Redmond	
114		Greiman	Explains 1372
114		Speaker Redmond	
114		Porter)	
115		Greiman)	
115	3:42	Ewing	Yield
116		Greiman	
116		Speaker Redmond	
116		Madison)	
117		Greiman)	
117		Speaker Redmond	
117		Huff	Moves previous question
117		Speaker Redmond	
118		Greiman	To close
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Deuster	
118		Speaker Redmond	
119		Mugalian	Responds
119		Speaker Redmond	
119		Meyer	
119		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
19.			
119		Greiman	Explains vote
119		Speaker Redmond	
119		Boucek	
119		Speaker Redmond	
120		Hoffman	Explains vote
120		Speaker Redmond	
120		Sumner	Explains vote
120		Speaker Redmond	
120		Johnson	Explains vote
121		Speaker Redmond	
121	3:55	Bradley	Possible verification
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Geo-Karis	Point of order
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Katz	
121		Speaker Redmond	
122		Geo-Karis	'Yes'
122		Speaker Redmond	
122		Huff	'Yes'
122		Speaker Redmond	
123		Leinenweber	
123		Speaker Redmond	
123		Speaker Redmond	
123		Huskey	
123		Speaker Redmond	HB 1372 passed
123		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1390-3rd
123		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
20.			
123		McPike	
123		Speaker Redmond	
124		Bradley)	
124		Deuster)	
124		Speaker Redmond	
124		McPike	Leave to hear 1390,1391 together
124		Speaker Redmond	
124		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1391-3rd Reading
124		Speaker Redmond	
124		McPike	
124		Speaker Redmond	
124		Madison	
124		McPike	
124		Speaker Redmond	
125	4:01	Madison	
125		Speaker Redmond	
125		Peters	
125		Speaker Redmond	
126		McPike	Continues-HB 1390
126		Speaker Redmond	
126		Hoffman)	
126		McPike)	
126		Speaker Redmond	
127		Byers	
127		Speaker Redmond	HB 1390-1391 passed
127		Abramson	HB 1399 - 3rd Reading
127		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
21.			
127		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Bill
127		Speaker Redmond	
128		Madison)	
128)	
		Abramson)	
128		Speaker Redmond	
128		Hanahan)	
129)	
		Abramson)	
130		Madigan)	
131	4:14)	
		Abramson)	
131		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1406 - 3rd Reading
131		Speaker Redmond	
132	4:19	Hanahan)	Speaks on HB 1406
132		Speaker Redmond	
132		Martin)	
132)	
		Hanahan)	
132		Speaker Redmond	
133		Simms	Opposes
133		Speaker Redmond	
134		Hanahan	To close on HB 1406
134		Speaker Redmond	
135		Huskey)	
135)	
		Hanahan)	
135		Speaker Redmond	
135		O'Brien	Moves previous question
135		Speaker Redmond	
135		Hanahan	Close
135		Speaker Redmond	HB 1406 passed



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
22.			
135		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1413
135		Speaker Redmond	
136,137		Hanahan	Explains HB 1413
137		Speaker Redmond	
137		Van Duyne	
137		Speaker Redmond	
137		Hudson	Opposes
137		Speaker Redmond	
138		Simms	Opposes
138		Speaker Redmond	
138		Kent	Opposes
138		Speaker Redmond	
138		Friedrich	Opposes
138		Speaker Redmond	
138		Skinner	Moves previous question
139, 140		Hanahan	To close
141		Speaker Redmond	
141		Walsh	Explains vote
141		Speaker Redmond	
141		Skinner	Explains vote
141		Speaker Redmond	
142		Bluthardt	'No'
142		Speaker Redmond	
142		Sumner	'No'
142		Speaker Redmond	
143		Wikoff	Explains 'no' on 1413
143		Speaker Redmond	HB 1413 lost



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

23. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
143		Speaker Flickman	Motion to suspend rules to extend deadline
143		Speaker Redmond	
144	4:50	Madigan	Opposes motion
145		Speaker Redmond	
145		J. Davis	Opposes motion
145		Speaker Redmond	
146		Hart	Supports
146		Speaker Redmond	
146		Hoffman, G.	Opposes
146		Speaker Redmond	
146		Well	Opposes
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Matijevich	Point of order
147	4:56	Peters	
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Motion-Rule 35
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Wilhoff	Parliamentary Inquiry
147		Speaker Redmond	
148		Madison	'Aye'
148		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
148	5:00	Clerk O'Brien	HB 1440
148		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
148		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1556
148		Speaker Lechowicz	in the Chair
148		Conti	1354 'aye' votes



24. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
148		Speaker Lechowicz	
148		Barnes, G.	Objects
149		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1556
149		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1556-3rd Reading
149		Speaker Lechowicz	
149		Steczo	HB 1556
149		Speaker Lechowicz	
149		Friedrich	
149		Speaker Lechowicz	
149		Friedrich)	
149		Steczo)	
149		Speaker Lechowicz	
150		Steczo	To close
150		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1556 passed
150		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1566
151	5:05	Stanley	HB 1566
151		Speaker Lechowicz	
151		Matijevec	'No' vote
151		Speaker Lechowicz	
152		Davis, J.	'Yes' vote
152	5:10	Speaker Lechowicz	
152		Dunn	Moves previous question
152		Speaker Lechowicz	
152		Stanley	To close
152		Speaker Lechowicz	
153		Robinson	'Yes' vote
153		Speaker Lechowicz	



25. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
153	5:11	Taylor	'No'
153		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1566 passed
153		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1571
153		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Marovitz	Explains HB 1571
154		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Marovitz	
154		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Ewing	
154		Speaker Lechowicz	
155	5:15	Ewing)	
)	
155		Marovitz)	
155		Ewing	Explains vote
155		Speaker Lechowicz	
155		Geo-Karis	'No'
155		Speaker Lechowicz	
155		Reed)	
)	
156		Marovitz)	
156		Speaker Lechowicz	
156		Hudson	'No'
156		Speaker Lechowicz	
156		Hudson	Continues
156		Speaker Lechowicz	
156		Giorgi	Suspend rules?
156		Speaker Lechowicz	
156		Leverenz	Moves previous question
157		Speaker Lechowicz	Moved



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
26.			
157		Marovitz	To close
157		Speaker Lechowicz	
157		Gaines	'No' vote
158	5:21	Speaker Lechowicz	
158		Skinner	Explains 'no' vote
158		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1571 fails
158		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1576
158		Marovitz	
158		Speaker Lechowicz	
158		Jones	
158		Speaker Lechowicz	Proceed
158	5:25	Marovitz	Explains HB 1516
158		Speaker Lechowicz	
159		Leinenweber	Explains 'no' vote
159		Speaker Lechowicz	
159		Pullen	Explains 'no'
159		Speaker Lechowicz	
159		Kent	Explains 'no'
160		Speaker Lechowicz	
160		Dyer	
160		Speaker Lechowicz	
160		Leverenz	
160		Speaker Lechowicz	
161		Wikoff	
161		Speaker Lechowicz	
161		Davis, C.	
161		Speaker Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

27. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
161		Mulcahey	Moves previous question
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
162		Marovitz	Yield to Kelly
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
163		Kelly	
163		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1576
163		Walsh	
164		Steczo	Urges 'aye' vote
164		Speaker Lechowicz	
164	6:37	Ewing	
164		Speaker Lechowicz	
164		Leverenz	
164		Speaker Lechowicz	
165		Keats	
165		Speaker Lechowicz	
165		Barnes	
165		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Ebbesen	
166		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Satterthwaite	
166		Speaker Lechowicz	
167		Gaines	
167		Speaker Lechowicz	
167		Holewinski	
167		Speaker Lechowicz	
168		Catania	
168		Speaker Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
28.			
168		Madison	
168		Speaker Lechowicz	
169		Friedrich	Possible verification
169	5:47	Kane	Explains vote
169		Speaker Lechowicz	
170		Deuster	'No'
170		Speaker Lechowicz	
170		Harris	
170		Speaker Lechowicz	
170		Mahar	
170		Speaker Lechowicz	
171		Levin	
171		Speaker Lechowicz	
171		Huskey	
171		Speaker Lechowicz	
171		Kelly	
171		Speaker Lechowicz	
172		Marovitz	
172		Speaker Lechowicz	
172		Cunningham	
172		Speaker Lechowicz	
172		Kelly	
172		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		Marovitz	Poll absentees
173		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees
173		Marovitz	Postponed Consideration



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

29. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
173		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		Clerk Hall	HB 1604 -3rd Reading
174		Speaker Lechowicz	
174		Levin	Leave to return to 2nd
174		Speaker Lechowicz	
174		Clerk Hall	Amendment #5
174		Levin	
174	6:00	Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #5 adopted-3rd Reading
174		Clerk Hall	HB 1621 - 3rd Reading
174		Mulcahey	
174		Speaker Lechowicz	
175		Friedrich)	
175		Mulcahey)	
175		Speaker Lechowicz	
175		Deuster	
175		Speaker Lechowicz	
175		Stuffle	
176		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
176		Clerk Hall	HB 1638 - 3rd Reading
176		Speaker Lechowicz	
176		Clerk Hall	HB 1638 - 3rd Reading
176		Speaker Lechowicz	
176		Skinner	
176		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
177		Clerk Hall	HB 1641 - 3rd Reading
177		Speaker Lechowicz	
177		Wolf	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Page	Time	Speaker	Information
30.			
177		Speaker Lechowicz	
177		Byers)	
178		Wolf)	
178		Speaker Lechowicz	
178		Pullen)	
178		Wolf)	
179	6:10	Gaines	Explains vote
179		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1641 passed
179		Clerk Hall	HB 1642-3rd Reading
179		Speaker Lechowicz	
180		Yourell	
180		Speaker Lechowicz	
180		Meyer)	
181		Yourell)	
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
182		Katz	
182		Speaker Lechowicz	
182		Catania)	
183		Yourell)	
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183		Schisler	Support
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Stuffle	
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
185		Mudd	
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
185		Friedrich	



31. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
185		Schlickman	
185	6:25	Speaker Lechowicz	
186		Yourell	
186		Speaker Lechowicz	
187		Martin	
187		Speaker Lechowicz)	HB 1642 - Postponed Consideration
187		Barnes, E.)	
187		Speaker Lechowicz	
187		Clerk O'Brien	House Bills Second Reading
188		Speaker Lechowicz	
188		Barnes, E.	
188		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #1-HB 107 adopted
189		Mugalian	
189		Speaker Lechowicz	Am #1-767 adopted
189		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1812-3rd Reading
189		Speaker Lechowicz	
189, 190		Terzich	
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Ewing	
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
192		Ewing)	
192)	
192		Terzich)	
192		Speaker Lechowicz	
193		Ryan	
193		Speaker Lechowicz	
193		Dunn, J.	Moves previous question
193		Speaker Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Page	Time	Speaker	Information
32.			
193		Terzich	Support
193		Speaker Lechowicz	
194		Hoffman	Opposes
194		Speaker Lechowicz	
194		Madison	
194		Speaker Lechowicz	
194		Miller	
194		Speaker Lechowicz	
194		Terzich	
194		Speaker Lechowicz	
194		Hoffman	
195		Speaker Lechowicz	
195		Telcser	
195		Speaker Lechowicz	
195		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1820
195		Speaker Lechowicz	
196		Holewinski	
196	7:00	Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1843
196		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1843
196		Speaker Lechowicz	
196		Houlihan, J.	
196		Speaker Lechowicz	
197		Greiman	
197		Speaker Lechowicz	
197		Skinner	Question
197		Speaker Lechowicz	
198		Unknown	



33.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	198		Speaker Lechowicz	
	199		Collins	Opposes
	199		Speaker Lechowicz	
	199		Greiman	To close
	199		Speaker Lechowicz	
	199		Houlihan, J.	Support
	199		Speaker Lechowicz	
	200		Katz	
	200		Speaker Lechowicz	
	200		Bluthardt	Opposes
	200		Speaker Lechowicz	
	201		Madigan	Supports
	201		Speaker Lechowicz	
	201		Totten	
	201		Speaker Lechowicz	
	201		Jaffe)
	202		Speaker Lechowicz)
	202		Sandquist	Supports
	202		Speaker Lechowicz	
	202		Mugalian	Supports
	203		Speaker Lechowicz	
	203	7:11	Clerk O'Brien	
	203		Speaker Lechowicz	
	203		Totten	
	203		Speaker Lechowicz	
	203		Houlihan, J.	Postponed Consideration



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

34. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
203		Speaker Lechowicz	
203		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1851
204		McCourt	
204		Speaker Lechowicz	
205, 206		Stuffle)	
206		McCourt)	
207		Hanahan)	
207		McCourt)	
207		Speaker Lechowicz	
207		Flinn	Moves previous question
207		Speaker Lechowicz	
208		Robinson)	
208		Stuffle)	
208		Speaker Lechowicz	
208		Wikoff)	
208		McCourt)	
208		Speaker Lechowicz	
208		McCourt	To close
209		Speaker Lechowicz	
209		Telcser	
209		Speaker Lechowicz	
210		Ebbesen	
210		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1851 lost
210	7:11	Clerk Hall	HB 1853 - 3rd Reading
210		Speaker Lechowicz	
210		Mudd	
210		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>35.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
210, 211		Hoffman)	
212, 213		Mudd)	
213		Speaker Lechowicz	
213		Stuffle	
213		Speaker Lechowicz	
214		Telcser)	
215		Mudd)	
215		Speaker Lechowicz	
215		Byers	Out of order
215		Speaker Lechowicz	
216		Telcser	
216		Speaker Lechowicz	
216		Collins	Yield to Telcser
216		Speaker Lechowicz	
216		Taylor	Moves previous question
216		Speaker Lechowicz	
216		Katz	
216		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion fails
216		Collins	Yield to Telcser
217		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1853
217	7:40	Mudd	To close
217		Speaker Lechowicz	
217		Katz	Explains vote
217		Speaker Lechowicz	
217		Ryan	Verify roll
217		Speaker Lechowicz	
217		Telcser	Explains vote



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
36.			
217		Speaker Lechowicz	
218		Schuneman	Explains vote
218		Speaker Lechowicz	
218		Martin, L.	
219		Speaker Lechowicz	
219		Collins	
219		Speaker Lechowicz	
219		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees
219		Speaker Lechowicz	
220		Clerk Hall	Affirmative Roll Call
220		Speaker Lechowicz	
220		Von Boeckman	'Aye'
220		Speaker Lechowicz	
220		Ewing	'No'
220		Speaker Lechowicz	
221	7:52	Ryan)	Questions
222		Speaker Lechowicz)	
223		Ryan)	
223		Wolf	Change to 'aye'
223		Speaker Lechowicz	
223		Schuneman	'Present'
224		Speaker Lechowicz	
224		Ryan	
224		Davis, J.	'Present'
224		Speaker Lechowicz	
224		Stiehl	'Aye'
224		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
37.			
224		Hoffman	'Aye'
224		Speaker Lechowicz	
224		Ebbesen	'Aye'
224		Speaker Lechowicz	
224		Schneider	
224		Speaker Lechowicz	
224		Geo-Karis	'Aye'
225		Speaker Lechowicz	
225		Klosak	'Aye'
225		Speaker Lechowicz	
225		Simms	'Aye'
225		Speaker Lechowicz	
225		Deuster	'Aye'
225		Speaker Lechowicz	
225		Abramson	
225		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1853 passed
225		Clerk Hall	HB 1871 - 3rd Reading
225		Greiman	
226	8:02	Wolf	
226		Speaker Lechowicz	
226		Friedrich)	
)	
227		Greiman)	
227		Speaker Lechowicz	
227		Taylor	Moves previous question
228		Speaker Lechowicz	
228		Greiman	
228		Speaker Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

38.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	229		Byers	
	229		Speaker Lechowicz	
	229		Simms	
	229		Speaker Lechowicz	
	229		Katz	
	229		Speaker Lechowicz	
	229		Martin, L.	Explains vote
	229		Speaker Lechowicz	
	230		Telcser	
	230		Speaker Lechowicz	
	230		Campbell	
	230		Speaker Lechowicz	
	230		Hoffman	
	230		Speaker Lechowicz	
	231		McAuliffe	
	231		Speaker Lechowicz	
	231		Mulcahey	
	231		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1886 - 3rd
	231		Johnson	
	231		Speaker Lechowicz	
	231		Polk	
	231		Speaker Lechowicz	
	231		Porter	
	231		Speaker Lechowicz	
	231		Houlihan	
	232		Speaker Lechowicz	
	232		Hudson	



39.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	232		Speaker Lechowicz	
	232		Keats	
	232		Speaker Lechowicz	
	232		Boucek	
	232		Speaker Lechowicz	
	232	8:16	Clerk O'Brien	HB 1952 - 3rd
	232		Speaker Lechowicz	
	232		Marovitz	
	232		Speaker Lechowicz	
	232		Huskey	
	233		Speaker Lechowicz	
	233		Geo-Karis)	
	233		Marovitz)	
	233		Speaker Lechowicz	
	234		Kelly)	
	234		Marovitz)	
	234		Speaker Lechowicz	
	234		Anderson	
	235		Marovitz	
	235		Speaker Lechowicz	
	235		Flinn	Oppose
	235		Speaker Lechowicz	
	236		Telcser)	
	237		Marovitz)	
	237		Speaker Lechowicz	
	237		Houlihan	
	237		Speaker Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

40.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	237		Speaker Lechowicz	
	237		Telcser)	
	237		Marovitz)	
	237		Speaker Lechowicz	
	237		Luft	
	237		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	238		Ewell)	
	238		Speaker Lechowicz	
	238		Taylor	Moves previous question
	238		Speaker Lechowicz	
	238		Ewell	
	238		Speaker Lechowicz	
	238		Hoffman	
	238		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	238		Marovitz)	
	238		Speaker Lechowicz	
	239		Davis, C.	
	239		Speaker Lechowicz	
	239		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1958
	239		Speaker Lechowicz	
	239		Meyer	
	239		Speaker Lechowicz	
	240		Brummer	
	240		Speaker Lechowicz	
	240		Simms	Questions
	240		Speaker Lechowicz	
	240		Brummer	



41.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	240		Speaker Lechowicz	
	241		Hoffman	Supports
	241		Speaker Lechowicz	
	241		Levin)	
	242		Brummer)	
	242		Speaker Lechowicz	
	242		Luft	Moves previous question
	242		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	242		Walsh)	
	242		Speaker Lechowicz	
	242		Madison	Moves previous question
	242		Speaker Lechowicz	
	243		Brummer	To close
	243		Speaker Lechowicz	
	243		Byers	Congrat Brummer's 1st Bill
	243		Speaker Lechowicz	
	243		Porter	
	243		Speaker Lechowicz	
	243		Anderson	
	243		Speaker Lechowicz	
	244		Stuffle	
	244		Speaker Lechowicz	
	244		Walsh	
	244		Speaker Lechowicz	
	244		Deuster	
	245		Speaker Lechowicz	
	245		Brummet	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

42. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
245		Speaker Lechowicz	HB passes
245		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1978 - 3rd Reading
246		Yourell	Explains 1978
246		Speaker Redmond	
247		Collins	Cosponsor
248		Bluthardt)	
248		Yourell)	
248		Speaker Redmond	
249	8:58	Kempiners)	
250		Yourell)	
250		Speaker Redmond	
251		Simms)	
251		Yourell)	
251		Simms	
251		Friedrich	
251		Yourell	
252		Conti	
252		Speaker Redmond	
252		Madison	
252		Speaker Redmond	
253		Conti	Continues
253		Speaker Redmond	
254		Madison)	
255		Yourell)	
255		Collins)	
255		Speaker Redmond	
255		Terzich	Moves previous question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
43.			
255		Speaker Redmond	
256		Collins	To close
256		Speaker Redmond	
257		Bluthardt	Personal privilege
257		Speaker Redmond	
257		Wikoff	
257		Speaker Redmond	
258	9:18	Steczo	
258		Speaker Redmond	
258		Byers	
258		Friedrich	
258		Speaker Redmond	
259		Schuneman	
259		Mahar	
259		Speaker Redmond	
259		Skinner	
260		Speaker Redmond	Passed
260		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1991 - 3rd Reading
260		Speaker Redmond	
260		McClain	
261		Speaker Redmond	Passed
261		Clerk O'Brien	
261		Speaker Redmond	
262		Matijevich	HB 1993
262		Speaker Redmond	
262		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1993 - 3rd Reading
262		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

44. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
262		Friedrich	
262		Speaker Redmond	
263		Leinenweber	
263		Speaker Redmond	
263		Matijevec	
263		Speaker Redmond	
263	9:32	Johnson	
264		Speaker Redmond	
264		Deavers	
265		Speaker Redmond	
265		Geo-Karis	
265		Speaker Redmond	
265		Taylor	Moves previous question
265		Speaker Redmond	
266		Matijevec	
266		Speaker Redmond	
266		Johnson	
266		Speaker Redmond	
266		Davis, J.	No
266		Speaker Redmond	
267		Huskey	
267		Skinner	
267		Speaker Redmond	
268		Gaines	
268		Speaker Redmond	
268		Kucharski	
268		Speaker Redmond	



Page	Time	Speaker	Information
45.			
268		Madison	
268		Speaker Redmond	
268		Lauer	
269		Speaker Redmond	Bill lost
269		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1995 - 3rd Reading
269		Speaker Redmond	
269		Marovitz	Yields to Telcser
269		Telcser	
269		Speaker Redmond	
270		Ewing)	
270)	
270		Telcser)	
270		Peters)	
271)	
271		Telcser)	
272		Speaker Redmond	
272		Taylor	Moves previous question
272		Speaker Redmond	
272		Friedrich	
272		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
273		Telcser	To close
273		Speaker Redmond	
273		Mahar	Explains vote
273		Speaker Redmond	
273		Totten	
273	9:56	Speaker Redmond	
274		Lauer	Explains vote
274		Speaker Redmond	
274		Simms	Explains 'yes' vote



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>46.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	274		Speaker Redmond	
	274		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1997 - 3rd Reading
	274		Speaker Redmond	
	275		Younge	
	275	9:57	Speaker Redmond	
	276		Collins)	
	276		Younge)	
	276		Speaker Redmond	
	276		Houlihan, J.	
	276		Speaker Redmond	
	276		Ewell	
	277		Johnson	
	277		Speaker Redmond	
	277		McBroom	
	277		Speaker Redmond	
	277		Stuffle	Moves previous question
	277		Speaker Redmond	
	277		Younge	
	277		Speaker Redmond	
	278		Simms	
	278		Speaker Redmond	
	278		Tipsword	
	278		Speaker Redmond	
	278		Speaker Redmond	
	278		Clerk O'Brien	
	279		McBroom	
	279		Madigan	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ious question

of order

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
47.			
279		Speaker Redmond	HB 2083 - 3rd Reading
279		Clerk O'Brien	
279		Laurino	
279		Speaker Redmond	
280		Madison	
280		Speaker Redmond	
281	10:10	Collins	
281		Speaker Redmond	
281		Mugalian	
282		Bluthardt	
282		Speaker Redmond	
282		Bowman	
282		Speaker Redmond	
282		Simms	Moves previous question
282		Speaker Redmond	
282		Huff	
282		Speaker Redmond	
282		Kelly	Point of order
283		Speaker Redmond	
283		Huff	
283		Speaker Redmond	
283		Laurino	Close
283		Speaker Redmond	Bill lost
284	10:10	Clerk O'Brien	SB First Reading
284		Speaker Redmond	
284		Madigan	
285		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>48.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
285		McBroom	Roll Call on adjournment
285		Speaker Redmond	
285		Lechowicz	
285		Speaker Redmond	
285		Speaker Madigan	
285		McClain	
286		Speaker Madigan	HB 2118
286		Clerk O'Brien	
286		Corneal Davis	Point of personal privilege
286		Speaker Madigan	HB 2118
286		Keats	Parliamentary Inquiry
286		Speaker Madigan	
287, 288, 289		Reed	
289		Speaker Madigan	
290		Macdonald	
290		Speaker Madigan	
291	10:45	Porter	
292		Speaker Madigan	
292, 293, 294		Porter	
294		Speaker Madigan)	
294, 295, 296		Keats)	
296		Speaker Madigan	
297		Keats	
297		Speaker Madigan	
297		Stuffle	
297		Speaker Madigan	
297, 298		Williams	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
49.			
298		Speaker Madigan	
298		Porter	
299		Speaker Madigan	
299		Geo-Karis	
300		Speaker Madigan	
300		Hudson	
301		Speaker Madigan	
301		Campbell	
301		Speaker Madigan	
302		Deuster	
302		Speaker Madigan	
302		Luft	
302		Speaker Madigan	
302		J. Davis	
302		Speaker Madigan	
303		Kempiners	
303		Speaker Madigan	
303		Katz	
303		Speaker Madigan	
304		Dyer	
304		Speaker Madigan	
304		Stuffle	
304		Speaker Madigan	
304		Skinner	
304		Speaker Madigan	
304		Ebbesen	
304		Speaker Madigan	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
50.			
305		Macdonald	
305		Speaker Madigan	
305		Catania	
305		Speaker Madigan	
305	11:18	Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
306		Speaker Madigan	
306		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Call
306		Speaker Madigan	
306		Keats	
306, 307		Speaker Madigan)	Questions of Affirmative Roll
307		Clerk O'Brien)	
308, 309		Keats)	
309		Speaker Madigan	2118 passed
309		Harris	
309		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2186
309		Speaker Madigan	
310		Huskey	
310		Speaker Madigan	
311		Johnson	
311		Speaker Madigan	
311		Houlihan, D.	
311		Speaker Madigan	
312		Porter	
312		Speaker Madigan	
312		Kelly	
312		Speaker Madigan	
312		Collins	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

51. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
312		Speaker Madigan	
313		Huskey	
313		Speaker Madigan	2186 passed
313		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2201
313		Speaker Madigan	
313		Houlihan, D.	Explains 2201
313		Speaker Madigan	
313		Schlickman)	
)	
314,315		Houlihan, D.)	
315		Speaker Madigan	
316		Terzich)	
)	
316		Houlihan, D.)	
316		Speaker Madigan	
316		Deavers	Moves previous question
316		Speaker Madigan	
317		Houlihan, D.	To close
317		Speaker Madigan	
317		Robinson	
317		Speaker Madigan	2201 Postponed Consideration
317		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2205
317		Speaker Madigan	
318		Lucco	Explains HB 2205
318		Speaker Madigan	
319		Anderson)	
)	
319		Lucco)	
319		Speaker Madigan	HB 2205 Third Reading



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>52.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
320		Laurino	Moves previous question
320		Speaker Madigan	
320		Stuffle)	
)	
321		Anderson)	Speaks to the Bill
321		Speaker Madigan	
321		Luft	Moves previous question
321		Speaker Madigan	
321		Lucco	To close
321		Speaker Madigan	
321		Speaker Madigan	HB 2205
321		Stuffle	
321		Speaker Madigan	
322		Geo-Karis	
322		Speaker Madigan	
322		Bartulis	HB 2231
322		Speaker Madigan	Passed
323		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2241
324		Speaker Madigan	
324		McBroom	
324		Speaker Madigan	
324		Lechowicz	
324		Speaker Madigan	
324		Houlihan	
324		Speaker Madigan	
324		McBroom	
324		Speaker Madigan	
325		Friedrich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

53. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
325	12:08	Pullen	
325		Speaker Madigan	
325		Sandquist	
325		Speaker Madigan	
325		Taylor	Moves previous question
325		Speaker Madigan	
325		McBroom	
326		Speaker Madigan	
326		Matijevich	
326		Speaker Madigan	
326		Davis, C.	
326		Speaker Madigan	
327		O'Brien	
327		Speaker Madigan	
327	12:12	Deuster	
327		Speaker Madigan	
327		Katz	
327		Speaker Madigan	
328		Mautino	
328		Speaker Madigan	
328		Sevcik	
328		Speaker Madigan	
328		Sandquist	
328		Speaker Madigan	
328		Catania	
328		Speaker Madigan	Passed
328		Lechowicz	Verification



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

54. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
329		McMaster	
329		Lechowicz	
329		Speaker Madigan	
329		Davis, J.	
329		Speaker Madigan	
329		Lechowicz	
329		Speaker Madigan	
329		Telcser	
330		Speaker Madigan	
330		McBroom	
331		Speaker Madigan	HB 2241 lost
331		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2246-3rd Reading
331		Speaker Madigan	
331		Skinner	
331		Speaker Madigan	
332		Farley	
332		Speaker Madigan	
332		Friedrich	
333		Keats	
333		Speaker Madigan	
333		Geo-Karis	
333		Speaker Redmond	
333		Deuster)	
334		Skinner)	
334		Speaker Redmond	
335		Ebbesen	
335		Speaker Madigan	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
55.			
335		Ewell	
335		Speaker Madigan	
335		Steele	
335		Speaker Madigan	
336		Dyer	
336		Speaker Madigan	
336		Totten	
336		Speaker Madigan	
336		Farley	Verify
336		Speaker Madigan	
336		Mugalian	
336		Speaker Madigan	
336		Ebbesen	
336		Speaker Madigan	
336		Farley	
337		Speaker Madigan	HB 2264
337		Lechowicz	
337		Speaker Redmond	
337		Marovitz	
338		Speaker Madigan	HB 2246 passed
338		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2287-3rd
338		Speaker Madigan	
338		Schneider	
338		Speaker Madigan	
338		Hoffman	
338		Speaker Madigan	Passed
339		Matijeich	HB 2313, 2173 & 583 on list



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>56.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
339		Speaker Madigan	
339		Wolf	
339		Speaker Madigan	
339		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2339 - 3rd
340		Tipsword	
340		Speaker Redmond	
340		Geo-Karis)	
)	
341		Tipsword)	
341		Speaker Madigan	
341		Ebbesen	
342		Speaker Madigan	
342, 343		Peters	
343		Speaker Redmond	
343		Gaines	
343		Speaker Redmond	
344		Ebbesen	
344		Lechowicz, S. C. Co.	
344		Peters	
344		Speaker Redmond	
344		Ebbesen	
344		Speaker Redmond	
344	12:56	Keats	
345		Speaker Redmond	
345		Tipsword)	
)	
345		Speaker Redmond)	
345		Madigan	Recess 10 a.m.
345		Speaker Redmond	

