

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

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Heinrich Heine observed: 'In medieval times men had convictions. We moderns have only opinions and it requires something more than opinions to build a Gothic cathedral.' Let us pray. Heavenly Father, we come to Thee this day as we begin a new week in our labors as Members of this Illinois House of Representatives. Give to us, we beseech Thee, the strength and stamina to be most thoughtful and watchful as we consider the many and complex issues that will come before us. Intensify our will and determination to devote our energies and abilities to complete understanding and appreciation of their value and effect upon the people of this state, that what we will have so done will be of monumental importance and benefit to all. This we ask in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 127th Legislative Day, Thursday, May 11, 1978, the House met pursuant to adjournment, the Speaker in the Chair, prayer by Father William Krueger, Chaplain. By direction of the Speaker, a Roll Call was taken to ascertain the attendance of Members of....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journal #127 of May 11, 128 of May 12, 1978, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with and they be approved? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Journal's approved. Representative Madigan, do you have any absences?"



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Pierce is excused?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, are there any excused absences on the Republican side? Clerk...no objection, the record will show that Representative Pierce is excused and that there are no excused absences on the Republican side. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 867, Redmond. House Resolution 868, Waddell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 867, Redmond, expresses our support for the efforts of Tom Brown, a Chicago area resident and original crew member of the USS St. Louis in preserving the Lucky Lou. House Resolution, 868, Waddell, we join in congratulating Jesse Pamela Bowdish on reaching her 100th birthday. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. House Bills Third Reading. Priority of call. House Bill 2790."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2790. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation, Division of Water Resources for use of Flatbush Drainage District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 0620."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 620. A Bill for an Act to license, tax and regulate the business of operating jai alai frontons. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn, you want this one called? Representative Flinn, 620? Out of the record. 2418."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2418. A Bill for an Act to abolish all ad valorem personal property taxes and to provide for replacement of revenues lost thereby. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian on the floor? Take 2418 out of the record. 2932."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2932. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of 2932? Out of the record. 400. Skinner."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 400. A Bill for an Act in relation to regulatory agency officials upon termination of their governmental service. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner on the floor? Out of the record. 634."

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

Speaker Redmond: "They don't do that on shipboard, they don't whistle on shipboard. Proceed, 634."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 634. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino. Out of the record. 2214. Representative Younge on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2214. A Bill for an Act in relation to Family Resource Centers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge on the floor? Out of the record. 3149. Representative Geo-Karis has arrived."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3149. A Bill for an Act concerning waterways and wetlands in the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of 3149? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "This is the Committee Bill for the Environment Energy Resources Committee, simply directs the Department of Conservation to undertake inventory. They have a lot of data already available but they haven't pulled together in any one place so that anyone asking a question about water resources can get a straight answer so this just directs them, gives them a three-year period to do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 2662."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2662. A Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Civic Center Support Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley on the floor? Out of the record. 2663."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2663. A Bill for an Act creating the Bloomington Civic Center Authority, defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley on the floor? Out of the record. 2808."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2808. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections ...a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton. Out of the record. 2926."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2926. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Friedrich: "I'd like to be heard briefly on a point of personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point, Sir."

Friedrich: "I'm sure every Member of this Body, and probably every Member of the Senate, received two letters the same as I did, one from the American Association of University Professors and the American Association of University Women, in which they boldly admit that they're driving business out of Illinois simply on the basis Illinois has not ratified ERA. Now these are people that are on the public payroll and certainly it is in their interest not to deprive Illinois of money. They're always asking more money for higher salaries for university people and here they are engaging in the business of driving conventions and things out of the State of Illinois. I think we ought to all deplore this action and I certainly do it here and now."

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



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think we're stretching personal privilege a little too far when we take it for that advantage. I think he's out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "2926, Representative Capparelli on the floor?
Out of the record. 3002."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3002. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Local Library Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond or Ralph Dunn. Out of the record. 1970. Oh, 3167, pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3167. A Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, do you want...."

Clerk O'Brien: "To amend Sections to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3167 would provide for a broadening of the scope, powers and function of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. This Agency has been in existence for several years, however, its operations have been restricted because of budgetary restraints and also because of a lack of acceptability within the financial institutions throughout the state. Now this Bill would provide that the Agency could become involved in the purchase of machinery and equipment, that the bond interest rate would be raised from six percent to eight percent and would place a limit on the outstanding bonds of 100,000,000 dollars. All of these items taken together it is hoped would provide for a more viable agency than we currently have."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93...94 'aye' and 58 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 1970."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1970. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio on the floor? Out of the record. 2800. What's your pleasure, Representative McMaster."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill.... House Bill 2800."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, do we have enough bodies? If we have enough bodies I'll try to run it."

Speaker Redmond: "I wouldn't guarantee it on this one. Out of the record. 2801 out of the record. 2850."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2850. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich on the floor? Out of the record. 2898."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2898. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 3039."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3039. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Judiciary I, Representative Getty, is this your Bill? Dan Houlihan. Out of the record. How about 3041?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3041."

Speaker Redmond: "That Products Liability, too? Out of the record. 3088."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3088. A Bill for an Act in relation to township government and repeal an Act therein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 3112." Representative Yourell, you ready on that one?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3112 requires the state to reimburse local units of government and school districts the full cost of any programs mandated by the state after January 1, 1979, or as well of any expansions required in existing mandated programs. Any new or expanded programs services required by the state will have to be accompanied by an appropriations



sufficient to pay for those program services. The Comptroller is to allocate the funds among the local units based on claims of estimated program costs for the fiscal year. These allocations will be approved and jointly certified in writing by the Governor and Auditor General. There was an Amendment put on by Representative Lynn Martin that would require that the funds supplied by the state for any mandated programs would be for that program only. I'd be glad to answer any questions and urge a favorable Roll Call On House Bill 3112."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Would the Gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Telcser: "Representative, do you have any idea of estimating what the possible fiscal impact of this could be for future General Assemblies?"

Yourell: "No, I have no idea, there is no fiscal note that can be attached to the Bill in my judgment because until we know what the mandated programs are, we won't know the cost."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to oppose House Bill 3112 for the very reason which was embodied in my question and to the Sponsor's answer. The fact of the matter is that the fiscal impact on the state budget could have dire consequences for the state and as a result I think that it would inhibit the Members of the Legislature and the Governor from discharging their responsibilities that we have as state officeholders. There are many, many programs which the state mandates which local governments ought to fund and which, I believe, they could very well be ready to fund. What we're doing with a piece of legislation like this is simply tying the hands of the Legislature and the Governor without giving us some leeway to look at every individual situation as it arises. It is within the realm of possibility that the Legislature in the future could mandate a program for local government and fund those programs if they so wish, but by passing House Bill 3112, we are giving up a very important option which we now have in state government. I



have been one who will always wanted to protect legislative prerogative. I hate to see us today in the Assembly give away that very important prerogative which we ought to retain in the future. House Bill 3112 is something which takes away from the Legislature, which takes away from you and I, the power to do something. And I'm sorry to say, but that over the years I've seen too much of the legislative prerogative powers become eroded for one reason or another. It's very easy to fall into a trap with a Bill like this. It has some sex appeal. It looks good on its surface but each and everyone of us has experienced Bills like this which have become law, and after they became law, we've been sorry we voted for them. I think that if the...if the Sponsor would reflect a little while longer on the impact that this Bill would have on us, you may agree that while the idea appears good, in the long run, it is not something which we should enact. And so, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in order to preserve the legislative prerogatives and the legislative option, I would urge every Member to vote against House Bill 3112."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tuerk: "Representative Yourell, Representative Von Boeckman and I had a Bill very similar to this last year, how did your Bill differ from your particular....."

Yourell: "As you know, Representative Tuerk, your Bill 297, along with Representative Von Boeckman, passed out of this House with tremendous majority. And I think you've got the Roll Call. This Bill is the result of the Governor's mandated commission that he appointed in two areas, one on local government, one on education. I was a Member of the mandated commission appointed by the Governor relative to local government. We traveled throughout the state, had twelve public hearings. The Chairman of that Subcommittee was the Lieutenant Governor and he indicated to us after the termination of the commission and the public hearings that legislation of this nature was desired. Wherever we went in this state units of local government and the representatives of those governments



from county, townships, cities, villages and town school districts told us, 'please do not mandate any more programs to us unless you're willing to pay for them.' We've been mandating salary increases for Judges that we expect the county to pay for. We've even mandated ...we mandated a 9-1-1 program and they said, 'that's a very fine program' but now after the seed money has run out, you expect us to pay for it.' In some of the smaller counties in the state they don't even have enough money to pay the salaries of the elected public officials. One little County Clerk downstate - and Representative McMaster was there at that meeting - testified that she hadn't been paid for five or six terms that she served in that position as County Clerk. And they told us, and the message was loud and clear, that the Governor was right, don't mandate any programs unless you want to pay for them. This Bill is very similar, Representative Tuerk, to House Bill 297. The only difference, this is an outgrowth of the commission recommendation."

Tuerk: "Thank you. You just saved me making the same speech and I thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield? Representative Yourell, I admit this Bill may be technically defective, I call your attention to page 2, lines 14 through 16. It says, 'the claims' now referring to claims submitted by affected units of local government, 'shall include the actual cost for the prior fiscal year and the estimated cost for the current fiscal year'. It sounds like, you know, has the...that the people or units of local government are being reimbursed twice, once for the last fiscal year and once for this fiscal year, and this would occur in each and every fiscal year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Bowman: "Wait a minute, this was a question and I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me."

Yourell: "Are you referring to lines 14 through 16 on page 2?"

Bowman: "Yes, Sir. It sounds like there...there is double claiming.

Or they're claiming the same cost twice, or they would get double payment. They would get payment for last year plus an expected...."



Yourell: "Yes, that's right. We can correct that by Amendment if you like."

Bowman: "Okay, will....I...I do think that the Bill needs...needs some cleaning up and I think the appropriate thing to do would be to take it out of the record at this time, move it back to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, was a Member of that mandated Laws Commission with Representative Yourell. I think this is an excellent piece of legislation. I think you should all note that ^{the} effective date as any laws passed mandating expenses to local government after January 1, 1979. So certainly we have time to take this into consideration when this General Assembly sits again in its next Session. It isn't very often that I disagree with our distinguished leader, Representative Telcser, but I think in this case perhaps the General Assembly should have its hands tied. When we start passing legislation onto local government without any consideration of how they are going to raise the money to pay for that legislation or that mandate that we passed down to them, I think we are making a very, very serious mistake. It's time that we sit and look at things. When we pass legislation affecting local government we must recognize what it is going to cost that local government and the local taxpayers. Don't forget the one who foots the bill is the local taxpayer and the local taxpayer back in our counties and our school districts are the ones that are paying the real estate tax and they're the ones that are being hurt by the mandate that we pass down to local government. All of you, on both sides of the aisle, are concerned about what the cost of real estate taxes is doing and certainly this is a good time to stand up, let yourselves be heard, vote 'yes' on this very good Bill. I commend the Sponsor. By the way, Representative Yourell, the Lieutenant Governor's name is Lieutenant Governor Dave O'Neal. I urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

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



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the traditional relationship between the State Legislature and units of local government is one of creator and creature. Units of local government and school districts are the creatures of the General Assembly, and it's our responsibility, by the Constitution, to pass enabling statutes so that the units of local government can be created. And we also have implicit, the responsibility, for providing to them duties, responsibilities by which they can implement the policy that we set and rightfully so and responsibly so - under the State Constitution. Now, ...Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if we are being told that we are going to have this new bureaucracy in state government, we're going to have this additional expense at the state level when, in fact, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are constitutionally required when creating these units of local government and school districts to provide them means by which to raise revenue, we are going to be giving up, relinquishing our responsibility as the creator of these...the responsibility of the creator of these creatures. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I do appreciate that over the years the State Legislature has imposed without fiscal responsibility and concern on the units of local government certain required programs. And this was acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, by the Governor's Commission on State-Mandated Programs. But, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is not recommended by that Commission. What this Commission has recommended, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is a permanent commission on local fiscal impact to administer the fiscal note procedures and to provide an ongoing review of state mandated programs. And that local policy making officials should participate in state administrative role-making that affects local government should be increased and that the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies should use forms and procedures for program analysis and budgeting which reflect the true cost...cost of new programs or reduced programs by including their direct and predictable fiscal impact on the local governmental units. That Commission, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, did not recommend House Bill



3112. It recommended fact-finding, it recommended analysis, so that there would be more concern, there would be more information at the state level by which to determine the appropriateness of a state mandated program. And, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, look at the Bill. It doesn't even define what a state mandated program is and then it gives to bureaucrats outside the Legislative Branch the duty to determine the cost of a state mandated program. And then the Executive Branch can impose upon us the responsibility of appropriating. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill if it becomes law is going to lead to bankruptcy of state government and it's going to lead to the inhibition of the Legislature in performing its responsibilities as mandated by the State Constitution. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this is a Bill not to be passed and I urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Cal Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us if local governments would have the right to sue state government in the Court of Claims if we did not pay for mandated programs as they defined it?"

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

Yourell: "As I understand it, Representative Skinner, the Comptroller would be the one to allocate the funds among the local units based on claims of the programs estimated for that fiscal year. And the allocations for those programs would be approved and certified in writing by the Governor and Auditor General. I don't know whether the unit of government would have the opportunity or the authority to sue the state in a...in a Court of Claims."

Skinner: "What if there's not enough money?"

Yourell: "Well, if there's not enough money, I would suggest that the program would not be adopted because in the...in the Bill it calls for, as you can see, are the appropriation for the program. So you'll be voting on both at the same time."

Skinner: "How do you answer the Representative from Arlington Heights' objection that you do not define mandated program?"

Yourell: "Well, my suggestion to the Gentleman from Arlington Heights is that I understand the meaning of a mandate and I think that everybody else in this General Assembly does as well. And I would suggest



also to the Gentleman that mandated...a mandated program is a program that tells a unit of local government to do something and then not provide the funds for that. I can recall when I first came to the General Assembly, we said that school districts would have facilities for special education and that was fine and that was a great program and it was a program that was needed. But at the same time we didn't fund them and then we had to go back to the units of local govern...school districts to levy for that program and that was what a mandated program,(sic) and I think it's very well understood. The Taxpayer's Federation who, as you know, has long been a watchdog of taxes in Illinois, is in complete support of this legislation and I've talked with their representatives and they find nothing wrong with the Bill."

Skinner: "What would happen if we voted to raise the minimum salaries of county officials or officials of the Metropolitan Sanitary District, would state government then have to pay the costs, the increased cost to county government if a county were at the minimum prior to the passage of such legislation?"

Yourell: "Well, as you know, Representative Skinner, as a hyphenated Cosponsor of this legislation that any increase...any increase in...in salaries certainly has to be considered at the time it's passed. I don't think that's the program."

Skinner: "So your answer is no? Is that correct?"

Yourell: "No, I don't think that we can mandate salaries back to counties for Judges and for any other elected official unless we do so with an appropriation in mind."

Skinner: "Then your answer is yes?"

Yourell: "The answer is yes."

Skinner: "Oh. Okay, I think there should surely ought to be enough money with all the salary increases that we ourselves are foregoing to be able to pay for this, don't you?"

Yourell: "Well, I don't...I don't know, Representative Skinner, if the money isn't there we shouldn't pass the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"



Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Conti: "Does the provision of a blank check, was that taken out, Buzz, or is that still in there?"

Yourell: "No, that was taken out by the...Representative Martin's Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Yourell, could I ask you a question, please?"

Yourell: "Certainly."

Kent: "We have many programs that are mandated by the Federal Government and sometimes there are matching funds or there are certain allocations that local governments have to do, where do we come in as a state on those programs?"

Yourell: "I don't think it has anything to do with the state...state program with matching funds with the Federal Government. This is with state and local units of government and school districts. All the Bill does, Representative, is, say if we in the General Assembly mandate a program then we're obligated to pay for it."

Kent: "The mandated programs by the Federal Government to us have nothing to do with that?"

Yourell: "I suggest they don't."

Kent: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Representative Yourell, does this...will this apply to executive department mandates as well as to legislative mandate?"

Yourell: "It only refers to legislative mandate."

Tipsword: "It's only limited to legislative mandate. That's incredible. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is similar to House Bill 297 of which I am Chief Sponsor.

This 297 sailed out of this House last year and I agreed to hold it



in the Senate until the mandated hearing program was conducted which I was a Member along with Representative Yourell. Now, in no way, are we relinquishing any of our powers as a Legislative Body in this matter. I feel like any program that a Legislator introduced that would mandate any local government or school district then that Legislature....Legislator should know where the funds are coming from or get permission from the Governor or anybody else that the program is good before he ever tries to pass it in the House. I feel this is good legislation because what we're doing when we continue to mandate programs to our local government we are then, Mr. Speaker, increasing local taxes which we, as Members of this General Assembly, are receiving much, much flak. I think it's good legislation although my Bill, 297, goes a little farther it does include the Executive or any other branch of government. I... I urge an 'aye' vote on this issue."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd, has moved the previous question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the 'ayes' have it and the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that this is a dramatic change from the way that the General Assembly has operated in its relationship with units of local government and school districts throughout the years. I know as well as others who were on that Commission that heard the pleas and the complaints and the laments of those people who represent other levels of government other than the one we represent, telling us from one end of this state to the other, 'please, we do not want to have your very fine programs unless you're willing to help us with them.' We were downstate in Carbondale and we heard from the County Clerk of that county and that individual told us about the 9-1-1 program, for example, that we in the General Assembly thought, and I still believe is a fine, fine program, but we gave them seed money to get the thing started and now after that period of time is



over, that unit of local government, that county, must assume the complete financial responsibility for that program. They have two options. They either have to disband a good program or they have to levy a tax to cover it. Either way, it's a sad, sad commentary on one level of government mandating a program to another unit of government. This legislation, as I indicated to you before, is supported one hundred percent by the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois, the Illinois Municipal League. And this is very similar to House Bill 297 that sailed out of this House in the last Session of the General Assembly. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "You've heard the debate on House Bill 3112.

The question is, shall House Bill 3112 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I suppose being in the position of a President of a village for 18 years that I should wholeheartedly support this Bill. Unfortunately, for the Sponsor, I don't. And I think, fortunately for the people of the State of Illinois, I don't. I don't think it's a good Bill. I don't think that we should reverse the philosophy of the relationship of local government to state government. State government creates local government and should be able to dictate whatever is necessary in order for that local government to operate. And if it means they dictate certain programs be...be done, or followed, then, of course, local government ought to do it. Local government also is authorized by the State General Assembly to levy taxes and I think that's where their...their...where the state ought to come in. If they mandate certain programs that are going to benefit the local government and the people of that local unit of government then they ought to also authorize the levying of a special tax or the increase in corporate or other taxes so that the local government can accomplish that which was mandated. I think the philosophy of this is wrong and I therefore oppose it and vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted...have all voted...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will....just one moment. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, for what purpose do you rise?"



Davis, J: "I wanted to explain my vote, Mr...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Davis, J: "Well, I...unfortunately most of my Republican colleagues on the aisle don't see the...the really effect of this Bill I don't believe. And in explaining my 'yes' vote, I would simply say to you that we continually go forward to put mandated programs on local units of government and, sure, they have the taxing power because we give it to them but they're going to continue to tax to do it and continue to tax to do it and the ultimate result of that is the Jarvis-'Gann' Amendment Proposition 13 in Illinois. We're on the verge of tax revolt and you'll all see the results of it on June 6 in California and that's what's going to happen. The spending has to stop so we better get some green votes up there and give the Senate a chance to work on this Bill and to pass it out and give the local units of government a little bit of breath."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Yes, I'd like to explain my vote. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm starting my 29th year as a local official and I found that in the last 29 years we keep getting these programs year after year after year and nobody tells us how or...how we can raise our taxes. Prior to the Hodge tax rate limitations that we've had it handicapped most of these municipalities. Now at least under home rule we can increase our bonding powers a little bit. The only bad provision in the whole Bill was eliminated when they stopped giving us a blank check. But I think that this is a good Bill and it's time that we start telling the federal guidelines and the state guidelines that if they want to...us to adopt the part of the state statutes they should at least generate enough revenue for us so that we can pay for them."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, to explain his vote and...."

Daniels: "It's...it's difficult to stand up vote against a Bill like this because of the intention and the meaning of the Bill is certainly excellent and I think we all agree that we shouldn't pass on the cost to the local units of government unless we pay for those costs."



However, I think that we do have an element that's thrown at us by the Federal Government, for instance, the unemployment insurance that we had last year that was...that we had to mandate inclusion of municipal employees under the federal...under the unemployment insurance with the estimated cost of 40 to 60,000,000 dollars to our local units of government. Now what we're doing by this Bill is saying that we've got to incur or include those extra costs under our state appropriation. And I think that the message is loud and clear now that we should not mandate. But I don't think we should pass a statute of this nature without considering the true consequences of them that if we're to mandate this under state law as contained in this Bill it might have disastrous effects in the future. So, unfortunately, I have to oppose this legislation and would urge each one of you also to oppose it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 104 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'nay', 9 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby...hereby declared passed. Leave to go to the Order of Postponed...the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, the Minority Leader, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to satisfy one of my colleagues in the House and make an introduction."

Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you."

Ryan: "I'd like to introduce Mayor 'McRae' from the Village of Mundelein, he's in the balcony here and he's represented by Representatives Geo-Karis, Griesheimer and you, Mr. Speaker, Matijevich."

Speaker Matijevich: "Colin, we're glad to have you aboard. Leave to go to the Order of Postponed Consideration, there's one Bill to be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of tacking on an Amendment and that Bill is House Bill 1357. No? No, that's been changed, it's not ready yet. On the Order of Third Reading we're going to go right from the start now, I understand. House Bill 788, Representative Edgar. It's not ready."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 620. A Bill for an Act to license, tax, regulate the...."



Speaker Matijevich: "Take it out. House Bill 634, take it out.

House Bill 788, out of the record. House Bill 1088, Representative Younge, is out. Take it out of the record. House Bill 1238, out of the record. House Bill 1275, Porter-Bowman. Out of the record. 1270, that was. House Bill 1533, out of the record. House Bill 1710, out of the record. House Bill 1764, out of the record. House Bill 1884, the Lady from Cook, Representative Catania. Out of the record. House Bill 2075, Representative Younge, out of the record. House Bill 2295, Representative Younge, out of the record. House Bill 2418, the Revenue Committee, out of the record. House Bill 2516, Levin-Collins-Pouncey. Out of the record. House Bill 2578, Lechowicz-Marovitz. Out of the record. House Bill 2580, Representative Schisler, are you ready? 2580. Out of the record. 2591, House Bill 2591, Flinn. Out of the record. House Bill 2619, Emil Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 2626, Representative Ebbesen, are you ready? House Bill 2626, out of the record. House Bill 2636, Representative Birchler."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2636. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "We've got a buyer or gambler, one. The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Birchler, on House Bill 2636."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill is a substantive Bill the state authorizes the State Board of Education to provide grants for in-service teachers' training and materials for career education centers and requires the board to report findings and recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly by March 1, '81 and then it will be repealed July 1, '81. This Bill has the money in the Office of Education Budget. It is approved by the Board of Education, State Board of Education, the Office of Education. It also went through the Committee without a dissenting vote and I ask support for this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is there...is there...is there any discussion?

The...the Gentleman from Randolph has moved for the passage of House Bill 2636. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Be quicker than that, Vince, with the button. Have all voted



...have all voted...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...

The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DuPage to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Under this Bill it authorizes the State Board of Education to provide grants for in-service teacher training. Now, as I understand the previous Bill that just passed, we're once again mandating the cost. Now those of you that voted for the previous Bill would also, under my impression, be required to fund the cost for the provisions of this Bill which is estimated to be substantial. And I think you ought to consider that when you're talking about mandating expenses for the state. So if you're going to pass a Bill like we just passed previously, then stick behind it and make sure you're willing to back up the mandates that we're doing here. The estimated appropriation for this is 500,000 dollars for fiscal year '79."

Speaker Matijeich: "The...the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Yes...yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I think it's important to point out as Representative Birchler did, that this Bill has the funding behind it currently and it has the support, as I understand, the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Education. And as I also understand it, it has a date certain in it when it would end. If this General Assembly decides not to fund it in the future it would not have to do so but at the current time it is supported by the various entities involved and ought to receive the green vote for that reason."

Speaker Matijeich: "Have all...have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 91 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'nay', 19 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Johnson: "Is it too late to ask for a verification? Well, I'll ask for a verification."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign has asked for a verification. The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Birchler, do you want to poll the absentees? The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, that was not a timely request, you've already reported the vote on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I hadn't gone on to the next Bill, I... it is timely, Representative Birchler. The Gentleman... Von Boeckman, I'm sure you wanted to raise the same point of order, is that true? All right. The Gentleman from Randolph to poll the absentees. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my 'aye' vote to 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Simms from 'aye' to 'no'. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. Bianco. Brandt. Caldwell. Cunningham. Deavers. Deuster. John Dunn....."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Von Boeckman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Von Boeckman: "Well, I'm going to take your place, Mr. Speaker, I believe you announced the result and declared this Bill passed."

Speaker Matijevich: "I...I..."

Von Boeckman: "So therefore I don't think it's timely to go back and go over it again. I think the individual who made that request should have been on his toes."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, we hadn't gone to the next Bill and he is timely. Is there anything...is there anything else, Representative Von Boeckman?"

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, a motion to reconsider or whatever I may do to get another vote...."

Speaker Matijevich: "He had his right for a verification, we hadn't gone to the next Bill. Proceed with the....."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell. Gaines. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hart. Hoffman. Emil Jones. Katz. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Mann. Lynn Martin. McBroom. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Pierce. Sandquist. Schneider."



Stearney. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Birchler, we are now going to be on a verification, what's your pleasure? Do you want to go to Postponed Consideration or...the Gentleman asks leave to go toOrder of....go to Postponed Consideration, place this Bill. Does he have leave? He has leave. House Bill 2636 shall be placed on the Calendar, Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2650, Katz. Out of the record. House Bill 2652, Polk. The Gentleman from Rock Island."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2652. A Bill for an Act permitting raffles or drawings for prizes to be conducted by not for profit organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "And now that he found out what the Bill is he said 'out of the record.' Out...out of the record. House Bill 2656."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2656. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, on House Bill 2656."

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

House Bill 2656 amends Chapter 95½ of the Vehicle Code. This Bill, as amended, empowers the Secretary of State to license vehicle auctioneers and to physically inspect the places of business :

licensed to deal in vehicles and auto parts; otherwise, makes it il-

legal for any person to modify or rebuild vehicle bodies or frames

unless the work is incident to the servicing of the vehicle and done

by a licensed individual. This Bill is a result of the cooperative

efforts of police agencies throughout the state, the National Body Shop Council

of Car Agencies and the Secretary of State's Office. During 1977

we have witnessed auto thefts throughout the state at a...at an

increasing and alarming rate. Percentages range all the way up to

233 percent. Several municipalities in my district and throughout

the state have had increases of over a hundred percent. Present

statutes allow any police officer to inspect the books and records

of any firm licensed under this Chapter, that includes rebuilders,

dealers, transporters, recyclers of scrap processors. This Bill

allows the law enforcement officers to inspect the premises. The



Secretary of State's Office doesn't anticipate any additional cost for the administration of this legislation. This Bill will also allow the Secretary of State to more adequately inspect the business places licensed to deal in vehicle and auto parts. By adding the vehicle auctioneers, the intent is to regulate the flow of stolen vehicles and parts throughout the state and the nation. I know of no opposition to this Bill. It passed out of Committee 13 to nothing and I would urge support and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2656. Is there any discussion? On that issue, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Levin: "Okay. Representative Mahar, I notice on your description you talked about this Bill being a licensing Bill. And wonder if you shouldn't go into a little more detail..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Could I disturb you for a moment? Somebody up there is taking picture and the light isn't on. The House Rules prohibit taking of pictures unless the light is on. Proceed, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Yeah. I wonder if you could go into a little detail as far as what is involved in the licensing? Do they have to take a test? Is there any limitation on the number of persons that can be so licensed? Other words, are we going to paying more under..."

Mahar: "Yeah. Thank you."

Levin: "Result of getting this legislation."

Mahar: "Presently there are somewhere around twenty auctioneers selling vehicles in the State of Illinois. The license would call for a 50 dollar annual fee for their primary place and if they happen to operate two places it would be an additional 25 dollars. This allows the Secretary of State's Office to keep track of the movement of vehicles through the auctioneer's office. Now it has been shown that a great number of auctions are held outside of the State of Illinois and that by...national firms that sell vehicles would like



to...to sell them in Illinois and it would be an advantage for them to do so. The main purpose as shown by the Secretary of State's request for the Amendment to this Bill - and by the way it was an Amendment on my original Bill - is to have better control because it is known that a great deal of illegal sales go through the auctioneers' office."

Levin: "I understand the intent of the Bill and I support it in that respect but my question is a more narrowly focused question. And that is, what is involved in licensing? Do they have to...."

Mahar: "It's a business license. It's a business license similar to any individual doing business in the State of Illinois to get a license to operate his business. In other words, an establishment ...it's the same as the individual who now sells used cars. He sets up a used car lot, in order to sell used cars he must have a license, he must be licensed by the State of Illinois. He must pay a 50 dollar license showing his name, where he's selling cars and he must maintain books and records for which the state has the opportunity to...to view them. The same thing applies to auctioneers."

Levin: "Okay, so that it was...my understanding from what your answer is, that a person is not required, number one, to take a test or (b) is not required to meet any specific requirements in terms of education, background or other kind of background. So anybody could be licensed if they pay the fee?"

Mahar: "Yes, right."

Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Representative Mahar, in many places in the State of Illinois young people today take vocational training in school and they learn mechanical aptitudes and many of them that I know of will go to their own body shop at home and take two or three old automobiles and in process put them together to make an automobile for themselves. Now, what will this do to these young people?"

Mahar: "Well, they're not in commercial business so they wouldn't have to be licensed, they're not licensed now, and the only way that you would be able to handle something like that would be through a local zoning law. This has nothing to do with local zoning..."



Hoxsey: "This wouldn't...this would not interfere with that part of it at all?"

Mahar: "No. No, Ma'am."

Hoxsey: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you through, Representative Hoxsey? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Mahar, I was interested, as the previous Gentleman from Cook was, are you confining yourself by the Bill only to auto dealers that totally modify car...what about the usual automobile dealer that has a body shop?"

Mahar: "He's already licensed, Representative Katz, now, under the present statute."

Katz: "And what group are you adding to the group that's already covered?"

Mahar: "We're not adding the license of any one other than vehicle auctioneers."

Katz: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, did you want....no, he's on the telephone. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Representative Mahar, does your Bill apply to charitable organizations that have a car and auction off the car for charitable purposes?"

Mahar: "No, I don't think it does. In fact, I'm quite sure it doesn't. This applies to a year around organizations that go into the...the auctioneering business."

Marovitz: "Well, according to the Digest it says, 'That no person other than a licensed new vehicle dealer or a licensed used vehicle dealer shall engage in the state in the business of auctioning vehicles.' Is there a clause in there that specifically exempts auction for charitable purposes? This is the kind of thing that goes on throughout the state for various charities licensed in the state."

Mahar: "There is no specific clause that deals with the auctioning of a car...you mean selling chances on a car? That type of thing?"

Marovitz: "No, I mean actual...well, selling chance is one thing but actually auctioning a car off at a charitable auction for charitable



purposes. This goes on very frequently."

Mahar: "Well, this Bill doesn't deal specifically with that but I think the fact that it requires setting up books and records which are available as they now can be looked at in regard to auto dealers and rebuilders and body cyclers and that sort of thing, I think takes care of this. It's in the same...you're talking about a different category than the one that the Bill addresses itself to."

Marovitz: "I...I know what you're addressing this Bill to and I'm in total agreement with the need for the Bill, I'm just a little bit concerned that we may be putting something in here that we may not even have anticipated and may imperil the effect of some charitable organization from raising substantial amounts of revenue."

Mahar: "Well, if that is the...the concern of anyone I certainly would be willing to clarify that in the Senate...very well be done."

Marovitz: "Okay. Fire."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijeovich: "He indicates he will."

Walsh: "It was my understanding that this Bill was directed at getting to the chop shops that...."

Mahar: "That is correct."

Walsh: "...pretty much in the northeastern part of the state.

But I don't see how it does. We're...we're licensing here vehicle auctioneers. Auctioneering, it doesn't seem to me, is a part of that procedure. It seems to me that what they do is they dismantle a car and they sell it part for part. Am I wrong in feeling that this is going to the chop shop operate a...."

Mahar: "As I stated earlier, the licensing of vehicle auctioneers was an additional Amendment that I took on the Bill because there is some activity of the movement of stolen vehicles, whole vehicles, through the auction process. But the main thrust of this Bill is it allows a police officer to inspect the premises, and that is a very key thing in which the police officers at the present time have not been able to inspect the premises, they have under the present statutes been able to inspect the books and records of a dealer or a junkyard or rebuilder but have not been able to go out on the



premises and that is considered to be the key factor of the whole Bill."

Walsh: "Well, then, even if a...an operation is not auctioning automobiles and if they are a junk dealer or something of that sort, they will be licensed under this Act?"

Mahar: "They are presently licensed under the Act now."

Walsh: "Well, then, how does this Bill get to the problem? How does licensing auctioneers get to the problem of stolen automobiles?"

Mahar: "By allowing the inspection of the premises. In other words, the...what's happened in the past in cases that have gone to court in which the testimony has been that the individual has looked at the books and records and has brought in evidence that they have seen particular articles in the yard has been inadmissible because we don't have the power to do that. This Bill allows them the power to inspect the premises which is all important in presenting a case in court against an individual firm. The fact that they can look at the books and records of auctioneers is just additional...additional part of the Bill that has been asked for by the Secretary of State's Office who has felt that there has been some need for surveillance in the area of vehicle auctioneers."

Walsh: "Couldn't we do this without licensing? Simply change the law as a result of that court decision and permit law enforcement agencies to look at the books and records of whoever is necessary?"

Mahar: "Well, I think by licensing auctioneers you have for a very small fee, you'd have a record of who's doing business in the state. And this is an asset, I think, to the law enforcement to know that those people who are...who are in the business of selling cars, that we have a record and the fact that they're being charged 50 dollars I don't think is a fee that's going cause...cause 'em any problems."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island...Rock Island, Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Jacobs: "Representative Mahar,...my memory serves me correctly, in Committee wasn't it stated that the auctioneers wanted this Bill?"

Mahar: "Yes, that is correct."



Jacobs: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Tom Miller."

Miller: "Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the previous question prevail? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The previous question is ordered. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, to close."

Mahar: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think each and everyone of us know of the problems that we're now having in the area of vehicles being stolen and sold as parts and et cetera. And there's a need work toward a solution to that problem. I'm sure that...I'll be first to admit that this Bill doesn't take care of the whole problem, no cars will be stolen if it's passed and signed into law, but it takes, I think, one good step toward tightening up the present laws to help our law enforcement people to work toward the solution of this problem and I think it's been pretty well aired and I would urge your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2656. The question is, shall House Bill 2656 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson, to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did have one question that I might ask in my explanation of the...of my vote. In our analysis along the same questioning that Representative Hoxsey had proceeded along, it says, 'The Bill makes it illegal for any person to modify or rebuild vehicle bodies or frames unless such work is done as an incident to servicing of the vehicle or the work is done by a licensed individual.' Now is this right or wrong?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I'm voting for this good Bill. The Human Resources Committee had a Bill last week to provide licensing for ambulances in order to save and protect the lives of Illinois



citizens, that could not find the same kind of receptivity that this one does so I can only presume that cars are more important than people's lives. I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Von Boeckman, to explain his vote."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this had a good hearing in our Committee, Motor Vehicles Committee. What it does, it stops out of state auctioneers from coming in on the issue too and when we talk about stolen vehicles and we complain...hear complaints from our constituents about high insurance I think it's time that we did pass such a legislation because this will have a tendency to put the clamps on a lot of stolen vehicles that are auctioned over their blocks. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. In the gallery to our right in the front are the members of Operation Shape Up and they, in turn, are represented by Representatives Collins, Dawson and Giglio. Will you welcome them please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Could you find out how we join Shape Up? The Lady from Cook, Representative....no, House Bill 28...661(sic)."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2661. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to private employment agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, WLS-TV in Chicago aired an investigative reporting series which resulted in the self-relinquishing of an....license of an employment service that provided domestic help. Questions raised during this serious child abuse case resulted in the introduction of this legislation, House Bill 2661. This action took place last summer when a Carpentersville resident employed a



live-in babysitter through a domestic employment service. A three year old child was beaten until 85 percent of his body was covered from bruises. He will never completely recover even though he was hospitalized for a week and a-half. The Bill I'm proposing to you today is supported by the Association of Employment Agencies. They want to improve the ability of the state to police these employment agencies. The Illinois PCA, the group of employment agencies, support this Bill I'm bringing to you. The Illinois Department of Labor worked closely with me in developing this legislation and they support it also. The Bill at the present time provides that the employer of a worker furnished by a private employment could sue that agency on its required bond for negligence as well as for misconduct. That the right to sue the agency on its bond is not an exclusive remedy. It abolishes the sense of contributory negligence and assumption of risk when the suit is brought for negligence against the domestic service agency. Eliminates certain specific procedural requirements that have created extensive time consuming and impractical procedures at odds with requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. And it gives to the Department a cease and desist authority which could be enforced by the courts. I ask for your support for a Bill which will do something about child abuse."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2661. And in discussion of that Bill, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to some questions?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Leinenweber: "Mrs. Chapman, I understand there's two different, in fact, this is roughly two Bills in one, is that correct?"

Chapman: "There are three Amendments on the Bill."

Leinenweber: "But then there's two separate subjects all encompassed within House Bill 2661. One was added by Amendment 2 and the other one was the Bill as originally introduced. Is that correct?"

Chapman: "The entire Bill deals with domestic employment agencies and..."

Leinenweber: "Well..."

Chapman: "Amendment #2 is the Amendment which the Department of Labor



requested in order that the law would conform with the Administrative Procedures Act."

Leinenweber: "Well, what I'm driving at, the Department... Illinois Department of Labor wants Amendment 2, the rest of the Bill they don't care whether it goes on or not, is that correct?"

Chapman: "The Department supports the entire Bill and has shown a lot of interest in improving their ability to enforce rules and regulations that we require where employment agencies are concerned."

Leinenweber: "Well, specifically, Amendment 2 gives the Department additional powers and regulations, isn't that correct?"

Chapman: "I do not see this as giving the Department additional powers. In general what I see it doing is conforming the law with the Administrative Procedures Act."

Leinenweber: "What I'm driving at, Amendment 2 provides additional powers for the Department to enforce the law in relation to private employment agencies. The Bill as you originally introduced it and the other portion other than Amendment 2 provides for private enforcement through civil actions, isn't that correct? Outside...for the outside and separate of the Department?"

Chapman: "Yes, that is true."

Leinenweber: "All right. Now, you mention that in certain instances the defense of contributory negligence is abolished. Do you know of any other incident in tort law in Illinois which the defense of contributory negligence has been abolished?"

Chapman: "I'm advised, Mr. Leinenweber, that there are some but I can't give you the specific instances."

Leinenweber: "Well, I don't know of any and I'd be interested to find out if there is...are any other instances in law where the defense where negligence, it's a negligence action in tort where the defense of contributory negligence has been abolished. I take it you don't know of any specific instance."

Chapman: "I have been advised that there are some but I cannot cite the cases for you."

Leinenweber: "And what is the justification for taking this defense away from the licensee under the Act?"

Chapman: "The most frequent abuse agency duty in the domestic service



field is the failure of agencies to investigate references and furnish references to employers. Most of the employers are working people who depend on these licensed professional agencies expertise in providing helpers for them to care for their children. They don't demand the reference and it...it seems that this is a way that we can get these domestic service agencies to take seriously their responsibilities to the rules and regulations that our state requires of them."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly on the Bill. As I've tried to point out, House Bill 2661, as amended, is essentially two separate Bills. One of part of which affects the Department of Labor gives them additional powers of enforcement pursuant to hearings under the...under the Act in relation to regulation of employment agencies. Part one of the Bill, which was the Bill itself, provides for an additional civil remedy for tort actions which include, among other things, personal injury actions. I think the...the portion of the Bill which...of the existing Act which this purports to amend was a...was a provision in the law which provided for requirement of bond for employment agencies and for violation of the terms of the bond provided for rights under that...under those bonds by people who deal with the licensee. Now the Sponsor has, I think improperly, attempted to graft personal injury tort law onto this particular provision. It doesn't fit...in doing so, she's abolished the defense of contributory negligence. For those of you who are concerned about insurance premium costs - and I've been accused as one who has never been concerned about insurance premium costs - this is, I suppose you might say, a lawyer's Bill because it will provide for additional causes of action, additional recovery. But I'm afraid what it will also do is create a problem with liability insurance coverage. The Bill isn't needed. The Sponsor's situation which she describes could have been handled under the existing law. As far as the second portion of the Bill relating to additional powers to the Department of Labor, that's what they want, they don't care one way or another about the rest of the Bill. I would suggest that the Sponsor probably ought to take this Bill back and just leave Amendment 2 in the Bill and go with it that way. I think then it would



probably be at least a good Bill. As it sits right now, I think it's going to add confusion to the law and I would suggest a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the coverage of this is very limited. It deals with the furnishing, with negligence in the furnishing of domestic service employees only. There are very serious problems in this area. When Channel 7 aired this program, they had responses from all over the metropolitan area that pointed up the problems the Department of Labor is having in enforcing the law. The Department of Labor not only has worked with me in developing the Bill but strongly supports it. The employment service agency people testified in Committee in support of the Bill. In the Industry and Labor Committee there was a unanimous vote for this legislation which speaks to a serious problem of child abuse. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "And the Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2661. The question is, shall House Bill 2661 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present' and this Bill, House Bill 2661, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2662. Out of the record. House Bill 2663, out of the record. House Bill 2670."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2670. A...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, on House Bill 2670."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2670 is a Bill that gives us an opportunity to do something for the people of Illinois. This Bill simply eliminates an annual expense to the taxpayer of some 40-some thousand dollars that just can't be justified and that is by abolishing the Illinois Naval Militia. I don't know



exactly when or why the Naval Militia was established in Illinois, although I am a former Member. But it no doubt was created to defend us in the event of an attack by the State of Michigan across the lake of the same name or possibly in case an invasion should be launched by Missouri or Iowa across the Mississippi River. I am at a little bit of a loss however to explain exactly how our 190-member naval militia would accomplish this since they don't even own a boat. The last time that the Naval Militia was called to active duty was in 1937 to fight flood waters on the Mississippi River at Savanna, Illinois. And I would like to point out that the only other state having a naval militia at this time is New York and at least they're on a salt water body. The Bill, as amended, would allow the National Guard to maintain title to the Randolph Street Armory at least temporarily which could benefit the Chicago community and save the state tax dollars besides. And the reason for this is, after discussing this with the Military Department, they would like to maintain title for a few more years. It would probably be utilized to straighten out the s-curve of the Outer Drive eventually but meanwhile they could move the troops from the Chicago Avenue Armory into the Randolph Street Armory and place the Chicago Avenue Armory on the sale block which could generate....probably could be sold for 5 to 15,000,000 dollars. This money could be used to get a 3 to 1 federal grant to construct some new, modern, small, functional armories in the Chicagoland area and would bring in some money for the State of Illinois through construction jobs. And I would certainly ask the favorable support of every Member of this House."

Speaker Matijevich: "I am told the Clerk read the wrong title. Will the Clerk reread the Bill, House Bill 2670?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, General DiPrima. Commander in this case."

DiPrima: "I thought the Bill was on Third Reading. Forget it."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's where it's at, you better get...."



DiPrima: "It's on Third, oh, well...."

Speaker Matijevich: "You better get back on your feet."

DiPrima: "All right. As Frank....as Representative Wolf stated, I mean, I...nobody from the Naval Militia has contacted me as to their feelings about this, evidently there ain't no Naval Militia. I'd rather have the money to the Illinois National Guard, at least we're getting some work of them, you know. So, I concur with Representative Wolf's motion....you know, Bill to abolish the Naval whatever it is. Militia."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is...is...is Representative Lucco on the floor?"

Yeah, they're up...up here, Joe. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Lucco, for introduction."

Lucco: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have with us today in the gallery students from the Holy Rosary School, North Chicago, the 31st District...they have with them Sister 'Greneta'. And of course the 31st District is ably represented by the Gentleman in the Chair today, Representative Matijevich, Representative Geo-Karis and Representative Griesheimer. Glad to have you here students."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Wolf: "Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Levin: "I think this is an excellent bill. In fact, you know, I can kick myself for not having introduced it first. I know a number of my ...supporters are very hot on this issue. I would like to ask you, though, just one question. And that is, what is the money currently going for? You know, there is appropriation for the Navy, what are they doing with it?"

Wolf: "Well, the money which is some 40-some thousand dollars is used mainly for maintenance. It's about a 70,000 dollar cost annually at the Naval Armory which is the only unit in the state; 30,000 of that, roughly, is reimbursed through federal dollars and that's where the money goes. The...the drill of members is paid by the federal government since you cannot join the Naval Militia unless you are a member of the Naval Reserve, United States Naval Reserve."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, to close."

Wolf: "Just ask a favorable vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2670. The question is, shall House Bill 2670 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 voting 'present' and House Bill 2670, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2687."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2687. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Adams, on House Bill 2687."

Adams: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we give him...give him your attention. House Bill 2687."

Adams: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what I have is a minor change on the Snowmobile Law. We are not removing any restrictions that are on the Snowmobile Law, we are modifying one aspect however and that is if a village has a bridge that goes across the river and the bridge has a sidewalk, this will allow the snowmobiles to go across the bridge on the sidewalks when conditions are favorable. This, however, could not be used unless the population was under 6,000."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Adams, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2687. Is there any discussion? If not, those in favor shall vote 'aye', those opposed, vote 'nay'. Have all voted....have all voted...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 voting 'aye', none 'nay', 3 voting 'present' and House Bill 2687"



having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2691, out of the record. House Bill 2707, Kornowicz, out of the record. House Bill 2708, Bennett. House Bill 2708, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2708. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to fencing and operating railroads. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bennett, on House Bill 2708."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill deals with blocked railroad crossings and changes the present law in two places. Number one, the law states now that railroads may block crossings for ten minutes and after that ten minutes time they can be penalized by a fine anywhere from one dollar to five hundred dollars and it would be a business offense. This Bill, as I indicated, changes that law in two respects. One, and it's the most important, and that is it increases the penalty for crossings that are blocked in excess of ten minutes and increases them a great deal. And I'll explain why the Bill was introduced....a few moments. As I indicated, the present law is anywhere up to a five hundred dollar fine. This Bill would make a minimum for blockage in excess of ten minutes, five hundred dollars. And depending upon the number of minutes for the blockage, the penalty would increase accordingly. I think in both staff analysis, both Republican and Democrats, you'll find a description of both penalties. In addition, in the law now, and this is important because it deals with who is to pay the fine, the corporation, the railroad corporation, is held responsible and also built in the law the employee of the corporation is not held responsible if, and I underline if, that employee is taking orders from the corporation or its supervisory personnel. They are immune if that is the case and in most instances I submit to you that is the case. However, built into the present law and that remains unchanged, the employee can be held responsible if he, on his own volition, without advice or direction of the company itself could be held responsible. I submit to you that is perhaps very seldom the case because most of the problem occurs during switching operations where



the dispatcher is doing the ordering. Now, you may think that the penalty Section as I submit to you is somewhat steep, and I believe it is, but there is a very good reason for that and I can outline those for you. Number one, I did not come out of the clear blue sky with this particular penalty violation Section. I patterned that Section after one of the home rule bodies in the State of Illinois, Elmer Conti's city, who has adopted an ordinance very similar and in the penalty Section; the same as this one. And in that particular city they have a mammoth problem of blocked railroad crossings in excess of 20 to 30 to 40 minutes at different stages. They passed that ordinance and all of a sudden with the steep fine that the railroads faced the problem stopped, they were able to break off the train, to separate when they should separate. They were able to live within the law and that was a ten minute section. Now, in my opinion, this particular Bill does not affect the situation where the railroad, completely beyond its control, has a breakdown of some kind. I did with the Bill, and I should address the Amendment because Amendment 1 is really the Bill, take out the section which deals with the ten minute provision except for such train, railroad car or engine cannot be moved by reasons or circumstances over which the railroad corporation has control(sic). In my experience as both a prosecutor and in looking at what is happening today in Decatur which is an industrialized city with a great deal of train traffic, the railroads have come into court and every time put up that clause as a defense and said it was beyond our control, we could do nothing about it. It put the State's Attorney on the offensive, frankly, or with the burden of proof trying to disprove that which is almost impossible because the railroads could come in after the train...course has left and many days have passed by and say we had a breakdown, have their expert come in and testify that they had a breakdown that was beyond their control and there was no way refute that. Invariably, 99 percent of the cases would be dismissed based upon that. By taking that clause out, it puts the burden of proof now on the railroads to prove that in fact they had a breakdown and not on the prosecution to show that they in fact did not have a breakdown. Why this particular legislation?



Number one, the laws says, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the railroads have ten minutes to block an intersection or to block a crossing and that's all. Right now in Decatur, in Springfield, all over this state, they are flaunting that law. I had some open hearings on it, they came in and as a matter of fact, said, 'Sorry, Mr. Bennett, it's not going to change.' They are flaunting the law. They are saying to the general public, it doesn't make any difference what you think, what the law says, we're going to block the crossings because it means doing business. We had a situation in our area, and I think it's so in other areas, where the health and the safety and welfare of the general public are very much at issue. Caterpillar Tractor Company, which is one of our biggest industries, is right close to the block... the crossings which are blocked continuously. These employees are reporting in late. Not only does that mean the employee has a... a record of tardiness, it also means that the corporation loses money. The same way with Firestone. A number of other industries that are... This is a people's Bill. This is a Bill that not only will protect business, it will protect labor and it will protect the health and safety of the general public insofar as... as fire and emergency services are concerned, not to say the inconvenience to the general public is tremendous. I submit to you, this is a tough Bill but it has proven to work in individual home rule cities and it will work for the state as well. I submit (sic) an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bennett, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2708. On discussion of that Bill, the Majority Leader from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates that he will."

Madigan: "Mr. Bennett, if you remove the exception from this Bill which would have provided that if the circumstances were beyond the control of the... corporation that the Bill would not operate?"

Bennett: "That paragraph, or that part of the paragraph, is removed, Mike. What I felt to be a very serious flaw in the law was the railroad coming in every time and using that section saying to the prosecutor or the jury or the judge, whoever it might be, that this was beyond



our control. It was impossible, almost impossible in 99.9 percent of the time to ever refute that because who is to go out to the scene, who is to have the prosecutorial evidence to show otherwise. By removing that Section, I still believe, a clear reading of that paragraph still makes it incumbent upon the prosecution to prove intent. Intent to block the crossing. It reads, 'It is unlawful for a railroad corporation....corporation to permit, to permit any train, railroad car, et cetera from blocking in excess of ten minutes.' I believe that language still says to the prosecution that there has to be intent on the part of the railroad in order to prove a violation of the Section."

Madigan: "Does the Bill still provide the provision which would prohibit parking of a train within 75 feet of a grade crossing?"

Bennett: "That has been taken out."

Madigan: "That's been deleted. But you have increased the penalties?"

Bennett: "The penalties have been increased, yes, Sir."

Madigan: "And do the increased penalties apply to a railroad employee such as the locomotive engineer?"

Bennett: "Okay, in Section 14-1, I have not changed that provision, which means - and the important language is - 'However, no employee, acting under the rules of orders of railroad corporation or its supervisory personnel may be prosecuted for such violation.' If that ...if that employee took orders from the dispatcher or any one, any supervisor, he is immune from prosecution under this Section. If he exceeds that authority, if he goes off on his own somewhere and has not received those orders he can be held under this Section."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in opposition to the Bill..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Madigan: "I certainly have a great deal of sympathy for the problems presented through Representative Bennett by a multiplicity of railroad grade crossings in Decatur; however, I suggest that increasing the current penalties in the Bill will not automatically remove the problem of stalled trains at railroad grade crossings. Please understand, that when you increase the penalty you are increasing the penalty upon the employee of the corporation, the engineer on a locomotive who, in most instances, certainly is not prepared to be paying



substantial fines in a local court. Also, please understand that the...exception that was in the statute which would allow for a train to block a grade crossing for more than ten minutes when the situation was beyond the control of the corporation, has been eliminated from this Bill. What that means is if a train is proceeding through the town and is forced to stop because of an accident ahead of the train along the track then the train, the locomotive, the corporation are all in violation of the statutes and there is nothing that they can do about the situation. This will also apply to a situation where there was an emergency vehicle and for one reason or another had blocked the grade crossing therefore had blocked the ability of the locomotive to proceed through that grade crossing within a ten minute period. As I stated at the beginning of my comments, I certainly have great empathy for Representative Bennett, for any other Legislator afflicted with this problem but I suggest to you that you cannot solve this problem by making the statute so stringent that it is unworkable. And by increasing the fines and penalties to be imposed upon a railroad employee...."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Matula, this is one of our new Members, let's give him our attention. Representative Matula."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

Matula: "Representative Bennett, who will serve the citation in the event of a train blocking in a grade crossing, who will serve the citation? And to whom?"

Bennett: "The...the local police will have to."

Matula: "To whom?"

Bennett: "To whomever is responsible for the blockage and they're going to have to find out."

Matula: "Are you talking about the engineer, are you talking about the brakeman?"

Bennett: "Well, if...if the engineer is served with the citation, it's still a burden of proof on the prosecution to show who is responsible for it. The engineer may tell the police, 'I had nothing to do with it, I took my orders from the dispatcher', then they will go to the



dispatcher. It's a...it's a question of who originated the blockage.
Now, I'd be...."

Matula: "Mr. Bennett....I'm sorry, go ahead."

Bennett: "Well, as a practical matter, it's very difficult for the police. This is one of the other problems that this Bill doesn't address and can't address and that is, the police authority trying to...investigate these particular problems. It's almost impossible. You've got to get the engine number in order to find out what train is affected, then you have to go through the process of determining who was responsible, whether it was the engineer or as in most cases, which I submit to you is the fact, in most cases has been orders from on high."

Matula: "Mr. Bennett...."

Bennett: "Yes, Sir."

Matula: "I rise in support for your Bill for the simple reason in Berwyn, the Burlington Northern has been giving us a headache for years upon years. In all these years there's only one time...we have an ordinance, a local ordinance if a train obstructs a grade crossing in fifteen minutes, it would get fined. There was only one fine that I know of that ever came about and that was a fifty dollar fine. We have had some big problems regarding the obstruction of the grade crossing. Now if you state that the citation has to be given by a police officer in Berwyn, he'll have to go all the way into the... into the train yard in Cicero. This is going to be very hard for him to do, to go into Cicero to give the engineer the ticket. Now if he could give it to the brakeman, which he wouldn't have to go all the way into another town, I think it would be more beneficial and more effective. Now what will happen, Mr. Bennett, if you... got one freight train going along for about nine minutes and the...the time limit is ten minutes, all of a sudden another train comes along and from the opposite direction and that's another nine minutes. Now you've gone over your ten minute limit, what do you do in that case?"

Bennett: "It's got to be each train on its own merit. Each train has to be blocking the crossing for ten minutes or in excess of ten minutes."



Matula: "Well, if this happens where one train comes along in nine minutes, it's obstructing that grade crossing for nine minutes, now, another train is coming along and he comes in at the opposite direction and he's obstructing that. Now what will you do in that case? This has happened. We've had some real problems over... I'm for your Bill really and I'd like to see something done that this would eliminate the problem that we've had in Berwyn for years upon years. And we've fought this. I know I fought this when I was an Alderman there and we never got any...any conclusive agreement as to what should be done over this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could I interrupt you, Representative Waddell wants to make an introduction before the people leave. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for the purpose of that introduction. In the gallery in the left in the rear are 200 students from the King Upper Grade Center accompanied by their instructor, Mr. Jim Robinson. Within that group is George Ryan, Jr., and they are represented by dad, Representative Christensen and Representative McBroom."

Speaker Matijevich: "On the order of introductions, the Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword. I think he has a point to make."

Tipword: "I do, Mr. Speaker, you just violated the rules again. The rules say, 'No introduction shall be made while any order of business is in progress!'"

Speaker Matijevich: "You're right and you know how I feel about that. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell. I just go along with the show, Rollie. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, but I don't know whether the Gentleman that was addressing the question previously had finished."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think he did, he took a comfortable seat over there."

Yourell: "Yeah...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Go ahead."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 2708. There isn't a community in the



district that I represent that hasn't had this specific problem. Just three weeks ago there was a...an activity in one of my towns and it took me an hour and forty-seven minutes to travel five blocks because I had to go around about way and finally after an hour and forty-seven minutes I finally gained access to the limits of that community. And at that time I was concerned because it came to mind that if something happened of a disastrous nature in that town relative to a catastrophe there is no way...there was no way that those people could have been helped or received assistance. I've talked with the Mayors the communities in my district and they have related to me the same story time after time after time. And they have suggested that their police forces have issued the citations but when those individuals who represent the railroads got to court they found that the fines and the court costs were so low that they would continue to violate our present statutes and pay the fine because in most instances they reduced the fines and the court costs to a point where it would be....just a...just a great thing for them to pay that fine and court costs. So to go along with Representative Bennett's argument that the fines that have been levied in our present statute are not substantial enough to teach these railroads that they have to respect the law. And I suggest that it's good legislation, it should be passed and it should have the support of everyone who has that problem in their district and I don't know of any Representatives in Cook County that does not have that specific problem. I urge a favorable vote for House Bill 2708."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I represented a municipality in Lake County by the name of Mundelein for eight years as village attorney. I can tell you that the railroad crossings in that town would be guilty of innumerable times of just blocking up the crossing. If there were any emergencies the people couldn't get to the hospital. And I might tell you that the railroad companies didn't like it when we passed an ordinance limiting their speed. Well, they didn't challenge it, I'm waiting for them to challenge it. I think this is a good safety factor. This Bill is necessary, not only that, but....the railroad officials are fined



they can always be given probation, they're just business offenses. But I think the railroad companies have to understand that the big lobby that they've had for years has to be turned to help the people instead of just sitting back and doing nothing about the safety of people."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hear. Hear. The Gentleman from Effington(sic), Representative Brummer."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effington(sic), Representative Brummer, has moved the previous question on House Bill 2708. Those in favor vote...say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay' and the previous question prevails. To close, Representative Bennett, from Macon on House Bill 2708."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I can only say that...briefly, that this is a people's Bill. It really is. I...I was talking with some people in my district who said to me, says, 'You're crazy' for trying to introduce like this...'cause they don't pay any attention to anything over there anyway or what happens'. And...and as I got into this, it's not only a Decatur problem, it's a problem all over the State of Illinois and...I was surprised, frankly, and I think if there's anything that we can do to help business, number one, labor, number one, and the public in general A-1 because they want this kind of legislation. It's by this Bill, the only way, only way, that you're going to make railroads understand is by tough legislation. And I think there are villages...home rule villages in this city, or in this state, that have proven that point over and over again. I solicit your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bennett, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2708. The question is, shall House Bill 2708 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's great to sit here and castigate the railroads but you're looking at one of the most decrepit sections of our economy and that is the American railroads. They can not support themselves. They cannot pay the bills to repair the



railroad tracks. The stations are in disrepair and here again we are attempting simply because it might be politically popular, and the railroads don't vote, to talk about us waging war on the giant that somehow or other affect our livelihood. I suggest to you that without the railroads none of these towns would have sprung into existence. Every town that said they didn't want.

.....that dirty iron horse is now a quaint little village barely on the map. The railroads were a necessary part of the American economy and for those of us who attempted to destroy them simply because it's politically popular is irresponsible. It's been pointed out over and over in this Bill that you are affecting the engineers. The only way that a train blocks a crossing and when they're guilty is if it's because they cannot move the train, who are we going to punish? I suggest we are ranting and raving in the dark. I think we ought to take a little bit closer look at some of our actions down here because we are constantly saying we want business, we want jobs, but nevertheless we'll never get.....this way...."

Speaker Matijeich: "Bring your remarks...."

Ewell: "And therefore I vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman, to explain his vote."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think some of the arguments against this Bill has been rather silly. State's Attorneys don't bring actions against railroads because they have accidents on the railroads. They don't bring actions against the railroads because of some inability of the railroad to move their train. The reason they bring action is that the railroads refuse to get off the crossings and they block those crossings for minutes and minutes at a time, up to thirty minutes, up to forty-five minutes. And at the same time the constituents in our communities are waiting at the railroad crossing. I submit to you that the only correct vote on this Bill is an 'aye' vote. There are instances in my own district, in Lee County, where for many years they fought the railroads in trying to keep the crossings open and the railroad companies absolutely ignore all the protests of that community. An 'aye' vote is the right vote."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski, to explain his vote."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, have waited an interminable length of time for trains to pass over a crossing so in part I'm in sympathy with this legislation. However, in terms of due process of law when we remove that clause which permits the railroad in its own defense to present evidence that the delay was beyond their control, I think we are eliminating a great portion of that defense. I cannot support this measure."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's just take a look in Cook County where this really has an effect. There's close to four and a-half million people that are dissected by the world's greatest hub, the railroad hub, in the City of Chicago. There are thousands and thousands of man-hours lost every week, millions of dollars spent by municipalities throughout the County of Cook because the municipalities...divided by a highway(sic), they have to build a fire station on either side of the...either the bisection of the railroad or the trisection. And in one community, in Leyden Township, there are four fire stations because they can't do with one station. It's the duplicity of taxpayers' dollars being spent to build these fire stations: The millions of dollars lost for the laboring people that work in over 1200 industries alone in just Leyden Township, not counting Cook County, but just Leyden Township, over 1200 industries and this is a necessity. It's worked real well. Now to answer Mike Madigan's question that the engineer cannot be responsible if there's an accident. That is taken into consideration. There are six grade crossing in the Village of Elmwood Park and when they now are fined 1500 dollars the brakeman has to telephone, calls the engineer, cuts up the brake the...the intersection, breaks up the train if there is an accident, allowing the traffic to flow without any trouble at all. Heretofore before we gave them the 1500 dollar fine they used to send us the 50 dollar check and laugh but now they make sure they break up that train and the people can get to the O'Hare Airport, they can get to the 1200



industries in that particular area. This is a very needed Bill in Cook County. I don't know what it does in rural areas but in Cook County this is thousands of man-hours and millions of dollars lost weekly and that's not an exaggeration."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I see that this has evolved into a very emotional thing. But let me suggest the real deficiency with this Bill. This Bill suggests that the engineer would be given the citation. Let's understand some things here. The engineer has about as much to do with where that train stops and when that train stops relative to a grade crossing as you and I do. That's in the dispatcher's office. He stops because of those stop lights that are out there, those blocks out there... that are out there on the tracks, tell him to stop and he has no other recourse. That's the real deficiency here. So you're gonna penalize the guy that has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with that train being stopped at that grade crossing because you want to get at the company. That makes a lot of sense. This Bill is, although well intended is very deficient and...."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Barnes: "They is(sic) no reason whatsoever to vote for a Bill of this type. I solicit your 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly am in sympathy with the Sponsor of this Bill but I will say...tell you how we handled this several years ago when I was Mayor of the City of DeKalb that....we had the same problem only it was a main line, Chicago-Northwestern Railroad, and they blocked every crossing which was indeed a very dangerous situation. We passed a local ordinance in which we...the ordinance stated we'd go out and arrest the crew right on the spot and if you don't think that blocking the main line of somebody like the Chicago-Northwestern didn't get their attention.... And the end result was that we at least brought these people to the table to sit down and talk about breaking those



trains when they got those difficult circumstances. And I am in sympathy with what the thrust of the legislation is attempting to accomplish but I...."

Speaker Matijevich: "...The Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Ebbesen: "Just don't think this is right. I would encourage others to vote 'no' also, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly, to explain his vote."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ...get some more green lights up on the board. There have been a lot of red herrings raised on the question of this Bill. It simply is not true that this Bill provides that the engineer is going to be the only one who is going to be ticketed and the engineer is going to be the one who is going to be fined. That will happen only in the case, only in the case, under the provisions of this Bill where the engineer is personally the one who makes the decision. If he stops because, as Representative Barnes suggested, the lights are red and that decision is made by the dispatcher, it will not, it will not under the provisions of this Bill, be the engineer who is fined. In any event, the reality is - and I can speak to this as having been a former city attorney who dealt with railroads on this as many others on this floor can - it is not the employæ of the railroad who is going to pay the fine, if in fact, the fine is imposed. That's just not going to happen...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we heard one of the speakers address the subject of the grade crossings and the fact that they're in disrepair. But you recall Public Act 80-462, this Session of the Legislature increased the annual amount of state money transferred under the grade crossing protection fund by 3.6 million dollars. We've responded to the question of construction and reconstruction of grade crossings, we've done it during this Session. Now it's only logical to follow that the disrepair mandates that we've increased by 3.6 million dollars carries with it a responsibility and the



responsibility of use of these crossings in a responsible manner. I think that we can respond to this by legislation of this nature. I think it's reasonable and I think we should enact this into law and I commend the Sponsor for bringing this to our attention. I think we ought to get some more green votes up there."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I notice that the City of Chicago apparently doesn't have this problem and they don't care whether or not we in downstate have it or not, they're not going to help us out. There's one town in the 5th District, Franklin Park to be specific, that is totally surrounded with railroad crossings, there's not a crossing you can get across either east, west, north or south at some times during the day or night. And they have a request in for federal and state funds to build overpasses and if they get 'em it'll amount to maybe 20 or 30,000 dollars in order to build those overpasses. It seems to me the easiest way and a better way would to...to adopt this legislation, put on stiffer fines and make the railroads be more considerate of the public. I would urge you to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Nobody changed their vote yet but the Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. really...in explanation of vote, I wanted to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions. Primarily the question I wanted to ask - and maybe he can explain it in his explanation of vote - was, this Bill's been on the Calendar for an extraordinarily long period of time on Second Reading and on Third Reading. And I know the problems in Decatur, I used to live there, they're horrendous and just ridiculous as they are around the whole part of the state. And the..and the eastern part of the County of Will, where I live, they're severe and in Joliet. I just wanted to ask him, has the...has the railroad companies that operate in the Decatur area made any attempts at all to mitigate the circumstances that created the problem in Decatur? Have they come to you and talked to you at all, Representative Bennett?"



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bianco, to explain his vote."

Bianco: "I'd like to rise in strong support of this Bill based on my community....part of my district comprises of....community called Garfield-Rich Clearing and in this community we have had many problems with this situation. A lot of people have talked on this Bill, I know, but nobody has mentioned the cases of life or death that come into play where railroad crossings are blocked, hindering ambulances and other emergency medical vehicles from getting through. This has been a very bad problem in our community and has been talked about many, many years. And I think this is a very good Bill. And as a new Member of this Legislature, I don't know all the technical aspects of this Bill but I would like to urge some of the Representatives to reconsider and vote for this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise sort of reluctantly here on this Bill, I know Franklin Park was mentioned. I'd just like to remind everyone that it was in 1974, which at that time Representative Romie Palmer and I introduced and passed the Bill which now does fine the railroads for blocking the crossings for more than ten minutes. I think that was a reasonable Bill and we, in Franklin Park who are crisscrossed actually by railroad crossings, have successfully been able to fine the railroads. Now I think where the problem is, is that the local community has to enforce that law that we passed here in 1974. I don't believe, and it's with a lot of reluctance here that I have to oppose actually the fines here, the fines are not going to solve the problem. The law is on the book(sic) now and it does work and it works in Franklin Park. We just got through....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman conclude his remarks....."

Williams: "Collecting about 6,700 dollars from the railroad on that Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bennett, the Sponsor, to explain his vote and maybe you might tell us your pleasure because I think you're going to have a verification."



Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just...just to say I'm sorry to see at least what looks to be somewhat of a partisan issue and I don't...I don't think this is that kind of Bill. But to...to answer in my explanation something from Representative Davis. Certainly, I've been working, I'm a reasonable man, I don't think anybody can say otherwise, and I've been trying to work with the railroads and they promise and promise and promise and promise to alleviate these problems but they know how powerful they are, it's obvious from the vote. Nothing's been done. Nothing's going to be done until we do something."

Speaker Matijeich: "Do you want to go up or down on it, Al? All right. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "One of the first opponents to speak against this Bill suggested the railroads don't have enough money. Well, let me tell you, they've got enough money to give you campaign contributions if you vote the right way or even if they think that you might vote the right way. I got a contribution from the Chicago Northwestern Railroad when they were still romancing me about RTA but then when I figured out how it was going to rip us off, son of a gun, if they didn't spend about 60,000 dollars to pass the referendum. The biggest year they ever had on the commuter operation, all they earned was 3.5 million dollars. First year under RTA they earned over 5,000,000 dollars from the RTA. So don't tell me the railroads don't have enough money to pay these fines. They certainly do. It's just that they prefer to spend it elsewhere, where it will do more good."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, to explain his vote. One more after that, I believe."

Marovitz: "I was voting 'aye' on this Bill and changed to 'present' and perhaps one of the Members on the other side of the aisle in explanation of his vote can explain something to me."

Speaker Matijeich: "I hope not."

Marovitz: "Is the...is the fine on this levied against the corporation with an option against the employee or is the fine levied directly on the employee? I think I...I'd like to know that, Representative Bennett, if it's levied on the corporation, on the railroad, I'd be very much in favor of this Bill."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson: "I'd just like...just like to say that there are...there are people, for example, in our area and Tolono and Villa Grove, I can name you five or six families, whose houses have burned because they happened to be on the wrong side of the street when the...the fire trucks tried to get across the blocked crossings. And a 500 dollar fine, the existing law, is...simply isn't enough incentive to prevent railroads from doing that and I'm pretty sure the same thing's true across the state. This is a life, health, safety measure. I think it's mild at best and it's something that ought be(sic) supported."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 78 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'nay', 19 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having ...the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Postponed Consideration, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to place on the Order of Postponed Consideration? Leave. And House Bill 2708...be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Leave to return to the Order of Resolutions. We have two Resolutions that we might...must consider, House Joint Resolution 89. We have leave? Leave. House Joint Resolution 89, Will the Clerk read the Resolution?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 89. Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that an invitation be and is hereby extended to the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of Illinois to attend in a body the Joint Session of the General Assembly, to be held in the hall of the House of Representatives on Friday morning, May 26, 1978, and to join in receiving Jimmy Carter, the President of the United States; and be it further Resolved, that the Clerk of the House is directed to transmit a suitable copy of this invitation and Resolution to the Chief Justices and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will we...withhold action on that and the Clerk also read House Joint Resolution 90."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution #90. Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that an invitation be and is hereby extended to the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Comptroller and the Treasurer of Illinois to attend in a body the Joint Session of the General Assembly, to be held in the hall of the House of Representatives on Friday morning, May 26, 1978, and to join in receiving Jimmy Carter, the President of the United States; and, be it further Resolved, that the Clerk of the House is directed to transmit a suitable copy of this invitation and Resolution to the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Comptroller and the Treasurer of Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to consider House Joint Resolutions 89 and 90 as companion Resolutions? Leave. On that issue, the Majority Leader, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these Resolutions simply invite the Supreme Court and the Executive Officers to attend the Joint Session on Friday to hear from President Carter. I move their adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "Do we have leave for the Attendance Roll Call for the....suspension of the rule for immediate adoption of these Resolutions? Leave. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 89 and House Joint Resolution 90. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the Resolutions are adopted. Back to Third Reading, House Bill 2730. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2730. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ben Polk, on House Bill 2730."

Polk: "John, this is the Bill I thought you were going to call earlier and I was ready to go with it. This is the supplemental appropriation that started 8,900,000 with Amendments 1, 2 and 4. It's been reduced to 6,900,000 and I...."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island has moved for the passage of House Bill 2730. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 2730 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this...on this question there are 123 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. And House Bill 2730, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2736. Out of the record. House Bill 2738."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2738. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, the Minority Leader, George Ryan, on House Bill 2738."

Ryan: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to defer to Representative Stiehl, Celeste Stiehl."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl, on House Bill 2738."

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

House Bill 2738 would place the state in a more competitive position in seeking new industry or in encouraging existing industries to expand in Illinois. We all know that one of the most expensive start up costs for any industry is training their employees and all this Bill does is give the Director of the Department of Business and Economic Development the authority to negotiate with new industry or expanding industry to assist them in training new people for new positions, positions that will be held in their industry. A number of other states have put this into effect and it has been determined that this is one of the greatest incentives for industry moving into these states. It is an inexpensive program. It works through the vocational training schools and the community college system. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2738. Discussion on that issue? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."



Brummer: "Is there any indication that businesses do not move into the State of Illinois because we do not have skilled labor or properly trained labor?"

Stiehl: "Well, Representative Brummer, I think that just recently, in fact last year when Ford Motor Company was considering bringing a plant in here, and Illinois was one...had three sites that were being considered, I know that one of them was in my hometown. And it was definitely felt and discussed at that time but when the other states were negotiating for this, that if we, in Illinois, could have provided this as an added inducement perhaps we would have been able to acquire this industry. Now, that was a half a billion investment there from Ford Motor Company."

Brummer: "I...did Ohio, where I think Ford Motor Company eventually moved to, have this type of program? It was my understanding they did not."

Stiehl: "Yes, they did. They offered them a free job training program."

Brummer: "Did they...did they..."

Stiehl: "They did not have a state-wide program but they offered it just for that plant."

Brummer: "Well, we have some of these type of programs existing now through the community college programs, do we not?"

Stiehl: "No, this is...this is specifically geared for the junior college program."

Brummer: "Yes, but the community colleges currently have numerous type of job training programs suited to specific industries. I know at Illinois Eastern they have a coal mining job training program, a telephone installation job training program. And I think through the community college system we have numerous different types of job training programs already available."

Stiehl: "No, they have two pilot programs of this type, one at Blackhawk Community College and one at...where's the other one...and one at Highland. There is no other program in our community college system geared directly to this program. What this does is, when the Director of the Department of BED goes out and he negotiates with an industry to come in here, he can then offer them this job training program. People that will be trained and skilled in whatever skills



it is that they need in their company. He then, after the contract is signed, negotiates with the other departments of the state, with the junior college system, and they arrange for this training program so that when the company opens its doors they have skilled employees."

Brummer: "It is...."

Stiehl: "Yeah, this is more than on the job training program."

Brummer: "It is anticipated under this that the community colleges will provide this training, as I understand it, but yet it...it's to be chaired by the Director of the Department of Business and Economic Development?"

Stiehl: "Yes, there will be an advisory council that will consist of the Director of Business and Economic Development and the community college system."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, she will."

Leverenz: "Why do we need that advisory council? Why can't the Bureau of BED handle it without an advisory council with the people that they have?"

Stiehl: "Well, they can but it's just simply in coordinating it with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation or with the employment services or with the...."

Leverenz: "Since they can, would you..."

Stiehl: "Community college...."

Leverenz: "Consider amending that out of the Bill if you say they can do it without an advisory council?"

Stiehl: "It's just the department heads and it's strictly advisory. It...it's just a matter of coordinating the program a little better. The Department of....Director of BED, actually, is the authority in this program."

Leverenz: "Who would appoint those people?"

Stiehl: "Yes, they're already there, it's just the Director."

Leverenz: "What would be the cost?"

Stiehl: "We have 1.5 million dollars appropriated for this program but that is just for the actual training, it's been...."



Leverenz: "How about the administrative costs?"

Stiehl: "That's 130,000 dollars for the Department of Business and Economic Development."

Leverenz: "What are the estimated costs of the advisory council to meet regularly and how often is regularly?"

Stiehl: "There are no costs. There're no per diems in this. These are all the directors of the departments."

Leverenz: "Our advisory council members shouldn't be treated that way, I suggest that they should be reimbursed for the costs if we...if we allow an advisory council. But I...I see that you say that this can be done without an advisory council so that answers my questions, Mr. Speaker."

Stiehl: "Well...Mr. Speaker, may I...these are the...the directors of the departments, they're already being paid. We're not asking them to do this without any reimbursement, they're receiving salaries right now for this specific....."

Speaker Matijeich: "If there's no further discussion, Representative Stiehl, to close."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, I believe that this is one of the most important programs in providing new jobs for Illinois and inducing new industry to move into our state to build and to expand. It is not a costly program, it's been proven in all of the other states that where this program is in-effect the revenue that is being brought into that state far exceeds any cost of the program. In fact, in the State of Virginia in just three years it has created 61,000 jobs. I think that this is an important Bill and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2738. The question is, shall House Bill 2738 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 149 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. And House Bill 2738, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2738. I'm sorry, the



Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword, for what purpose do you rise?"

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to request a unanimous consent that I might be shown as voting 'yes' on House Bill 2730. I was called down front on another piece of business, couldn't get back to my switch in time."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has asked leave to be voted 'aye' on House Bill 2730....30. There....no one dissenting, so he has such leave. Same request, oh, on this Bill, Representative Dunn votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "Same request as Representative Tipsword on 2730...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Representative Bradley? Leave. The... House Bill 2753."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2753. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have House Bill 2753 returned to Second Reading for purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Jacobs, has asked leave that House Bill 2753 be returned to the Order of Second Reading and held, I understand the Amendment is not ready yet? And held for that purpose. Does he have leave? Leave. And House Bill 2753, I see now why you object. The...the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I have a very serious interest in that Bill and I'd like to talk with the Sponsor before we grant leave for that."

Speaker Matijevich: "You want to talk that over out in the back somewhere? Let's keep it on Third then and we'll come back to it. House Bill 2754."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2754. Porter. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, on House Bill 2754."



Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2754 amends the Environmental Protection Act and, as amended, Amendment 2 is now the Bill. It affects only skeet trap and shooting sport clubs in Illinois organized and in operation prior to January 1, 1975. And what it does is to exempt them, those groups from the noise abatement regulations of the Pollution Control Board. And I think the Bill is in a very slim shape now directed just at these gun clubs that have been regulated by the PCB. And I believe, and I think many of you believe, that the Environmental Protection Agency has a great deal more to do than to regulate these types of operations that have been in existence for a long time and were begun in open areas and have been moved in by urban development and we have a large number of Cosponsors on the Bill from both sides of the aisle. And most importantly I think it should be known to those of us, and I include myself among this group, should be known to those of us who are strong supporters of the environment that the Environmental Protection Agency has indicated that as amended they have no objection to the Bill. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2754. On discussion of that Bill, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would just like to rise in support of this Bill. Like Representative Porter, I, too, have a great concern for the environment but I also look at many of these gun clubs which were established long before the communities were ever built around them. And it just seems inconsistent to me, Mr. Speaker, that some people would like to put these clubs out of business because they...when they bought their homes or had them built, the gun clubs were there, they were there many years. They were established when the land was open and now some of the communities have moved in around them and I think it's only a matter of equity that they be allowed to continue. And I would certainly urge the support of the Members of this House."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, to close."

Porter: "I would just urge the Members to support this good legislation



and it is supported by the Illinois Wildlife Federation as Representative Wolf mentioned. Urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2754. The question is, shall House Bill 2754 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And House Bill 2754, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2757, I believe is out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 2770."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, on House Bill 2770."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give a little historical background to House Bill 2770. In 1975, during that Session of the Legislature, Representative Skinner introduced a Bill, passed it into law...passed into law which permitted taxing districts which overlap into multiple counties to have their taxes apportioned according to market value. In effect it provided an in-district multiplier effect to level off assessments between the counties. We passed a Bill in the last Session of the Legislature, which was House Bill 199 which was signed into law, it passed out of this House unanimously which permitted those taxing bodies whose taxes were being apportioned to object to apportionment. In other words, by Resolution from the elected officials of the taxing body. One of the problems arose, was during the last Bill, in fact, not exactly a typographical error but an error in draftsmanship, we forgot to put an immediate effective date. And we gave the taxing districts up till October 1 of 19.... of a particular year to object and the Bill didn't go into effect till October 1. So all House Bill 2770 is, to permit a one-time extension of time for taxing districts to object to apportionment. The Amendment #1 to the Bill provides that the Department of Local Government Affairs which does the apportioning may accept these Resolutions and apply them up to the earlier of two dates, July 1, 1978, or



the date the last county in the district received this multiplier. Prior to that time, there's no way that the counties can extend taxes in the particular district. It's a clean-up Bill in effect and it... original House Bill 199 was supported by both sides of the aisle, all Representatives in South Cook County and Will County which is the area that will be the principle beneficiary and both sides of the aisle and all Representatives in both counties. So I would urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The...the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, has moved for the adoption of House Bill 2770. On that issue, in discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Majority Leader Mike Madigan."

Madigan: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Leinenweber, did you indicate there's an Amendment on this Bill?"

Leinenweber: "That's correct. It was put on in Committee. The language was suggested by the Department of Local Government Affairs, Mr. Yung, so that there would be no disruption in tax bills."

Madigan: "How did he provide for no disruption in tax bills?"

Leinenweber: "Because the way the Bill originally was drafted and was pointed out by him, if these rejections Resolutions could be accepted up to July 1, then it would be impossible to send out tax bills prior to that date. He pointed this out to me and said that the earliest date that the tax..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, Representative Leinenweber, would the Clerk indicate to the Chair whether there is an Amendment on that Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, the Bill doesn't indicate that it's been amended."

Speaker Matijevich: "You want to take that Bill out of the record until you..."

Leinenweber: "I'll take it out of the record, yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Out of the record. House Bills 2772."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. House Bill 2775."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2775. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections



of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Jane Barnes, on House Bill 2775."

Barnes, J: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2775 addresses itself to the problem of child kidnapping and what child kidnapping involves is a person, or a parent, taking a child away from a parent who has custodial rights. And they secrete the child in the state or they remove the child from Illinois without the parent's approval. And this Bill would make this offense a Class IV felony which in effect would cause extradition and bring the child back to the original judge who had set forth all of the decrees of custodial agreement where the proper decision can be handled again and with thorough knowledge so that the child does end up where it belongs with the proper parent. This is a problem that is becoming very prevalent. There are child-snatchers that are hired for this purpose without thought of a child's feelings and I think it is much needed legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2775...on the discussion of that issue, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Getty: "Representative Barnes, you and I discussed an Amendment last Friday and would you tell me what your intention is relative to that Amendment?"

Barnes, J: "The Amendment that we discussed and agreed upon, I have in my hand and when the Bill gets over to the Senate, I will assure you that the Amendment will be attached to the Bill."

Getty: "With that understanding, I'm going to support the Bill."

Barnes, J: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I, likewise, rise to support this Bill. As I understand the genesis of this legislation, as a member of the bench that has had a lot of experience in this particular subject, and if it's good enough for him, it's good enough for me. And I would also urge an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, will the Lady yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Epton: "Representative Barnes, I certainly can understand this legislation. I will vote in favor of it. But there are some of us who feel very strongly about an individual running away and leaving the children, how do you feel about legislation that might insist that anybody leaving take the kids with them?"

Barnes, J: "I'll look into that situation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close on House Bill 2775."

Barnes, J: "I feel that this is an excellent piece of legislation that the judges in a divorce court are anxious to have and with that in mind, I would ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2775. The question is, shall 2775 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 145 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And House Bill 2775, having reached(sic) the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative... The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword. I'm sorry, I didn't see you. For what...."

Tipsword: "...I regret, I hit my button but it didn't light. I'd like to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk, Tipsword 'aye' and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "I'd like to be recorded as 'aye' on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Levin, 'aye'. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, 'aye'. This Bill has been declared passed. Representative Miller, 'aye'. Tom Miller. And Ewing, 'aye'. And Huskey, 'aye'. Ewing and Huskey are 'aye'. Let's get on those switches. The...House Bill 2787."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2787. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections



of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Fayette, Minority Whip Don Brummet...Majority Whip Don Brummet."

Brummet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Bill does is to amend the Illinois Municipal Code and provides for annexation by a municipality of territory, which though not contiguous, is owned by that municipality and has a water reservoir or a water treatment plant thereon. The Bill was introduced specifically to help out Greenville down in Bond County. And, incidentally, this Bill does not affect any county that has county zoning. But we have so many counties in the southern part of the State of Illinois that do not have county zoning that we need it in probably about six different cities. And in Bond County, Greenville owns the lake that is some four or five miles from the town. At the time they put in the lake they did not have the bonding ability to buy any of the adjoining land so they own up to the water level in the lake. And we need some kind of a control to keep from polluting this lake. The Pollution Control Board can do nothing about it until actually the pollution has actually occurred. And the whole reason for this Bill was to give the city the control that a municipality ordinarily gets around a municipality. I know of no opposition to the Bill and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2787. On the discussion of that Bill, the Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMasters."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

McMaster: "Don, then what is the purpose of this Bill? The municipality by annexing the property, then has zoning control within a mile and a half within of that...."

Brummet: "Around the lake, that's right, Tom. This is where there is no county zoning."

McMaster: "How many counties do we have that don't have zoning?"

Brummet: "There's 38 counties in the State of Illinois that do not have county zoning but there are only about six cities that's affected with this. And they're all in the extreme southern part of the state."



Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation somewhat reluctantly because it does set a precedent I think. For the first time it allows the municipality to annex noncontiguous territory. I might say that the Amendment that was added to it provides some of the safeguards one that is not effective in a county that has zoning power, has a zoning ordinance, and it's retroactive. In other words, it doesn't apply to any future municipal annexation of a water treatment plant or a sewage treatment plant. Therefore, there are safeguards which makes this particular piece of legislation pertinent to only four or five municipalities in the state. However, it probably does set a little bit of a precedent."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Indicates he will."

Rigney: "Would this allow a city to annex an industrial park that might be outside of its territory?"

Brummet: "No, definitely not."

Rigney: "Thank you."

Brummet: "Just...just the lake itself."

Rigney: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Adams, my seatmate, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, it's good to see you up there. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Mr. Brummet, in my community we have an airport which also has a reservoir and it is owned by the municipality but it's fourteen miles outside of the limits...city limits of the municipality. Now, could they annex that property?"

Brummet: "Isn't your county zoned?"

McClain: "No."

Brummet: "No county zoning?"

McClain: "No, Sir."



Brummet: "They could annex the lake just...."

McClain: "Only the lake?"

Brummet: "Only the lake."

McClain: "Now would this...I notice also in the Amendment that it says 'Therefore you could not annex any other property', I imagine that's property in between the lake...."

Brummet: "That's right. In other words...in other words, Representative McClain, you could not start annexing from the lake on back to town or around it like you could an ordinary municipality unless they could annex it all the way from the city out to the lake...."

McClain: "But isn't one of the...this is sort of a cruel hoax, I know, maybe a double-edged blade, but isn't one of the advantages having the reservoir...or let's say the city-owned property, part of the municipality is that some day you will be able to annex either through hook-ups or whatever all the property in between the city limits and the city owned property?"

Brummet: "This would be impossible. This wouldn't help it out any because you'd still have to start at the city limits to start annexing. So if you could do that you would do it now. This...this...."

McClain: "Well, what I'm saying is, let's say that the city has a water system out to the city owned property. One of the ways they get people to join into the city is they make them hook up, or they at least make available to them, hook ups on that water system so that they'll join the city. Now, will this prohibit that because of this Amendment?"

Brummet: "No, I can't see where it would prohibit it."

McClain: "Well, but by the Amendment it says that you have to start at the city limits out towards the city owned property. What if you could get somebody that was three miles outside the city limits?"

Brummet: "Well, he couldn't annex because the Bill says you can't. You can't annex from the lake on in. The only way you could annex would be from the city limits on out as the city limits exist now. So this would not affect that in the least."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you satisfied, Mike?"

McClain: "All right. Yes, I don't think it's very good for my area. Thanks."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."



Friedrich: "No, Mr. Speaker, I'm in favor of the Bill and I was just going to attempt to answer Representative McClain's Bill(sic). It does not change the present annexation laws with respect to expanding your city from the city out."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet, to close."

Brummet: "If I've answered all the questions, I think it's a good Bill for about a half a dozen cities who have a definite problem down in our part of the country and I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2787. The question is, shall House Bill 2787 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. All...Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...the Gentleman from Conti...The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "In explaining my vote, this...this excludes Cook County? I can't make up my mind how to vote on this Bill. I know...does this exclude Cook County? I..."

Speaker Matijeich: "...Somebody vote Jack Wolf, he wants to vote 'aye'. Go ahead. Proceed, Elmer."

Conti: "Does this exclude Cook County?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Leave for Representative Brummet to answer that.

Does this exclude Cook County? Yes, it does. Change your vote to 'aye', Elmer. On...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 21 voting 'present'. And House Bill 2787, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. I understand Representative Vinson and Representative Jacobs have at least agreed to return House Bill 2753 to the Order of Second Reading and held there for the purpose of Amendment which is not ready yet. Do we have leave? House Bill...leave. And House Bill 2753 will be held on the Order of Second Reading. That's 2753."



Speaker Matijeich: "House Bill 2790. Tipsword, 2790."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2790. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation Division of Water Resources for use of Flat Branch drainage district. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "Is the county correct? It says Flatbush. I was going to introduce you as the Gentleman from Brooklyn. The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword, on House Bill 2790."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave to take that back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman has asked unanimous consent to return House Bill 2790 to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Harris-Richmond. Amends House Bill 2790, as amended, by deleting everything proceeding the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Matijeich: "The... Whose Amendment is that? The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This will be Amendment #2. Amendment #2...by deleting everything preceding the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof, the following: An Act making certain appropriations to the Department of Transportation. By deleting all of Section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof, the following: The sum of 30 million dollars or so much thereof as may be necessary is appropriated to the Department of Transportation from the Emergency Pothole Repair and Road Restoration Fund for expenditure and distribution in accordance with the Emergency Pothole Repairs and Road Restoration Act of 1978. Enacted by the Eightieth General Assembly."

Speaker Matijeich: "I will say, you've got everybody's attention on this side of the aisle, Representative Harris. On Amendment #2, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Is the Gentleman for real?"

Speaker Matijeich: "It looks like it to me. Do you have any questions



on the Amendment, Representative?"

Skinner: "Yes, this proposal was fairly debated in the House Transportation Committee and we concluded that all the potholes in the State of Illinois would be capable of being filled with the paperwork that would be produced from the Representative from Cook County's Bill to inspect every railroad crossing once a month. Now, as everyone knows, every railroad crossing... Illinois has more railroad crossings than any other state in the country. And these monthly reports, which of course will require more patronage employees who of course would be hired on a nonpartisan basis, would generate enough paper that they'd never be able to be filed. So all we'd have to do would be ship that paper into a compactor and then distribute it state-wide and we will not need an extra 30 million dollars to fill potholes in the State of Illinois. I think that is a much better proposal. And before consideration of this Amendment, Mr. Speaker, I would submit notice that I'm going to file a fiscal note because I'm not at all sure the Department of Transportation will find that 30 million dollars is needed to fill potholes. Perhaps, to fill holes in heads of people in the General Assembly but not in the roads of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser. I called on you, that's all I can do, Art."

Telcser: "Would the Sponsor yield? Representative, I see in Section 2 of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2790 you are appropriating the sum of 30 million dollars from the Emergency Pothole Repair and Road Restoration Fund. Is that correct, Sir?"

Harris: "Representative Telcser, the funds would be from the General Revenue Fund."

Telcser: "Well, the Amendment..."

Harris: "It's a loan from the General Revenue Fund."

Telcser: "Do we have the same Amendment? It says: Section 2. The sum of 30 million dollars or so much thereof as may be necessary is appropriated to the Department of Transportation from the Emergency Pothole Repair and Road Restoration Fund.' Do I have the



wrong Amendment or do I have the correct one?"

Harris: "That's the correct Amendment."

Telcser: "All right, so you want them taking 30 million dollars from the Emergency Pothole Repair and Road Restoration Fund. Is that correct, Sir?"

Harris: "Yes, that's correct."

Telcser: "All right, now where does this fund exist? Where is this fund? I cannot find any such fund anywhere."

Harris: "It's an Amendment put on a House Bill over in the Senate."

Telcser: "It's a what?"

Harris: "It's an Amendment placed on the House Bill in the Senate."

Telcser: "But the fund does not exist, is that correct?"

Harris: "Representative Telcser, this money would be from the General Revenue Fund, which presently has a balance of 96 million dollars."

Telcser: "Your Amendment doesn't say that though, Representative. Your Amendment is in error. Mr. Speaker, may I address the Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I...I've served for more years, perhaps, than I'd like to remember. And I've seen, over the years, my great City of Chicago rip-off the state as often as they can and in many, many different variations of every different kind of forms trying to grab some money from the State's General Revenue Fund. Now, the Sponsor of the Amendment indicated that the money would come from general revenue and I'm sure that was the intent of the individuals who were the architects of this Amendment. The Amendment, however, indicates that the money comes from a nonexistent fund. So I can't understand how money could come from a fund that does not exist. That's 30 million dollars that should go to...that would go to some local governments, perhaps, to fix their potholes which I'm sure occurred due to a very harsh winter. It seems to me that this is a feeble attempt, which apparently has failed, for the City of Chicago to rip-off some extra money to help repair the side streets and alleys which perhaps should be taken care of



by local government. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House and particularly my downstate friends on both sides of the aisle, I come from Chicago and I don't mind ripping off the state once in a while for money for my home town but for God's sake you ought to at least take the money from a fund which exists. If I voted for this Amendment the money wouldn't be available. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think we ought to oppose this Amendment because it's incorrect. And for those of us who are from the City of Chicago, who would love to get the money, I'd like to talk with the Representative who sponsored this Amendment so we can try to rip-off some money from a fund that exists. Please, oppose this Amendment.

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On my way to Springfield today I happened to take one of the roads that I do not normally take, including Route 136 and 97 in the west central part of Illinois. Frankly, it was a discussion as to whether or not that route was possible to be traveled and I would like to inform the General Assembly that it does indeed look like that it has previously been traveled by the jolly green giant on a pogo stick. Anyone that thinks that we do not have potholes in the State of Illinois has not been around...especially west central Illinois. If you traveled the roads over there you would swear that it was sometimes designed by the Capital Development Board on the advice and consent of the Illinois Office of Education, it's so well planned. We indeed need this. We need it badly. We are now in the process of setting up lunch stands along our roads so that we can sell picnic lunches for people that have to travel around the potholes. I had a run along the Mississippi River last week...that the pothole got so deep that indeed the Mississippi River had to flow backwards two days just to fill this pothole. If you don't think that we need this money I suggest that you come visit my legislative district."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, the Minority Leader, Representative Ryan."



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

Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Ryan: "Representative, can you tell me why you're handling a Bill that earmarks 8 million dollars for Cook County and 3 million dollars for Chicago? Out of 30 million that's 11 million dollars, Representative Harris. Do you know what the allocation is for the rest of the state?"

Harris: "Yes, I do, Mr. Leader. That's a very good question. My... my figures show that there would be 3 million dollars for Cook County and the allocation for all the counties throughout the state is allocated on a proportional basis with the gas tax. And since I have had calls from throughout the area from county boards and other mayors that shows that the pothole problem is not just a problem for the future, it's an immediate problem. And 30 million dollars, according to statistics, would possibly save us 60 million dollars in the long run because the roads now are in such a deplorable condition if they're left to go for another 6 months we're probably going to have to spend another 30 million."

Ryan: "Well thank you, Representative. I certainly agree that we need some work done on the potholes but I don't think that this Bill is going to do your area or my area or any downstate area a bit of good. The 11 million dollars that goes to the City of Chicago and the County of Cook...there's not going to be any money left for you downstaters. There's not going to be any dollars left to fix your potholes. Not only that, they're going to take this money out of the general revenue and then repay it out of the road fund and that's another loss that you're going to have downstate, Mr. Harris. And I'm absolutely amazed that a downstate Representative, such as you, would handle such a piece of legislation. This is a terrible, terrible Amendment and clearly needs to be defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "For the other side of the issue, the Majority Leader, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, judging from the comments of the Minority Leader and his able assistant this certainly must be a good Amendment. I suggest to you that it is a good Amendment because the arguments offered by the Minority Leader and his able assistant simply drag up the old red-herring of the City of Chicago. They do not offer any arguments on the merits. They do not offer any arguments of substance. They do not argue that this is not needed because they know it is. They do not argue that they know a better way to do this because they have none. They simply drag out the old arguments of the past, the old arguments displaying the octopus of the City of Chicago. If you examine the Amendment, read the staff analysis that has been presented to you, you will see that the distribution proposed under this Amendment is fair and equal for every county and road district in this state. There is nothing inequitable; there is nothing unfair. It is a good, sound, legislative proposal by Representative Harris, designed to alleviate the problem of potholes. We all know that there are potholes because our cars have fallen into them. As our cars fall into the potholes, as our tires are damaged, as our insurance rates go up, the Governor, once again, is silent. The only word we hear from the Governor comes from the Minority Leader and he talks about a city in the northern part of the state. I suggest to you, this is a good proposal. It simply proposes a loan and it proposes a good, sound repayment plan for the loan."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Majority Leader has very ably cleared the air on this Amendment by determining it a red-herring, it is, because it stinks. The plan stinks because you're taking money out of the General Revenue Fund to be repaid by the road fund and it's a hoax to the People of the State of Illinois. And most of it's going to wind up in Chicago and Cook County, as everything else does. The same with the R.T.A. and every other program. It's nothing to do



with the...the maintenance of a good road program, it's to take from the general fund and repay it from the road fund. And frankly, this Amendment does nothing, basically, as far as equity to help down-state Illinoisans in proportion to Cook County. Now, my good friend, Representative Telcser said he didn't mind taking from the areas of the rest of the state to help Chicago but he himself has said that it's a poor Amendment. So, I think the proper term for Amendment #2 is the Red-Herring Amendment because the whole concept stinks."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Chairman of the Transportation Committee, Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, dealing first with the Minority Leader's claim that Cook County and the City of Chicago is going to be getting more funding out of this 30 millions of dollars than they're entitled to, let me remind him and all of you Members on the other side of the aisle, that these funds are to be distributed in the same manner that our motor fuel tax is now being distributed. And this motor fuel tax formula has been founded on a sound basis. The distribution is fair and it is equitable. And as far as the charges they've been making over there on the other side of the aisle; they've been putting labels of frivolous, silly, fraudulent and it stinks, on something as serious as the pothole problem that we now have in this state. And let me say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's nothing frivolous about miles of county and township roads and city streets turning back to mud, gravel and chuckholes. In many areas of our state these roads are in real bad shape. We have an area right here in county...right county...right here in Sangamon County where there is a child that had to be taken to the hospital for emergency heart treatment, these medical...these chuck...these ambulances could not even get to her for the potholes on the roads and for the conditions of the roads. The roads are in a deplorable condition and the only way that we're going to meet them at the present time and this year, is through this vehicle



that we have in front of us right now. And we ought to address ourselves to it, not with these silly...not with these phony terms that the other side of the aisle is throwing at us but in a realistic manner and pass this Amendment that is sorely needed in this state."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I would first like to answer Senator...Representative McGrew. I know the road that he rode on and he knows very well that that's in the road program and that's in the process of being paved. Another thing I'd like to ask is, what is this road restoration fund? I've worked in Transportation for six years and I've never heard of it. What is it, Representative Harris?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he'll yield. Go ahead."

Harris: "It's a new fund being created."

Kent: "By what, by what fund?"

Harris: "It's in the Senate presently and this is not a new concept..."

this is part of a...the whole total Bill. They have part of the appropriation and we have part of the other Bill. This is nothing new, it's been done many times before."

Kent: "But why would we need a road restoration fund when we already have a road fund that's practically defunct. Where are we getting this money?"

Harris: "We are earmarking the money out of the General Revenue Fund to be..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's have your attention... Let's have your attention. Representative Kent, do you want to..."

Harris: "...for emergency repairs. And you and I know that there are 6 million 700 thousand motorists in the State of Illinois and possibly you may not have any potholes in your district."

Kent: "Huh, you know how many I have and you also know that there is over 6 million dollars in the Transportation appropriation for this purpose. And I think that this Amendment is giving hope when there won't be hope. And I know that the townships and counties that are expecting this, when they read this in the paper, will be



very disappointed and they will be coming back to you and saying, 'Why? Why did you promise and not be able to deliver? Where are you going to take this money from?' You keep talking about saving money, we're spending it faster than we've got it. The people won't allow this. I think it's a sham, I think we should defeat this Amendment so soundly that we know what we're doing and I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, has moved the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The previous question prevails. Representative Bruce Richmond from Jackson, to close."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm very pleased to be a Cosponsor of this Amendment. I...There's no question about its need and there's certainly no question that 30 million is a lot closer to being what is needed than the 6 million that has been mentioned that is in the current D.O.T. budget. And also, those who would...would have us believe that this is a very unfair distribution, if this be true then certainly we ought to revise the distribution formula that's currently being used for the distribution of funds from the motor fuel tax, because this is the identical system that will be used under this Bill. And it will not put any serious financial problems on the general fund, inasmuch as this would get 1/15th right off the top of the collections from motor fuel tax each month, which is approximately 2 and a half million dollars. So, as you can see...within a 12 month period the money would be restored to the General...Fund. Now, I consider this a legislative mandate to the Department of Transportation, that this is the way we want them to respond to the pothole situation that exists in Illinois. I don't believe that they have, the Governor or the Department of Transportation, at the present time, has responded in a manner that will take care of the situation. We have circumstances



where roads are closed, people require two cars to get to work. They leave one on one side of the pothole area and walk around it and get in the car and go from there. And I think this is kind of a sad situation, I urge your support of this fine Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentlemen from Marion and Jackson have jointly moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2790. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. To explain her vote, the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's very significant to me that the original Bill simply appropriated 22 thousand 5 hundred dollars to the Flat Branch Drainage District and then it was changed by Amendment #1 to send it to the Department of Transportation's Division of Water Resources and now we have a perpetration of 30 million dollars...Red-Herring... Let me tell you, you've got all the herrings in Illinois with this Amendment...30 million dollars to the Emergency Pothole Repair and Road...Construction Fund. And it's significant also that Representative Winchester's Amendment that had the R.T.A. pay back the money they were supposed to pay was ruled not germane. Now if this Amendment is ruled germane, I'm ashamed, shocked and just completely horrified at the ruling of the Parliamentarian. I urge a 'no' vote, I think this is a horrible perpetration of an apparent...and therefore I certainly oppose this Amendment, as much as I like the Sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, in explanation of my 'aye' vote, I would like to read a letter addressed to the City Council of Olney, it goes as follows: 'We have an enterprising and money making suggestion for you which will put an end to the complaints about the street conditions in Olney. People, we are driving on a virtual gold mine. Did it ever occur to anyone that we could contract the usage of our streets to the testing laboratories of multi-million dollar car industries. This is an excellent place to test the new chassis



designs to see if they can withstand cruel and unusually hazardous driving conditions. The next logical step would be to contract the tire and shock absorber manufacturers; then of course paint manufacturers might be interested in how well their products stand up to long exposure of tar globules. When the money starts to pour in we could start...we could expand by selling the rights of private drives to NASA, they could test the durability of their all terrain lunar vehicles. Then, to put Olney on the map, we could invite Gene Roddenberry to film new star trek extravaganza here with all our scenic meteorite craters; after all, bikers have known for years that Olney is the best mud track for miles. So Gentlemen, start your engines.' There is a P.S. establishing a reward for information leading to the whereabouts of a 1970 Volkswagon, last seen in a crater on South East Street."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Minority Leader has requested a verification on this matter. The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, in explanation of my vote, I'd like to tell the Lady from Lake, who spoke a while ago that the Amendment in regard to the R.T.A. was not to this Bill. The Amendment of Representative Winchester's was voluntarily withdrawn on this Bill. The R.T.A. Amendment was to a completely separate Bill with regard to downstate transportation. In addition, changing this appropriation to the Department of Transportation was at the recommendation of both Appropriations Staff of the Appropriations Committee, together with the Legislative Reference Bureau saying that it was, first of all, incorrectly directed and should have to go through the Department of Transportation. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Steele, to explain his vote."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to oppose and speak against this Amendment. The 30 million dollars we're talking about here, I think we all should sit back and realize that we may be depriving our roads of much more than 30 million dollars. These are actual state dollars out of our road fund. And when you realize that most of our



state money for roads is used to match federal dollars...In other words, we're talking about a 70% to 90% match. When you take 30 million dollars out of the actual road money of this state we may be losing up to 300 million dollars of actual road construction, when you consider that there's a 70 to 90% match of federal funds with most of our actual state dollars. So I think that we should look very closely at this and oppose this Amendment because if we spend this money we're actually going to take out possibly the entire road program for this state for the next several years, up to maybe 280 to 300 million dollars; something we shouldn't be doing. We need that money and we need the federal matching funds that this money can bring to our roads in Illinois. I oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to let the people know that down in Madison-St Clair County we've got potholes that are the size of Volkswagons, small vans and I think that the Minority Leader...talked about this issue being a Democratic or Republican issue, it's not, it's a good government issue and it's good government to fix roads. And I'm happy to vote 'aye' on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, to explain his vote."

Daniels: "It's a good government issue all right, somebody ran a political survey and told the candidate for Governor that potholes is more important than education. Somebody told the Governor that potholes is more important than mental health, welfare or the criminal justice system in the State of Illinois. What we have here is a man who's a candidate for Governor and by the way, from DuPage County, that believes that one of the most important issues in this state is potholes. Now, somebody ought to tell that man that education is more important than potholes, that other systems of running needed services in the State of Illinois are more important. I'm from DuPage County and I can tell you, the



people from DuPage don't believe that potholes are more important. Vote against this Amendment. Vote for good government. Put the money where it belongs; in education. Set your priorities right now...telling you where your priorities are."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before this debate goes to pot, the Lady from Cook, Representative Willer, to explain her vote."

Willer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Normally, I vote reluctantly on anything to do with the Department of Transportation. I happen to think that human services and education come way before roads. And I think if it was just a matter of being inconvenienced driving over potholes, I wouldn't be supporting it. It's gone beyond that. You get on a road where the speed limit is 45 miles an hour or over, you are absolutely in danger of being injured or killing yourself in some of these potholes. I have...witnessed this myself going down the Eisenhower. I think it's absolutely essential and I don't think we have to equate choosing between this or education. I think this is a very creative, innovative plan; it is borrowing money, it will be repaid in a year..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady...conclude her remarks."

Willer: "And I think... I just urge more green votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman, to explain his vote. One minute."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'no' on this Amendment. I think we're seeing some strange activity on the floor of the House this afternoon. The same two Gentlemen who are sponsoring this Amendment are two, who in Appropriations Committee, last week voted to deny the Department of Transportation the money that they had spent, already spent, to care for the roads this winter. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that that is not very consistent on the part of the Majority Party. This Amendment is a political sham. It's nothing more and I advise everybody to vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Representative Lechowicz."

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



In explaining my 'aye' vote, I'd just like to point out to the Membership, especially to the Membership on the other side that the only reason why they're opposing this Amendment at this time is because Mike Bakalis came out first with the proposal, just maybe a week ahead of Governor Thompson, which was pointed out in the Chicago press over the weekend. It's not that it's a bad proposal, it's just the wrong Sponsor. But I've always believed that an item should be merit...judged on its merit and not as far as whose idea it is. I strongly recommend an 'aye' vote on this proposal...because it's a needed proposal throughout the state. In fact, the United States Government is addressing this same issue, not only on a state by state basis...based upon needs. Unfortunately, we've experienced two severe winters in concurrence with extremely severe springs. It's an item that's needed throughout this state. Maybe 30 million isn't enough but it's all we can afford and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson, to explain his vote."

Robinson: "Well, you know the Minority Leader ought to be asking himself, 'What's another 30 million dollars?' After all, only at the end of last Session Representative Telcser and Representative Ryan got together with the Chicago Democrats to vote 50 million dollars for the crosstown expressway. Downstate got nothing out of that. Now, it's true that maybe downstate doesn't get all it should but you know, I..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Would the Gentleman conclude his remarks?"

Robinson: "Wait... I would rather get crumbs from Madigan than nothing from Ryan and Telcser."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, to get into the act."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned in debate and I rarely rise on a point but let me first inform the Gentleman, if he checks the record he'll see I voted 'no' on the Amendment for the crosstown. But secondly...secondly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this debate has really come way off of the point. The



fact of the matter is, the 30 million dollars which the Members on the other side of the aisle are so vigorously fighting for, simply does not exist. If you'll take a moment to read the Amendment, you will see that the money is appropriated from a road restoration fund which is nonexistent. The Amendment does not take the money from general revenue, as some people have been talking about during the course of this debate. You are talking about 30 million dollars which is a phantom, which does not exist, it's funny money. You're making a promise to your constituents..."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McGrew...from Knox, Representative McGrew, rises on a point of order, that you're out of order and have gone way beyond personal privilege and the Chair agrees. Have all voted...have all voted who wished? The Clerk will...take the record and there has been a request for a verification. Do you persist in that, Minority Leader Ryan? You got a partisan vote, you don't need it."

Ryan: "Yes I do, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right, the Gentleman from Marion has requested a poll of the absentees. Will the Clerk call the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Cunningham. Hart. Hoffman. Laurino. Madison. Mann. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Pierce and Stearney."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Clerk will proceed with the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Breslin. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Chapman."

Speaker Matijeich: "One moment. Does Representative Chapman have leave to be verified? She has a meeting. Leave...Go ahead, Jeanie."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman. Christensen. Darrow. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J. M. Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Levin. Lucco. Luft. Madigan. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijeich."



Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Mudd. Mugalian.
 Mulcahey. Murphy. Nardulli. O'Brien. Pechous. Pouncey.
 Richmond. Robinson. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider.
 Sharp. Shumpert. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich.
 Tipsword. Van Duynes. Vitek. Von Boeckman. R.V. Walsh.
 Willer. Williams. Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Questions of the affirmative vote from the
 Minority Leader, Representative Ryan. Proceed, with help from Skinner."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Representative Bradley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is Representative Bradley here? I don't see
 him in his seat. Is Representative Bradley coming out yet?
 Here he is. He says he'll do the same for you someday, George."

Ryan: "Representative Davis, Corneal Davis."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dawson is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Doyle is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Farley is way in the back, in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Matijevich: "Giglio. I don't see him in his seat. Is Giglio
 on the floor? Take him off. Giglio."

Ryan: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see Representative Greiman. Is Greiman
 in the chambers? Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see him. Is he...How is he recorded,
 Mr. Speaker?(sic)"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative James Houlihan."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see him in his seat. How's Jim Houlihan
 recorded?"

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



Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Huff. Is he back there? Huff.

Doug Huff, I don't see him back there. How's he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe is not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative O'Brien is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? I don't see him anywhere. How's he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schneider is not in his seat.

How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Sharp is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Matijevich: "Steczko is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stuffle is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Von Boeckman. Here he is, over here." Proceed."

Ryan: "I can't tell whether Representative Williams is in his chair



or not there."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Williams. Jack Williams is not in his chair. Is Representative Williams here? I don't see him anywhere. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijeich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Younge."

Speaker Matijeich: "Wyvetter Younge is not in her seat. How's she recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijeich: "Take her off. Proceed."

Ryan: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Matijeich: "What's the vote, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 80 'ayes', 76 'noes' and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijeich: "Third Reading. There has been a request for a fiscal note and the Chair will rule that that cannot apply because this is an Appropriation Bill. Third Reading. Just a minute. I understand there is another Amendment. Return that. Further Amendments. 3 has been withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Skinner. Amends House Bill 2790 as amended in Section 2 by changing 'emergency pothole repair and road restoration fund' to 'public transportation fund'."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if we're going to have fun, let's have some real fun."

Speaker Matijeich: "On Amendment 4."

Skinner: "The Regional Transportation Authority takes \$16.4 million out of the state road fund every year. That's the equivalent of \$2.21 for every license plate sold anywhere in the State of Illinois. All right, that's for starters. That's the money that could be spent on potholes right now if our predecessors in 1974 hadn't had the extremely poor judgment to follow the leadership of Governor Walker and other former Governors, several of which



I could mention but won't. In addition, the RTA estimates that 89.4 million dollars per year will be taken from motorists in the six county area to go to the RTA through the RTA gas tax. Additionally, the RTA has the authority but has not yet imposed it to tax commuter...to tax parking lots which charge. Now they can get probably 10 to 20 million dollars from that. What we have as a general philosophy which ought to be rejected, and that general philosophy is that car owners and truck owners should pay for the public...for the cost of subsidizing train riders and bus riders. Now this is totally unjustifiable. It is unjustifiable because the average railroad commuter earns 50 percent more than does the average nonrailroad commuter in the six county area yet we're spending over 45,000,000 dollars a year subsidizing railroad commuters. What this Amendment does is puts it back into...puts it more into balance. It takes 30,000,000 dollars away from the RTA to subsidize people who don't deserve subsidizing and gives it to potholes relief so you can have the best of both possible worlds. You can help abolish the RTA gas tax. if you want. or you can help abolish the...the rip-off of the Road Fund, the 16.4 million dollar rip-off of the Road Fund, or you can just do it for spite. You can do it send the RTA a message if you have a message. And since this Bill will obviously be vetoed anyway it's a harmless message." I can't imagine anybody who would want to argue against this Amendment so I'll just ask that everyone who...is awake enough to push the 'yes' button to please do so and those that are awake enough to push the 'no' button, please don't."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that...the discussion, the Majority Leader from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, very recently we watched the show from the other side of the aisle once again dragging up the Red(sic) scare of Chicago. Now we have the second act in that performance, a continuation of a beating of the same dead horse. The first act wasn't too bad but I must suggest to the Minority Leader that the second act in this performance is of a lower quality and since you agree with me I



would hope that you would join in defeating this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me simply comment upon the remarks of the Majority Leader that this is indeed an act. It's an act orchestrated on the behalf of the Democratic candidate for Governor who has turned this chamber into a bitterly partisan chamber and it seems that we've set aside the good interests of the people of the State of Illinois simply to help the Democratic nominee conduct a faltering, trite campaign here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Let me assure you, Representative, that you and your minions who follow your orders every day on the floor of this House will only lead yourselves and your candidates to no good because the people of this great state have long said that they're tired of partisan politics and petty bickering which you have forced us to take part in. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I simply want to set the record straight and remind the Majority Party that their days as a majority are numbered."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before I call on the next Gentleman, one announcement. There's been a request for an announcement on how late we're working. The Speaker said you might as well order now because we'll be in for quite a while. Order your food whenever you want to eat it, that is, we'll be working late. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative...the Majority Leader, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you withhold that announcement until Mr. Ryan and I have a chance to talk to the Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The...Representative Ryan is the one who asked for that. All right. Work it out. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McGrew."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Beautiful. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McGrew, has moved the previous question on House Bill 2790. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Did I tell you yet about the radio ads we're going to cut for this false campaign in those downstate districts that have two Democrats where one of them...were sort of a marginal districts."



We've already got one Roll Call on RTA and we'd sure like to have another one so I would ask all of you downstate Democrats to please vote against this Amendment so we'll have two Amendments that show that tie you directly to the City of Chicago through RTA. We appreciate that very much. If you don't think it'll work, ask the...the one Representative left from Rockford what Representative Martin did to him two years ago by talking Chicago interests in the lottery and RTA. Which is where, by the way, the proceeds from the lottery went. But back to the substantive rather than the partisan content of this Amendment, what you have here is an opportunity to tell the RTA that you really don't think people in McHenry County earning 77 percent more than the average nonrailroad commuter household ought to get 26 cents every time they step on the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad. You've got an opportunity to tell the people in Joliet that their mass transit district shouldn't have full page ads run by the RTA every once in a while to buy off the local newspaper. That instead - or perhaps it'll be preferable just to wad up the newspaper and throw them in the...in the potholes - but failing that, why don't we spend the money buying asphalt, hot patch, to put into the potholes and let's...let's...let's...take it from the RTA. No one's going to be hurt except the monstrous bureaucracy in the Chicago Transit Authority and with their cost of living increase, my heavens, we'll never be able to fill that bottomless pit. You want to talk about a pothole, man, I'm giving you a pothole. The RTA is the biggest pothole in the State of Illinois. It'll never be filled as probably neither will the...the hopes of the Democratic candidate for Governor to win through using this issue."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 2790. On this issue, the Chair is going to order a Oral Roll Call, Mr. Clerk, an Oral Roll Call. When your name is called, stand, announce your vote and at the same time depress the voting of your choice. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Abramson. Pass. Adams."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mr. Clerk, I understand now that the...someone who had thought they were going to request a verification over there



has...doesn't look like they will. So let's...all in favor vote 'aye', all in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think that this Amendment should certainly not be passed. The previous speaker on the Amendment alluded to the fact that he thinks that money for downstate potholes should be....come out of the RTA fund when we don't pay it but the money that they're paying for RTA up there, we should suffer downstate and we don't even pay that damn thing. The other...the other thing that we should talk about here today, I think everybody in his district knows that he's opposed to the RTA, I know that they do in my district, and I spend just about two days down here every Session listening to him reinforce his position. So I think everybody knows it by now."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my 'yes' vote." The Majority Leader referred to the two acts and the second act that we're getting into right now. Well, if he wants to see an act he ought to come out in the collar counties and see the act that the busdrivers are putting on acting like they're busy when they've got empty buses going 25 miles an hour down a highway holding up traffic because they....they've got to go that slow to keep up with the schedule that's established thinking they'll have customers. The people in my area that are going to have to pay this tax, they ought to get a benefit for it and that benefit ought to be filling in the potholes. So I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Garmisa, to explain his vote."

Garmisa: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'no' vote. The Minority Leader on the other side of the aisle made derogatory reference to the way the Majority Leader has been leading his minions, his so-called minions. Well, let me say, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, that if the Minority Leader is going to be leading his minions to the political promised land he is going to find that it will be lined with potholes if he prevails with this Amendment. I ask for a 'no' vote from every



Member of this House."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would never deign to call anyone a minion or a lackey or anything. I would simply say that those people who are voting 'no' on this Amendment are blind followers. And I might tell you that if we want to show a good example, let's vote for an Amendment that at least has a legal fund, a public transportation fund. There's no such thing as an emergency pothole repair and road restoration fund. It's a figment of the imagination, which the majority on the other side is going to pass whether we like it or not. Now it's high time to consider the people's cost and we are putting a lot of cost on the people when we don't want to return money that's duly...supposed to be returned by the RTA Board to the public transportation fund."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, to explain his vote. One minute."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, somebody mentioned acts and it dawned on me that perhaps we could expand this very good Amendment by taking some of the money that we waste on the Illinois Arts Council and tie it to this Amendment. Just think of all the artists that we have running around this state, they could do...they could fill in these potholes and even do some finger art in the...in the wet cement before it hardens. And of course the organic theater should be more than happy to supply some kind of matter to fill these...potholes. Beyond that, we have been spending so much money on dance theaters around this state that perhaps the people are so happy dancing that they really aren't concerned about this momentous issue. And when you think of riding down the street reading poetry on the buses, my God, we'll be so euphoric that we won't have time to worry about it when we hit a pothole...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Collins: "So I...I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we can take at least 3,000,000 dollars more and put the Illinois Arts Council where it belongs - in the potholes of this state."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. Methinks."

Skinner: "Well, there are some people we're going to miss here next year. We're going to miss Representative....we're going to miss... we're going to miss Representative Tipword or Representative Dunn. We're going to miss Representative Darrow and we're going to miss Representative Kane or Representative Robinson....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman....would the Gentleman confine his remarks to the explanation of vote?"

Skinner: "And prior to this date, Representative Mulcahey has had a lot better judgment. But let me speak to the issue."

Speaker Matijevich: "About time. Proceed, you...have about 20 seconds."

Skinner: "The Gentleman from Peoria suggested that downstate Illinois doesn't pay anything to the RTA and I would suggest that just indicates he hadn't looked at the budget and perhaps he ought to serve on the same Appropriations Committee I serve on, which is....I believe he does! Does he know that the 16.4 million dollars that goes from the Road Fund amounts to \$2.21 for every set of license plates bought any place in the State of Illinois? That gets ripped right off the top before the Road Fund even gets started....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman conclude his remarks"

Skinner: "Does he know that 10 dollars for every person for every year gets ripped off the top of the General Fund that otherwise would go to education? Does he know that as much money as the State-Aid Education Fund has been underfunded since 1974 has gone to the RTA with 50,000,000 dollars....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman conclude his remarks? Your time is up, Cal."

Skinner: "Okay...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No, we don't have time for that....."

Kane: "Well, since...since he's already read my mind I'd hate to disappoint him and I'll vote 'no'."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I just want to verify, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, you changed your mind."

Ryan: "...Good Amendment, happens to get beat."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 83 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and there has been a request for a verification by Representative Ryan. And will the Clerk poll the absentees? I guess.... Skinner, do you want the absentees? No. All right. Does anybody want the absentees? No. The Clerk will...the Clerk will poll the negative vote. Rather... rather, will read the...call the negative votes. The negative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J. M. Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Excuse me, Representative McClain would like to have leave to be verified, he has a meeting. Representative McClain. Leave? Go ahead."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Levin. Lucco. Luft. Madigan. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijevich. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Mudd. Mugalian. Nardulli. O'Brien. Pechous. Porter. Pouncey. Richmond. Robinson. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Sharp. Shumpert. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Tipsword. Vitek. Von Boeckman. W. D. Walsh. Willer. Williams. Younge. Yourell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Questions of the negative vote? The....oh, just a moment. Before we do that, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you rise?"

Deuster: "Please vote me 'aye', on this, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Please record Deuster 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, for what purpose do you rise?"



Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to be verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Representative Porter to be verified.

Leave? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jones, E: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to be verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Emil Jones to be verified. Leave? I think that's it. Questions of the negative vote? Representative Ryan, questions of the negative vote?"

Ryan: "Representative Farley, is he back there? I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's there."

Ryan: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giglio is not in his seat. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is that Greiman?"

Ryan: "Greiman, yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi."

Ryan: "Right here."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi. Oh, here he is."

Ryan: "Here he is, down front."

Speaker Matijevich: "Cavorting with the Republicans. Proceed."

Ryan: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dan Houlihan is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative James Houlihan."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's not in his seat, take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Huff."



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative what?"

Ryan: "Huff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Dove Huff is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's not in his seat, how is he recorded, Mr...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Matijevich: "O'Brien is not in....oh, he's back."

Ryan: "Nice to see you're back, Dan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Here he is. Hallelujah."

Ryan: "Representative Robinson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Robinson is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich, I don't see him. I see Capparelli, he can't be too far behind but he's not there. How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Williams."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who was that? I missed that."

Ryan: "Williams."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Williams in his seat? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off. Put Terzich back on and the Speaker was rolling around the aisle here and told me to vote him 'no'. Record the Speaker as voting 'no'."

Ryan: "Who did you put back, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Terzich."

Ryan: "And who else did you put on?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Speaker of the House."

Ryan: "Okay. Did I call Representative Williams?"

Speaker Matijevich: "We took him off, at least I told the Clerk to."



Ryan: "Did I call Representative Young?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Young is not in her seat, how is she recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take her off."

Ryan: "Representative Kozubowski."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in...he's in Domico's seat."

Ryan: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further questions? What is the count, Mr. Clerk? There are 74 voting 'aye', 76 voting 'nay' and this Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. As I said, there was a request for a fiscal note which was out of order. Third Reading. What? We will now return back to House Bill 2770, Representative Leinenweber's Bill."

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

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to bring this Bill back on Second Reading for purpose of giving the Membership the opportunity to file a motion as to the Committee....the Amendment adopted in Committee. It had been incorrectly reported, as I understand it, to the Clerk's Office without Amendment but...Amendment had been offered by Representative Ewing in Committee and had been adopted. The records of the Committee, as I understand, reflect that. So I would ask leave to bring this back to Second."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to return House Bill 2770 back to the Order of Second Reading so that...so that the Assembly can have the opportunity to file a motion upon the Committee Amendment. Do we have leave? Leave."

Leinenweber: "Read it a second time?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2770. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment Representative Leinenweber for his action in taking this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading to allow for the filing...a...a motion to table the Amendment. However, Mr. Speaker, the record on our Calendar, to my knowledge, never indicated that there was an Amendment on this Bill. And I would suggest that the Bill be allowed to stay on the Order of Second Reading at least until tomorrow to allow the Membership to examine the Amendment in relation to the Bill and decide if in fact they do wish to file such a motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will indicates he has no opposition...."

Leinenweber: "No opposition...."

Speaker Matijevich: "To that request and the Chair appreciates that bipartisan spirit of cooperation. The Bill will be held on the Order2770 when...when Leinenweber expects the motion. House Bill 2800. House Bill 2800. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2800. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation simultaneous tenure of certain public offices. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, on House Bill 2800."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I think we could hear 2800 and 2801 at the same time and might save a little time and effort of the House."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave to hear House Bill 2801 with House Bill 2800 as a companion Bill? There being no objection, leave is granted. Read House Bill 2801, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2801. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, on House Bill 2800 and 2801."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there have been no Amendments offered to the...."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you rise?"



Skinner: "Well, I notice that these are extremely separate issues.

One is a codification of...of...of the Township Act by the Commission that Representative McMaster....."

McMaster: "That's wrong. That's wrong, Cal, you're talking about another Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "We...we asked for leave and nobody objects...."

Skinner: "I'm sorry, I can only turn the pages so fast, Mr. Speaker. I'll be happy just to vote against both, I guess."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed with the Bill."

McMaster: "Cal, the Bill you're referring to is 3088, this is 2800 and 2801. I would advise you to clean off your glasses so you can read a little better. All right, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2800 is a Bill that would allow Township Supervisors to simultaneously serve on the County Boards. There is an election coming up this fall in which County Board members will be elected. And Township Supervisors, if they are such, in being elected to the County Board will automatically lose their office as Township Supervisor. All other township officials can simultaneously occupy positions on the County Board. The Township Supervisors can not and I think this is undue discrimination. House Bill 2801 would try to get around the conflict of interest problem by saying that township officials who are members of the County Board would not vote at the county level or township level on anything that affects the various things regarding both offices. And it is an attempt to avoid the conflict of interest. I would answer any questions and urge your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2800 and 2801. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. These Bills were, as you know, heard in Counties and Townships Committee of the House. There were some problems with the Bills but after the Sponsor cleared up those problems, I find that these Bills are not objectionable and I urge an 'aye' vote for both House Bills 2800 and 2801."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, under your Bill, House Bill 2800, what you're trying to do then is make it possible, if I understand correctly, to have a Township Supervisor also be qualified to run for the County Board. Is that correct? Is that right?"

McMaster: "I'm waiting to be turned on."

Geo-Karis: "You're on...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMasters."

McMaster: "Yes, essentially that's about what it is. They can run for both offices anyhow, Geo, but that under current law they cannot hold both offices. So it doesn't affect their running for both offices, but it does affect their ability to serve in both capacities."

Geo-Karis: "Well, under your Bill, if I understand it correctly, at the present time we did pass a law a couple of years ago where we eliminated the possibility of a Township Supervisor being also running ...a member of the County Board. Am I correct?"

McMaster: "No, Geo, I don't think we ever did pass a law to that effect. There was an assumption from the Attorney General's ruling that they could not because we had not passed any laws such as this but to say that we passed a law prohibiting that, I would say, no, we did not."

Geo-Karis: "I think if I recall correctly, and you correct me, Sir, there was a law passed that the...up till 1979 they could hold both offices but...."

McMaster: "Yes, there was that type of a law passed but that did not prohibit them from holding office."

Geo-Karis: "Well, do you not feel that there would be a conflict of interest since there are federal funds involved on a County Board and also federal funds involved in a Township Supervisor's Office?"

McMaster: "That is the purpose of House Bill 2801 if you will read your analysis..."

Geo-Karis: "Fine. We have a situation where we have a county home and it happens to be located in...in a township where the member of the...the Township Supervisor is also a member of the County Board. Now, certainly, there will be opportunities where there'll be conflicts



in these two situations and I just wondered if you feel that these conflicts are easily resolved."

McMaster: "Geo, if you will look at the analysis of 2801...."

Geo-Karis: "I know...."

McMaster: "It specifically directs itself toward that problem. It says that it prohibits elected township officials who were also members of a County Board from voting either the township or county level on agreement between the township and the counties concerning expenditures of federal revenue sharing money or certain other township funds."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on the Bill. I regret that I have to speak against this Bill but I feel that the two offices... I feel the offices should be spread around. That the Township Supervisor is mainly concerned with his township, and should be rightfully so. The member on the County Board will be representing more than one township and I feel that it's best to separate the two and therefore I speak against the Bill because I know there are many inequities that can happen. And I so...I can see your point on 2801 and I'm not against 2801 because some of them are township officials and are members of the County Board. I speak for 2801 but I speak against House Bill 2800."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in favor of these Bills. If House Bill 2801 had it been passed back in the 79th General Assembly it wouldn't be necessary for us to have 2800 here. This all came about as Representative McMaster mentioned to you because of a ruling of the Attorney General. Representative Geo-Karis is right, I passed...I got a Bill passed - 1624 in the 79th General Assembly - which would limit the terms of office...holding both offices to the first Monday in December of this year. After that, unless we change the law, they cannot hold it. But Representative McMaster is absolutely right, it is discriminatory against the Supervisors since anyone else in the township can serve on the County Board also. We are in a position of losing some of our best people on the County Boards around the state simply because they cannot hold both offices according to law."



Now I think that since the people do elect both of them, there's nothing wrong. In the first place, all of the conflicts of interest is removed by 2801 since they cannot vote on anything that affects the contract between the county and their particular townships. I think these are both good Bills and both should be passed. I would like to correct Representative Geo-Karis. She can't be for one and not the other because we don't need 2801 unless they hold the job under 2800."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. I would like to suggest to you that we have people serving on County Boards today that got there through a popularity contest. They never served...Township Supervisor, they do not know what township government is all about. And I suggest to you that the people that served as Supervisors of township government are much better qualified to serve on your local County Board."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland, has moved the previous question on House Bills 2800 and 2801. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the 'ayes' have it, the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, to close."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these Bills are an effort to correct the discriminatory practice that has existed for quite some time. I think we have discussed them at great length. I think that I should tell you the Township Officials Association is in strong support of these Bills. And I would certainly urge your support by means of a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, has moved for the passage of House Bills 2800 and 2801. The question is, shall these Bills pass? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Vote me 'aye', Zeke. The Lady from Winnebago, Representative Lynn Martin, to explain her vote."

Martin, L: "I would suggest that the interrelationship with townships and counties is too intense to ever have any conflict of interest



legislation truly work. We're not just talking about the federal contracts, we're talking about assessment practices, we're talking about where things are going to be built. We're also talking about the fact these deficiencies have already been made by township officials. We lost a County Board Chairman of one party, a Democratic Finance Chairman of another party, who even if they could have been allowed to serve would have had an inherent conflict of interest. This Bill is going to pass. It should not. Township officials should not serve on County Boards. And if you're serious about taking care of some of the assessment problems and property tax reform..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Martin, L: "You're taking a step backwards with this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. When we changed the procedure a few years ago in not allowing that the County Board to be made up simply of the Township Supervisors we were attempting to get a new form of county government. I think it would be a vast mistake for us now to backtrack and allow some Township Supervisors to serve as County Board members when other Township Supervisors would not be serving in there, would not be equality between the representation of the townships on that County Board. There are many other areas of conflict besides the ones addressed in House Bill 2801 and I urge that you get some red votes up there."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with Lynn Martin who is a former County Board member in an urban county, heavily populated county. It's a severe conflict of interest to permit Township Supervisors to serve on the County Board. She mentioned assessments. Another area of a conflict is in the running of a county convalescent home. There's a...there's a very severe conflict in deciding who's going to get in that county convalescent home and who's not because the Township Supervisors are...each one wanting to put their client in. If you want to see people indicted



for conflict of interest in your area then vote 'yes' on this Bill and apparently 105 of you are willing to take that chance but it's a bad, bad, bad Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to explain his vote. One minute."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to some extent this Bill is a test of whether you have some trust and confidence in the people. If a person who happens to be a Township Supervisor is running for County Board the fact that he's Township Supervisor is one of his qualifications and one of his areas of background and experience. And certainly if the people think that there might be a conflict of interest they don't have to vote for them. But what we're doing here is...is...is we are...we are making it possible for anybody to run for County Board including somebody who might serve on the lower level of government, Township Supervisor. And I think we can trust the people. I think that they will...they will weigh this, the fact that the person is a Township Supervisor is one of the qualifications and they'll make a good judgment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, one minute to explain his vote."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's evident the Bill is going to pass but frankly it should not because you're dealing with some very crucial sets of principles. But I hear the human(sic) cry of the media about double dipping. I want to tell you for those Supervisors of a County Board can become County Board Chairmen on the respective counties...frankly, they make our colleagues from Chicago that are on two payrolls look like pikers because they can come out of it really in good shape. And this is not a service to the citizens of Illinois and this Bill should be defeated. I'd like to see the Roll Call reversed."

Speaker Matijevich: "The...that's it. Have all voted? Have all voted? Yeah. All right. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. And on this issue there are 109 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'nay', 7 voting 'present'. And Representative Geo-Karis would like to have leave as being recorded 'aye' on 2800 and 'nay' on 28... just the reverse rather....'no' on 2800....."



Geo-Karis: "No on 2800."

Speaker Matijevich: "And 'aye' on 2801."

Geo-Karis: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "She has leave."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "These Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. House Bill 2808."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2808. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "House Bill 2808. Representative Epton would like to have leave that that Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment which is not ready and held there, is that true, Representative Epton? Does he have leave? He has leave. House Bill 2808 will be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 2834. O'Brien." 2834, out of the record. 2835, out of the record. Out of the record. 2844, Cunningham? Out of the record. 2850, Terzich? House Bill 2850. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2850. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, on 2850."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2850 amends the State Employees Retirement System. The Bill is designed to correct an inequity resulting from the passage of House Bill 1782 which became in effect January 1, 1978. It provides the State Employees Retirement System Recodification Bill; under the recodification method by which a member could purchase service credits for the initial qualifying year. There was a... a portion of the plan that did exclude certain employees from coming into the plan. This simply clarifies that. It has been approved by the Pension Laws Commission and there is no cost involved. And I would urge support...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2850. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, shall House Bill 2850 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? All right. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk



will take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', 22 voting 'present'. And House Bill 2850, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

House Bill 2853. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2853. A Bill for an Act in relation to the creation and management of forest preserve districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, on House Bill 2853."

Brady: "Yes, thank you...."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, on the previous Bill, could I have leave to be recorded as 'no'? I accidentally pressed the wrong button."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Representative Simms to be recorded 'no' on...."

Simms: "2850."

Speaker Matijevich: "On 28....."

Simms: "2850."

Speaker Matijevich: "2850? Leave. All right, proceed, Representative Brady. on House Bill...."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, House Bill 2853 is an Act that amends the Act governing the Cook County Forest Preserve Districts. Provides that property owned by the District shall not be subject either eminent domain proceedings or special assessments by the units of local government. This does two things. It puts the Cook County Forest Preserve District on an equal footing with other units of local government and it will also go a long way to preserving open lands based in forest preserve districts which is our only opportunity in Cook County to continue to have it. And I urge your support of this."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, has moved the passage of House Bill 2853. The question is, shall that Bill pass? In discussion of that, just one moment. Representative Conti, the Gentleman from Cook."



Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is just the Bill that I...we talked about in Committee. There are many communities and municipalities contiguous to a forest preserve where there are homes built facing the forest preserves but the property line of the municipality ends at the side....at the lot line and there cannot....they cannot build any sidewalks or charge any special assessments to the forest preserve and these kids are forced to walk on the streets. I would take a second look at this Bill. I'm afraid that you're foreclosing any community from any public improvements that would be beneficial to the citizens that are surrounded by these forest preserves."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman, the Sponsor, yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Brady, you indicated in your remarks that this would put the forest preserve on the same footing with other units of local government, or government. Can you name me any unit of local government not subject to special assessments by another unit of local government other than the State of Illinois?"

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

Brady: "Representative Bluthardt, when you say, can I name you any unit of local government, I believe that most of them are not. I don't believe you can add a special assessment, for example, to the municipality by the...the surrounding taxing districts. Maybe you can point out to me where you can."

Bluthardt: "Why, certainly, I think that school districts are subject to...assessments, special assessments. I think other units of government that may be within a municipality are subject to special assessments. I know of none other than those that are not contiguous or not within the municipal boundaries that are not subject to special assessments except the State of Illinois. And even in that case, usually by a special Bill in this General Assembly an assessment is permitted and levied against the State of Illinois. My point is this, that if the property is properly within the jurisdiction of a municipality, it is subject to special assessment even though it's a separate taxing



unit."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are...are you finished, Representative Bluthardt?"

All right. The Lady from Winnebago, Representative Martin. The
Lady from Winnebago, Representative Lynn Martin."

Martin, L: "Okay. Fine. Okay. Do downstate districts have these
same rights that you're asking for Cook?"

Brady: "No, as a matter of fact, I said both in Committee and on the
floor when this was amended before that I would support that. I
even put a Bill in for population of a county 3,000,000 or under but
no one wanted to support it."

Martin, L: "So, in other words, this will make Cook separate, have a
separate standard from every other forest preserve district in the
state and you did not amend this Bill to include for forest preserve
districts?"

Brady: "No, but as a matter of fact, Representative Martin, if you
would have agreed--as I said before--that that is good, I'd be glad
to try and get that amended in the Senate for you."

Martin, L: "Well, I'm suggesting your argument is that you're making
it equal with other governments, or units of government, but at the
same time you're rather specifically--perhaps not voluntarily--but
you're excluding every other district in the state. If it's a good
idea for Cook--and I'm not sure your argument is persuasive enough--
then it is good for all districts and then we're getting into an area
where we're not just voting about let it go for Cook County because
that might be interesting to see what downstate cities, townships and
counties would think about such a Bill. I'm saying, it should be all
or nothing on the Bill. And maybe what you might want to do is bring
the Bill back and amend it and let's see if it'll go all at once.
Because if it's good for Cook it should be good for Winnebago or Will
or Jo Daviess or any other county."

Brady: "Representative Martin, I couldn't agree more that I thought it
was good for all counties. I did not get any takers up until this
time. It was interesting. I had the Bill. I introduced the Bill. I
had in Committee and...and nobody helped me support that position.
I know it's good for Cook County. We have a distinct situation there
that maybe isn't applicable in other counties but we have very little



open space land in Cook County and the encroachment of the open space land by anybody is a serious problem for the residents of Cook County. I'm trying to preserve the open space of the forest preserves for the people of Cook County."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can't understand why the Sanitary District or any other unit of local government should be exempt from having to pay a special assessment if property owned by that district is benefitted. The State of Illinois is exempt, which shouldn't be. We passed a Bill out of both Houses last year and for some reason that I still can't understand the Governor vetoed that Bill. The principle is that if you're benefitted by an improvement, be it a sewer or a street or any...any similar public improvement, that you must pay your proportionate share. And that should be applicable to all units of government and, certainly, to carve out as one exemption a sanitary district is beyond me."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "What is your rationale, Mr. Brady, relative to that very point? Why should they get the benefit without paying the price?"

Brady: "I don't believe they should get a benefit without paying a price and I think you'll find that anywhere where they do get a benefit they will pay the price. The rationale for the Bill which does that is really to preserve it from the process of taking by municipalities.

What is the rationale for a municipality to be able to come in and take part of the forest preserve district when the forest preserve district in a county like Cook is needed for the common good of all?"

Tuerk: "Well, I'm addressing myself not to the condemnation but to special assessment. Wouldn't it be better for the court to establish the benefit, and therefore the price of benefit, and therefore the payment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Respond to that, Representative Brady or not?"

Brady: "I...I'm not disagreeing with you. If...if you feel that the court is the one that should establish the benefit, and the price of the benefit, I guess I would have to agree with that. But what I'm



saying is, what we're still allowing here then is a municipality to take by power of eminent domain free open space in Cook County and eliminate the possibility of more open space for the people of that county."

Turk: "Well, I think on the one hand, what you're saying is you're... you're agreeing that the court should establish the price. I think that's the way it is now, in fact, I know it is. And relative to the condemnation I think that's already provided in the statute so I... I've lost you, or you've lost me."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, to close. He'll...he'll let you know in his closing."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While what was determined here are separate questions, one was the assessment question. I think that ...that you're right, that the court could come up with a fair and equitable answer for that. But the question of eminent domain leaves intact that any municipality can move in with eminent domain in a court proceeding and move on that open land. And I think that's what we are trying to address the Bill to, Gentlemen, and I would urge your favorable support."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2853. The question is, shall House Bill 2853 pass? Those in the affirmative vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...Clerk will...aye'...Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Postponed consideration."

Speaker Matijeich: "Asks leave to place this on Postponed Consideration. Leave. And this Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2854? Out of the record. House Bill 2857, Houlihan's not here. Out of the record. House Bill 2865, John Dunn? Out of the record. House Bill 2870, Tipword. Read House Bill 2870."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2870. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword, on House Bill 2870."



Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the appropriation Bill for the Judicial Inquiry Board. It appropriates 232,500 dollars for their budget for the ensuing year. I urge passage of House Bill 2870."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman from Christian has moved for the passage of House Bill 2870. Is there any discussion? There...the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the speaker(sic) yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "Could you tell me one thing? Are these hearings that they hold open to the public?"

Tipsword: "It's my understanding that they are but may I defer to Representative Willer to...who served on that board? I believe that she call tell us if those...if the meetings of the Judicial Inquiry Board are open."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Willer, are the meetings of the Judicial Inquiry Board open to the public?"

Tipsword: "The hearings. The hearings."

Speaker Matijevich: "The hearings, rather."

Willer: "If you're talking about the hearings before the Commission, those are public. The meetings of the Judicial Inquiry Board are confidential."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right."

Tipsword: "That is the meetings in which they make a decision, I believe, upon the status of a Judge. At that time, those have to, I believe the law requires that they have to be confidential, does it not?"

Willer: "I'm sorry, would you repeat that?"

Tipsword: "The hearings where they actually make a decision upon...upon the status of a Judge who is under inquiry, is it at that point..."

Willer: "Yes."

Tipsword: "That is....confidential by statute?"

Willer: "Everything, according to the Constitution, everything the Judicial Inquiry Board does, except the filing of a complaint with the Courts Commission, is confidential."

Tipsword: "Thank you. That's by statute, I believe."



Speaker Matijevich: "That's according to the Constitution, according to their answer, Representative Waddell. The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson. Anderson."

Anderson: "Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "I sure will."

Anderson: "The other day I got a report from the Auditor General and in the report it said that the board is presently employing an attorney at a retainer fee of 2900 dollars a month. And in his recommendations, it spelled out that the board should delineate the task and requirements for this attorney. I wonder if you are cognizant of that fact, Representative Tipsword?"

Tipsword: "I am personally not cognizant of that fact. The...there was discussion as to whether or not they should have an attorney that would handle all of the hearings. And it was discussed...it was found that all of the hearings being scattered throughout the state that one attorney could not handle those, so some of those were on a contractual basis in regard to the various inquiries. In regard to the attorney who just...is the represent.....represents the board, is the legal counsel for the board, I'm not aware of what he makes particularly."

Anderson: "Well, I wonder if this Bill should and gets to the Senate, you would like this report over and bring it in line with the Auditor General's recommendation?"

Tipsword: "This...this attorney is the...that you mentioned to me, I find out, is the only attorney for the board and handles all of their legal questions that come before the board. Now they don't handle the board and the representation in...in various inquiry cases."

Anderson: "But, yet his...his duties are not delineated what he should do and what he shouldn't do?"

Tipsword: "I think that was a matter that was...that the Auditor General pointed out to them that they should take up and that those are matters that they should delineate."

Anderson: "Well, I just wanted this to be part of the record. Thank you very much."



Tipsword: "Yes, I think that's correct. I think they mentioned that the other day."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "Would the Sponsor indicate what this appropriation was last year, how much it's gone up and what's the reason for the increase?"

Tipsword: "I regret, I don't have before me what last year's was. It... I'm...it runs in my mind that this about an 11,000 dollar increase over last year but I'm not positive about that."

Totten: "I'd like to have the answer, Mr. Speaker."

Tipsword: "No, it's a 20,000 increase. I'm sorry."

Totten: "From what to what?"

Tipsword: "It's a 20,000. That would be from a...approximately 212 to 232,5."

Totten: "What's the reason for the increase?"

Tipsword: "The increase is...is in the area...is in the area of personal services and contractual services."

Totten: "Who...who is the personal service increase for, what they're supposed to do, what's the contractual service increase..."

Tipsword: "The personal services are for standard increases allowed for their current employees..."

Totten: "No additional people?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Three more meetings..."

Tipsword: "No. No request for additional people."

Speaker Matijevich: "The...the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative..."

Totten: "Wait, I haven't got the other answer yet."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Totten: "Contractual service increases for what?"

Tipsword: "The contractual service increases, amount of 9,800 dollars and this would be used to defray the cost of increasing legal services that they have."

Totten: "Additional attorneys?"

Tipsword: "Yes. That'd be on contractual service basis on...on cases as they arise."

Totten: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, if I could...to the Bill rather briefly?"



Probably there is only one other agency, or branch of state government, that deserves to be abolished more than this and that's the Arts Council, this is second."

Speaker Matijevich: "How about commissions?"

Totten: "Commissions will come up later. This is...this appropriation when you look at the value judgments that we've put into the Judicial Inquiry Board, you ask yourself simply this question. Has the creation of the Judicial Inquiry Board improved the quality of justice in this state? And the answer is no. Then why waste the money to keep it in creation? This is a waste of money. A 'no' vote on 2870 would be the best vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Daniels: "The selection of the board attorney, is that done by competitive bidding?"

Tipsword: "No, I don't think that it is."

Daniels: "Well, you are aware, of course, that we have a Bill on House floor right now sponsored by Representative Houlihan and it would require competitive....."

Tipsword: "I've heard."

Daniels: "Now, is it your position then that the board would go to a competitive bidding for legal services, professional services?"

Tipsword: "Well, that would depend upon that Bill, I would say. And someone tells me that that particularly doesn't apply to this...this inquiry board."

Daniels: "So, in other words, the Inquiry Board would be exempt from the legislation....."

Tipsword: "The Inquiry Board is not an executive agency. The Judicial Inquiry Board is a constitutional agency."

Daniels: "I believe the Bill would cover all agencies under the Constitution, executive, legislative and judicial."

Tipsword: "I'm informed that the Bill you're referring to doesn't require competitive bidding."

Daniels: "Does it require a delineation of professional services?"

Tipsword: "Yes."



Daniels: "Would your...would the commission go to a delineation of professional services and a full acknowledgement of the amounts of money that were being paid to various lawyers."

Tipsword: "I presume they would if that is a law that applies to them."

Daniels: "As far as you know, have you had an opportunity to discuss Representative Houlihan's legislation with the Judicial Inquiry Board?"

Tipsword: "No."

Daniels: "Could you do that and get back to me and let me know their position on it?"

Tipsword: "Well, I suppose I could. Is Representative Houlihan around?"

Daniels: "No, but you will...I mean, even if the Bill passes you'll get back to me on it...."

Tipsword: "Yes. Sure."

Daniels: "And let me know their position."

Tipsword: "I'm not going to...I have no means of directing the Judicial Inquiry Board but I...sure will advise them."

Daniels: "You have some people there, could they check it out and let me know what their position on the...."

Tipsword: "Certainly."

Daniels: "On Representative Houlihan's Bill so that we can discuss that when this Bill is brought before the House?"

Tipsword: "Yes. Yes, I suppose so. This Bill is before the House. You mean Representative Houlihan's Bill?"

Daniels: "Right. I'd like to know the Judicial Inquiry Board's position on that Bill...."

Tipsword: "All right. Fine."

Daniels: "Next time we vote on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Friedrich. Representative Daniels, would you please be seated?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrichs."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I agree with Representative Totten, this undoubtedly is a big waste of money. I don't know if you've ever had a occasion to ask them to investigate a Judge. I have. I can tell you they're not very good detectives, they don't seem to be able to find anything. And I don't know of a single Judge that's



been removed because of this Inquiry Board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Isn't it interesting that there's so much opposition to this board that's a relatively...one of the smallest budgets in this state. On Second Reading we managed to restore 11,000 dollars and you'd think we had restored 111,000,000. Has this board been effective? The very fact that so many people in the political system in Illinois are doing their utmost to destroy it is proof positive it has been effective. The Judiciary is better off because of it. They are aware of this board's existence. And, yes, Judges have been removed and I...you know, we talk about a hundred dollars a day per diem, we try to cut it down. RTA gets 200 dollars a day per diem, nobody around here bats an eye over that, up to 24,000 dollars a year. What's more important if you really have priorities? Trying to discipline the Judiciary that has gone it's own way for years or having some...we don't even have terribly effective people on RTA for 24,000 dollars a year. It is an effective board. The very fact there's so much opposition is ample proof it is an effective board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege. My name was mentioned in debate. I was just going to say before the previous speaker got up that the only thing good the Judicial Inquiry Board has done is bring Mrs. Willer to the General Assembly, but I won't say it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Representative Tipsword to close."

Tipsword: "I wonder if I might close, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword to close."

Tipsword: "In answer to some of the things that have been brought out here, I discovered in the number of hours that the attorney that they have is spent is...approximately one-third of the usual and customary fee for the time that he has spent on the matters of the Judicial Inquiry Board. And the Judicial Inquiry Board has acted in many



areas. There have been three Judges removed, there have been two others who resigned before they could get an effective order removal to them. There have been many others who have been censured and disciplined who have been suspended without pay for several months and so it has been doing some good. I would also say that the last Constitutional Convention and the Constitution that came out of it require the Judicial Inquiry Board. It is not a child of the Legislature. It is a matter that is set up by the Constitution and required by the Constitution that our last Constitutional Convention and the vote of the people gave us. It is a matter which we must fund. It is a constitutional agency that we are required to have in the State of Illinois. It has...had a very small increase and they have a 54 percent increase in the business that they've handled during this past year. So I think that they're a very small increase in contractual services along with a very small increase for their current employees is certainly a very, very well justified minor increase in the appropriation for this constitutional agency. I would recommend the passage of 2870."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 128 'aye' and 17 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bills Second Reading. We'll be back on House Bills Third Reading but we have to go and get some of these Second Reading. House Bills Second Reading, 1333. Out of the record. 2316. Representative Kane, 2316? Out of the record. 2548. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2548. A Bill for an Act to require all...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn. Out of the record. 2555.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2555. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1. Bowman. Amend House Bill 2555 on page 1, line 18 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."



Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman withdraws Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2593."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2593. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2594. Out of the record. 2604."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2604. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2. Leinenweber. Amends House Bill 2604 on page....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber on the floor? Out of the record. 2794."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2794. A Bill for an Act to abolish the Comprehensive County Hospitals, Health and Allied Medical Programs Governing Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk Hall: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2837."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2837. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2. Stanley. Amends House Bill 2837 on page 1, lines 1 and 5 by deleting Section 24(a) and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich. 2837. Representative Stanley has an Amendment. We'll break till 7 o'clock. Out of the



record. 2944. Alas, I suspect that Amendment has something to do with the 7 o'clock closing, I think."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2944. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Commission on Pioneer Memorial Plaza. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2949."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2949. A Bill for an Act....to permit lessees to receive rent credit for paying certain lessors' obligations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments 1 or 2?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "He'll be here in a minute. Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #3. Corneal Davis. Amends House Bill 2949 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu of the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of that Amendment? Maybe we'll take that out temporarily. Till Beverly finds him. How about 2950?"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2950."

Speaker Redmond: "Better take that out for the same reason. 2951. Out of the record. 2973."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2973. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Industrial Commission. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson."

Clerk Hall: "Amendments 1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments 1, 2 and 3?"

Clerk Hall: "Motion. I move to table Amendment #1...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 2978."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2978. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Fair Employment Practices Commission. Amendments...."



Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect...."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment 4 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania from left field suggests that the Bill be taken out of the record. 2986."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2986. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Financial Institutions. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 failed in Committee. Amendment #2 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 2?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3040. On which one? You say there is a floor Amendment? Okay, let's back up. 2986 be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #3. Leverenz. Amends House Bill 2986 on page 2, lines 3 and 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Neff on the floor? Take it out of the record. 3040."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3040."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3057."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3057. A Bill for an Act in relation to clarification and enforcement of the rights of handicapped persons. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #....."

Speaker Redmond: "Fiscal note filed on this one yet? Fiscal note requested, has it been filed? Fiscal note has been requested and not yet filed, so it'll have to come out of the record. 3138."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3138. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1, 2 and 3 were tabled in Committee. Amendments 4 and 5 were adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to 4 and 5?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

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

Matijeovich: "Speaker, this Bill has about 40-some Amendments. I'm working on a...an Amendment which the Public Action Council and the Representative Campbell and some people who oppose the Bill in its initial form and the Amendment which I hope will suffice and is being prepared



right now. I...I don't want to delay the work tonight but I'd like to know for sure if I can get this Bill called tomorrow."

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

Matijevich: "All right, let's take it out then, so we don't have to work all night."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3186. Out of the record. 3187.

Out of the record. 3259. Representative E. M. Barnes on the floor?

Out of the record. 3270. What do you want? We took it out of the record, is that what you wanted? 3259. Out of the record. Don't get shut out. 3270."

Clerk Hall: "HouseBill 3270. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1. Stuffle. Amends House Bill 3270 on page 1, line 15, by changing...so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle on Amendment."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members, the Amendment is a technical Amendment. It simply clears up one of the figures in the Bill which was messed up by the Reference Bureau when it was originally written. I would move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Will you put the Amendment number up on the board? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ryan: "Representative, this is a transfer, is that right?"

Stuffle: "That's right."

Ryan: "How much money?"

Stuffle: "I believe 52,000 dollars roughly, don't have the figures in front of me. The Amendment deals with the fact that one of the figures in the Bill was incorrectly written at the time the Bill was introduced. All the Amendment does is put in the correct figure with regard to the transfer. It's a....a deletion of one of the numbers."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Ryan: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment



#1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. Amendment adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3287."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3287. A Bill for an Act in relation to State Finance...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 3296."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3296. A Bill for an Act in relation to peer review committees for long term health care facilities. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1...."

Speaker Redmond: "Has a fiscal note been filed on this? Okay, proceed."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1. Bowman. Amend House Bill 3296 on page 1 by deleting lines 16, 17 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Campbell on the floor? Representative Campbell. Out of the record. 3312."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3312. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1. McCourt. Amends House Bill 3312 on page 2, by deleting line 15 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2. McCourt. Amends House Bill 3312 on page 1, lines 1 and 5 by deleting Sections 212 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill as originally introduced was to change two Sections of the Community College Act. And the Community College Board asked that I delete changing Section #2 so merely this just conforms with their wishes. I ask your approval."



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

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3337."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3377(sic)...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, is this yours? 3337. Proceed."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3337. A Bill for an Act making various revisions in the consolidated schedule of elections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of this Bill? Who? Is this a Committee Amendment? I mean a Committee Bill? Who's been handling it? Is this Representative Laurino, has he been handling this? Representative Bluthardt, have you....floor manager of 3337? Representative Telcser, will you please sit down? I can't see Representative Bluthardt. 3337, are you managing that, Mr. Bluthardt? Out of the record. Former House Member, former Representative Richard Walsh, blood brother of Representative William Walsh. One has a good disposition. 3347."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3347. A Bill for an Act to create in the Circuit Court Clerk's office, a Department of Support Order Compliance. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2554, Representative Yourell, are you ready on that one? Representative Collins here? Poise yourself. 2554, Representative Yourell."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2554. A Bill for an Act to revise the law governing local government in school elections. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move now to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 2554. That's covered in Amendment #11."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. Amendment #1 is tabled. Are there



any motions with respect to Amendment 2?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "With respect to Amendment 3?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "With respect to Amendment 4?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "With respect to Amendment 5?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "6?"

Clerk Hall: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "7? Any motion with respect to Amendment 7?"

Clerk Hall: "I move to table Amendment #7. Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt, motion with respect to Amendment #7."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I filed a motion to table Amendment #7 which is an Amendment that would change the date of the nonpartisan election from a Tuesday to a Saturday. This primarily affects school elections and some special district elections such as park, library boards and other special districts. And the reason for my motion to table is that, first I think that under consolidation of the election, all the elections are called on a Tuesday and have the same election hours. Second, we've had experience with school elections on Saturdays for years, we find that the turnout is is terrible, 10, 12, 14 percent. And I...I know that the history of Saturday elections in other states, not only school board elections but other elections has indicated that there are less people who turn out on Saturdays to vote than they do on other days of the week. I think it's a bad move. I think that the elections ought to be held on Tuesday. All five elections call for and...consolidations of the elections. If we're going to have consolidation of elections, let's put them all on the same day of the week, not have four on Tuesdays and one on Saturdays. And I would ask your support to table Amendment #7."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. I disagree with my colleague. This Amendment was adopted in Committee. The purpose



was twofold. One, that voter turnout in school board elections is low on a Saturday now but let's think what it would be if it were moved up to a Tuesday. And the second reason is, that on a Saturday it gives an opportunity for considerably more people, and working people, to vote than it does on a weekday. The only elections that are affected by this particular Amendment are school board elections, school trustees, community college boards and other small districts. Now understand what this does. It moves it from Tuesday back to Saturday and that is only for the nonpartisan elections in the odd-numbered years. This does not affect township elections, does not affect municipal elections. And I respectfully would ask that we leave this Amendment on in the order that it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I would join in the motion to table this Amendment.

One of the strongest arguments advanced in favor of consolidated... of elections was not only voter convenience but it was that it would encourage voter turnout. Now if we're going to roll this nonpartisan election which seemed to have near universal acceptance on Tuesdays, which is our traditional day of...for having most elections, and roll it back to Saturday, I think what you're doing is encouraging low turnout. Now this may be what some of the special districts and some of the school boards want but I think if...all of us who stand for consolidated elections and for...for honest elections would...would want to encourage voter turnout and participation in their elections. And so I think that this motion to table is most reasonable and I would ask all Members to join in Representative Bluthardt's motion to table Amendment #7."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Question's on Representative Bluthardt's motion to table Amendment #7. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'aye' and 17 'no'. The motion prevails, Amendment #7 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #8. Klosak. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 187 by deleting line 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of 8? Representative Klosak."



Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the effect of Amendment #8 is to...to delay the implementation date for a period of two years for school districts only. Now I am a supporter of consolidation of elections but as a Member of the Elections Committee at hearings in Springfield and in Chicago there has been one recurrent theme brought forth by the County Clerks and that is, they do not believe that they are able to gear up in time to implement this present...at the present effective date which is December 1st of this year. And that is the only reason why I have submitted this Amendment. I feel that if we do want consolidation of elections, we must give the Clerks time to make it work. The reason I have picked the schools, the school districts as the ones to exempt is because I believe they are doing the finest job under the existing law. We do know that they already, in a sense, have consolidation of the elections inasmuch as college, secondary and elementary elections are held on the same days in the same polling places. The costs at school board elections are so much lower than the ones we expect when the County Clerk will run them. It is for that reason I have submitted Amendment #8 and I ask your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I hate to rise in opposition to this Amendment but there're several reasons why I believe it should be defeated. Under this Amendment #8, the first school elections to be affected by consolidation would be those that were scheduled for the spring of 1981. If this Amendment passed, this...these elections would then be put back to November of 1921(sic) that's the date that we decided to put all of the school board elections on, the second Tuesday in November. We would delay that till 1981. Until 1981, that'd be a period of almost two and a-half years, school elections in this state would be unconsolidated and remain separately held and separately administered. Other school offices would be consolidated, Regional Board of School Trustees, Township School Trustees, Community College Trustees, would be subject to consolidation but the school board elections would not be. And I think that's one of the fatal defects of the Amendment. If we're going to have consolidation, it's absolutely necessary that we have all of the schools consolidated,



not wait two years for some and let the others come under the...at the regular consolidated election date. And worse than that is the fact that all of the schools districts would then have a free rein on school rate referendum for a period of two years. One of the reasons for the introduction of this legislation was to provide that school board referendums be held on a regularly scheduled election date so that the people in this state would have an opportunity to get out in force and vote on what affects 70 percent of their tax dollars. And so I suggest to you for those two reasons it does not affect consolidations in the school area completely and it would give a free rein on school referendum for a period of two years. I ask that you join with me in voting 'no' against Amendment #8."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #8. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 48 'aye' and 81 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9. Mahar. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 187 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #9 allows for the terms of the community college trustees to be six years. Presently they are three year terms. Actually if this...if the Bill passes and they're elected under the present system, they'll go to four year terms and they'll be a majority elected at one particular time. Now for long range planning, it's consistent with institutions like this, it'd be more appropriate to have two community college trustees elected every two years and then that way you'd have more continuity on the board. I think there's some tradition for that. Actually, in the field of higher education, Illinois...the Board of Governors for a university, I think that's six year terms. The community college people are in favor of this. They strongly support it. They...run a survey among 312 trustees from 39 community college districts and...they're in favor of this Amendment. I urge its adoption."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't have any real feelings about this Amendment. The only...the only problem I can cite to you with it is that this is one of the few, if only, office that is...will hold office for a period of six years. I would suggest also to you that it's been the history of community college trustees that they very seldom fulfill a six year term or stay in that office for six years. For the most part they're corporate executives who like this kind of elective office and who have found themselves serving their communities in this capacity but because of transfers and...and for many other reasons, my research shows that very seldom do junior college trustees run for more than one term. I suppose this Amendment could be generated by the presidents of the community colleges who are fearful of their jobs if a majority of the board is elected at one time. Under consolidation of elections these terms would go automatically to four years. Presently, as you know, they're three years. I...I would leave it up to the Membership to decide what they want to do with this. I...I just can't see six years for these offices."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Collins." Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I share Representative Yourell's reservations. I don't feel that this does any real violence to the principle of consolidated elections however the reason for the Amendment escapes me. It does seem unreasonable to give these officers six year terms...for the many reasons elucidated by Representative Yourell.But beyond that, in Committee Hearings and Commission Hearings, these very people who we are now extending their terms to six years can't do it and objected personally to having their terms extended to four years as the Bill finally was rounded into shape. So, if four years was...reasonable or unreasonable, depending on where you look, I would...or where you stand, I would think that doubling their terms would be unreasonable from everybody's position. So at best I'd label this Amendment premature. I think maybe it's a concept that we ought to weigh a little longer and chew on and maybe...maybe address ourselves to this problem at a different



time. But I really don't think it's the kind of Amendment that we should rush into at this time."

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

Mahar: "Thank you. In answer to the previous speaker, I think the reason why the Community College Boards objected to going from three to four years is for the fact that in a given period, given time, they would have the majority elected at one time. This would eliminate that, and provided the way it is now in which they have only two members elected at any one given election out of the seven members on the board. And I wanted to repeat what I said earlier, that the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Community College Board, Board of Regents and Board of Governors, all serve six year terms. So this is not something new, it's in keeping with what is going on now in higher education and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #9. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 20 'aye' and 98 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Any further...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10. Mahar. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 1 by deleting lines 1 and 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #10 is improperly withdrawn, I ask to withdraw...properly drawn, I ask to withdraw."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment 10. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11. Yourell. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 1, line 24...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you...."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Body when we addressed ourselves to Amendment #1, that subsequently I tabled; this Amendment #11 would replace Amendment #1. and it has to do with paper ballots. The Amendment is substantially identical to #1 which was a



Committee Amendment and includes some technical language accidentally omitted by the LRB in typing. I move for the adoption of Amendment #11 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question's on the adoption of Amendment #11. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Motion... the 'ayes' have it, motion carries and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12. Yourell. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 8 by inserting at the end of line 11, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment #12. That will be replaced with Amendment #23."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #12. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13. Tuerk. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 1, line 8, by inserting...2A-1.2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment merely addresses itself to school districts adopting Article 33 of the School Code which, to my knowledge, only includes Peoria. What it does is embody in it the consolidated election schedule which we've been operating under for many years and that is in the odd-year election, it would be in April and in even-year election it would be in March. I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, if this Amendment is not adopted the term will be four years and the election set for every other November, that would, of course, be in the odd-numbered years. This Amendment, as the Sponsor of the Amendment indicated, creates a different schedule for only one category of schools. But it is compatible with consolidation of election schedules, does not add any election dates and I move for the adoption of Amendment #13 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

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

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield? Fred..."



Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Simms: "Fred, this...why does this only pertain to Peoria?"

Tuerk: "Well, as far as I know, Tim, at one time I was laboring(sic) under the understanding that Rockford was under Article 33-1, but as I understand it, Peoria is the only one. So...."

Simms: "Is that...is that the charter district?"

Tuerk: "Yeah, right."

Simms: "Well, we're under the same."

Tuerk: "Well, as long as you are then, you're affected and that'll be fine for you too."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #13. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'..."

Tuerk: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14. Mahar. Amends House Bill 2554, as amended, in Section 2 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment 14, as you know, that the Bill presently drafted allows for a referendum not held at the election date by the local taxing body petitioning the court to ask to have a referendum date set. It seems to me, and to many others, that this does take away from the local taxing body the authority to set their own policy and be responsible for their own actions. This Amendment allows the local taxing body to hold one referendum each year at a time of their choosing to solve their problems. There's a general feeling that it's not appropriate and taxing bodies will not hold a referendum at a...in even years at a general election or a primary election. And if they want to have more than one election then they have to go through the court procedure. It does stop the common practice of schools holding elections every 78 days which many people object to. I think this is a transitional type of Amendment that ought to be adopted so that the local taxing bodies will have something to work with in the...in the years ahead and can certainly always be changed later on down the road. I urge



its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

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

I ask every Member of the House to look very carefully at this Amendment because if there was one...there was one provision in consolidation that met with the acceptance of nearly everyone, whether you be a proponent or opponent of consolidation, it was to tighten up the schedules of referenda. The people were sick of having school boards and other districts hit them with referenda, have them defeat it and then have them come back again. We attempted to establish a realistic schedule of referenda in the Bill. And the...the referenda under the Bill may be held at one of the five elections in the two-year period under the consolidation Bill. We went one step further and gave them an emergency provision and I think that that's more than reasonable. And I don't think that we should be chipping away at this schedule to try and tie up the expenditure of taxpayers' money. All more referenda means is more taxes, more bond issues. And I don't have to tell any Member of the House what this means. I would urge the defeat of this Amendment."

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

Yourell: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Along with what Representative Collins has indicated to you of the faults of Amendment #14, I would suggest to you also with... with the adoption of this Amendment, it will delete what we did with House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session. One of the provisions of that legislation was to provide for an emergency referendum that would take care of a catastrophic happening such as a tornado or a fire or some natural occurrence, perhaps, that would destroy a school or school buildings. If you take away, if you take away that provision then you will have no emergency provisions in the legislation and I think that perhaps is the greatest flaw in the legislation...in the Amendment. Then, too, I would suggest to you that we have as Representative Collins' indicated, five separate dates for the placing of a referendum plus the emergency provision and plus I am going to present as we continue on, an Amendment to provide for a...another referendum in the even-numbered years which will be the second Tuesday in June so that we will have the one referendum that can be held in the odd-numbered years or the even-



numbered years plus the June 2nd referendum in the even-numbered years plus the emergency. So we have in effect really three referendums in a two year period and I think that's sufficient. So I would move to defeat Amendment #14 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar to close the debate."

Mahar: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I...as I stated earlier, I think that in the consolidation in which is something that is...is new to all of us and we have many taxing bodies and they're going to have to take time to get accustomed to consolidation of dates and consolidation of control and all the various factors of it. The fact that they have an opportunity to hold an Amendment at their discretion is important. Bear in mind, if you have a referendum the people are the ones that are going to vote on it. The local boards are the people who have been elected to set the policy and if it's in their wishes that they'd like to have a referendum for some particular reason, it's important to them, people ought to have an opportunity to vote on it. And I'd urge adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion, say 'aye', all in favor of the motion...all in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 22 'ayes', 118 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15. Mahar. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 187....."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #15 is a very simple Amendment. It postpones the effective date of the consolidation of elections to December 1, 1980. Now the reason for that, I think, is quite clear. When the original consolidation Bill was passed we found it had many, many flaws in it. We had to come back and have a Special Session of the Governor in the fall to try to take care of the flaws in the initial Bill. The implementation Bill which we're working on right now has had a great deal of discussion. There's a lot of difference of opinion. Many people are confused, the local clerks, the local school boards, the local park



boards are very much confused about this. They don't know exactly what...what all is involved in it. It seems to me it'd only be appropriate that after this legislation is placed on the books, if it is, there ought to be a period of time to address ourselves to each aspect of it. Many of the Amendments, I don't know whether you've seen them or not, are hundreds of pages that nobody really knows what's in them except those people who drafted them. Many of the aides are not sure what's in them. I think we ought to have time to have the municipal attorneys, to have the school boards, to have the park boards, to have everybody involved to take a look at it so we can come back and address ourselves to any changes next spring and next year before the ...before the Bills are implemented. And I would urge very serious consideration of this Amendment because if this Amendment isn't adopted you may find that they...our election machinery will be in chaos without some good look at it next year. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

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

I would urge the defeat of this Amendment because truly this...this is the most insidious Amendment of them all. This is the last ditch attempt by the enemies and opponents of consolidation to defeat the... the principle of consolidated elections. And I would ask you to... to defeat this Amendment. We have tried to work with those who would amend the principle of...of consolidation over the past few years.

~~They refuse to offer anything constructive other than an attempt to~~ scuttle the Bill or, failing that, they attempt to delay and delay and delay. Now if it is true that we're not able to implement the provisions of the Bill in the called for schedule I would be the first one to join in a move to extend the effective date. But you know what's going to happen the moment that we pass a law to extend the effective date, everyone will quit cooperating, if they ever did cooperate, people will ...will not working on the Bill and before you know it we'll be up against another deadline. This is another one of the obstreperous, obstructive and obnoxious attempts of a certain...of certain people to defeat the entire consolidation principle. And I would ask you to defeat this Amendment."

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



Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sorry to hear my colleague and my good friend, Phil Collins, use those three adjectives, obstructive, obtrusive...."

Unknown: "Obstreperous."

Conti: "Obstructive(sic) and obstructionist(sic). But let me tell you if there's any single key issue when I go back home on weekends, it's tax revolts, it's consolidation of elections, this is all I hear. I would like to vote for this Bill and this is my last opportunity to go back home and say, 'Yes, I voted for the consolidation of elections. I believed in the consolidation of elections.' And that's why I take issue with Phil Collins. Before the State of Illinois decided to have consolidation of elections I consolidated my elections in my municipality. but I made it permissive for those who wanted to join. But all the governmental agencies voted on the same day but the park districts and the special districts with different boundaries had an opportunity to vote their own election day. If we can change the effective date on this, let's not make the same mistake we did by waiting a hundred years to change the Constitution of the State of Illinois and then...then having a convention and then coming in with a brand new document, the Constitution, and we are still fighting after ten years, almost eight years, of not knowing what the new Constitution has done to these municipalities and to the State of Illinois. If there's ever an opportunity for all of us to get behind this good Bill, if it's such a good Bill, give us this opportunity to examine it, let us know who is going to have control of these elections and give us ...extra time that we need to study the 700 to 900-page Amendments and implementations that will follow this Bill. If this Bill was well thought out and thought of for ten years, why...why then do we need 900 pages to implement and to amend this consolidation of elections? Give me the opportunity to vote for this Bill. Give me the opportunity to say that I'm on the side of the consolidation of elections. But if you do not change, if you don't change the effective dates, I can't possibly vote for this Bill in good conscience. And I will go back home and I'll campaign on this issue and I know I will be reelected just on this issue alone."

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



Bluthardt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I, too, rise to support Amendment #15 which calls for an extension of the effective date of the implementation Bill that we're now considering. Let me point out, and I think it's already been pointed out, that the consolidation election Bill that passed here had many, many errors in many, many oversights and it was necessary for us to come back here and adopt and pass into law House Bill 3 that corrected the provision that would have reduced the terms of many elected officers from four years to two years. That was one of the things. The other was the emergency referenda provision. Now we have this 300 or more page Bill 2554 that we're already considering 23 Amendments on today. Lord knows how many more corrections ought to be made in that Bill. There are...to follow shortly after this, if not this Session next Session, four, five, six hundred more pages of implementation of the...of the Election Code. Why should we be asked to buy a pig in the poke and that's we're asked to do today, that's what we were asked to do last year when we adopted consolidations. I assure you that I'm not opposed to consolidation. I'm not one of the obstructionists that...that my good colleague, Phil Collins, seems to think we are. Anyone who happens to oppose the Bill's an obstructionist. And we say, 'Let's, slow down, let's look at this thing, let's find out what it contained.' How many people in this room have actually read all those 300-plus pages? How many people know, you know, what evil lurks in the many pages that are in that...in that - I know, the Shadow do(sic) - but I'm telling you that, let's not buy a pig in a poke. Let's extend this time for two years and in the meantime work on it and let's adopt something that will make sense and will be workable and not keep us busy with Amendments from now until hereafter. Vote 'yes' on the Amendment."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I could continue on in the same vein that Representative Collins indicated to you in his debate relative to this Amendment. But I would suggest to you that all of the talk about a pig in a poke, all of the talk about 5 or 600 pages...600 page Bills, that is the pig in a poke because, really, those are not substantive changes to be made. Those are already



in the election laws. Now House Bill 2554, those of you who recall the history of this, Senate Bill 1149 and House Bill 1978 and House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session of this past Session, was an attempt to bring to you a document that you could vote on ^{intelligently} intelligently. Now to say that this is something that's been done in haste is very, very far from the truth. We've been studying consolidation elections in this state for ten years or more. To suggest that by delaying this Bill we will come up with something that everybody in this chamber will support and the people of the State of Illinois will accept is certainly not in the best interests of legislation introduced in this House. I ask each of you to examine the legislation that you have proposed and to tell me if any piece of legislation that you introduced ever was not amended but was ^a perfect from the beginning? I promised the Members of this House that I would hold House Bill 2554 on Second Reading until everybody had an opportunity to examine it in detail, present Amendments, introduce Amendments and try to do the things that they thought were proper with the Bill. There is nobody in this Body that can say that promise was not kept. This Bill has been on Second Reading for a long, long time. House Bill 3...Senate Bill 1149 came back from the Governor without an amendatory veto. I talked with the Governor and he suggested to me that we examine the Bill and see...in what way we could improve it. We did that with House Bill 3. To delay this Bill now for a period of two years would be exactly what the opponents of the legislation would like to see happen. All discussions would stop immediately. The experience of other states in promulgating the consolidation of elections is simply this, their experience has dictated to me and other proponents of consolidation of elections that we have to pass the Bill. Now if we delay this for two years you will have a situation in a year where the...where the elections will be more difficult to overcome with the new implementation Act than it would if we go ahead with the Bill as presently written with the Amendments. Get into the consolidation, find out what is wrong with it, if there's anything wrong with it. The big 500 or 600 page Bills that are to follow is just poppycock. There's nothing to it. Those are not substantive pieces of the election laws. They're in there already. 2554 is a big, big Bill



but only those items in that Bill that are underlined are the pertinent facts about this legislation. I ask you to get with the consolidation of elections. You know what the people of this state want. They want consolidation of elections. You know that. They've told you that. There are certain segments and sectors of our society that...that are absolutely opposed to any change whatsoever. That's the kind of dilemma we're facing today. I've had talks with the PTA. They support the legislation. The Taxpayers' Federation supports the immediate adoption of the implementation Bill 2554. The League of Women Voters supports it. They don't ask for a delaying provision of this Bill. I ask for a defeat of Amendment 15 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, to close the debate."

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

I don't consider myself an obstructionist. I don't think I've ever been an obstructionist on the floor of this House or in Committee.

I don't consider the fact that I'm offering Amendments to correct something that I think is totally wrong at the way it's going out of here now to classify me as one who is not in favor of consolidation.

because I've been in favor of consolidation long before I came to this particular Body, recognizing the problems. What I think we're doing

here is we're entering into some kind of a crash-x consolidation

complex in which we're going to have it now or never. We're going to

have it the way the Sponsors want it. We have had hearings upon

hearings, some of which I didn't attend but some of which I did,

in which local officials who I think speak for their people - and

they have been speaking for their people and doing a good job and getting

reelected - have voiced a great number of concerns about this, local

village boards, local school boards, park boards, clerks, municipal

attorneys. I think they've got something to say. And the fact that

they have concerns is something that's very, very, very important. I've

been told the reason we want to go with this thing in December 1, 1978,

is because the first election will be a municipal election in 1979 at



which there's only going to be three aldermen or three trustees or whatever...elected. And we can afford to experiment with those people. Well, I say to you that the job of an alderman, a man who's running for alderman or trustee in his community is just as important to him and to his people as the President of the United States. So why would... why should we....why should we go through a system where we're going to experiment with his office? Why should we be sure if we're going to have this thing right? Now we come down here and we...we propose a lot of legislation to correct things. There'll be an opportunity to look at this thing with it on the books. We know it's going to have to be corrected. There are many, many places - I could go through a list of about 30 things - that there are questions about in this particular Bill. I think it's important that we...we postpone the effective date until December 1, 1980. And I urge your strong consideration more than anything I've ever done before this House."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the adoption of Amendment #15.

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', those by...opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. Mr. Friedrich, explain your vote, Sir?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the consolidation of elections is probably one of the most far-reaching things that we've done around here in many years. We're advocating...and consolidation of elections of course that the County Clerk will run the school elections, the city elections, and so on. We've been accustomed to cities running their own elections, to schools running their own elections. We've got all kinds of problems.

The City of Centralia is across two county lines. The city limits does not follow precinct lines. We'll have two County Clerks running that election. Centralia High School is in four counties, we'll have four County Clerks running that election...again, the lines don't follow precinct lines, township lines or anything else. I'll tell you if it takes 15 Amendments to clean a Bill up so...to this point it certainly needs a lot more time to see what we're doing. I urge you by all means to vote 'aye' on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote."

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



voting 'no' on this Amendment. I represent the bulk of the City of Evanston and I know that ever since this Bill was introduced to consolidate elections that there's been intense discussion within the city. Every major organization in the city that has an interest in elections has had briefing sessions, open meetings on the subject. I assure you that we do not need additional time to study this and that...for that reason I urge defeat of this motion so we can get on with the business of consolidating elections as the people want."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I did vote for the Bill, 1149, and it was one of the worst votes I ever made in my life because that Bill was not in good faith but it was in the crunch month when it came before us and we didn't have much time to study it. And I certainly urge an 'aye' vote on this time because those of you who represent a municipality and townships and school districts like some of us have, I can tell you that the consolidation of elections Bills did create a lot of havoc to local governments and they have to be straightened out. And I think by at least 1980 we can straighten it out."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the soothsayers that oppose this Amendment are carrying the biggest shotguns I've ever seen because this is the closest to a big shotgun wedding I have ever seen."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff, to explain his vote."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's interesting to note - and the reason that I am casting a 'yes' vote on this - it was mentioned earlier that the Taxpayers' Association, the League of Women Voters and two or three other organizations were in favor of this. But I think, if you will note, that every individual who's had anything to do with any unit of local government and has been involved with any elections has been up and spoken against this. That's the reason I'm casting a 'yes' vote."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was...there was discussion by several Representatives who are in favor of this Amendment that indicated there would be so many County Clerks and so many county boundaries and so many jurisdictions involved in this...in the implementation legislation. That simply is not true. Those who indicated that have not read the legislation. They will know that we have taken care of that in the Bill. That simply is not the case. It's just simply scare tactics. We have to face up to consolidation of elections. This will work. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will...."

Yourell: "A 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Jack Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the term, Representative, means to represent. And for those of you that bothered to check with your taxing districts, an elected Representative back home in local government who this Bill vitally affects - as I have taken the trouble to do in Will County - find out unanimity exists in my district that everyone will like to see this Bill delayed until such time as the smoke can clear. They're in a state of panic back home so look into your consciences and remember what you've been told and you better vote 'aye' for this good Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, or....from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...in explaining my vote. For some time many of us have heard the gripes of people because they fear that they vote in too many elections, they feel... they vote in different precincts, they feel that very often issues come up before them about taxes and then they're defeated and then they come back just a few months later.... This Bill will save the taxpayers money. Sure, they don't like to lose authority. Everybody screams when they lose authority. But we have been on record that consolidation of elections are better for the taxpayers. It provides uniformity in elections that we so direly need. It is going to be



a cost savings, after all, what is the one scream by taxpayers? They want us to save them money. We can do it by consolidating elections. All you're listening to is the Election Authority, some elected people who are afraid of their shadows. They don't have to be afraid. They can run anytime and win if they're capable and they do their job. I ...I say we ought to vote 'no' against this Amendment which will kill the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "And so does Buzz Yourell. All right? No. Mr. Speaker, I'm asking your indulgence and that of the House because if any rules have been broken, they've already been broken. Yourell spoke in debate and also spoke in explaining his vote."

Speaker Bradley: "I think the rule is, Mr. Bluthardt, the Sponsor of the Bill can explain his vote...."

Bluthardt: "No, no, the Sponsor of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I merely wanted to correct the statement by the last speaker, it won't take long. You know, originally, the consolidation of the election was passed on the pretense that it would save a lot of money. Now ...that has been withdrawn. I don't know where John has been because they no longer claim that this is going to save any money. In fact, it's going to cost a lot more money than they anticipated, especially the school districts. They're talking about authorizing a special tax for the school districts to pay the cost of running their elections because it's going to cost them fifteen and twenty times more than it's costing them today to run an election. So let's not bring in that economy. If you want to help the taxpayers, you vote to extend this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell.... and what's the Gentleman from..... Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Cunningham, Hart, Hoffman, Jaffe, Laurino, Luft, Madison, Mann, McBroom, Meyer, Molloy, Mulcahey...."



Speaker Bradley: "Mulcahey, what purp....Mulcahey wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pierce. Schneider and Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "There are 82 'ayes' and 81 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "What is the count, Sir?"

Speaker Bradley: "It's 82 'ayes' and 81 'nays'."

Yourell: "I want a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "We've already done that."

Mahar: "Oh."

Speaker Bradley: "Yeah, I think we can save some time with a Verified Oral Roll Call because if it goes one way, we're going to verify the other. We're going to verify them both, so let's have a Verified Oral Roll Call. And if when...when your name is called, holler out to the Speaker...or the Clerk can hear which way you want to go and push your voting machine, red or green."

Clerk O'Brien: "You want to call the question? You want to call for the question? You want to call for the question?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes. Question is, shall the...on the adoption of Amendment #15, all in favor will signify by saying and voting 'aye' and opposed by saying responding in the negative and voting 'no'.

Clerk will call the roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, 'aye'. Adams."

Adams: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Aye. Anderson, 'aye'. Antonovych, pass. E. M. Barnes, 'no'. Jane Barnes, 'no'. Bartulis, 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, Jack. Would you call it out a little bit louder, please, so the Clerk can hear it. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty, 'no'. Bennett, 'aye'. Bianco, 'aye'. Birchler, 'aye'. Bluthardt, 'aye'. Boucek, 'aye'. Bowman, 'no'. Bradley."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "No. Brady, 'no'. Brandt, 'no'. Breslin, 'no'. Rich Brummer, 'aye'. Don Brummet, pass. Byers, pass. Caldwell, 'no'. Campbell, 'aye'. Capparelli, 'no'. Catania, pass. Chapman, 'no'."



Christensen, pass. Collins, 'no'. Conti, 'aye'. Cunningham, pass.
 Daniels, 'aye'. Darrow, 'no'. Corneal Davis, 'no'. Jack Davis, 'aye'.
 Dawson, 'no'. Deavers, 'aye'. Deuster, 'aye'. DiPrima, 'no'. Domico,
 'no'. Doyle, 'no'. John Dunn, 'no'. Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. Dyer, 'no'.
 Ebbesen, 'aye'. Edgar, 'aye'. Epton, 'aye'. Ewell, pass. Ewing,
 'aye'. Farley, 'no'. Flinn, 'aye'. Friedland, 'aye'. Friedrich,
 'aye'. Gaines, 'aye'. Garmisa, pass. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. Getty, 'aye'.
 Giglio, pass. Giorgi, 'no'. Greiman, 'no'. Griesheimer, pass.
 Hanahan, 'no'. Harris, pass. Hart, pass. Hoffman, pass. Holewinski,
 'no'. Dan Houlihan, pass. J. M. Houlihan, pass. Hoxsey, 'aye'.
 Hudson, 'aye'. Huff, pass. Huskey, 'aye'. Jacobs, 'no'. Jaffe,
 pass. Johnson, pass. Dave Jones, 'aye'. Emil Jones, 'no'. Kane,
 'no'. Katz, pass. Keats, pass. Kelly, 'no'. Kempiners, 'aye'.
 Kent, 'aye'. Klosak, 'aye'. Kornowicz, 'no'. Kosinski, 'no'.
 Kczubowski, 'no'. Kucharski, 'aye'. Laurino, pass. Lechowicz, 'no'.
 Leinenweber, pass. Leverenz, 'no'. Levin, 'no'. Lucco, pass.
 Luft, pass. Macdonald, 'aye'. Madigan, pass. Madison, pass. Mahar,
 'aye'. Mann, pass. Margalus, 'aye'. Marovitz, 'no'. Lynn Martin,
 'no'. Peggy Smith Martin, pass. Matejek, 'no'. Matijevec, 'no'.
 Matula, 'no'. Matula, 'aye'. Mautino, 'no'. McAuliffe, 'aye'.
 McBroom, pass. McClain, pass. McCourt, 'aye'. McGrew, pass.
 McLendon, 'no'. McMaster, 'aye'. McPike, 'no'. Meyer, pass. Miller,
 'aye'. Molloy, pass. Mudd, Mudd, 'no'. Mugalian, 'aye'. Mulcahey,
 'no'. Murphy, 'no'. Nardulli, 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz,
 arise?"

Katz: "...Is 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Katz as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Katz, 'no'. Neff, pass. O'Brien, 'no'. Pechous,
 pass. Peters, 'aye'. Pierce, pass. Polk, 'aye'. Porter, 'aye'.
 Pouncey, 'no'. Pullen, 'aye'. Reed, 'aye'. Reilly, 'aye'.
 Richmond, pass. Rigney, 'no'. Robinson, 'no'. Ryan, pass.
 Sandquist, 'aye'. Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Schisler, 'aye'. Schlickman,
 ...Schlickman, 'no'. Schneider, pass. Schoeberlein, 'aye'. Schuneman,
 'aye'. Sharp, pass. Shumpert, 'no'. Simms, 'no'. Skinner, Skinner,
 'no'. Stanley, 'aye'. Stearney, pass. Steczo, 'no'. E. G. Steele,



'aye'. C. M. Stiehl, 'aye'. Stuffle, 'aye'. Sumner, 'aye'.

Taylor, 'no'. Telcser, 'aye'. Terzich, Terzich, 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Terzich, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich, 'no'. Tip sword, 'no'. Tottèn, 'no'. Tuerk, 'aye'. Van Duynè, pass. Vinson, 'aye'. Vitek, 'no'. Von Boeckman, pass. Waddell, pass. R. V. Walsh, 'aye'. W. D. Walsh, 'no'. Wikoff, 'aye'. Willer, 'no'. Williams, pass. Winchester, 'aye'. Wolf, 'aye'. Younge, 'no'. Yourell, 'no'. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Speaker votes 'no'. Now we'll pick up the absentees. Call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. Don Brummet, Byers....'no'. Catania. Catania, 'no'. Christensen. Cunningham. Garmisa, 'no'. Giglio. Griesheimer."

Speaker Bradley: "Griesheimer, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Aye. Harris. Hart. Hoffman. Dan Houlihan. J. M. Houlihan. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson, 'aye'. Keats. Laurino. Leinenweber. Lucco. Luft. Madigan, 'no'. Madison. Mann. Peggy Smith. Martin, 'no'. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McGrew, 'aye'. Meyer. Molloy. Neff. Pechous, 'no'. Pierce. Richmond, 'aye'. Ryan, 'aye'. Schneider. Sharp. Stearney. Van Duynè. Von Boeckman, 'no'. Waddell, 'aye'. Williams. No further."

Speaker Bradley: "Brummet wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'.

Any further absentees? Mr. Keats, Mr. Ewell, how do you wish to be recorded, Mr. Ewell? Record Mr...press...press his button.

Jane Barnes, how are you recorded? You wish to be recorded 'no'?"

Barnes: "I'm recorded 'no', I want....recorded 'yes'."

Speaker Bradley: "You want...change her vote...change her from 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Did she change her switch?"

Speaker Bradley: "Any other...any other changes? We got everybody? Mr. Harris, the Gentleman from Marion."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Push your switch, Mr. Harris. Any other additions or subtractions? If not, take...Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 'ayes', 75 'noes' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16. Stanley. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 1, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Stanley."

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

This is an Amendment that applies to the new consolidated election schedule and what it does is, extends the polling hours. Instead of 6 to 6, it gives us 6 to 7, something we should have had last year. But just let me briefly reiterate a couple reasons why this should have been done 20 years ago. We're the fifth largest state in the country and today there are 39 other states that have longer voting hours than Illinois. We look at our neighbors. You look at Michigan, they vote from 7 in the morning till 8 at night. You look at Ohio and they vote from 6:30 to 7:30. You look at Minnesota, it's 7 to 8 o'clock and so forth and so on. In 1957 we had approximately 4,300,000 working men and women. Today we have a million more. So let's give those commuters a chance to vote....."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I question the germaneness of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that the Amendment is germane."

Stanley: "Mr. Speaker, did I hear you...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Stanley: "Thank you. I think in the two points that I want to make here, one is that I think there's a knee jerk reaction on the part of Democrats insofar as what this Amendment will do and what happens when you extend those voting hours for an hour. I'm not sure anything, anyone...anyone benefits from it except the people of Illinois. And let me remind you of this, that the Speaker of the House and a number of other progressive Democrats have recommended and put in...and had Bills in Election Committee in previous years to extend the voting hours. So I recommend the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he will."

Matijeovich: "Representative Stanley, I understand what you say, in other words, you're giving the opportunity for more people to vote, is that



correct?"

Stanley: "By extending the hours? That should help more people participate in the process...."

Matijevich: "Well, could I ask you a question? How would you feel if we had a measure here for instant voter registration so that people could come to the polls who were not registered and register right away and gave them the vote? How would you feel about that?"

Stanley: "Well, I think we're talking about apples and oranges, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "No, we're not."

Stanley: "We're talking about something that...that simply extends by one hour and does not deal with the technicality in other areas regarding...voter registration, instant voter registration. That's not what we're debating here and we're talking about two different things."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to discuss this briefly because I think...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Matijevich: "I think we're not talking about apples and oranges if the Gentleman is trying to bring forward an issue to allow more people to have the ability to vote. What better way to allow people to have the ability to vote than to have anybody who has not registered to come before the...on election day...."

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

Johnson: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is clearly out of order in debating this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, address your remarks to the Amendment, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I am because in my questioning I posed an issue to...to delve into the sincerity of the Gentleman posing this Amendment. And I think I brought that point forward but I...I'll..."

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

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The issue here is not qualifications of voters. And, certainly, Representative, the issue is not the integrity of the mover of this Amendment. I'm ashamed of you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, stand ashamed."

Matijevich: "I...well, Mr. Schlickman, you know that I'm not questioning his integrity and I never will. But I, what I am questioning is...is whether this Amendment can do any more than what I had posed to really allow more people to vote. I've heard some mention on the other side of the aisle about additional costs. We know that there are people who are judges and what a terrible job and what a difficult job it is to be a judge all day in an election. We know if we extend the hours of the election that there will be more judges screaming. I know, I happen to be a County Chairman, some of you may know, and I know the difficulty in just getting judges for elections. We can't get them in Lake County, Democrat or Republican. You are going to make it even more difficult by extending the hours, make no mistake of that. So I would urge the Members of the House, no matter how good this may sound, that in practicality it will not bring more voters out. And in practicality it will cost more money and therefore I would urge its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Stanley to close."

Stanley: "I would say, Representative Matijevich, you should refer those remarks and let those...the heavy commuting population you have in Lake County understand what you're saying. Those many that leave from Lake Bluff and Waukegan to take the train in and leave too early and come home too late at night to vote and I think those are the people you have a responsibility to. I urge the adoption of this Amendment as a progressive step in helping enfranchise a significant number of Illinois voters."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 16. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Turn me on, oh, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise in support of this Amendment. There's nothing wrong with extending the voting hours one hour. It's going to give many extra people a chance to vote that don't now. There's many people in the communities I live in, in Madison County they go to St. Louis, St. Louis County to work and they simply cannot make it within the twelve hour period that they have now. And



this will give the...extension...this will give the extension...some of the cast...Democratic votes or Republican votes or whatever. But there's a lot of people who commute today on our highways, a long way to work and they need this extra extension. It's a good Amendment and I commend Representative Stanley. The Springfield Redbirds are leading the St. Louis Cardinals 4 to nothing."

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

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a little difficulty with this Amendment because if you look at it, this just extends the polling hours - if I'm reading correctly - for the odd year local government elections and it doesn't apply to all general elections or general primary elections. I...I think that perhaps this...this Amendment should be the one that should be defeated and I intend to support the next one but would...well, wait..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Collins: "Well, wait...wait a minute, I...I'm not finished, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me."

Collins: "I...I'm being told that I can't be because the next Amendment's not germane. Well, you haven't ruled on that yet and I wasn't aware of that. But I would like to see an Amendment that would extend it... all elections to seven o'clock but I think it would be a mistake if we had local government elections extended to seven and not all elections. Again, I think we're just bringing confusion to an already confused area. And I would...I would suggest that we do defeat this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

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

Representative Collins pointed out to you that this Amendment applies only to municipalities, municipal elections. And I know how difficult it is to ask people, to beg people to serve as election judges not only in our city but I think it's true in almost every city in this state. I know the hours they put in now and that they firmly believe that they are underpaid and they are. I don't know about your precincts or the municipalities you come from but our judges are there approximately at 5:15 in the morning to make sure everything is set up before a person is able to vote punctually at 6 a.m.. And, yes, our precinct



representative or captain or community representative is there.... as well. Now, I don't know how many of you ever worked a precinct or worked in election....day....in lieu of being a candidate but it's not a very easy task. And to the ladies and gentlemen that serve as election judges, you're not doing them a service in telling them instead of working the thirteen or fourteen hour day - and many times it's longer than that - you're stating that before they can close the polls at six o'clock, now it will be eight o'clock or seven o'clock. Before you can have a bite to eat, it'll be nine-thirty or ten o'clock after being there from five o'clock in the morning. To the Members that are not committeemen, to the people that have never asked a person to serve as an election judge, you are doing them a disservice. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a verification on this Roll Call. I ask that we poll the absentees. And, in turn, I believe that...is unfair to municipalities and the people that serve as judges."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

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

This Amendment, if adopted, will do two things. This Amendment in the City of Chicago, this Amendment in Madison County, where we have already adopted...Amendment allowing municipal corporations to use paper ballots will now have the judges of elections counting paper ballots at eight, nine, ten o'clock at night. In the last election in my township, we have 167 precincts, the Republican Party had 287 vacancies for Republican judges. The Democrats had about 192. And that was ten days prior to the election. Now if you think you're going to have anymore success in getting people to serve as judges of elections by extending the time that they have to be at the polling place in satisfaction of an additional hour of voting, you're absolutely mistaken because with the Paper Ballot Amendment, you're going to have judges staying till all hours of the day and night. Now I suggest to you that the judges don't want this, the judge...you're having a difficult time getting judges now, and the cost of the additional hour for the judges is going to be tremendous. And we're talking about saving cost, saving money, saving revenue to the State of Illinois with the consolidation of elections. Now if you're going to do this, to extend the time the polls are open, you're going to have problems with voting places as well...



polling places because some of our polling places are in areas where they want to get rid of them, get the voting out of the way as quickly and as expeditiously as possible. And I suggest that you vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that...explaining your vote there's only one minute, these have been some of the longest one minutes I ever remember."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, your minute is up, the minute's up. Representative Simms."

Simms: "I...I'm sorry."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I heard....pardon me, I heard of the soothsayers say that in my township we were short two hundred and some judges, that is not the truth. We were over judges, we had extra judges, we had some five hundred and some judges. And we had extra judges if we needed them. And that...that statement is not right and we have no problem with judges and if this is extended another hour we will have no problem with judges. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my vote is 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I think this is...is an extremely important vote particularly in the rural downstate counties where we primarily have paper ballots. The judges, as Representative Yourell mentioned previously, are working late hours. He said something about nine or ten o'clock, in some areas of our districts they are working till two and three and four o'clock in the morning as it is counting paper ballots. Ten of the thirteen counties in our district have paper ballots, this is an undue additional burden upon the judges and this Amendment ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For you that have not had to go out and find judges I think you, with this Amendment, are encouraging judges to quit or not be judges in the first place. And, too, that it should be accompanied with a companion Bill to pay for the overtime for the judges. And if the Amendment is limited to municipal elections there is no reason to extend the hours



for thirty percent of the voters that come out. I urge the defeat of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Lechowicz has requested a poll of the absentees. On this question there's 81 'aye' and 74 'no'. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "Antonovych. Christensen. Cunningham. Deuster. Ebbesen. Hart. Hoffman. Huff. Laurino. Leinenweber. Madison. Mann. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Neff. O'Brien. Pierce. And Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson. Adams. Anderson. Jane Barnes. Bartulis. Bennett. Bianco. Bluthardt. Boucek. Bowman. Byers. Catania. Chapman. Daniels. Jack Davis. Deavers. Dyer. Edgar. Epton. Ewing. Friedland. Gaines. Geo-Karis. Getty. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Holewinski. J. M. Houlihan. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Clerk Hall: "Dave Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Goody-goody."

Clerk Hall: "Katz. Keats. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Levin. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Lynn Martin. Peggy Smith Martin. Matula. McAuliffe. McCourt. McMaster. McPike. Miller. Mugalian. Murphy. Peters. Polk. Porter. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robinson. Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Steczo. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Telcser. Totten. Vinson. Waddell. W. D. Walsh. Wikoff. Winchester. And Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Boucek in?"

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

Lechowicz: "Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lechowicz: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, in your seat and in order."



Lechowicz: "Griesheimer. Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Is he in the chamber?
How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Lechowicz: "Jim Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Lechowicz: "Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. Is he in the chamber? How is
he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Lechowicz: "Keats. There he is. Klosak."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Klosak in the chamber? Representative
Klosak. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Lechowicz: "Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lechowicz: "Mrs. Macdonald. Oh, there she is. McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lechowicz: "McCourt. McCourt. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lechowicz: "Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lechowicz: "There he is."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the aisle. Representative Campbell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Campbell recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Campbell: "Change me to 'aye'."

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

Lechowicz: "Robinson. Oh."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...."



Lechowicz: "Totten. Robinson's here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien, for what purpose do you rise?"

O'Brien: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien is 'no'. Representative Totten.

Representative Totten here? He's in the aisle there."

Lechowicz: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, change my 'present' vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Willer from 'present' to 'yes'."

Lechowicz: "Speaker, what's the count?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 79 'aye', 74 'no'."

Any further questions, Representative Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Murphy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Murphy."

Lechowicz: "Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Abramson's here."

Lechowicz: "Murphy's in his chair, he just got back."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis, you seeking recogn...."

Lechowicz: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 79 'aye', 74 'nay' and

the motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?

Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "Having voted on the prevailing side, Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #17 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative....Representative Schlickman, having voted on the prevailing side, moves that the vote by which Amendment #16 was adopted be reconsidered. Representative Telcser moves that that motion lie on the table. The question's on Representative Telcser's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the motion is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #17. Stanley. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 1, line 10, by inserting '7.5' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I question the germaneness of Amendment #17."

Speaker Redmond: "In the opinion of the Parliamentarian, which he has communicated to me, and inasmuch as the title of the Bill is local,



election and school elections, Amendment 17 is not germane. Any further Amendments? Representative Ryan. Representative Stanley."
 Stanley: "Yes, pursuant to Rule 70, I'd like....motion to overrule the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Chairman, I just have an inquiry about the ruling of the Chair, if I may put it."

Speaker Redmond: "This Amendment 17 is not germane. The title of the Bill is Local and School Elections. The Amendment would apply to elections other than local and school elections."

Mugalian: "I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but we have already passed some Amendments to this Bill that refer to general elections. And if those were germane it seems to me that this would be germane because we...this Bill we treat more than the special elections, off-year elections. We also deal with elections held in the even-numbered year and those include, Amendments 3, 4, 5 and 6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Amendments previously adopted will have no bearing upon your current ruling. If the Gentleman disagreed with your prior ruling then he should have made a point of order at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think that the ruling about germaneness is correct. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Even within the existing Bill there are references to referenda held during general elections...."

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

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, you have ruled on this. The Representative from Sangamon knows the remedy. I believe there's even been a motion to overrule the Chair...."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Darrow: "Can we proceed?"

Speaker Redmond: "I've ruled that Amendment 17 is not germane to House Bill 2554. Representative Stanley has moved that the ruling of the Chair be overruled. The question's on Representative Stanley's motion. The question is, shall the Chair be overruled? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's



59 'aye' and 81 'no'. The motion fails and the Chair is sustained.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #18. W. D. Walsh. Amends House Bill 2554, as amended, by inserting 2a.14 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. Representative Deuster, Representative Breslin, Representative Bowman."

Walsh, W.D.: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to consider Amendment #19 with Amendment #18?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Is there any objection? Representative Collins objects. Have you read the Amendment...."

Walsh, W.D.: "He doesn't really object, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you read...have you read the Amendment 18, Mr. Clerk? Representative W. D. Walsh on Amendment 18."

Walsh, W.D.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #18 -- and I must discuss Amendment #19 with it because it is a ...an integral part -- but Amendment #18 removes the emergency referendum provisions from the Consolidated Elections Bill that we passed in the last fall election. What we said at that time was that if a taxing body determines that a public issue should be submitted to the people and they felt that they did not have time to submit it at one of the regularly scheduled elections then they could go to the courts and establish an emergency with the court and the court would say either, yes, they may have the referendum; or, no, they may not. I am philosophically opposed to this provision in the law because it makes administrators of the judiciary and gives the judiciary life and death control over whether a...whether a local taxing body can continue to exist, presumably. Now, I submit to you that what they will do is say, yes, you may have the referendum. And I submit to you that no responsible taxing body would offer a referendum to the people unless it were an emergency. Now it has been said to me that the question of whether or not it is emergency...what an emergency is is spelled out very accurately in the law and I submit that that is not the case. I have a copy here of House Bill 3 of the Session last fall and it has very loose language with respect to what an emergency is. So what we do and what we have in the Consolidated Elections Act is the courts being in charge, almost totally, of whether a referendum



will pass or not because the local taxing body with any sense is not going to submit a referendum at an election where there are people elected. There are simply too many participants in that election, too many that are not familiar with the issue and only think that their taxes are going to be raised. Now, Amendment #19 is important to this because it adds a date each year for local taxing bodies to have a referendum, that date is the second Tuesday in September. And I submit to you that this idea is good, it is sound, we ought to get the courts out of administering local government.

And I urge the adoption of Amendment #18."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

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

I rise in opposition to Amendment #18 although if 18 were to stand on its merits I'd be inclined to support it but 19 would undo a lot of work that we have already accomplished. 18, we who devised this... method thought we were giving the school boards and special districts one additional opportunity if there truly was an emergency to offer referenda to the people. But to put a restriction whereby they weren't going to get around the...the prohibition on referenda but were in fact going to have to establish that there was a truly...an emergency and we left it in the hands of the court to decide that. Now I think that is eminently fair. Now I would...as I said, would be inclined to support this Amendment because I didn't think we should give them any further chance at referenda but I reluctantly did support it. However running in tandem with Amendment #19, which the Sponsor has already explained although we're not considering them together, I think I would have to oppose this one and then Amendment 19 on which I hope to be heard when it's offered. But for the time being I would recommend and urge every Member of the House to reject Amendment #18."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #18 destroys completely the concept of consolidation of elections with the intent of the legislation to provide for referendum. It authorizes school boards and local governments to conduct referendum at anytime, at anytime. Now you know the guts of this



consolidation of elections legislation is to prevent that. It deletes, along with calling for a referendum at anytime, the emergency referendum that we allowed in the provisions of House Bill 3, Second Special Session. Now there's been some problems with perhaps the definition of the word, emergency, and I would suggest to the Members that the word, emergency, is exactly what it says, exactly as it's defined in the dictionary. It is something out of the ordinary. It's something that has to be taken care of now because it is an emergency. I'm referring, of course, to a catastrophic disturbance, a fire, a tornado, whatever might happen to destroy a school building where you would need that emergency referendum. Now the petition of the school board, the majority of the school board, by petition, can petition the Circuit Court to declare an emergency does exist. And I don't want to see that taken from the Bill because if you establish a referendum in September you're already close to the November date, just two months away when you can have, when you can have another referendum date scheduled along with the consolidated schedule. Now, I have coming up another Amendment that will provide for a...a referendum on the second Tuesday in June in the even-numbered years. So what we have in effect is one referendum that can be scheduled on any one of the five scheduled election dates plus the referendum, additional referendum, on the second Tuesday in June of the even-numbered years plus the emergency provision. So if you look at it in that context you'll see that there is in effect in reality three dates for a referendum in a two-year time schedule. I think that's important. I think that's sufficient. And I think that the Amendment ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh, W.D.: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The two Gentlemen before me said that in the case of a catastrophic emergency, a tornado, the city hall falling down, whatever, that's an emergency. Well, that's all well and good if the law said that that's what an emergency is. But that isn't what it says. It says this. It says the court may approve the petition for an emergency referendum only upon a finding supported by the evidence that the referendum is necessitated by an imminent need for approval of



additional authority in order to maintain the operation or facilities of the unit of government or school district and that such need is due to circumstances beyond the control of the governing body. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the law says gibberish. It doesn't say anything specific whatsoever, therefore the emergency aspect of this is nonsense. What it means is, and I submit to you that the law as it is now destroys the concept of consolidated elections because there will be referenda at all times during the year because, Mr. Speaker, the courts will automatically, will automatically approve these petitions by a local governing body. Now I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I'm loose with respect to the second Tuesday in September as the referendum date. I feel very strongly that the date should be once a year, though, there should be one day each year that is set aside for referenda where local taxing bodies might feel the need to submit a proposition. It is nonsense to believe that they can pass a tax rate increase at one of the five special elections. It is nonsense to believe that one day every two years is sufficient. The only avenue they will have is to use this emergency prospect, to go to the courts to make the courts administrators of local government. Mr. Speaker, that goes absolutely against my grain and it should go against yours. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the objections of the Ev and Charlie show, I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #18 to House Bill 2554. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I missed asking the Sponsor of this Amendment a question but...before I was voting I was wondering if emergency would be interpreted the same way as it is when we consider Bills in the Rules Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 36 'aye' and 85 'no'. Gentleman's motion fails. The Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #19. W. D. Walsh. Amends House Bill 2554, as amended, in Section 2a-1.1 and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative W. D. Walsh. Amendment 19 is withdrawn.

20. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #20. Robinson. Amends House Bill 2554, on page 79, line 8, by deleting '99 or less and 92' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, currently in the Bill, candidates for school boards will have to file during the summer. A number of parent organizations and teacher organizations are concerned that there will be very few candidates filing for school board elections if those filings have to take place in July or August. This Amendment says that the filing for school board will be in September after the school year starts, after interest in education and in schools picks up. I feel that already many school districts have problems getting qualified candidates, in getting any candidates at all in some cases, to run for school board. I think that unless we have these filings after Labor Day this will compound the problem. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I oppose Amendment #20 to House Bill 2554 because the...the Amendment to begin with is incomplete because it does not amend the certification date or the deadlines for the objection procedure and for absentee ballots. It's already in the law. The 99 to 92-day filing period is designed to provide sufficient time before the election to complete all of the legal and administrative procedures necessary for the conduct of the election. And for that reason I would ask you to vote 'no' on Amendment #20 to 2554."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "I'd like to rise in support of this Amendment. I think it gives an adequate amount of time and a more realistic period of time, not during the summer months when many people are on vacation and not interested in the political process."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson to close."

Robinson: "I've examined this. I believe that even for looking at petitions there would be time, there would still be time, to print the ballots. I think that this is a reasonable Amendment. And, again, this Amendment would even though it's a bunch of numbers



says essentially that you would file for school board elections after the school year begins, after Labor Day."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #20. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 32 'aye' and 71 'no'. Gentleman's motion fails and the Amendment's not adopted. Representative Lucco, the former scout of the St. Louis Cardinals, for the purpose of an announcement."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't do that to me. The St. Louis Cardinals are trailing the Springfield Redbirds at the moment by the score of 5 to 0."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #21. Yourell. Amends House Bill 2554, as amended, in Section 2a-1.1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

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

Amendment #21 is a simple Amendment that does exactly what we discussed when we were addressing ourselves to Amendment #18. What it does is provide for an additional referendum in the even-numbered years, even-number year to be held on the second Tuesday in June. I move the adoption of Amendment #21 to House Bill 2554."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My objections to this Amendment would be identical to the other similar Amendments that were offered to add further referenda to the schedule. I think that we have bent over backwards to afford those who would present referenda to the people ample opportunity to...to pass their local issues. We do have the five referenda. We now still have in the Bill the emergency provision. I just don't think we should loosen it up any more. And I'm not sure that...I'm not sure if I'm Ev or he's Charlie but I...I...I don't...I don't think that Charlie over there really is that sympathetic to further referenda but is making a genuine effort to appease some of the people who feel that their ox is being gored by their referenda being curtailed. I think the Bill as presented and as is in shape now is ample, and more than ample. If anything,



I'd go the other way and I would urge the Members of this House to turn down this Amendment as they have the other Amendments that would add additional referenda."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Representative, why do you propose this extra date for a referendum?"

Yourell: "This...this Amendment was designed to address some comments made by the school people who thought they had need for an additional referenda date. Now we do have one, as you know, in the...in any one of the five scheduled dates as well as the emergency referenda that can be held upon petitions of school boards and certification by the Circuit Court. This is an additional Amendment that was asked for by the people who are involved in schools and municipal elections. Now I have no feeling one way or the other. I'm just trying to satisfy, as I indicated to every Member of this House, that I would entertain the Amendments and let the Membership decide if that's what they wanted or not."

Skinner: "Well, then, may I speak to the Bill? If you go out and take a poll of your constituency you'll probably find that of those who return the poll, about 90 percent of them want fewer elections. And if....unless you think there're more tax eaters than there are tax payers, I would sincerely hope that you would vote against this Amendment. Five times every two years ought to be enough and if there's a real emergency - and I don't mean one created by the EPA setting a false deadline or by the Capital Development Board setting a deadline that's basically irrelevant - if there's a tornado or something like this, let 'em go, let 'em go to the court. I'm sure the court will be generous. So we ought to kill this thing. Five times every two years is enough."

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

Yourell: "I'm not going to recommend this Amendment one way or the other, I'm going to let the Membership decide."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #21. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. 'Noes' have it, the Amendment fails, the motion fails, the Amendment's lost. Any further



Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #22. Yourell-Collins. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 84, line 15 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "This Amendment was designed to meet some objections in those counties which have established a County Board of Election Commissioners and I can think of DuPage County as the one that comes to mind instantly. The Board shall....any...any county that has established a County Board of Election Commissioners, that Board shall constitute the County Officer's Electoral Board for certification. I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #22."

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

Daniels: "Is the Speaker for this Amendment?"

Yourell: "I understand he has no objection."

Daniels: "Well, then, I object."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #23. Yourell-Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amends House Bill 2544....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is another technical Amendment. This replaces Amendment 12 which has...which has been tabled. It clarifies that registration records must be coded by municipal wards as well as by political subdivision. It also reconciles the existing provision for immediate notice of municipal boundary changes with five-day notice requirement added by the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 23. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed.... The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried, Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #24. Yourell-Collins. Amends House Bill 2554 on page 53, line 8...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Amendment #24 to House Bill 2554 deals with the publication notice. It's a technical Amendment and says that the notice shall



be of substantially in the form prescribed in Section 12-1. It may not need, 'need not include notice of location of precincts and polling places within or including part of the applicable subdivision.' This is a technical Amendment for posting and publication. I move the adoption of Amendment #24."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 24. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #25. Bowman. Amends House Bill 2544 on page 118 by inserting between lines 10 and 11, the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it occurs to me that since a lot of special districts have been operating their own elections and using their own procedures, their own kind of materials and so forth that when we go to consolidate elections there'll be, you know, a lot of conflicting pressures for the kinds of materials that have to be used and so forth. And I think the State Board of Elections simply ought to define the...the kinds...set standards for election materials and services and so forth. I move adoption of the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I oppose Amendment #25 because it takes away from the elected public official who's...who is designated as the election authority and gives that authority to somebody else for subscribing standards for election materials and so forth. I think it's very well prescribed in the Bill. Those election authorities, either County Clerks or the local election authority, should retain that and I move to...to do not adopt on Amendment #25."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all it really says is that the State Board, you know, shall set basic standards so that the...you know, the ballots look alike. Some of you were talking about paper ballots. No matter where you are in the state. I think we have a very mobile society and people moving



around a lot. I think it's valuable to have some kind, you know, standardized materials and procedures and so forth. And I think, you know, we pay these people on the Board of Elections enough, let them earn their money."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #25. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...it was my fault, I didn't...my light on but I did want to express support for this Amendment. I think it is a reasonable one. It...it lets the State Board of Elections function, I think, in a manner that was contemplated by the Constitutional Convention. It does no violence to the Bill and I would urge support for this Amendment. I...I really don't...I wasn't listening that closely but I really don't see the reasons for opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 51 'aye' and 59 'no'. Representative Bowman. Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative..... Poll the absentees. No, he just wants a poll. Poll the absentees is what he wanted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Adams. Antonovych. Bartulis. Bennett. Bluthardt. Brandt. Rich Brummer. Byers. Caldwell. Christensen. Cunningham. Daniels. Jack Davis. Deavers. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Friedland. Friedrich. Giglio. Griesheimer. Hart. Hoffman. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Kelly. Kempiners. Klosak. Kosinski. Kucharski. Laurino. Leinenweber. Luft. Madison. Mann. Peggy Smith Martin. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer. Miller. Molloy. Neff. O'Brien. Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey, 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Peters, 'aye'. Representative Deuster, 'aye'. Representative Reed, 'aye'. Representative O'Brien, 'no'. Caldwell, 'no'. Christensen, 'aye'. Representative Ryan. Representative Ryan, 'aye'. Representative Giglio, 'no'. Representative Abramson....no? Aye? How do you vote? Abramson, 'aye'. Kucharski... huh? I guess we got all mixed up here. Dump the Roll Call. The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #25.



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 61 'aye' and 78 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails and the Amendment's not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Announcements. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Appropriations I Committee will meet at 10 a.m. in the morning. The Democrats of that Committee will meet at 9 a.m. in G-3 or 4, whatever. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. How about the other Appropriations Committee, do you know... Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "The same thing for Appropriations II."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further announcements? Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, question of the Chair. One of my colleagues from Winnebago would like to know if the cafeteria will remain open so he can have his evening meal."

Speaker Redmond: "He can go over to Representative Edgar's trailer and eat(sic) some of Leinenweber's milk. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, the Republican Members of Appropriations II Committee will have no meeting tomorrow morning. No meeting tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Are there any further announcements?"

Speaker Redmond: "Two minutes for the Clerk."

Madigan: "Allowing two minutes for the Clerk, I move that we adjourn until 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried, we now stand adjourned."

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

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of the following Joint Resolutions, to wit: House Joint Resolutions #89. House Joint



Resolution #90. Concurred in by the Senate, May 22, 1978.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Senate Bills First Reading.

Senate Bill 554. Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 571. Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1532. Peters. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Treasurer. First Reading of the Bill.

Introduction and First Reading of House Bills.

House Bill 3395. Terzich-Hanahan. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Comptroller for disbursement to John Tebbens. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 3396....House Bill 3396. Schisler. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the County Cooperative Extension Law. First Reading of the Bill.

No further business, the House now stands adjourned till 1 o'clock tomorrow."



<u>1.</u> Page	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	1:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
1		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call
1		Clerk O'Brien	Reading of Journal
1		Speaker Redmond	
1		Matijevich	
1		Speaker Redmond	
2		Madigan	Excused absences
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Matijevich	On Agreed Resolutions
2		Speaker Redmond	Passed House Bills 3rd R
2		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2790-3rd R
2		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
2		Clerk O'Brien	HB 620-3rd R
2		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
2		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2418-3rd Reading
2		Speaker Redmond	
3		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2932-3rd R
3		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
3		Clerk O'Brien	HB 634
3		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
3		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2214
3		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
3		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3149-3rd R
3		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
2.			
3		Bowman	
3		Speaker Redmond	Passed
4		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2662,--HB-2808
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2926-3rd Reading
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Friedrich	Point of personal privilege
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Matijeovich	Point of order
5		Speaker Redmond	
5	1:14	Clerk O'Brien	HB 3167 - 3rd Reading
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Madigan	
5		Speaker Redmond	Passed
5		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2800
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		McMaster	
6		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
6		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3112-3rd Reading
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		Yourell	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Telcser)	
7)	
7		Yourell)	
7)	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Telcser	Speaks on Bill
8		Speaker Redmond	



<u>3.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	8		Tuerk)	
)	
	8		Yourell)	
)	
	9		Speaker Redmond	
)	
	9		Bowman)	
)	
	10		Yourell)	
)	
	10		Speaker Redmond	
)	
	10	1:27	McMaster	
)	
	10		Speaker Matijeich in Chair	
)	
	11		Schlickman	
)	
	12		Speaker Matijeich	
)	
	12		Skinner)	
)	
	13		Yourell)	
)	
	13		Speaker Matijeich	
)	
	14		Conti)	
)	
	14		Yourell)	
)	
	14		Speaker Matijeich	
)	
	14		Kent)	
)	
	14		Yourell)	
)	
	14		Speaker Matijeich	
)	
	14		Tipsword)	
)	
	14		Yourell)	
)	
	14		Speaker Matijeich	
)	
	14		Von Boeckman	
)	
	15		Speaker Matijeich	
)	
	15		Mudd	Moves previous question
)	
	15		Speaker Matijeich	
)	
	15		Yourell	To close



3. (a)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
16		Speaker Matijevich	HB 3112
16	1:43	Bluthardt	Oppose
16		Speaker Matijevich	
17		Davis, J.	
17		Speaker Matijevich	
17		Conti	
17		Speaker Matijevich	
17		Daniels	
18		Speaker Matijevich	HB 3112 passed
18		Ryan	Introduction
19		Speaker Matijevich	
19		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2636-3rd R
19		Speaker Matijevich	
19		Birchler	
19		Speaker Matijevich	
20		Daniels	Explains vote
20		Speaker Matijevich	
20		Stuffle	Explains vote
20		Speaker Matijevich	Passed
20		Johnson	Verification
21		Speaker Matijevich	
21		Birchler	Request not timely
21		Speaker Matijevich	Poll absentees
21		Simms	Change to no
21	1:56	Speaker Matijevich	
21		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
21		Speaker Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
4.			
21		Von Boeckman	Verification not timely
21		Speaker Matijevec	
21		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
22		Speaker Matijevec	Birchler asks Postponed Consid.
22		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2656-3rd R.
22		Speaker Matijevec	
22		Mahar	
23		Speaker Matijevec	
23		Levin)	
)	
24		Mahar)	
24		Speaker Matijevec	
25		Hoxsey)	
)	
25		Mahar)	
25		Speaker Matijevec	
25		Katz)	
)	
25		Mahar)	
25		Speaker Matijevec	
25		Mahar)	
)	
26		Marovitz)	
26		Speaker Matijevec	
27		Walsh)	
)	
27		Mahar)	
27		Speaker Matijevec	
27		Jacobs)	
)	
27	2:15	Mahar)	
28		Speaker Matijevec	
28		Miller	Moves previous question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
5.			
28		Speaker Matijevec	
28		Mahar	To close
28		Speaker Matijevec	
28		Anderson	Explains vote.
28		Speaker Matijevec	
28		Chapman	Explains vote
29		Speaker Matijevec	
29		Von Boeckman	Explains vote
29		Speaker Matijevec	HB 2656 passed
29		Waddell	Introduction
29		Speaker Matijevec	
29		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2661 3rd Rd
29		Speaker Matijevec	
29		Chapman	
30		Speaker Matijevec	
30,31,		Leinenweber)	
)	
32		Chapman)	
)	
33		Speaker Matijevec)	
33		Speaker Matijevec	
33	2:29	Chapman	To close
33		Speaker Matijevec	HB 2661 passed
33		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2670-3rd R.
33		Speaker Matijevec	
33		Wolf	
34		Speaker Matijevec	
34		Clerk O'Brien	Rereads Bill



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
6.			
34		Speaker Matijeich)	
35		DiPrima)	
35		Speaker Matijeich	
35		Lucco	Introduction
35		Speaker Matijeich	
35		Levin)	
35		Wolf)	
36		Speaker Matijeich	
36		Marovitz	Moves previous question
36		Speaker Marovitz	
36		Wolf	To close
36		Speaker Matijeich	HB 2670 passed
36		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2687-3rd Reading
36		Speaker Matijeich	
36		Adams	
36		Speaker Matijeich	HB 2687 passed
37	2:38	Clerk O'Brien	HB 2708-3rd Reading
37		Speaker Matijeich	
37,38,39		Bennett	
39		Speaker Matijeich	
40		Madigan)	
40		Bennett)	
41		Speaker Matijeich	
42		Matula)	
43		Bennett)	
43		Speaker Matijeich	
43		Waddell	Introduction



<u>7.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	43		Speaker Matijevich	
	43		Tipsword	Violation of rules
	43		Speaker Matijevich	
	43		Yourell	Support
	44		Speaker Matijevich	
	44		Geo-Karis	Support
	45		Speaker Matijevich	
	45		Brummer	Moves previous question
	45		Speaker Matijevich	
	45		Bennett	To close
	46		Speaker Matijevich	
	46	3:01	Ewell	Explains no vote
	46		Speaker Matijevich	
	46		Schuneman	Explains aye vote
	47		Speaker Matijevich	
	47		Kosinski	Explains no vote
	47		Speaker Matijevich	
	47		Conti	Explains aye vote
	48		Speaker Matijevich	
	48		Barnes, E.M.	Explains no vote
	48		Ebbesen	
	49		Speaker Matijevich	
	49		Reilly	Explains no vote
	49		Speaker Matijevich	
	49		Daniels	Explains aye vote
	50		Speaker Matijevich	
	50		Bluthardt	Explains aye vote



<u>8.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	50		Speaker Matijevich	
	50		Davis, J.	Explains aye vote
	51		Speaker Matijevich	
	51		Bianco	Explains no vote
	51		Speaker Matijevich	
	51		Williams	Explains vote - oppose
	51		Speaker Matijevich	
	52		Bennett	Explains vote
	52		Speaker Matijevich	
	52	3:16	Skinner	Explains aye vote
	52		Speaker Matijevich	
	52		Marovitz	Explains present vote
	53		Speaker Matijevich	
	53		Johnson	Explains aye vote
	53		Speaker Matijevich	
	53		Bennett	Postponed Consideration
	53		Speaker Matijevich	
	53		Clerk O'Brien	HJR 89
	53		Speaker Matijevich	
	54		Clerk O'Brien) HJR 90
	54		Speaker Matijevich	
	54		Madigan	
	54		Speaker Matijevich	Leave to suspend rules. Reso. adopted.
	54		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2730 - 3rd Reading
	54		Speaker Matijevich	
	54		Polk	



<u>9.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
55		Speaker Matijevich	Passed
55		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2738-3rd R
55		Ryan	
55		Speaker Matijevich	
55		Stiehl, C.M.	
55	3:26	Speaker Matijevich	
56		Brummer)	
57		Stiehl, C.M.)	
57		Speaker Matijevich	
57,58		Leverenz)	
58		Stiehl)	
58		Speaker Matijevich	
58		Stiehl	To close
58		Speaker Matijevich	HB 2738 passed
59		Tipsword	Yes on HB 2730
59		Speaker Matijevich	Leave
59		Bradley	Yes on HB 2730
59		Speaker Matijevich	
59		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2753 - 3rd Reading
59		Jacobs	Leave to return to 2nd
59		Speaker Matijevich	Hold on 2nd
59		Vinson	Objection
59		Speaker Matijevich	Keep on 3rd
59		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2754 - 3rd R
59		Speaker Matijevich	
60		Porter	
60		Speaker Matijevich	



<u>10.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	60		Wolf	Support
	60		Speaker Matijeich	
	60	3:37	Porter	To close
	61		Speaker Matijeich	HB 2754-passed
	61		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2770-3rd R
	61		Speaker Matijeich	
	61		Leinenweber	
	62		Speaker Matijeich	
	62		Madigan)	
	62)	
	62		Leinenweber)	
	62		Speaker Matijeich	Question on Amendment
	62		Clerk O'Brien	
	62		Speaker Matijeich	Out of record
	62		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2775
	63		Barnes, Jane	Explains 2775
	63		Speaker Matijeich	
	63		Getty)	
	63)	
	63		Barnes)	
	63		Speaker Matijeich	
	63		Leinenweber	Supports
	64		Speaker Matijeich	
	64		Epton	Yield?
	64		Barnes, J.	
	64		Speaker Matijeich	
	64		Barnes, J.	To close
	64		Speaker Matijeich	HB 2775 passed
	64		Tipword	Aye



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>ll.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	64		Speaker Matijevec	
	64		Levin	Aye
	64	3:47	Speaker Matijevec	
	64		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2787-3rd R
	65		Speaker Matijevec	
	65		Brummet	Explains 2787
	65		Speaker Matijevec	
	65		McMaster)	
	65		Brummet)	
	66		Speaker Matijevec	
	66		Mahar	
	66		Speaker Matijevec	
	66		Rigney)	
	66		Brummet)	
	66,67		Speaker Matijevec	
	67		McClain)	
	67		Brummet)	
	67		Speaker Matijevec	
	68		Friedrich	
	68		Speaker Matijevec	
	68		Brummet	To close on 2787
	68		Speaker Matijevec	
	68		Conti	Explains vote
	68		Speaker Matijevec	HB 2787 passed 2753 held on 2nd
	69		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2790
	69		Speaker Matijevec	



<u>12.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
69		Tipsword	Back to 2nd?
69		Speaker Matijevec	Leave granted
69		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #2
69		Speaker Matijevec	
69		Harris	Explains Amendment #2
69		Speaker Matijevec	
70		Skinner	Opposes
70		Speaker Matijevec	
71		Telcser)	
)	
71		Harris)	
72		Telcser	
72		Speaker Matijevec	
72		McCrew	
72		Speaker Matijevec	
73		Ryan)	
)	
73	4:05	Harris)	
73		Speaker Matijevec	
74		Madigan	
75	4:10	Simms	Oppose
75		Speaker Matijevec	
76		Garmisa	
76		Speaker Matijevec	
77		Kent)	
)	
77		Harris)	
77		Speaker Matijevec	
77		Darrow	Moves previous question
77		Speaker Matijevec	



13. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
78		Richmond	To close
78		Speaker Matijevich	
78		Geo-Karis	Explains vote
78		Speaker Matijevich	
79		Brummer	Explains vote
79		Speaker Matijevich	Ryan requests verification
79		Tipsword	Explains vote
79		Speaker Matijevich	
80		Steele, E.G.	Oppose
80		Speaker Matijevich	
80		Byers	Explains vote
80		Speaker Matijevich	
81		Daniels	Explains vote
81		Speaker Matijevich	
81	4:26	Willer	Explains vote
81		Speaker Matijevich	
81		Schuneman	Explains vote
81		Speaker Matijevich	
82		Lechowicz	Explains vote
82		Speaker Matijevich	
82		Robinson	Explains vote
82		Speaker Matijevich	
83		Talcser	Point of personal privilege
83		Speaker Matijevich	
83		Ryan	Verification
83		Speaker Matijevich	Poll absentees
83		Clerk O'Brien	



<u>14.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
83		Speaker Matijevich	
83		Clerk O'Brien)	Proceeds with affirmative
83		Speaker Matijevich)	
84		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
84		Speaker Matijevich	
85,86		Ryan	Questions Affirmative Roll
86		Speaker Matijevich	Am #2 adopted-Am 3 withdrawn
86		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4-2790
86		Speaker Matijevich	
86		Skinner	
87	4:43	Speaker Matijevich	
87		Madigan	
88		Speaker Matijevich	
88		Telcser	
88		Speaker Matijevich	
88		Madigan	
88		Speaker Matijevich	
88		McGrew	Moves previous question
88		Speaker Matijevich	
88		Skinner	To close
89		Speaker Matijevich)	Am #4-Oral Roll Call
89		Clerk O'Brien)	
89		Speaker Matijevich	Calls Roll
89		Speaker Matijevich	No request for verification
90		Mudd	
90		Speaker Matijevich	
90		Kempiners	Explains vote
90		Speaker Matijevich	



15.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	90		Garmisa	Explains vote
	91		Speaker Matijevich	
	91		Geo-Karis	Explains vote
	91		Speaker Matijevich	
	91		Collins	Explains vote
	92		Speaker Matijevich	
	92		Skinner	Explains vote
	92		Speaker Matijevich	
	92	4:55	Kane	Yield? Vote no
	93		Speaker Matijevich	
	93		Ryan	Verify Roll Call
	93		Speaker Matijevich)	
	93		Clerk O'Brien)	Calls negative vote
	93		Speaker Matijevich	
	93		Deuster	Aye
	93		Speaker Matijevich	
	94		Porter	Leave to be verified
	94		Speaker Matijevich	
	94		Jones, E.	Leave to be verified
	94		Speaker Matijevich	
	94,95,96		Ryan)	Questions Negative Vote
	96		Speaker Matijevich)	Amendment #4 fails-3rd R.
	96		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2770-3rd Reading
	96		Leinenweber	Leave to return to 2nd
	96		Speaker Matijevich	
	96		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2770-2nd-Am 1 adptd Comm.
	97		Speaker Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
16.			
97		Madigan	Wants Bill to stay on 2nd
97		Speaker Matijevich	
97		Leinenweber	No opposition
97	5:10	Speaker Matijevich	HB 2770-held on 2nd
97		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2800-3rd R.
97		Speaker Matijevich	
97		McMaster	Leave to hear HB 2801 also
97		Speaker Matijevich	Leave granted
97		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2801-3rd R.
97		Speaker Matijevich	
97		McMaster	Speaks on Bills
97		Speaker Matijevich	
98		Skinner)	
98)	
98		McMaster)	
98		Speaker Matijevich	
98		McMaster	Continues
98		Speaker Matijevich	
98		Yourell	Urge aye vote
99		Speaker Matijevich	
99		Geo-Karis)	
100)	
100		McMaster)	
100		Speaker Matijevich	
100		Flinn	
101		Speaker Matijevich	
101		Hoxsey	Support
101		Speaker Matijevich	
101		Friedland	Moves previous question



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>17.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
101	5:20	Speaker Matijevich	
101		McMaster	To close
101		Speaker Matijevich	HB 2800 & 2801
101		Martin, L.	Explains vote
102		Speaker Matijevich	
102		Satterthwaite	Oppose
102		Speaker Matijevich	
102		Dyer	Explains vote
103		Speaker Matijevich	
103		Deuster	Explains vote
103		Speaker Matijevich	
103		Simms	Explains vote
104		Geo-Karis)
104		Speaker Matijevich)
104		Clerk Hall	HB 2808-3rd Reading
104		Speaker Matijevich	(Epton) Returned to 2nd & held
104		Clerk Hall	HB 2850-3rd R.
104		Speaker Matijevich	
104		Terzich	
104		Speaker Matijevich	Passed
105		Clerk Hall	HB 2853-3rd R.
105		Speaker Matijevich	
105		Brady	
105		Speaker Matijevich	
105		Brady	
105		Speaker Matijevich	
106	5:30	Conti	



<u>18.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
106		Speaker Matijevec	
106		Bluthardt)	
)	
106		Brady)	
107		Speaker Matijevec	
107		Martin, L.)	
)	
107		Brady)	
108		Speaker Matijevec	
108		Mugalian	
108		Speaker Matijevec	
109		Tuerk)	
)	
109		Brady)	
109		Speaker Matijevec	
109		Brady	To close
109		Speaker Matijevec	HB 2853
109		Brady	Postponed Consideration
109		Speaker Matijevec	
109		Clerk Hall	EB 2870-3rd R.
109		Speaker Matijevec	
110		Tipsword	
110		Speaker Matijevec	
110		Waddell)	
)	
110		Tipsword)	
110		Speaker Matijevec	
110		Waddell)	
)	
110		Willer)	
111		Speaker Matijevec	



19.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	111		Anderson)	
)	
	111		Tipsword)	
	112		Speaker Matijeich	
	112		Totten)	
)	
	113		Tipsword)	
	113		Speaker Matijeich	
	114		Daniels)	
)	
	114		Tipsword)	
	114		Speaker Redmond in the Chair	
	114		Friedrich	
	115		Speaker Redmond	
	115		Willer	
	115		Speaker Redmond	
	115		Totten	Point of personal privilege
	115		Speaker Redmond	
	115		Friedland	Moves previous question
	115		Speaker Redmond	
	115		Tipsword	To close
	116		Speaker Redmond	HB 2870 passed
	116	5:53	Clerk Hall	HB 2555-No C.A.-2nd R.
	116		Speaker Redmond	
	116		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
	116		Speaker Redmond	
	117		Bowman	Withdraw #1
	117		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn. 3rd R.
	117		Clerk Hall	HB2604-2nd-AM 1 adopted Com.
	117		Speaker Redmond	



20. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
117		Clerk Hall	Amendment #2
117		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
117		Clerk Hall	HB 2794-2nd R-No C.A.
117		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
117		Clerk Hall	HB-2837-Am 1 adptd Com-2nd R.
117		Speaker Redmond	
117		Clerk Hall	Amendment #2
118		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
118		Clerk Hall	HB 2944-2nd R-No C.A.
118		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
118		Clerk Hall	HB 2949-Am 1,2 adpt Com-2nd R
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Clerk Hall	Amendment #3
118		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
118		Clerk Hall	HB 2973-2nd-Am 1,2,3, adpt Com
118		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
118	6:00	Clerk Hall	HE-2978-2nd-Am-2,4-adpt
119		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
119		Clerk Hall	HB 2986-2nd-Am 1 failed Am 2 adoptd Comm
119		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
119		Clerk Hall	Floor Am on 2986
119		Speaker Redmond	Return to 2nd
119		Clerk Hall	Am #3
119		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
119		Clerk Hall	HB 3057-2nd R
119		Speaker Redmond	Fiscal note filed? Out of record



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

21. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
119		Clerk Hall	HB 3138- 2nd-Am 1,2,3 tabled Am 4, 5 adopted
119		Speaker Redmond	
120		Matijevich))	Out of record
120		Speaker Redmond)	
120		Clerk Hall	HB 3270-2nd R-No C.A.
120		Speaker Redmond	
120		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
120		Speaker Redmond	
120		Stuffle	
120		Speaker Redmond	
120		Ryan))	
120	6:05	Stuffle)	
120		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd R.
121		Clerk Hall	HB-3296-2nd-No-C.A.
121		Speaker Redmond	Fiscal note filed
121		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
121		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
121		Clerk Hall	HB 3312-2nd-No C.A.
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		McCourt	Withdraw #1
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Clerk Hall	Amendment #2
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		McCourt	



<u>22.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	122		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
	122		Clerk Hall	HB-3337-2nd-
	122		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
	122		Clerk Hall	HB 2554-2nd R
	122		Speaker Redmond	
	122		Yourell	Move to table Amendment #1
	122		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
	123		Clerk Hall	
	123		Speaker Redmond	
	123		Bluthardt	Amendment #7-move to table
	123	6:12	Speaker Redmond	
	123		Stanley	Oppose
	124		Speaker Redmond	
	124		Collins	Joins in motion to table
	124		Speaker Redmond	Motion prevails, #7 tabled
	124		Clerk Hall	Amendment #8
	124		Speaker Redmond	
	125		Klosak	
	125		Speaker Redmond	
	125		Yourell	Oppose
	126		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #8 fails
	126		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #9
	126		Speaker Redmond	
	126		Mahar	
	127		Speaker Redmond	
	127		Yourell	
	127		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
23.			
127		Collins	
128		Speaker Redmond	
128		Mahar	To close
128	6:25	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #9 fails
128		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #10
128		Speaker Redmond	
128		Mahar	Withdraw #10
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #11
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Yourell	
129		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #11 adopted
129		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #12
129		Yourell	Withdraws #12
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #13
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Tuerk	
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Yourell	
130		Speaker Bradley in the Chair	
130		Simms)	
)	
130		Tuerk)	
130		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #13 adopted
130		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #14
130		Speaker Bradley	
130		Mahar	



24. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
131		Speaker Bradley	
131	6:32	Collins	
131		Speaker Bradley	
131		Yourell	
132		Speaker Bradley	
132		Mahar	To close
132		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #14 fails
132		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #15
132		Speaker Bradley	
132		Mahar	
133		Speaker Bradley	
133		Collins	Oppose
133		Speaker Bradley	
134		Conti	Support
134		Speaker Bradley	
135		Bluthardt	Support
135		Speaker Bradley	
135,136		Yourell	Oppose
137		Speaker Bradley	
137		Flinn	Moves previous question
137		Speaker Bradley	
137		Mahar	To close
138		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #15
138	6:51	Friedrich	Explains vote - aye
138		Speaker Bradley	
138		Bowman	Explains vote - no
139		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
25.			
139		Geo-Karis	Explains vote - aye
139		Speaker Bradley	
139		Huskey	Explains vote
139		Speaker Bradley	
139		Wikoff	Explains vote
140		Speaker Bradley	
140		Yourell	Explains vote
140		Speaker Bradley	
140		Davis, J.	
140		Speaker Bradley	
140		Matijevec	
141		Speaker Bradley	
141		Bluthardt	
141		Speaker Bradley	
141		Yourell	Polls absentees
141		Speaker Bradley	
141		Clerk O'Brien	
142		Speaker Bradley)	81 ayes - 81 nays
142		Yourell)	
142	7:00	Speaker Bradley)	Verified Oral Roll Call
143,		Clerk O'Brien)	
144		Speaker Bradley	
144		Katz	No
144		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
144		Speaker Bradley	
144		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
144		Speaker Bradley	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>26.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
144		Harris	Votes no
144		Speaker Bradley	Motion fails-Am #15
145		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #16
145		Speaker Redmond in the Chair	
145		Stanley	Amendment #16
145		Speaker Redmond	
145		Madigan	Questions germaneness
145		Speaker Redmond	It's germane
145		Stanley	Proceeds
145		Speaker Redmond	
145		Matijevich)	
)	
146		Stanley)	
146		Speaker Redmond	
146		Johnson	Out of order
146		Speaker Redmond	
147		Matijevich	
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Schlickman	Point of order
147		Speaker Redmond	
147	7:22	Matijevich	Responds
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Stanley	To close
147		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #16
147		Byers	Support
148		Speaker Redmond	
148		Collins	Against



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
27.			
148		Speaker Redmond	
148		Lechowicz	Against. Asks for verification
149		Speaker Redmond	
149		Yourell	
149		Speaker Redmond	
150		Keats	
150		Speaker Redmond	
150		Simms	
150		Speaker Redmond	
150		Huskey	
150		Speaker Redmond	
150		Bowman	
150		Speaker Redmond	
150		Leverenz	Urges defeat
151		Speaker Redmond	Polls absentees
151	7:30	Clerk Hall	
151		Speaker Redmond	Lechowicz-Verif Affirm Roll
151		Clerk Hall	Affirmative Roll Call
151		Speaker Redmond	
151		Lechowicz	Questions Affirmative Roll
152		Speaker Redmond)	
152		Campbell	Change to aye
152		Lechowicz	Continues
153		Speaker Redmond	
153		O'Brien	Votes no
153		Speaker Redmond	
153		Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

28.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	153		Speaker Redmond	
	153		Willer	Yes
	153		Speaker Redmond	
	153		Lechowicz	What's the count?
	153		Speaker Redmond	
	153		Lechowicz	Continues questions
	153		Speaker Redmond	
	153		Lechowicz	
	153		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #16 adopted
	153		Schlickman	Moves vote be reconsidered
	153		Speaker Redmond	Telcser moves lie on table Tabled
	153		Clerk Hall	Amendment #17
	153		Speaker Redmond	
	153		Yourrell	Questions germaneness
	153		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #17 not germane
	154		Stanley	Moves to overrule chair
	154		Speaker Redmond)	
	154		Mugalian)	Inquiry
	154		Speaker Redmond	
	154		Madigan	
	154		Speaker Redmond	
	154		Robinson	
	154		Speaker Redmond	
	154		Darrow	
	154		Speaker Redmond	Stanley moves to overrule Chair Chair sustained
	155		Clerk Hall	Amendment #18



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
29.			
155		Speaker Redmond	
155		Walsh	Leave to consider 18 & 19
155		Speaker Redmond	Collins objects
155		Walsh	Amendment #18
155		Speaker Redmond	
156	7:50	Collins	
156		Speaker Redmond	
156		Yourell	
157		Speaker Redmond	
157		Walsh, W.	To close
158		Speaker Redmond	
158		Ewing	Explains vote
158		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #18 fails
158		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #19
159		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn - Amendment #19
159		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #20
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Robinson	
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Yourell	Oppose
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Stanley	Support
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Robinson	To close
160		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #20 fails
160		Lucco	
160		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #21



<u>30.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	160		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #21
	160		Speaker Redmond	
	160	8:00	Yourell	
	160		Speaker Redmond	
	160		Collins	
	161		Speaker Redmond	
	161		Skinner)	
)	
	161		Yourell)	
	161		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #21 fails
	162		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #22
	162		Speaker Redmond	
	162		Yourell	
	162		Speaker Redmond	
	162		Daniels)	
)	
	162		Yourell)	
	162		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #22 adopted
	162		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #23
	162		Speaker Redmond	
	162		Collins	
	162		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries-Am adopted
	162		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #24
	162		Speaker Redmond	
	162		Yourell	
	163	8:05	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #24 adopted
	163		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #25
	163		Speaker Redmond	
	163		Bowman	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
31.			
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Yourell	Oppose
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Bowman	To close
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Collins	
163		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #25
163		Bowman	Poll. absentees
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
163		Speaker Redmond	Dump Roll-25 fails. 3rd R.
163		Matijevich)	Announcement
163		Speaker Redmond)	
163		Simms	Question of Chair
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Peters	Announcement
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Madigan	Move to adjourn
163		Speaker Redmond	House adjourned
164	8:15	Clerk O'Brien	

