

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Clerk, Jack O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Let us pray. Lord, bless this House and all those that serve and work here. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. No, he's officiating at a funeral today at ten o'clock. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is 10:02 and where is everybody? I just wanted to make that inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "You have a Calendar on your desks which you don't have. We had problems with the printer which is customary for the home stretch. Hopefully we will have some in-house printing so this doesn't happen any more. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, if you would like something to do, I have a motion that I filed and I saw Representative Matijevich, I don't know... well, let's hold it until he gets back."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 880, Waddell. 881, Younge. 882, Geo-Karis. 883, Tuerk. 884, Kelly. 885, Marovitz. 886, Hoxsey. 887, Hoxsey. 888, Mann."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Waddell's House Resolution 880 notes the Melvin Piske 25th anniversary. Younge's Resolution 881 talks about Harriet Jones. Geo-Karis' 882 talks about the Golden Deeds Award. Tuerk's Resolution 883 notes William H. Kennedy. Kelly's Resolution 884 mentions the Speed Developmental Center of Chicago Heights, Illinois. Marovitz' 885 talks about a 50th anniversary for the Camp Ojibwa. Hoxsey's 886 notes an Eagle Scout of progress. 887 by Hoxsey, again an Eagle Scout Progress. And 880 by Mann recognizes Rabbi Hayim Goren Perelmuter and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Question? Any discussion? Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Resolutions."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay, on House Bills, Second Reading... on House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 2316. Representative Kane, has that fiscal note been filed on that one?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, it's not."

Speaker Redmond: "2538."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2538. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2548."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2548."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2593."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2593. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 29...2594. Out of the record. 2753. Is the fiscal note filed or are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Redmond: "There any motions filed with respect to Amendments 2 and 4?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2837. Are there Floor Amendments on that? Take it out of the record. 2843."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2843. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Legislative Reference Bureau. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2851."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2851. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Legislative Council. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2911."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2911. "

Speaker Redmond: "There are Floor Amendments you say?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No; no."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment #1, the Committee Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2911. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2951."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2951."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz, there's three Floor Amendments on that. Who are the Sponsors of the Amendments? Are those your Amendments, Representative Kornowicz. Well, read Amendment #1."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2951. A Bill for an Act relating to conducting of pull tabs and jar games by certain non-profit organizations. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, J.M. Houlihan-Kornowicz. Amends House Bill 2951..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "I agree on the Amendment, Speaker. It's a change in language there, that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a legalized gambling Bill and I think we are deserving of the courtesy to know what the change in language is by Amendment #1 to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the language, Mr. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "In regards to the Amendment, Amendment #1 that all supplies and materials used in conducting the pull tabs and jar games



shall be purchased by the licensee permit holder from the Department of Revenue or from vendors on a list approved by the Department of Revenue prior to the purchase. In other words, we want to make sure that they're bona fide. Move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further... questions? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Madigan: "Will there be an Amendment to change the recipient funds of this tax?"

Kornowicz: "No."

Madigan: "You don't plan to offer the Amendment that I prepared for you?"

Kornowicz: "No, I don't remember the Amendment now. I mean, this Bill has been on the books for a long time, but I don't recall..."

Madigan: "Well, the Amendment was prepared and given to you while the Bill was still in Committee. You don't plan to offer that Amendment?"

Kornowicz: "Take it out of the record temporarily."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 2973."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2973. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Industrial Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to the Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendments #1, 2 and 3 by Representative Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was the Sponsor of the Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E.M. Barnes. James Houlihan presented Amendment #1. E.M. Barnes presented Amendment 2 and 3."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we'd better take this one out of the record temporarily. 2978."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2978. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Fair Employment Practices Commission. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."



Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendments #2, 3 and 4 by Representative Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendments #2, 3 and 4 by Representative Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, with regards to this procedure that we're following this morning, we called this one Bill and you passed it, 2973. There was a motion, the Sponsor of the Bill was on the floor, I don't understand your procedure. Are we going to be sitting here waiting for the people with... that have put Amendments on or are we going to proceed with the Bills? Do we have a normal pattern that we follow here? Are we making an exception in the case of 2973? Mr. Abramson is here. He's the Sponsor of the Bill. Why wouldn't we proceed with the motion that he has?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, in my opinion it was advised due to the attendance and the lack of attendance to take it out of the record."

Beatty: "Well, if we follow this pattern, Mr. Speaker, when will we ever get word done?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. You get your... go out to the highways and the byways and get your Members on the floor and then we'll be able to answer that a little bit better. They tell me there's a former Member, former Member J. Norman Shade from Pekin, Illinois. He always sends Representative Bill Walsh a comb on Christmastime. Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side I'd like to move to reconsider the Amendment which was adopted to Representative Vinson's legislation yesterday in the wanning hours of the... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise again? Would you repeat?"

J. Houlihan: "To reconsider the Amendment which was adopted to Representative Vinson's legislation yesterday at the closing hours of the Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."



E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have no problems with Representative Houlihan's motion at this point, but that's not where we are. We are on 2978 and there was a motion to table three Amendments on that Bill at this point, Representative. That's where we were at."

J. Houlihan: "I'm sorry, Representative Barnes. I... after we get through with that order, I thought we were standing at ease for a few minutes. When we get through with that... this order of business, I'd like to be recognized for my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "2978 is out of the record. Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe this motion with regard to Amendment #2 with 2978 has now been taken out of the record. Would it be appropriate for me to make my motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe I'd better get back to you in a little bit."

J. Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

J. Houlihan: "Point of personal privilege then to help you in your deliberations on this particular consideration. Sometimes it's raised or the question is raised as to why Members distrust the Leadership and sometimes it's suggested that the Members are being out of line in saying that the Leaders are acting improperly. And I think this particular Amendment is a good case in point. What we had was disguised end run around the entire Legislature merely by the Leaders. And in fact, it wasn't even one of the duly appointed Leaders. It was Representative Houlihan who moved over and used Representative Madigan's microphone to give the impression that he was speaking for the Leadership and then we adopted Amendment..."

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

Kozubowski: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Gentleman is talking to a motion or Amendment that we're not on. I suggest we get on with the Order of Second Reading."

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

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I wasn't addressing the motion which you



said you would take under consideration. I was asking a point of personal privilege and I was indicating the concern of many Members. We voted on that Amendment to Representative Vinson's legislation. The House rejected it and that effort to increase patronage in the Governor's Office was then put on by a voice vote when nobody was aware of what the details were. Representative Skinner asked what the substance of the Bill was and all he got was a smile from Representative Houlihan and a chuckle from Representative Vinson. And I believe there must have been some implicit agreement with the Chair because that was put over on all the Members who specifically took a Roll Call vote on that issue and what we have is again the Leadership, whether it's for off-track betting or whether it's for increased patronage or some other deal trying to completely void a decision made earlier by all of the Members of the House where we knew what the substance was and Representative Vinson's sneaking something through is not the honorable way of getting patronage restored. You may want patronage, the Governor may want patronage, Representative Houlihan may want to get his share, but the Members rejected that vote. We voted on it and then you come around with it end run. I think that's totally out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Priority of Call, House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2555. Okay, it should be 788, pardon me. Representative Catania or, I mean... what is your name again? Geo-Karis. You so rarely ask for attention that I don't remember your name."

Geo-Karis: "I know that, Mr. Speaker. I know I've been a shrinking violet, but I'll try to remedy that. The reason I'm calling on you, Mr. Speaker, it's awfully muggy and warm in here. Is there any possibility of increasing the air conditioning?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know, we'll see what we can do. 788."

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

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. Representative Schlickman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 788. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to school district income tax and amending Sections of Acts named therein. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Speaker, I have an inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your inquiry?"

Schlickman: "I don't mind going to the Priority of Call Calendar. I'm wondering why we don't start with 2932 which is the first item."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, on Priority of Call the first Bill, the Clerk advised me should be 788. Is that correct? I announced at ten o'clock in the morning that the Calendar got kind of discombobulated yesterday and... On May 3, 1978, it should be 788 and 1238, 255, 2560. Don't you have the Priority of Call Calendar?"

Schlickman: "I'm just wondering why we don't start with 2932 which is April 20, 1978."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we finished yesterday. We're starting where we left off."

Schlickman: "We're picking up where we left off."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "27...788. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just point out to the Body that House Bill 788 and House Bill 1238 were printed on the Calendar Priority of Call today incorrectly. They are listed under the 9th and yesterday they were listed under the 3rd. And so, House Bill 788 and 1238 should be on the Calendar today at the 3rd of May rather than the 9th of May where they appear."

Speaker Redmond: "According to the Clerk's Office, 788 is the next Bill to be called on Priority of Call. Now is there any discussion of 788? Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the biggest problems I think we face this year is the property tax relief need of the people of this state. Many pieces of legislation have been introduced, many hours have been spent trying to find ways to bring about relief for the real estate taxpayer in this state. I suggest maybe we're going about it the wrong approach. We're trying to make the real estate tax a better tax. I think the problem with the real estate tax is it's overburdened. We've used it far too much. House Bill 788 would provide a major step in tax reform in the





State of Illinois. It would allow the local voters, not... we would not mandate but would leave it up to the local voters the choice of how they would fund their schools at the local level. This would give them the option by referendum if they so approve to adopt an income tax. For many years I've heard people talk around here how the income tax is a far fairer tax than the property tax. I think we should leave that up to the local voters to determine what type of tax system they want. House Bill 788 would allow a school district to levy an income tax if approved by the voters in a referendum. That tax rate would be set also by referendum. The school district's income tax would be levied on all individual's trust in the state located in the school districts. At least one half of the amount of money raised through the school district income tax would go to reduce individual's existing property tax bills. So this means we would have guaranteed property tax relief if they adopt the local school district income tax. The income would be a surtax on to the state income tax. It would be collected by the Department of Revenue so there would be no need for an additional bureaucracy by the local school districts. The Department of Revenue would then reimburse the money to the school districts and school district would determine how those dollars are to be spent, not the State of Illinois. Corporations as we discussed in Amendments last week were taken out of this Bill at the request of the Department of Revenue because of administrative problems of determining how much income a corporation makes in our over one thousand school districts. In place of that, the corporations would pay an additional increase in their property tax which would correspond with the individuals income tax. The other states in the United States which have a local income tax do not have the income tax on corporations either because of the same problem the Department of Revenue found in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Giorgi. Representative Kornowicz, the Gentlemen in the aisle, please be seated. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, as a Cosponsor of 788, I'd like to refresh the memory of the General Assembly in that the past half a dozen



Governors and the School Problems Commission and everyone entrusted with the study of school reform or financial reform for schools has always pointed to the state income tax. Now I know that there are many of us that feel that the state income tax on a state basis ought to be the basis for reform, but here's a case where you're asking school districts throughout the entire hundred and two counties to help themselves. They are... there are taxpayer revolts going on in all hundred and two counties because of the saturation point reached by the property tax. This is an opportunity by referendum to give the people of those school districts to conduct a referendum and ask themselves if they'd like to freeze the real estate tax at where it's at and roll it back somewhat with the passage of a referendum to use a district income tax. This is the only reform possible. This is the only direction that eyes have looked forward to support schools. It's just that we have to reach a point in time and this is a point in time where we should say to the people of our districts... tax, tax... property taxes have reached saturation point, property taxes have reached a confiscatory point. Now is the time to enact a district income tax and after a referendum, support your schools by an income tax. I really think the time is now for the General Assembly and I'd like to urge my support of Edgar's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor will yield for a question. Representative, if in fact an income tax is passed by referendum and it is paid for by the people and corporations of a district, what's to guarantee that property tax will go down and that rebates would be passed on to, for example, tenants who don't pay a direct property tax, but many of whom are involved in urban areas with people in school?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further?"

Brady: "The question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "The same thing's true with any kind of, I think, property tax relief. You have a difficulty with a landlord passing that relief on to the tenant if they're paying rent. The only thing would



be, I think, the tenants would have a good case to argue against an increase in rent if the landlord tried to raise under the disguise of tax increase or whatever. The Bill provides though that those who pay property tax will receive a reduction in their tax they pay for schools. At least fifty percent of the money raised by this tax will have to go to offset current real estate tax bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson. Hudson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Representative Brady, will you..."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I just asked a question. I wonder if I could address the Bill then..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, many groups, I don't know whether the Body knows it or not, but the Taxpayers Federation, the Chamber of Commerce and other groups have come out in opposition to this proposal. I think singly the biggest problem that we have right now with a proposal like this is anybody who is not in control of the property that gets the tax relief will just have an added tax that they have to pay. Any tenant will pay an income tax and will also pay a rental for a property tax. And there's no guarantee that the landlord will reduce his rental because he's paying an income tax for school districts. I can't see where this proposal can work for the many tenants in Illinois and for that reason, I think we should oppose this at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

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

I rise in opposition to this proposal because I can't imagine anything that would create a more of a hodgepodge, confused situation relevant to taxes in the State of Illinois than this. I share the concerns of the previous speaker who indicated that probably what would happen would be that this income tax would simply end up being an add-on tax. The property tax would probably be there or it would rise in some way to offset the difference and the income tax would be imposed on top of that. Now, granted a referendum. Another concern I have is what districts would pass a referendum imposing an income tax on themselves? It seems to me that those



districts would have to be the more affluent districts and then the districts that were not so affluent could claim that they were discriminated against. We would not have equal protection under the law so the claim would be. I think this proposal is one that is fraught with possibilities for confusion and indeed possibilities of imposing even more of a tax burden on our people than they already have. Rather than relieving the situation, I sincerely believe that the people will end up being taxed, taxed, taxed even more than they are now. So I urge you, my colleagues, to think seriously about this proposal before you vote for it and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I too rise somewhat reluctantly to oppose this Bill for a number of reasons. I think it strikes at the heart of an issue that needs to be addressed but doesn't do so in a way that is concrete and workable. In fact, in talking even to some of the people who testified for this Bill in the Revenue Committee, I find that they agree with my reading of the Bill which says this. If you happen to be a farmer who had zero income in a particular school district, you could in effect pay no income tax and still have an abatement of property tax. In fact, beat the rap on both ends of the ticket so to speak. The reverse can also be true and again I have talked to some of the people who support the Bill and they agree that this in reading the Bill is also true. Let's take the case of a teacher, for example, who might teach in a particular school district that adopts this income tax. They could be burdened with a new tax, a local income tax on that teacher. If that teacher or some other workers so burdened also own property outside of the school district, that person could be forced to pay not only the burden of the income tax in the district in which he lived, but also property tax outside that district for the property which he owns. In that sense, this would not be tax relief, it would be a tax burden in one case. And in the former case I mentioned, would be tax relief on both ends of the spectrum. For those reasons, I would rise in opposition to this and reiterate as Representative Brady did that there



are many holes in this thing with regard to tenants and renters. And to point out also again that three groups at least that I know of are formally opposed to this Bill - the manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce and the Taxpayers Federation. For those reasons, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

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

Van Duyne: "The Sponsor yield for a question please? Representative Edgar, Representative Edgar, you said before that when the...all the ramifications of this Bill were all finished, then the state would rebate the money back to the school districts and they would decide... 'they would decide how the money is spent.' Now don't you consider that this gives the school board or the... the administration of the school a little bit more authority in spending money or establishing their priorities in spending that money than they do now? For example, if they have the whole say over... consideration over how to spend the money, they could just say, 'well, we're spending it all on building' rather than education and such."

Edgar: "I'll have to reply. Representative Van Duyne, I'd much rather have my local school board determine how to spend my money than I would the State of Illinois to tell my local school board how to spend my money. And I think that's what happens when we continue to rely on more and more state aid for education. We're going to have more and more strings to it. I think that's been the history in the past few years. I don't think we're giving the school board any more power than they already have because if they didn't have the income tax and the people did not approve an income tax increase, they might approve a property tax increase and they have the same power. So I don't think we're giving the local school board any additional power, but I do think we're guaranteeing that if we have to go an income tax route if it's the local level we'll have local control. If we don't go this way, I'm afraid we're going to see the push for the state income tax to be increased which would have strings tied to it by the state government to the local school boards."

Van Duyne: "Well okay, that's just a matter of opinion. Now you were



talking about the corporations paying the same... as far as the real estate taxes, even though they wouldn't pay an income tax, but isn't it also a fact that corporations generally are underassessed and even if they consider their assessment extensive in their mind, don't you agree that they also have a little bit more success in protesting their taxes and getting them lowered rather than the... as compared to the average individual?"

Edgar: "I would think that might vary from county to county. Maybe that's true up in Will and we don't really get into the assessments procedure here. What we're saying is that.. if that inequity exists, it already exists. What we're trying to do..."

Van Duyn: "I understand it's an indirect windfall to corporations. That's what I'm..."

Edgar: "No, I disagree..."

Van Duyn: "But nevertheless, it still is an indirect benefit to the corporations even though it's an assessing problem."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Bill has commendable features. But what worries me is that one of the problems brought forth that one of the speakers from the other side that if you own property in another... in the land adjoining the school districts, you still have to pay high taxes. I would like to see a Bill come out of this House that would tailor the state income tax on the same principles that this Bill has been tailored to provide for tax relief to property owners so that we can get a better consensus of payments and those people could pay not just some of the property owners, the people who are willing to work hard and save that have property, yeah but also from others who don't have property. So I'm forced to speak against the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to support this Bill. I'm a Cosponsor of the Bill and I'd be the first one to say the maybe there are things about it that are not absolutely perfect in everybody's eyes. But this Bill can only come into being in any school district by the vote of the people who reside in that district. They will not... this will not apply to anyone's



taxes unless the people of that school district adopt it. It gives the people of that district, it gives to the schools of that district an alternative means of financing. And we've heard on the floor of this House and throughout the State of Illinois for year after year that there has to be some means other than the property tax. One of the means has been to come here to the General Assembly and the state has found itself over the past several years in dire financial circumstances because of the economic condition in the state and throughout the nation and in fact throughout the world so that it has not been able to meet the kind of promises that some five or six years ago we made to school districts when we thought there was going to be plenty of money in the state coffers. This will give people who couldn't vote for local property tax increases an opportunity to vote for something else. And if they wish to apply and income tax upon themselves, an income tax law which provides that there has to be a consequent decrease in their property taxes of at least fifty percent so far as the cost of schools are concerned, this gives them that kind of an alternative. If they don't want an income tax or they don't want this Bill, they do not have to adopt it. This is not imposed upon them in any way. Perhaps there will be other suggestions that come forth from this Legislature that will give some different kinds of opportunities to our school districts. Right now, this is the only one we have. If there are others that are of sound nature, I'll support those also. I urge the Members of this House to adopt this Bill which only gives an alternative to our school districts and to the people who live therein that they must adopt for themselves."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, this has been well debated. I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cole, Mr. Edgar, to close the debate."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think there might be still some



more debate and maybe it can come out on the explanation of vote. Let me just say there's been opposition raised because this tax might discriminate against certain people. When I first came down here ten years ago when we adopted the state income tax and I was a staff aide, I had a gentleman tell me once that the only fair tax is a tax on the other person. That's probably true. I don't think you're going to have any tax that's going to be a hundred percent equitable. There's always going to be somebody that might feel like they're being mistreated and I wouldn't claim that this approach or any other approach you can come up with is a hundred percent perfect. But I think this is a step in the right direction. I can guarantee you one thing that if we don't go this route, we will have property tax increases in the downstate school districts. Because of the way the school aid formula is now set up, we are losing money downstate. And realistically, we're not going to see a major change in that. We're going to have to rely on local money to fund our schools. And if we don't have the income tax, that means eventually we're going to have to raise the property tax which I think would be unfortunate. There have been people mentioned who's opposed to this Bill and I find it interesting who mentioned that the I.M.A. and the Chamber of Commerce are opposed to these Bills. Usually, they're opposed to anything that they're for. They are opposed to this Bill as originally introduced because of the confusion it would cause if corporations had to pay. I have not heard from them since we amended the corporations out so they don't have that confusion. I will tell you who's for this Bill. The Illinois Farm Bureau is for this Bill, the I.E.A. is for this Bill. It's the first time I've ever known those two Greeks to agree on anything. Also, the School Board Association favors this Bill and several senior citizens groups favor this Bill. In closing, let me just say I think... you can vote against this Bill if you like the real estate tax better than the income tax or if you don't have faith in your local voters to let them determine what kind of tax structure they're going to have at the local level. I'd urge a 'yes' vote so we can begin to accomplish some meaningful tax reform in the State of Illinois."





Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to explain his vote."

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

I think it's probably appropriate to consider Representative Edgar's proposal at some point. I'm reluctant to support it for at least one reason and one is... that is that the proposal went to the Revenue Committee which I think probably lacks the insight or the expertise to give the evaluation of the education community. And the consequence of that, I operate on the assumption that there is a Committee that functions with the expertise and the knowledge of how such a concept would impact on the educational communities. Whether the I.E.A. is for it or the I.A.S.B. is for it, to me is irrelevant because both of those organizations are interested in the money anyhow. What we need to know is what kind of relief does it offer in terms of tax base? How much of a correlation is there between income as compared to property when you want to assess the wealth of a community? And with just some of those reservations and with the hope that maybe the proposal can be kept alive somewhere, I think we ought to explore it. But I think the right way to go in all honesty is to assign a Bill of this nature in the Education Committee and let us take a look at it because we do consider all of those concepts in a better frame or a better picture. So I would ask that you not support the Bill until the full Committee and the education community has a chance to get together and discuss it more formally."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, to explain his vote for one minute. We'll use the timer."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there have been a lot of aspects of this Bill mentioned and I think that the Membership ought to pay attention. This is one of the most important Bills that we're going to be considering. But one aspect that hasn't been sufficiently considered is the fact that if you believe in a continuing responsible role for local government in Illinois, if you don't want the state to assume entirely the responsibility for financing which also means entirely the responsibility for



controlling local government, then this Bill is a necessary piece of the legislative and revenue picture in the State of Illinois. I took a poll in my district and had a thousand returns on the questionnaire which is unusually high. Fifty-eight percent of the people who returned that questionnaire said, yes they would favor this kind of Bill. Twenty-eight percent said, no; and the rest were undecided, did not have enough information. So that it seems to me that this is an important question which we must...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard the Gentleman from DuPage, Gentleman from... DuPage say that the Revenue Committee shouldn't be assigned school distribution tax Bills. That's you, Mr. Schneider. Will you listen for one minute? He said the Education Committee is the only one with the expertise in the education field to fund schools. Now let me tell you, the people in my district have seen the Bills that came out of the Education Committee this year. They saw the defeat of the Jaffe Bill which would have done something for us. They saw a Bill that came out so bad that we had to put Amendments on them in the floor for the Strayer-Haig districts and for the other districts downstate in the suburbs that were neglected. Thank God we don't depend on the House Education Committee or the School Problems Commission to fund our schools. And believe me, an income tax Bill should go to the Revenue Committee and not to the House Education Committee which is held by a narrow band of par... run by a narrow band of part-time school teachers who claim they're experts in...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote for one minute."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday there was a group of people out in the rotunda that were lobbying for property tax reform and I quite frankly disagree with their approach to property tax reform. When I get my tax bill, seventy percent of what my property taxes goes to school districts. And if we're really going to have reform of property taxes, this is what we've got to be looking at - alternatives to funding local government to the property



tax and this may not be the answer but I'm sure going to help it get along to the point where we can really consider it. On top of that, if you come from a rural area where you've got people who are having to pay high taxes for land that's not being that productive, this is good for your district. And for those reasons, I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote for one minute."

J. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish I had time to ask a question during debate because I am concerned that if this Bill becomes law individuals in school districts which adopt this program will be taxed more and they will know exactly how much more they will be taxed. But the corresponding increase in real property taxes on corporations is much more difficult to compute and I am not at all certain that this Bill will provide for the proper constitutional ratio. We may find if this Bill becomes law that the individual taxes go up and the corporate taxes go down. I don't think that's what we're after in this State of Illinois and because of that and because of these unanswered questions, I have to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote for one minute."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has been adequately considered by the House Revenue Committee and every downstate voter in this House ought to be on this Bill. This is one way that we can... channel more money to our schools without increasing state income tax and at the same time, give us property tax relief. It is permissive, it's a good Bill. We ought to send it over to the Senate for their consideration. We've given it adequate consideration in this chamber and I would surely urge of both a 'yes' vote from every downstate Legislator."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the arguments that have been made on this Bill are kind of going in a



circle. They have been stated by Representative Tipsword very well, Kempiners and Ewing. The highlights I think that ought to be reiterated once more is that is an alternative way of financing our schools the way we're going to have to go and start thinking about. Secondly, it is permissive, it's not mandatory on anyone to follow this kind of program. If the local people want it, they can do it by referendum. That goes for the heart of the entire argument of local control which a lot of us are very much concerned about without dictate from the state level locally or from Washington down to the state. It does provide tax relief, property tax relief from that group of people which is least able to pay it and that's our senior citizens. These are all things that are encompassed and considered in this Bill and we ought to give it very, very serious kinds of consideration. As Representative Tipsword indicated, it's not the perfect kind of measure. No tax is perfect. No tax...  
(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote for one minute."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would urge an 'aye' vote on this income tax proposal by local referendum. I had a call-in radio show in Sparta, Illinois about two weeks ago and I asked the question of how, whether the people in this radio listening area would subscribe to this idea and the vote as about sixteen to one or two who said they favored an income tax in favor of raising or in... in exchange for a lowering of real property taxes. I this this is a good Bill and I think we ought to send it over to the Senate where maybe it needs some refinement. But it eventually is what we're going to have to do and I'd urge more 'aye' votes so we can pass this Bill out of the House. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "I would like to speak about the cost benefit relationship between state and local income taxes. Those who argue for state, increasing the state income taxes who are from the suburbs or who are from downstate have just not figured out how many state income tax dollars are paid compared to how many come back in benefits



to schools or local government. I did a study in 1969 in McHenry County when I was Treasurer and discovered that McHenry County individuals would pay out three to four dollars for every one dollar that local schools, municipalities and counties would get back. If you vote for this, one thing you'll know, any tax dollars that are raised won't get ripped out of your suburban or downstate district and dumped into the bottomless pit in Chicago. You cannot say that with an increase in the state income tax. One final note, how could this be worse than the property tax?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 77 'ayes' and 78 'nays' and the Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the House for their time and their attentive debate, the Committee, too. I'm not going to put this on Postponed Consideration because we don't have that much time left. We'll be back next year. Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there's 77 'ayes' and 78 'nays' and the Bill not having a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Now, Mr. Schneider. All right, Mr... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know today is the day we sell our poppies here in the House and in the Senate and last year net receipts were two hundred and sixty-five dollars. And as you know, these monies go toward rehabilitation programs for the veterans that are hospitalized in the veteran's hospitals. We're going to start our program this morning by having the modern Susan Anthony, none other than Susan Catania, recite the poem 'Flander's Field'. Susan Catania."

Catania: "In Flander's Field the poppies grow between crosses row on row that mark our place, and in the sky the lark still bravely singing flies scarce heard amid the guns below. We are the dead. Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw a sunset glow, loved and were loved, and now we lie in Flander's Field. Take up our quarrel with the foe, to you from sailinghands we throw the torch. Be yours to hold it high. If ye break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep, though poppies grow in Flander's Fields."



DiPrima: "Thank you, Susan. And now we'll have our own House diva, Adeline Geo-Karis, sing the song 'Trees'."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the song 'Trees' was written by George Kilmer who was killed in action in World War I with our troops. I would like to ask the Speaker to open all the microphones and all join me if they will because this song is a very beautiful song and I will endeavor to speak it and sing it. 'I think that I shall never see a poem lovely as a tree. A tree whose hungry mouth is pressed against the sweet earth's flowing breast. A tree that looks at God all day and lifts her leafy arms to pray. A tree that may in summer wear a nest of robins in her hair, upon whose bosom snow has lain, who intimately lives with rain. Poems are made by fools like me but only God can make a tree.'"

DiPrima: "Thank you, Adeline. All right, wait... all right, now for the new Members as you know we have our annual Poppy Day at this time every year. And Poppy Day is the month of May and that's the month dedicated to our deceased veterans. And I want to specifically point out that this month is dedicated to the memory of the late and beloved Phil Collins. Phil Collins was one... is a World War... was a World War I veteran and he was one of the founders of the American Legion and eventually got to be the king-maker in the American Legion. With that, I mean he helps select the National Commanders, State Commanders, et cetera. And he was very beloved by his comrades in the Legion and in... with all other veteran organizations. He happened to be the father of our present colleague, Phil Collins. And therefore, I have selected Phil Collins to be the Chairman of this year's Poppy Day affair. Now here's the group that's been selected to sell the poppies. On the Republican side we have Chairman Phil Collins, Co-Chairman Jake Wolf, Co-Chairperson Adeline Geo-Karis, and Co-Chairperson Mary Lou Sumner. On the Democratic side we have my aide-de-camp from the Marines Taylor Pouncey, Eddie Kornowicz who recovered from a very serious illness and is now able to get around, and Chairperson none other than Genie Chapman and Chairperson Peggy Smith Martin. They will be going around selling poppies to you.



Now Bill Watson from the State Farm Insurance will peddling poppies to all the lobbyists in the rotunda. Bill Watson did a terrific job for us last year, but in the Insurance Committee I haven't been too cooperative with him but he's still done a good job. And we'll have Bill Watson peddling to the lobbyists. Now I have a five dollar donation here that Pouncey got from a Mr. Martin Cotten, President of Local 5608, a Trustee of Subdistrict #4 Council of United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO District 31, Subdistrict 4 and this is a five dollar donation and this will be the first one going in the box. And any other five dollar donations will be announced periodically. Thank you now. Don't forget to buy your poppies and then what I'd like to have you all do if you will, if we would all wear them tomorrow when the President comes here, I think that would be a splendid way of showing him our welcome. Thank you, thank you every so much."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for an announcement I think you'd all be interested in and if you'd listen attentively we'd appreciate that we would like to this evening when you leave that all the drawers be left open because they're going to be searched tonight in preparation for tomorrow. So if you leave them unlocked, if any of them are locked now, the Doorkeepers have the key and they'll unlock the desk drawers, both of them, and it'll save a lot of time and trouble later on. Let me make one observation. I don't know who's going to be sitting in this seat... I don't know who's going to be sitting in the Chair tomorrow night at midnight, but we just spent one hour killing one Bill. And if we're here until five this afternoon, we can work on five more Bills. And there are going to be a lot of people hollering at the Chair for not recognizing them for passing the Bill and so if that... the House wants to go at that pace, we'll end up with a lot of Bills not being called. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Sir."

Schlickman: "On a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for a number of years now I and others have jointly sponsored Bills that would bring Illinois in line with the Federal Government and most of the other states relative to the celebration at Memorial Day. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have been subjected to charges that we are un-American and that we have been disrespectful towards the memory of our war dead. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to call to your attention a report in today's Chicago Tribune as follows, 'In a major breakthrough against Memorial Day confusion, the City of Chicago and its public schools will observe the holiday on Monday instead of Tuesday. For the first time all Chicago city government offices and public schools will be closed for Memorial Day on Monday, the federally designated holiday, and open on Tuesday, May 30, the Memorial Day specified by state law. Mayor Bilandic announced late Wednesday that the city was switching to the federal holiday. A short time later the Chicago Board of Education voted to take the same action. The move could be followed in the future by other local government agencies and schools.' Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm pleased to have the distinguished Mayor of the City of Chicago join with those of us who have been accused as being un-American and disrespectful towards the memory of our deceased war dead. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill... we're going to go out of order because of an emergency nature on House Bill 3380. The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, and he can explain the emergency nature if you would while on the..."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3380 is the D.O.T. fund transfer Bill which will allow the Department to meet its June payroll. The emergency and I apologize for asking this Bill be taken out of order. The emergency is that we do face a deadline, particularly if we're not going to work next week we must get this Bill over to the Senate today so that they can begin work on it. I really don't think there's a great deal of explanation needed. I'd be glad to answer any questions. I'm sorry that we added to the Bill, the Amendment that we did yesterday but it seems to me that the best part of statesmanship on





this is to move the Bill today and to get it on the Governor's desk as quickly as possible so that the payroll can be met if at all possible. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no objection, the Clerk will read the Bill a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3380. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think that you'll all recall that we heard this Bill on Second Reading yesterday and I think that it is important that this Bill does go out of the House at this time. I think it's in proper form. It... everyone in the House can support it and I think we should move on it right away so it can get over to the Senate for immediate action."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he will."

Pullen: "Will you please tell us what the dollar amounts are and what they are for?"

Reilly: "Yes. The total transfer is eight million, five hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars. Primarily this is a transfer due to the fact that we had to make payment for overtime and snow removal during the winter due to the winter storms that we had. Primarily it's for that. The other amount, the other reason that the Department's over budget in some items is that the Department has been trying to do more in-house engineering rather than contracting out all this engineering. So while the contractual services line item has a substantial surplus in it, the personnel services line item for engineers has a deficit."

Pullen: "This a supplemental appropriation?"

Reilly: "No, it's a transfer."

Pullen: "Are there any C.E.T.A. employees involved?"

Reilly: "I couldn't answer that for certain. I don't believe so. I think these are all maintenance employees, truck drivers and people who run the snow plows and so on. In any event, there's no net



increase here. It's simply taking money out of one fund and putting it in another."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. Mr. Matijevich. I don't know. Mr. Barnes, your light's on and you're pointing to somebody else."

E.M. Barnes: "Representative Matijevich's light was on first. That's the only reason I pointed to him."

Speaker Bradley: "It wasn't flashing up here. Mr. Mulcahey then."

E.M. Barnes: "I'll explain my vote, go ahead."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mulcahey, the Gentleman from Winnebago."

Mulcahey: "Move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine, the Gentleman moves the previous question.

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, motion prevails. The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the emergency nature of this is obvious. No opposition has been expressed so far. If anything comes up under explanation of vote, I will be glad to respond at that time. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Barnes, did you want to explain your vote?"

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In deference to the excellent Sponsor of this Bill, I wanted to let him know why I was voting 'present'. I'm not voting 'no', but one of the things that did occur over the weekend relative to this Bill is that I received many calls from many people from... Department of Transportation relative to my holding up their appropriation. I think they didn't have things straight but I believe that the administration must have gave them my phone number to let me know. I'm voting 'present' just to let them know that this Bill was not heard in Appropriations II and I had nothing to do with the process of that Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I want to just quickly explain my vote because I think that our Appropriations I Committee received some criticism in today's Register that we didn't deserve. We weren't the ones that put this Bill in very late. It was the Department. They knew what monies they needed for the transfer. This happens all the time. I don't care if you have a Democratic Governor or a Republican Governor. They come in at the last minute and say that this is the amount of money we need for a transfer. And then they say if you don't go along with it, people are not going to be paid. And they put that hammer over your head. Governor Walker did that to us and as I recall, Representative Lechowicz called his bluff and they were paid. The same thing actually would happen right now. If we didn't pass this Bill, they would get paid. There's no doubt about it, but I'm going to support this Bill. We worked out the Amendment and Representative Mudd had some difficulties and they worked it out with him and I'll now support it. But they... they're not calling my bluff. I could vote 'no' and we all could vote 'no' and they'd still get paid."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', no 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 3040. Judiciary I."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record? 3049."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3049. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for the financing of... for the furnishing of legislative staff, secretarial and clerical. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3062."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3062. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Business and Economic Development. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Any motions relative to Amendment #1?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3128."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3128. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3186. Out of the record. 3187. Out of the record. 3193. Mr. Laurino. Mr. Brummer, are you handling 3193 for Mr. Laurino on... Out of the record. 3231."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3231. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Capital Development Fund. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3287."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3287."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3287. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Chapman. Amends House Bill 3287 on page 1, line 3 and 12 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, on the Amendment."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, if you'll just wait while I put my poppies away, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3287 I hope can be described as an agreed Amendment. The Sponsor indicates we can. And it makes a number of technical changes and certain additions such as requiring the Illinois Department of Public Aid to consult with the Legislative Advisory Committee on public assistance with respect to these expenditures. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Mrs. Chapman has indicated,



this is an agreed Amendment worked out by Members of the Majority Party, the Department of Public Aid and the Governor's Office and I would move that we adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, all in favor of the... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, on the Amendment."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. The Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

E.M. Barnes: "May we have a little more information relative to what's embodied in this Amendment? As I understand this this is...local donated fund issue and apparently there have been some changes and I think those changes need to be more clearly delineated here. What's involved?"

Chapman: "I'll be glad to do that, Mr. Barnes. In addition to the example I provided, the Amendment requires quarterly reports by the Illinois Department of Public Aid to the General Assembly regarding expenditures and transfers for services and local initiative fund programs. Reports rather than to be provided to each individual Legislator are to be filed with the Chairman of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the House Human Resources Committee and the Senate Public Health, Welfare and Corrections Committee. Additionally, we amend Section 12-10 of the Public Aid Code exempting the L.I.F. monies from inclusion in the Special Purposes Trust Fund. This is merely a technical change. We require that expenditures from the L.I.F. be made for services contained in the Comprehensive Annual Services Plan required by Title XX. We provide that the Illinois Department of Public Aid shall administer the L.I.F. This is one of the provisions that we include that spell out what has been anticipated. The fund shall receive... the Department shall receive appropriations for the purpose of providing or purchasing social services. Written contracts are required for services for purchased from qualified providers which are to be filed with the Department and the State Comptroller. We provide that the L.I.F. shall consist of local and public private agencies contributions made pursuant to a written agreement filed with the Department and the State Comptroller. The agreement shall include the amount of the contributions, the purpose for



which the funds would be expended, the area of the state where services are to be provided and the conditions and schedule of payment into the fund by the local public and private agencies. Transfers from the Federal Public Aid Trust Fund payments by the Department as reimbursement for services not approved by the Department of H.E.W. for federal financial participation, then, three other provisions, state, local and private source money within the fund shall constitute the state's share of matching funds for the purpose of claiming federal financial participation. We delete the provision for the annual administrative transfer of two million and we delete the provision that General Revenue Funds shall be the last expended from the fund and there are some other technical, nonsubstantive changes."

E.M. Barnes: "Well, Representative, one question. Right at the end there you said that the general revenue would be the last expended. How can you tell that?"

Chapman: "They will mingle. They will... the Amendment provides that the funds will be commingled."

E.M. Barnes: "Yeah, well how can you determine that the general revenue would be the last expended if they are commingled?"

Chapman: "We are removing the provision within the original Bill that they would be last expended. One of the problems would be that it really is almost impossible not to commingle these funds."

E.M. Barnes: "Well, maybe we will get to that on the Appropriation Bill, but I still think that your proposal has a deficiency, a glaring deficiency is the commingling of funds and no way to track those funds once they are commingled. I still have some problems relative to that reporting system that you're talking about because they would be reporting after the fact and not reporting prior to the fact. I still see some glaring deficiencies in this proposal. Now I'm not going to oppose the gentle Lady from her Amendment, nor will I oppose the Sponsor on putting his Bill in the shape that he desires. But I think the General Assembly and I realize we're a bit hurried today, but I think you should address some attention to this issue. But you're talking about appropriating general revenue dollars that you're not going to have any kind of



basic controls over and in the final analysis we may be... may be doing something here that many of you might, just might not want to see happen. I'm not going to oppose the Amendment. I still think it has some glaring deficiencies and I just suggest to all of the Members of the House to take a very, very hard look at this Amendment #1 to House Bill 3287 when it comes up on Second Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, J. Houlihan."

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

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

J.M. Houlihan: "Representative Chapman, what is the ratio local to state match in this particular proposal?"

Chapman: "Mr. Houlihan, in Amendment #1 there is no change in this. The Bill, as you know, doesn't require any state money outside of the two million that would be appropriated to the fund. It's twenty-five percent local voluntary dollars matched with seventy-five percent federal match. The Amendment does not affect that match. An Amendment which Representative Madigan is offering which will be coming up next does affect the match."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed... Mr. Kempiners, did you speak in favor of the Amendment once already?"

Kempiners: "I did but I think that both the questioners had questions that were answered. But there's one thing that I'd like to add to that answer that the provision..."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think you can do that, Sir. If you want to explain your vote, we'll allow you to do that. The question's on the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Madigan. Amends House Bill 3287 as amended in Section 2 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Madigan on... Representative Houlihan, Dan Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 would provide that the local agencies



providing the match in order to be eligible for the federal funding that that local match will be reimbursed by the state. And I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, J. Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Representative, I'm not sure I understood your explanation of the Amendment. Does this Amendment affect the amount of dollars in the General Revenue Fund or does this merely say that there's going to be a reimbursement? Do you want to take it out of the record?"

D. Houlihan: "No, I don't. Can you have the courtesy to wait just a moment please? I'll try and respond to your question."

J. Houlihan: "Completely, I hope."

D. Houlihan: "I'm informed here with the staff person next to me that what we are talking about here will not be a total reimbursement as far as the local share to be reimbursed by the state. It will be a combination in order to make the match be eligible for the federal funding. It will be a combination of both state and local funds so that there will be an effect on the General Revenue Fund."

J. Houlihan: "Right. My question, Representative Houlihan, is as the Bill is drafted now, it's all local funds and what, in effect, we're doing is we're accomplishing a transfer of the state's responsibility to deliver social services to the local sources. And what we've done is made a policy decision. I think Governor Thompson has not effectively implemented the Title XX program or the social services program and so we're just shifting all that burden to the local communities. And I think that's inappropriate. I think the state ought to have some role in total planning and in total financing."

D. Houlihan: "Well then, if I understand you correctly, what you're doing is supporting what we're intending to do here in the Amendment by transferring part of that responsibility and that burden to the state and not making it exclusively on the local agencies."

J. Houlihan: "Right, I'm in support of the general direction. What I'm trying to get at is the percentage. I didn't hear what you said it's going... part of the local funds are going to be reimbursed with state funds. What I'm looking for is what that





percentage is."

D. Houlihan: "Fifty-fifty."

J. Houlihan: "Fifty-fifty? Now is there any way that we can assure local communities when they put funds in that they're going to have projects funded that they are interested in that... they're putting it sort of into a grab bag and then they're not certain that there is going to be funded. Isn't that correct?"

D. Houlihan: "Well, requires of course a state appropriation and a federal approval. Well, so within those parameters, yes, but not exclusively will the local agencies be able to determine exclusively at a song... you know, what the project will be."

J. Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to the Amendment. I concur as Representative Houlihan pointed out that this is an Amendment that improves the Bill because it does acknowledge some role in the state in these programs. But I still have serious reservations with the way that we're going about funding of these important social service programs. What, in effect, we're doing is saying and what the Governor wants to say is that he has no responsibility for financing these programs and he's throwing it totally on the local communities. And I think that's rash and possibly neglectful, but I do support the Amendment because it does bring us back to some state involvement."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As usual, the Gentleman from the 13th District is getting political and not addressing the Amendment, nor the intent of the Bill which is an expansion of social services above and beyond what the state can afford. I do oppose this Amendment which is why we have two Amendments offered. Everything that we agreed upon was in Amendment #1 which I supported. This one we cannot agree upon because as I have indicated, this Bill and this concept is intended as an expansion of the social services above and beyond what the state can afford. Many of the social service agencies in the state are supporting this and they are aware that prior to any commitment of funds on their part or the part of any unit of local government that a contract will be entered into by the social service agency providing the services



GENERAL ASSEMBLY 5-25-78  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Anderson: "As I understand this fund, originally the local government was to put up twenty-five percent of the money and the Federal government seventy-five percent of the money. And also the twenty-five percent had to be up front. In other words, that had to be spent first. The idea of this fund was to provide an ongoing program once it was started till the Feds came forward with their money. Now you're changing the whole direction of this. Is this correct in saying that twelve and a half per month... percent of the money will be put up locally, twelve and a half percent by the state and seventy-five percent by the Federal Government. Is this true?"

D. Houlihan: "What we're saying, the percentages as far as the federal share stays the same - seventy-five percent. As far as



percentage is."

D. Houlihan: "Fifty-fifty."

J. Houlihan: "Fifty-fifty? Now is there any way that we can assure local communities when they put funds in that they're going to have projects funded that they are interested in that... they're putting it sort of into a grab bag and then they're not certain that there is going to be funded. Isn't that correct?"

D. Houlihan: "Well, requires of course a state appropriation and a federal approval. Well, so within those parameters, yes, but not exclusively will the local agencies be able to determine exclusively at a song... you know, what the project will be."

J. Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to the Amendment. I concur as Representative Houlihan pointed out that this is an Amendment that improves the Bill because it does acknowledge some role in the state in these programs. But I still have serious reservations with the way that we're going about funding of these important social service programs. What, in effect, we're doing is saying and what the Governor wants to say is that he has no responsibility for financing these programs and he's throwing it totally on the local communities. And I think that's rash and possibly neglectful, but I do support the Amendment because it does bring us back to some state involvement."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As usual, the Gentleman from the 13th District is getting political and not addressing the Amendment, nor the intent of the Bill which is an expansion of social services above and beyond what the state can afford. I do oppose this Amendment which is why we have two Amendments offered. Everything that we agreed upon was in Amendment #1 which I supported. This one we cannot agree upon because as I have indicated, this Bill and this concept is intended as an expansion of the social services above and beyond what the state can afford. Many of the social service agencies in the state are supporting this and they are aware that prior to any commitment of funds on their part or the part of any unit of local government that a contract will be entered into by the social service agency providing the services



and the state. The state is already guaranteeing a match which is specifically included in the first Amendment for any funds which are turned down or which any programs which are rejected by the Federal Government under Title XX so that the social service agency will not be at fault, that the state will cover anything that is turned down as a result of the Federal Government which is not the fault of the local agency. I think this Amendment is misplaced and I would object to it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I concur with much of what Mr. Houlihan, both Mr... Mr. Houlihan, Mr. Houlihan and Mr. Barnes have stated regarding the issue before us. The concept is one that is, is unique, but it does not represent on our part a commitment by the state for the funding of human services. Mr. Madigan's Amendment addresses this so that even though we are still including the local voluntary dollar within the program, we at least are matching the local dollar with a state dollar keeping in mind that for every dollar we provide, the Federal Government if we meet their eligibility standards will reimburse us with three dollars. I urge you to vote 'yes' on Amendment 2."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Anderson: "As I understand this fund, originally the local government was to put up twenty-five percent of the money and the Federal government seventy-five percent of the money. And also the twenty-five percent had to be up front. In other words, that had to be spent first. The idea of this fund was to provide an on-going program once it was started till the Feds came forward with their money. Now you're changing the whole direction of this. Is this correct in saying that twelve and a half per month... percent of the money will be put up locally, twelve and a half percent by the state and seventy-five percent by the Federal Government. Is this true?"

D. Houlihan: "What we're saying, the percentages as far as the federal share stays the same - seventy-five percent. As far as



the twenty-five percent share that the local agencies would have to match that with, one half that twenty-five percent share would come from the state."

Anderson: "So it's twelve and a half, twelve and a half, seventy-five."

D. Houlihan: "That is correct."

Anderson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Anderson: "It's not needed. It changes the whole direction of the concept of this revolving fund. The idea was to make sure that the state programs once they were approved by the Federal Government would have money to keep them going. Now we are interjecting the state government into the Title XX Fund. I think it's a program that is unnecessary the way the Sponsor of this Amendment has proposed it and I urge its defeat."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close the debate. Pardon me. Mr. Barnes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I pushed my light so I wish you would take a look at the board. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I again arise to advise the Members of the House to take a very close look at this proposal. In Amendment #1 which we just adopted it states in there on page 4, in paragraph 3, explains the procedure relative to disallowance to local agencies if it is determined, that language says, in effect, that it is... if it is determined by the Department of Public Aid that the local agency was at fault relative to the disallowance, that the local agency would have to pay that reimbursement back to the Federal Government. Without the protection, without the protection in Amendment #2 of Representative Houlihan, the local agency will be at a loss relative to in... having any assurance that they will not get caught in the switches by an agency of state government determining that they are at fault at the disallowance. It is this as I say in terms of the concept, raises some questions but we must have Amendment #2 to insure the local agencies in the event of a disallowance that the state will stand for and pay for



that disallowance because it could be by the language in Amendment #1 determinate... determined by agency of state government that the locals would have to pay for that disallowance. We must have Amendment #2 to balance out to give the local agencies any kind of insurance that they will not be caught in those switches. I support Amendment #2."

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

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Minority Spokesman of Human Resources we heard this concept that Mr. Kempiners was bringing about was to enable private agencies to use their funds to get federal matching funds because the state could not fund all the programs that might need to be funded in order to get these federal matching funds. And this whole concept of Amendment #1 and #2 is to spend more state money and to defeat the purpose of this Bill. And of course Mr. Kempiners said he'd agreed to Amendment #1 so I did not object to that. But I do feel that when you go so far as to say that the state has to pay extra money when we don't have the extra money, it defeats the whole purpose of being able to use private funds to attract federal money to save state money. You're just defeating the whole purpose. So therefore, I ask you to vote 'no' on Amendment 2."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close the debate."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment will insure that the services to be purchased through this new Local Initiative Fund represent a state, local and federal partnership. Federal reimbursements for Title XX services require a twenty-five percent state match. The Bill as originally introduced assumed that the state match for certain services would derive from local sources through the creation of a new state fund which is the Local Initiative Fund. The state



would not be responsible for any commitment of state General Revenue Funds to help local agencies capture fifteen million dollars in federal funds and thereby the state was once again shifting the responsibility for funding state programs and services to local governments and local private agencies. The state would, in effect, be capturing local and federal money to administer state programs. What this Amendment will do would be to enable local agencies to capture federal money in a true partnership with the state. It proposes that the state have a vested interest in the outcome of these services to insure the federal assistance. And it recognizes that the state bears the primary responsibility for social services, but does not ignore the desires of local agencies to initiate the services which they consider worthy of inclusion under the federal Title XX program and I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question 77 'ayes', 70 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3347, Matejek."

Clerk O'Brien: "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. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor. The Gentleman from Cook, Matejek."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had some problems with this Bill and I think it needs some further study so that the Bill would be in its best possible form to be passed out of this chambers. Therefore, I would ask leave of the House to commit House Bill 3347 to the Interim Study Calendar of the House Executive Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave to commit the Bill? Hearing no objections, the Bill will be recommitted to Interim Study



Committee. House Exec? Fine. 3368."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3368. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3377."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3377. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3384."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3384. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 1238."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1238. A Bill for an Act in relation to the off-track pari-mutuel system of wagering on horse races. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like unanimous consent to bring House Bill 1238 back to Second Reading and if I might, Mr. Speaker, have it to remain there for a short period of time. Some Amendments that are being presently drafted and if you could, come back to it and then we could move it on Second Reading at that point. But I would like at this point unanimous consent to return it to Second Reading..."

Speaker Bradley: "There have been objections heard, Mr. Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would then move under the proper rules to have this Bill returned to the point of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to return House Bill 1238 to

the Order of Second Reading. And on that we'll have a Roll Call.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. How many votes does it take to move this Bill from Third Reading to Second?"

Speaker Bradley: "89. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I personally will have no objection to this coming back to Second Reading if it's not to undo something that has been done previously. And I'm wondering if the movant would explain to us the purpose for bringing it back to Second Reading and which Amendment or Amendments he intends to offer at that time."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Representatives. The purpose of my asking leave was to bring this Bill back to Second Reading, put the exact Amendment on that are on 3259 to put it in the same shape and I understand there is some other Members that have some additional Amendments that they wish to offer and I wanted to afford them that opportunity."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to be advised as to what those Amendments are more so than simply by reference to another Bill."

E.M. Barnes: "Well, Representative, the prime purpose of my returning it to Second Reading is to hopefully with the concurrence of the Membership to put it in the exact shape that 3259 is currently in. With the addition that some Members from the...both sides of the aisle have indicated that they, not me, let me make that clear, that they would like an opportunity to offer additional Amendments. That's the only purpose I'm asking for this privilege to move the Bill back."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if I may address myself to the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "There were approximately thirty-five Amendments offered to this Bill at Second Reading previously. It seems to me we exhausted ourself at that point and now we should vote on this Bill as is once and for all without any further changes to it. I think





the Sponsor of the Bill and others have had their day in court and let's get on with the business of the House. Vote House Bill 1238 up or down as it is and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Is Mr. Telcser on the floor? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I mean this is a very, very shallow ploy. They'll put additional Amendments on. All the Amendments will come off in the Senate and then in the Conference Committee, we'll come up with off-track betting. Now this is just so patently obvious that I'm even surprised it's being suggested. As the Gentleman from Cook just said, you've had your day in court, let's go. Up or down, up or down. But it's all going to be taken off in the Senate. Let's not be sucked in by this ploy."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

E.M. Barnes: "I would like to make something clear here. Apparently either some people are not paying attention to the proceedings or they are not in attendance when things are taking place. Now if you are here, you will know that House Bill 1238 has never been amended. That is the point that I'm trying to make. House Bill 3259 was amended. I'm calling 1238 back to be amended in the same shape that 3259 was amended the other day. This Bill has never been amended."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Holewin... or from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, first of all, how did we get to this order of business?"

Speaker Bradley: "It's on priority of call."

Holewinski: "All right. There's a mistake in the priority of call?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Sir?"

Holewinski: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, then, then on the Gentleman's motion.

We've already got another O.T.B. Bill amended, as the Gentleman has explained, on Third Reading which we'll be voting on shortly. I see..."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's talk to the motion and let's put the motion and see if he's got 89 votes. If he doesn't have 89 votes..."

Holewinski: "I'm speaking to the motion, Mr. Speaker. I'm speaking



in opposition to the motion. We have another Bill on Third Reading that the Gentleman claims he wants to make this Bill identical to. What on earth do we need two Bills on off-track betting, identical Bills pending for? What we, I think, are going to see is that when this Bill comes back to Second Reading, the Amendments that were adopted to the other Bill, some of the Amendments that the Sponsor would consider antagonistic will not be adopted on this Bill and they'll have a clean Bill with which to... to take a shot at in the Senate. I would hope that we would defeat this motion."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I was..."

I tried to get your attention from the very beginning. I asked Mr. Barnes to bring this Bill back because there are several Amendments that were missed on 1238... on 12... 1359 that I'd like to put onto this Bill. And Mr. Barnes was gracious enough to bring this thing back. If we're going to have any kind of a Bill out of here, I don't whether we're going to vote for it or against it, but there's certainly an awful lot of duplicate Bills that are in here in case one fails the Senate, the other one's there for a backup."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, on the Gentleman's motion."

Kane: "How many... how many Amendments are filed for this Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think the last count was something like twenty-seven. There's another... the Chair will point out another problem with the Bill also the way it... the way it is. That was sent back last year to Interim Study and came out in the Committee this year with an Amendment on it that Mr. Telcser put on it. That's why I was talking to him, asking if he was here. It was moved from Interim Study back on the Calendar, Third Reading. It's never been back on Second Reading to put Mr. Telcser's Amendment on it. It creates another little problem with the Bill for Mr. Telcser. All right, on the motion..."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "I recognized you, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "What I would like to suggest is this. If there are twenty-seven



Amendments filed to this Bill and we're coming up against a deadline tomorrow night and we already have a O.T.B. Bill on Third Reading and the intent seems to be to put this Bill in the same position as that Bill, I'd see no reason why we should have two Bills on Third Reading. Why don't we just table this Bill and go with the other Bill? I think that would save us an awful lot of time."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, on the Gentleman's motion to move the Bill back to Second Reading."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If we are going to get out of here at midnight tomorrow night and give everybody a fair shot at this Bill who've gone through the process in a regular way and you've got twenty-seven Amendments proposed to this Bill, I find it very difficult to believe that we can accomplish our task if we allow this type of thing to happen."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, Mr. Barnes, do you want to close the debate? Mr. Walsh, I recognized you... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, on the Gentleman's motion."

W. Walsh: "Yeah, well, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the objections raised about thirty-five Amendments to one Bill and twenty-seven pending on this one and the time that it will take, it's interesting to me to note that the two Bills are sponsored by the same person. Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that's asking too much of this House. For this House to consider upwards of sixty Amendments to the same proposition for one Sponsor is just simply too much. We've got just a matter of hours to go before everyone's Bills are heard. This is a bad idea and we've got the <sup>idea</sup> I-E-V. notion of off-track betting to vote up or down on. Let's vote 'no' on this Amendment and get out of here at a reasonable time tomorrow night."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Jimmy Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that that motion lay upon the table."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, on that motion, Mr. Skinner. He's not here. All right. All right, now we're on the Gentleman's motion that Mr. Barnes' motion lie upon the table. On that question, the... all in favor of the Gentleman's motion to table that motion will



vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that the Executive Director of the Chicago Crime Commission is in Springfield. Mr. Steve Schiller and they're absolutely, unalterably opposed to this Bill and to this maneuver and I just can't believe that at this eleventh hour having given all that time to twenty-seven Amendments, knowing that this Bill is a rip-off of the poor and it involves an actual conspiracy of executive fiat between the Mayor of the City of Chicago and the Governor of the State of Illinois, I can't believe those 77 'no' votes up there."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I'd like to explain my vote very briefly. Some people may not realize the parliamentary posture of this. This is a motion to table the motion to bring the Bill back. So if you're against off-track betting, you should be voting green."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've sat here for three days now and I've been hearing about a conspiracy between the Mayor of the City of Chicago and the Governor on the second floor. Now if somebody has any definite proof about this, I don't want to be used as a Legislator in this House, if they have any information to this... to this being the truth, I wish they would let the rest of us Members, they're not being fair with us, because I don't want my vote to be used in any way with a deal that's cut out between the Mayor of the City of Chicago and the Governor of this state. I would like to know about it."

Spaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm absolutely amazed at the Majority Leader in his eagerness to pass the O.T.B. Bill. The House, as I understand it, is going to adjourn at 3:30 this afternoon so that Democrats can attend a dinner in Chicago. They're going to adjourn tomorrow morning so we can hear the President bang us on E.R.A. And they're not coming in until noon. And here we are with Bill on Second Reading that



haven't been called. Bills that Members need to be called before midnight tomorrow night. And in Mr. Madigan's eagerness to promote this Chicago program, we're here messing around with this. And, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a terrible, terrible move and I really think that we as Republicans ought to just object to anything that you folks want to do here today until we get back on track."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, the motion before us at this time is a tactical attempt to prevent a Member from bringing a Bill back to the Order of Second Reading to allow Amendments to be offered by a Representative on the other side of the aisle who has requested that the Bill be brought back for Amendments. Mr. Barnes is no different than any other Member of this House and some of those who have spoken already on this issue have been very inclined in the past to degrade defenders of the rights of individual Members to have their Bills heard and have a full hearing. But yet on a particular issue such as this, they seem to change their mind or they become blinded. If we fully believe that every Member is entitled to a full and fair hearing on his Bill in the condition that he desires his Bill to be in, then you ought to vote 'no' on this Amendment. And to the Minority Leader, if he is upset with the pace of action in this House, then I suggest to him that he might attempt to work cooperatively with us in the future during the next couple of days, that he ought not to be delivering political harangues on the floor directed at one political party. I think that he ought to address himself to the Bills, talk to the issues, talk to the merits of the Bill and not try to be such a partisan Republican all the time."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, J. Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur wholeheartedly with Representative Madigan's words on this issue. Representative Madigan has clearly stated the problem with the Minority Leader. He's off-track. The only reason though that he's asking for this particular motion to carry is so that there can be two vehicles and you heard the speech yesterday that



Representative Telcser gave. The only reason they want two vehicles is so Representative Telcser can vote against one and for the other and keep the deal going. Then we'll get crosstown, we'll get less money for education, we'll have half of an off-track betting proposal and what we'll have is no involvement by the Members. We'll have two Bills. Now if this was Representative Barnes' only Bill, I can understand bringing it back even though I oppose the proposal. But the fact is this is the second Bill he has and it seems purely a tactical move to give Representative Telcser an out."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, on the motion to table."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems that I'm involved in the eye of the storm. But let me suggest to all of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, I believe that one time or another in the last four years at least, every Member of this House has come to me for some consideration. I have never failed to extend that consideration. I have never, never in my eight years in this House have I ever went back on my word to any Member. I suggested in the beginning that a Member from the other side of the aisle had asked me to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of trying to adopt one of his suggestions to this Bill. That was the only purpose of my motion. Now some people here want to read something in their own minds into my purpose and question my integrity. And I consider that, I consider that not only shortsighted, but I consider that a slap at me personally since in the eight years I have been here, I have never, never voted against or even suggested a motion to table another Member's motion to insure that he'd get his legislation in the kind of position that he wants to move it on Third Reading. I would suggest to the Members of this House and I want to add to that, to the Members on my side of the aisle that nothing in this Bill, nothing in this motion was for any purpose other than to afford another Member the opportunity, the opportunity to offer Amendment on this Bill. I'd suggest that we'll be doing that in the future, but I will suggest also, also that I will be very leery in terms of making my decision."



Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 76 'nays' and the Gentleman's or the Gentleman's motion to table Mr. Barnes' motion prevails. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2591. The Chair would like to recognize we're right on schedule. We've had... we've worked on two Bills in two hours, one an hour. 2591."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2591. A Bill for an Act to amend the Transportation Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Flinn. Out of the record. 2619. For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, arise?"

Greiman: "Just, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement. We have a visitor in..."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think..."

Greiman: "Well, I..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Tipsword, where are we on the motion for introductions? Did you withdraw that yesterday or are we still operating under that motion that passed?"

Tipsword: "What does the Leadership want now? You asked me to make the original motion and then the Leadership doesn't stay with it, so if you want me to, I'll make a motion to reinstate Rule 55(i)."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, was it withdrawn? We have a Gentleman who wants to make an introduction and I was going to uphold your... the motion that you'd make originally. But if..."

Tipsword: "I suppose it's Carol Burnett and I don't really care one way or the other. I'll make the motion that we restate the provisions of 55(i) because we haven't been living up to our rules in the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think then our position is that the Gentleman is able to make the introduction."

Tipsword: "That's... not until you vote on that motion to restore 55(i)."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Then the motion you originally and adopted by the House that there would be no introductions prevails and we're still operating under that motion."

Tipsword: "I'll make the motion that we restore 55(i)."



Speaker Bradley: "No, no. I'm not asking you to do that. I was just wondering if we were still operating under those."

Tipsword: "I have so moved."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, the Gentleman so moves then that we re-instate 55(i) for the purpose of the announcement... can be made. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Gentleman from Cook wanted to make an announcement or was it an introduction? An announcement. So I don't know that it's necessary to move..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greiman for your announcement."

Greiman: "I think I'm in Dante's Inferno right now. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I merely... Mr. Speaker, I'm just making a short announcement. Okay?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Greiman: "In the Capitol today is Miss Carol Burnett. She's here for the Equal Rights Amendment, but she's a national personality. It might... she will be in Room 400 from 12 to 1:30 to meet any of the Members, be they for the Equal Rights Amendment or against it. She's a charming personality. I met her this morning and she's just a nice woman and you might want to go and just chat with her. That's all I have to say. I'm sorry I caused all this difficulty with the House of Representatives."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bills, Third Reading. We skipped over... unintentionally, the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, there's a motion on the floor to which there has been a second. I would kind of liked to have asked the Gentleman if the lady is a taxpayer and a voter in Illinois, but I'm sure she's not. But I'd like to proceed with my motion."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman moves that... Mr. Tipsword, would you state your motion again please?"

Tipsword: "I move that we restore the provisions of Rule 55(i)."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we restore the provisions of 55(i). On that motion the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis." Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Put me on Conti's. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to make one comment if I may. No





matter what anyone thinks here about E.R.A., Carol Burnett and her troupe brought in at least three million dollars to the State of Illinois when they made a picture in Illinois last year. And I think we should consider that."

Speaker Bradley: "You're out of order. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an announcement not on the motion and I assume I'll get equal time to Representative Greiman. For those of you that are interested, tomorrow morning at 8:30, my wife, Virginia Davis, who is a taxpayer and resident of Illinois will be here for anyone that would like to see her. She'll be here until noon."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 41 'ayes' and 64 'noes' and the Gentleman's motion fails and we still are operating without introductions. House Bills, Third Reading.

2555. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, for an introduction."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not rising for the purpose of an introduction because as I understand the rules, we don't have the right to introduce people anyway."

Speaker Bradley: "That's correct."

Telcser: "Is that correct?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'm rising to make an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, it's quite clear that you've lost control of this Assembly. It's quite clear that the agenda for your party is going to wipe out the last two remaining days of this week and I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, I've had Democratic Members come to me just now and tell me how concerned they are with their Bills and asked me if I'd vote for 'em or against 'em. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know what you're going to do to help us finish up the work of this House and meet the deadline which we've established for tomorrow with the Calendar with hundreds of Bills - most of which are sponsored by your Members, Mr. Speaker. You've made this a social week, Mr. Speaker. When are we going to be able to get this work done? And, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you now, Mr. Speaker, if you're planning for a User List, don't put it together, Mr. Speaker. You did it a couple of years ago, you're not going to do it again."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2555."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2555. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair what the



planned schedule is for today and tomorrow."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll get back to you as quick as we can."

Ryan: "I would like to know now. I would certainly think you'd be organized enough that you could tell us what the program is for the rest of the day."

Speaker Bradley: "The program is to work as hard as we can to address as many of the Bills as we can as Mr. Telcser suggests we should do."

Ryan: "That's the program every day, Mr. Speaker. I want to know what time we're going to adjourn today."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we'll get back to you as soon as we get the answer. Mr. Levin on House Bill 2555. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "Could you let us know if a motion to do away with the Bill deadline tomorrow would be in order? Would that be..."

Speaker Bradley: "Suppose it would be in order. Not at this time, though."

Robinson: "Speaker, that..."

Speaker Bradley: "Not at this time. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2555 is aimed at correcting one technical problem with the insurance redlining Bills we passed year - House Bill 520 and Senate Bill 1102. We have the situation under those two Bills that if you have renter's insurance now and the insurance company because of the geographic location refuses to renew, that is a violation of the insurance redlining laws. However, there is no similar provision with respect to the initial refusal to write. House Bill 2555 simply corrects that technical oversight by adding 'insofar as the initial refusal to write renter's insurance.' The Department of Insurance expressed no opposition to the legislation in Committee. A lot of the problems are very, very similar to those of homeowners and I urge the adoption of this legislation."

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

Schuneman: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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



Schuneman: "Representative Levin, was Amendment #2 adopted on this Bill?"

Levin: "Okay, Representative Schuneman, the answer is 'no'. It's... was the..."

Schuneman: "Okay, thank you. You've answered my question. Then the Bill is back into the same nothing posture that it was when you first introduced it, right?"

Levin: "I disagree with your statement, I believe, that we have..."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill if I might.

This Bill which was introduced by the Sponsor for no purpose serves that purpose very well. The... the Bill says that an insurance company shall not refuse to provide homeowners or renter's insurance solely on the basis of the geographic location of the real property. The problem with the Bill is that the term 'homeowner's insurance' which is presently in the statutes includes renter's insurance. And the Department of Insurance in a letter to me says that the Department of Insurance considers House Bill 2555 to be superfluous in that the term 'homeowner's insurance' already includes by definition a form of renter's insurance. Therefore, the current Section 155.22 Prohibition already extends to renter's insurance. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not so bad except that it's taking up the time of this House. We've had so many introductions and social engagements going on, now we're taking up the time of the House with a nothing Bill that will do nothing, isn't going to go anywhere and I suggest we give it a proper burial right now."

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

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

Will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Epton: "When this Bill came up before the Insurance Committee of the House you presented to the Committee a letter from the Lakeview Citizens Council indicating that they had fifty-five complaints, over fifty complaints relative to inability to get renter's insurance. Is that statement correct?"

Levin: "I'm sorry. What is your question?"

Epton: "My question was that when this Bill came before the Committee



of the House, House Committee on Insurance, you presented a statement from the Lakeview Citizen's Council indicating that they had received in excess of fifty complaints about renter's insurance.

Do you still believe that to be the case?"

Levin: "Yes, I do and I have on my desk a number of complaints both that my office has gotten from residents of our district and complaints from various communities..."

Epton: "Well, before we get to the other complaints you have on your desk which, of course, I have never seen, could you explain to me why the Lakeview Citizen's Council on the response to a letter of May 4 when we asked them to advise us as to the..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Holewinski on a point of order."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, I wish the Gentleman would confine his dialogue to the contents of the Bill and not..."

Speaker Bradley: "I think the Gentleman was within the purview of the question."

Holewinski: "He's talking about communications with community organizations and not about the contents of this particular piece of legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "It's rather ironic that Gentlemen on the floor who are constantly speaking on every issue at every time at every moment which are relatively never germane, would take issue when someone does try to get something germane into a Bill. The fact remains, my distinguished colleagues, who constantly seek headlines of any nature whatsoever, generally on subjects of which they have absolutely no knowledge, attempt to intimidate this House by suggesting a simple piece of paper is the truth. I submit that my question will establish that the document presented by the Sponsor of this is not only false, but unless the Sponsor can... is prepared to state otherwise, was deliberately introduced as a false document. My question is, do you believe that the Lakeview Citizen's Council had fifty complaints? And if they do, why have they failed to respond to a letter asking for a copy of those fifty complaints? Why have they failed to respond to a second inquiry - where are



those fifty complaints? And why have they failed to respond to a telephone call asking about those fifty complaints other than to state that they've had a change in personnel and they can't find their records. So all I would ask the Sponsor is, separate and apart from that great mass of complaints you have on your desk which I will insist on seeing, what... where are the fifty complaints about renter's insurance which in ten years on the Commission I have not received even one?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to reply."

Levin: "All I can suggest, Representative Epton, is this is a matter you have not previously asked me about. I don't know about your communications with any community group. If you had raised this issue with me, I would have been happy to intervene. It is a community group in my area. I've had conversations with them and I would be, you know, most happy to continue to intervene on your behalf if you raise the issue with me. This is the first time you have asked me about this issue in terms of why the Lakeview Citizen's Council or any other group has not responded. It's been about three weeks, I think, since this matter was in Committee. And if you had a concern, I think it would have been appropriate to raise it with me before right this moment. But I'd be most pleased to intervene, you know, should this Bill get out of here, to get you whatever that I have and also to provide in addition to try to intervene with the Citizen's Council and other groups to provide you with all the information that they have. That's the only way I can respond to your question."

Epton: "If I may speak to the Bill?"

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

Epton: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, I'm sorry."

Epton: "Thank you. Just so there can be no question, I followed what I believed was the proper procedure. This instrument, this letter was presented to the Insurance Committee of the House. They advised us that upon request we are happy to supply detailed information. I wrote to them. I didn't think it necessary to question Representative Levin. I wrote to them a second time. I didn't



get a response to the second letter. And then I saw fit to call them. So no discourtesy was intended to Representative Levin. What I will suggest, however, is that in ten years in this field in investigating we have not found any complaints. We have found that like most groups in the neighbor... the community, there... a lot of allegations are made generally without substance. In this case, I submit the fact that those fifty complaints cannot be located at the present time would give rise to the belief they do not exist. As my previous colleague spoke, this is a Bill which does absolutely nothing. It does nothing except clutter up our statute books. I would suggest again that to pass this is an exercise in futility and I would hope you would vote 'no'."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's my intentions to rise every time this issue comes up for debate. I think that the legislation that's being offered here by Representative Levin is an excellent piece of legislation and it's arrival, in my opinion, is a timely intervention to all of the doggerel excuses that we hear from the other side of the aisle. In answer to Representative Schuneman's observation that the statutes revised for homeowners and renter's insurance, that is not what Mr. Levin's Bill is addressing itself to. We know that there are provisions for this insurance, but we also equally know that this insurance is pro... is denied people in certain geographical areas based on no other reason than for the fact that that potential insurer is in a particular designated geographical area. And Representative Levin's Bill is an attempt to rectify that. I don't want to hear anything that the Illinois Insurance Commission has to say on this subject. There are more than fifty-five Members out there. The reason they can't find 'em, I submit, is because they aren't looking for 'em. I wouldn't believe anything that they had to say if they say it on a stack of Bibles and was flanked by Mary, Joseph, Paul and twelve apostles. This is a good Bill and I urge you if you give us the time of day, we're going to prove inexonerably (sic) that redlining does exist, that the Members of the other side of the aisle in spite of the fact



have persisted in ignoring it, we're going to prove that it does exist and it exists and affects people in the thousands. This is a good Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I rise in support of Representative Levin's Bill. Certainly in the City of Chicago today there is a great and serious problem concerning the inability of people to obtain insurance solely because of the geographical location. The Bill is a good Bill. It is a Bill that ought to be passed. But there is something more significant happening here today than just simply this one Bill. Yesterday, a Democratic Representative, Representative Brummer, offered an Amendment to a Bill which would have established an insurance rate-setting system in this state. That Amendment was close to adoption when an administrative assistant to the Governor of this state came down onto the floor of this House of Representatives and changed four Republican votes. Those four Republican votes defeated that Amendment. Today, we have another Bill designed to help the consumers in their fight against the insurance industry and we see the Republican Spokesman on the Insurance Committee rise in opposition to this Bill. If the Bill goes on to Third Reading, if there's a sufficient number of votes to pass the Bill, we can expect to see the reemergence of the Governor's people on the floor to work against the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan, Mr. Kempiners, on a point of order."

Kempiners: "I'd just like to point out to the Majority Leader that Mr. Epton is not the Minority Spokesman on the Insurance Committee. I am and if you'll look at the record, I voted for this Bill in Committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Continue."

Madigan: "Mr. Kempiners, I would not have brought you into this, but you brought yourself into it. You may be designated at the Republican Spokesman on that Committee, but anybody who has every attended any meetings of the Committee knows that Mr. Epton is the Chief Spokesman for the Republican Party on that Committee. And I want to point out something else. While this Bill is pending,





we have not heard one word from the Minority Leader. All we hear from him are political harangues against the Democratic Party. If he's interested in good government, if he's interested in helping the people of Chicago who need insurance, let them speak out on this Bill."

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

Totten: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, for what purpose do you rise?"

Epton: "On a matter of personal privilege. My name was taken in debate."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Epton: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll ignore the remarks of one young Member of the House who undoubtedly has failed to read any of the reports of the Insurance Study Commission which has done more for the underprivileged in the city than all his orations in the past several years. But I will not ignore the insult of the Minority... the Majority Leader, soon to be the Minority Leader, the Majority Leader who suggests that Representative Kempiners is not the Spokesman, the Minority Spokesman on the floor. He happens to be the Republican Spokesman in the Committee on Insurance. But even more important is the fact that in his haste to cover so many bases, Representative Madigan forgot to read the Bill. This sometimes happens when you become very, very busy and very occupied. I get up and speak on a Bill very rarely. But when I do, I try and speak to the truth. Discrimination - why, ninety percent of the people on this floor didn't even know it existed until our Commission brought it to your attention. We spent thousands of dollars to fight the insurance companies and some of these individuals who suggest that they're fighting it are simply looking for press releases. It's a great, great issue. Attack an industry, hurl charges, go ahead, but don't worry about any truth in the charges. And that, I submit, is what the Majority Leader has done in this case. This Bill



is not at all necessary. It is completely covered by the statutes. He has on his side of the aisle Gentlemen who read the statutes beautifully. We can point page and verse where it's covered and the fact remains because some of his colleagues will...fortunately, will soon be leaving this House, have decided they must campaign on something two or four years hence, will come in this headline and that's their privilege. But I personally find it offensive that a man whom I respect and admire and even like would suggest that Representative Kempiners does not speak for us in Insurance. He does and I bow to his judgment. Representative Schuneman does speak well and does quote the facts - the truth. This has nothing to do with discrimination. I live in the highest rent district in the city, in the highest insurance district in the City of Chicago. Representative Madigan doesn't, I do. Ellis Levin doesn't, I do. And neither does Holewinski, I... excuse me... Representative Holewinski. Or Representative Houlihan, your rates aren't as high as mine. And if you want to argue that point, I'll be happy to give you that list. And before I give everybody a point of privilege in my naming all of you, let me simply submit that this Bill was initially a bad Bill, it's gotten no better by its Sponsors."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this Bill even though I am a Sponsor..."

Speaker Bradley: "You can't, Sir. You can't. The previous motion has already been passed and we're on the motion to adopt the Bill. All in favor of the motion to... for what purpose the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, arise?"

Schuneman: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."

Schuneman: "My name was used in debate and I'm not going to take a lot of time. Representative Huff used my name in debate and he pleads the cause, Mr. Speaker, that this particular Bill would somehow help people who feel they are victims of redlining. And I simply want to say once more, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill has nothing to



do with that. What this Bill does is offer false hope to people who really have a problem. And this Bill does nothing, it's going nowhere, we're wasting our time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jimmy Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I was rising on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, you said you were going to speak to the Bill."

J. Houlihan: "I said I was not going to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "You want a point of personal privilege?"

J. Houlihan: "That's correct."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

J. Houlihan: "I was not going to speak on the Bill because I know how deeply Representative Epton feels about these issues. I know his deep involvement in the issue and he's spent a good deal of his life and his law practice involved in this area and he knows the issue very well. I didn't think that my being the father of the first anti-redlining law in Illinois qualified me to speak because I know Representative Epton's great experience there. In fact, he helped me when I first passed that Bill. And I appreciated that and I was not going to..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, for what purpose do you... Just a minute."

Collins: "Aw, Mr. Speaker, we've been treated to too much cynicism already. Let's not abuse this for a point of personal privilege to the extent that this Gentleman is trying."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we'll let him continue, but I will say we break the rule on every occasion. They have a rule of the House that says we'll not use Member's names during the debate. And we've broken that rule a number of times on this occasion. Mr. Epton, are you seeking... Proceed."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, in deference to the Representative who just spoke and to the speaker who used my name in debate, I won't continue this comment and I will just say that I support this Bill and I would leave it at that. And I appreciate the help I've received in this House to get that first Bill passed which prohibited redlining in Illinois. And I think it was an important step and



this would be a help to that."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Sangamone, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "No, I would like to make a point of order when the vote is... after the vote is taken."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote for one minute."

Gaines: "I wish to take this opportunity as one who also lives in the highest district for insurance that this will help the people in the district. Also, as one who has joined with Representative Ewell and Representative Barnes and others in suing the insurance industry, I feel that anything you can do to help the poor people who are overburdened will be helpful."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 101 'ayes', 58 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared... The Gentleman from Christain, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I purposefully have waited till now until you have announced the Roll Call on this Bill. I just would like to say, we get carried away in our debate upon Bills from time to time, and I wanted to wait until after the debate on this Bill is over. I merely would like to say as Chairman of the Insurance Committee that Representative Kempiners has been a very effective, a very active Spokesman for the Minority in Insurance Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "And having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2560. Now, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, we do have a rule that prohibits Members from mentioning another Member's name in debate and I think that that rule should be enforced by the Speaker and rule that Member out of order rather than relying on other... the Member named to rise on a point of personal privilege. I think that if the Speaker would start enforcing that rule and cutting off the Members that use other



Member's names in debate we could get going an awful lot faster."

Speaker Bradley: "Point's well taken."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2560. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "To our guests in the galleries, it's against the House rule to take pictures in the galleries. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, on 2560."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I offer House Bill 2560 on behalf of myself, Representative Collins and Representative Pouncey. It is directed at the problem of handicapped special education children as far as these children being guaranteed the appropriate facilities to deal with their particular educational needs. We've had the problem of the Office of Education apparently having a policy bias against making private placements even when the public schools lack the appropriate facilities to deal with the particular needs of the child. The basic Bill... language in House Bill 2560 was included in a Senate Bill that passed last year. Unfortunately, that particular Amendment to the Senate Bill got cut off in the germaneness controversy and was amendatorily vetoed. The veto message contained absolutely no substance of objections to the language in 2560. In addition, House Bill 2560 as amended attempts to make some procedural reforms in the appeals procedures for the handicapped special ed. children to guarantee that these appeals are as fair as possible. I think the most important of these is that these appeals according to the Bill are no longer to be considered adversary, that the hearing officer as he or she feels that there is evidence that is missing can ask for the additional evidence. The hearing officer can ask for additional information to be provided. That's the basic tenor of this legislation. I think it's had fairly extensive hearings. I think it has been looked over both by the Office of Education and the Bureau of the Budget and I might add that it has some... it has a number of similarities to Senate Bill 386. I think its most redeeming feature is that it's less expensive than House Bill 386. I urge its adoption at this point."

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



Katz: "Mr. Levin, you indicated that the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Education have looked over your Bill. Does the... are they supporting your Bill or did they simply look them over?"

Levin: "I have... you know, I cannot make a statement in terms of what their policy is with respect to the legislation. I would say that Amendment #4 which is a technical rewrite, Amendment #2 which is a technical rewrite of Amendment #1 embodies some suggestions that were put forward particularly by the Office of Education, you know, to this."

Katz: "May I speak on the issue, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Katz: "It would seem to me that in view of the overriding problem that exists at the moment with the federal law, 94-142 mandating special education and Illinois not yet having acted with regard to compliance and as I understand it, the Bureau of the Budget and the Governor having raised some question in the Senate with regard to Senate Berman's Bill, that first things really ought to come first. I think we ought to deal with that critical problem and I do not believe that we ought to deal with side issues that relate to that central problem until we have resolved the central problem. Accordingly, I would urge that we deal first with the central problem of the federal legislation as it relates to the handicapped and that we put on a back burner the question of internal Illinois procedures that will relate to the handicapped. Accordingly, I would recommend a 'no' or a 'present' vote with the thought that it ought to be taken in conjunction with the Bills of the School Problems Commission that relate to the central problem."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your recognizing me. Ellis... I want to get clear on a few things. One is on the due process hearing, the results of the decision, is it a binding decision or a recommendation on this question or any question that is raised according to your Amendment?"

Levin: "Okay, according to my Amendment, it is a binding decision unless appealed by any side."



Schneider: "But the 94-142 does not require a binding decision? I think that... I think that... I think we're exceeding... Representative Katz raises a very sound position on this. And that is that I think on the basis of the on-site inspection that was done by H.E.W. recently, I think the fall of last year, what we discovered is that the State of Illinois was basically in compliance. One of the peripheral issues and although it's important, I have no trouble with that, is that there should be due process. The difference, however, was that the present due process procedure was adequate and did place Illinois in compliance. What you're doing at this point is now making the decision binding and I think that's a bit different than H.E.W. You may support the concept if you all want, but what I'm suggesting is that it goes beyond 94-142 and again I want to refer back to Representative Katz. I think before we look at this Bill in an isolated fashion, we ought to look at the total package that is coming over from the Senate and see how those pieces fit together because there is going to be a cost factor in all of these Bills and I'm reluctant to support a Bill unless I see the total package and the total cost because we're getting into a position at this point where we're recommending as high as twenty million bucks on some of the current funding approaches to the programs and also from additional costs that I think I can foresee in 2560. So I share, again, the point of view of Harold Katz. I recommend either a 'present' vote or a 'no' vote and possibly we can hear this Bill along with the others at a later date."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins. Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we're getting bogged down in a lot of needless dialogue or on at least superfluous dialogue on this issue. This is an issue of handicapped children. We went through a situation a year ago or two years ago where children were being taken out of private facilities and placed in public schools which were ill-equipped or not equipped to handle the problems of these children. Now I'm not talking about children who are educable or ambulatory."



I'm talking about children who are so severely handicapped and so severely retarded that they are unable to move about by themselves without assistance. They require special teachers. They require special equipment. They require special buses. These children are, in many cases, so helpless that they are not even able to perform normal toilet functions without assistance. So here is a Bill that will put the State of Illinois squarely on record as being in favor of taking care of these people who are most severely handicapped and severely retarded. This is a chance for the State of Illinois to say to these people we are, we do have the heart of take care of those who are least able to take care of themselves. The Illinois Office of Education admits and supports this Bill as I understand it. The Chicago Board of Education admits that they don't have the facilities or the... or the personnel to take care of these children. And here is an effort, a sincere effort to try and help these most unfortunate children. I can't imagine how we can get mired down in semantics at this point when this is a problem which is crying out for us to assist and to do something about. I've been involved in this problem for some years now. I've... I would like to commend Representative Levin and Representative Pouncey Taylor... or Taylor Pouncey, pardon me, for getting into this most pressing problem. And I implore you as I don't... I don't think I've ever been so emotional about a subject in my life that has come before this Legislature. I urge every Member of this House to vote 'yes' and do something about a problem to help those persons... those people who are totally unable to assist themselves and have very few people speaking for them. Please give a 'yes' vote to this Bill and let's move it on and forget about unnecessary dialogue. This is a problem that must be addressed and addressed immediately."

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

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Phil Collins has just delivered my speech. Being a handicapped Member, I never had the benefits of that education, but my folks struggled putting me through school. But let's help these poor, unfortunate people. I think it's a good Bill."





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

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

I also rise in support of this particular Bill by Representative Levin. We do not always agree, but here's one area where we have both been quite active and we have finally reached a Bill that will definitely solve the problems we've been having in the special education area. Many of you have...have, I'm sure, as I have been active in the special education area dealing with individual kids who have individual problems and they have sort of slipped through the cracks of our bureaucracy. This Bill will help to make it even more difficult for these types of retarded and disabled children to slip through the cracks. We have got to find a way so that they get due process so that they can get the hearings we've put in the correct schools. Public law 94-142 has been mentioned in this debate, but that's a red herring. It is not related to this Bill. We are working right now within the Education Committee and on our Subcommittee to deal... 94-142, with that issue. They are unrelated. And also so you're aware the Bills for 94-142 sponsored by Senator Berman are not out of the Senate. They have already been knocked down once. There's a chance we will never see them here in the House. I personally support those Bills, but there's no guarantee they're going to get here. This Bill may be the only vehicle we have to insure correct medical care for those students in this state who do have severe disabilities. I ask for your support."

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

Van Duynes: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman, Mr. Levin, to close."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in closing I would say this Bill embodies a few reforms which will help make the appeals procedure where a school district does not want to provide private placement make that appeals procedure a little fairer to the child. I think the need for this is suggested by data supplied me by the Office of Education which suggests that under the existing appeals



procedure at the state level appeal, fifty cases that related to public versus nonpublic placement, thirty-six were decided in favor of the public placement, only three in favor of the nonpublic. It suggests that there are some inequities in the current procedures. What this legislation tries to do is to make the procedures a little fairer. We have talked to the Office of Education, we have talked to the Bureau of the Budget. As I said before, this Bill also has the merit of being less expensive than other legislation dealing with a similar subject. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook or from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, looks like it doesn't need explanation. But as the original Sponsor of the Bill providing state reimbursement for tuition and transportation for students, handicapped students who because of their nature must attend nonpublic, in other words, private special education schools and facilities, I think this is a logical improvement on that program. It provides for due process hearing. It recognizes the role of the private institutions. It's a good Bill and I support it. Thank you for supporting it."

Speaker Bradley: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 2 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2591."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2591. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Transportation Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Flinn. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne, arise?"

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just simply like to let you know my own stupidity. I didn't even punch my button. I'd like to be recorded 'aye' on that last Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave to be recorded 'aye' on 2560? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "I ask leave to be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 788. I wasn't recorded earlier and I was downstairs on other business."

Speaker Bradley: "It would save a lot of time if... if you want to



vote on it, come down to the well. 2591 is out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Out of the record, Mr. Flinn?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, the reason I'm holding that Bill, there's one in the Appropriations Committee, this is a Companion Bill and they have to run together. Try to explain that that's why I'm holding it."

Speaker Bradley: "2619."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2619. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Former Member on the floor we all knew for many years down here, Representative Capuzi, over here on my right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones, on 2619."

E. Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2619 is a similar Bill that we passed out of here last year. Under the provisions of House Bill 2619, those school districts with an average daily attendance of fifty thousand or more will be required to spend Title I monies on the students who generate those funds. That is fifty percent of the funds would be spread throughout the attendance centers in the public school system. The other fifty percent would be distributed to those students based on their percentage of the total Title I eligibles. These monies will be phased in over a three year period. The Bill passed out of Secondary and Elementary Education Committee with a unanimous vote and I solicit an 'aye' vote on this appropriation."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. I rise in support of Representative Jones' Bill as amended. I think he's worked long and hard on this proposal and he's put a responsible Amendment on to phase it in so as not to create any chaos in the present system. I would urge your favorable support of this Bill as it's now amended."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Unless Mr... All in favor of the Gentleman's... all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will



take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 1 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2650."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2650. A Bill for an Act creating the 911 Emergency Telephone System Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Katz: "In the form in which House Bill 2650 now is, it is a Study Commission designed to study the problems of securing funding for implementing a state-wide emergency telephone system in Illinois. It, as far as I know, has no opposition and Carol Burnett and Mrs. Jack Davis both support this Bill I'm very sure and we would favor a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz, I've been informed I should not allow Members to use other Members names on the floor of the House."

Katz: "Well, I didn't use another Members name."

Speaker Bradley: "I thought I heard..."

Katz: "I thought that the rules did not prohibit humor, Mr. Speaker. I think that it might be a good idea to have a little of it. Tempers are getting a little testy here today."

Speaker Bradley: "Very true. The question...the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 124 'ayes', 16 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2707."

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

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

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 2707 is a Bill which amends Section 5 of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Property Tax Relief Act. It also allows claims for the year of '72 to '77. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a senior citizen's Bill which there's about thirty percent of



people that did not file their claim. In regards to the Department's position, the Department of Revenue has no position. This is a Bill for the people and for the senior citizens. I ask you for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is... The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "I merely want to move the previous question cause we all know about these Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Mr. Mann, the Gentleman from Cook."

Mann: "I'll wait to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, fine. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't seem necessary. It's a good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question 143 'ayes', 14 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2736."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2736. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on the floor? Mr. Ryan. Take it out of the record. Is he in the Speaker's office? Out of the record. 2757."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2757. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2757 is a Bill which was on Second Reading last week and you put five Amendments on it, three of which still have an impact on the Bill. Amendment #1 provided that districts were to be allowed a three-year payback if for over... overpayment. This part of the Bill was the original part of the program. The second part of the program has been changed by Amendment #9 which provided the... an increase for Strayer-Haig districts from a



twenty-five percent add on to fifty percent, changed the limit increase from twenty-five to thirty-five percent for all districts over prior year entitlement, and also provided that no districts entitlement shall be less than ninety percent of the prior years entitlement. We increased the guaranteed assessed valuation up to the thirteen hundred dollar level as well as reducing the maximum operating tax rates by seven cents per units and four for elementary districts. One other factor that was changed is that we increased the Title I waiting from the floor of 375 to .45 if you have a state average and we reduced the maximums from a 75... or .75 add on to .675. One other Amendment was adopted by the present Speaker, was proposed by the Gentleman who is acting as the Speaker right now, Representative Bradley, which also affected the Strayer-Haig districts and increased the basic flat grant from forty-eight dollars to two hundred dollars per pupil. As the Bill stands now, there is... there are a hundred and eighteen or a hundred and nineteen million new dollars in this program and I ask for your support."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. If you'll remember, we debated this Bill very much when the Amendments were going on. We debated whether it should be moved to Third because of the fiscal note impact and I think if anyone would be willing to check the record, they show that the fiscal notes and the impacts don't tie into the present figures being given. Someone came up with a total of a hundred and one million that night, was able to move it to Third Reading. Fiscal impact by the Sponsor's admission and by the Illinois Office of Education printout is somewhere around a hundred and sixteen to a hundred and twenty million. This doesn't even talk about categorical grant funding. We're ten million over what the Governor said he'd do in all of education. Beyond that, it takes that hundred and twenty million and of that, gives somewhere around twenty million to the City of Chicago which puts it somewhere around a twenty percent or less category funding for that certain area of the state, a direct penalty to them and to no one else, and I stand in opposition



to this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "How much of... how much did you say the total cost of this Bill was now?"

Hoffman: "The total cost is a hundred and nineteen million dollars, eighteen or nineteen million dollars. There was nineteen million in the three-year payback and that's where the difference in the figures between the figures mentioned by the previous Gentleman from Cook. That's where your difference is."

Kane: "What's the total amount of money that the Governor is allocating new dollars to education this year?"

Hoffman: "Well as you know, the program that we started out with at a hundred and twenty-five million in it and this has a hundred and nineteen. The present time, the Governor's at a hundred and ten."

Kane: "And approximately how much of that would go into the formula?"

Hoffman: "That is to be decided by the General Assembly and ultimately by the Governor. What you have before you today is the desires of the Legislature... legislative action in this House last week."

Kane: "One further question. You have a proposal in there for a three-year phase in for repayment of overpayments last year. What's the cost of that proposal?"

Hoffman: "I'm sorry, I didn't catch the last sentence."

Kane: "What's the cost of that proposal and reasoning behind it? The three-year phase in."

Hoffman: "The cost of that proposal is approximately nineteen million dollars. This came out of... well, actually it's eighteen million dollars and this is a result of testimony that came before the School Problems Commission as we travelled around the state, that a number of districts who... increased in assessed valuation but between '75 and '76 had been significant and their declining enrollment caught them in the slot of having their overpayment being as high or this year being as high as the payments they would have received next year. As we looked at the list of



districts that were involved, we could see they were spread all over the state and they were districts which were hit extremely hard and this was just a way to not forgive the payments, but to make them eventually pay it back but give them three years to do it instead of one."

Kane: "Isn't it true, however, that most of these school districts would have known that they were being overpaid?"

Hoffman: "I'm sorry."

Kane: "Isn't it true that most of those districts would have known they were being overpaid?"

Hoffman: "One could assume is that given good... in most cases, given good and responsible administration of the school districts, you would assume that they ought to have known they were going to be overpaid. Some districts got caught in the slot late in terms of being notified what their increase in their assessed valuation was, however. But one should not assume that you have a thousand plus school districts that they have the kind of administrators that we would like them to have and we felt that we couldn't penalize the community and penalize the schools if there was some sloth on the part of school administrators in those particular districts."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would oppose passage of House Bill 2757 at the present time because of the... primarily because of the provision in the Bill which allocates nineteen million dollars to those districts around the state that received overpayments last year. Most of those school districts would have known that they were going to receive overpayments, they knew that they were going to be penalized in this year and there was no reason why they could not have set that money aside and held it for use this year. Half of that nineteen million dollars is going to be distributed to only sixty school districts around this state and I think that in a year of limited resources that we cannot afford to send that kind of money to those few districts, most of whom knew that they were being overpaid, most of whom could have either adjusted their figures to the Office of Education or if they could not adjust those figures, last year they could have at least set that money aside for use





this year. And I would urge a 'present' or a 'no' vote on House Bill 2757 at the present time."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman to close."

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

The Bill in its present condition affects everybody's district. You take a look at the comments made by the last Representative, this happened to be a part of the Bill that he neglected to take out by Amendment. I think that what you have here is that these school districts are located all over this state and they need help the same as anyone else does. And it's for that reason that they were included. We have in the program a total package for all the schools in the State of Illinois and it's a kind of help that school districts need and this Legislature is capable of giving and for that reason, I ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 25 'nays', 10 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2844."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2844. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Motor Fuel Tax Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2844 seeks to address a very real problem that we as practicing politicians come into contact with at every election. It's called voter apathy. Somehow, somewhere a people must find a way to inspire those that are governed to go to the polls and properly select their servants. There are many who believe that voter apathy is a cancer that can destroy democracy if it isn't remedied. We have a Bill here and I want to publicly say thank you to the gifted, learned Speaker of this House for joining me in the Sponsorship of it. We seek to address the problem by allocating motor fuel tax on the basis of the primary vote turnout for municipalities. Now let me explain it to you just for a moment if I may. Motor fuel tax is a big money item - \$377.5 million were distributed



in 1977 throughout the State of Illinois in motor fuel tax. There's a formula that provides who gets what. One-fifth of it goes into the Road Fund for local distribution. Then there's the item for boats, then thirty-two percent of the remainder goes to municipalities and is presently distributed on the basis of the census - strictly on a population census basis. It's the ratio of what your town has to the total population of the state. We propose that we adopt a new rule and just take the primary vote in both parties, combine them and the ratio that that bears to the total state population would be the basis for the distribution of this fund. I guarantee you and none will dispute that this rule would as easy to fly as the present formula, be absolutely no expense to the State of Illinois. It would not go into effect until the year 1981. It would be based on the 1980 census so everyone starts even. Now I've gone on bended knee to practically every Member of this House to plead with you, I will if you'll wait, to plead with you for your support in regard to this Bill. And I find two interesting observations. There are many who have said to me, 'We think it's better that so many do not go to the polls in the primaries.' I've been appalled how many feel that way. Doggone it, we must believe that the democracy should be a participation sport rather than a spectator sport. And you cannot have a democratic form of government if it's elitists, just where a handful of people select the nominees of their parties in the primary. I urge you not to believe that the cause of good government is in any way served by keeping down voter turnout. And yet some of you kind of have that notion in your mind. The second thing that's been said to me as I have plead with you for your votes has been, 'it'll help Chicago.' Well doggone it, Chicago is a part of the State of Illinois and it will not help Chicago and it will not hurt Chicago. It puts everybody off at the same start in this race. It gives the voters an incentive, it gives them some purpose to go to the polls because it will affect in some degree the amount of motor fuel tax that comes to each municipality. Those communities that show the maximum of citizenship concern will get a few more dollars than those that do not. I'm proud to assure



you that many groups, many newspapers have endorsed this concept. WGN had an editorial on behalf of it. I urge it for your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'noes' have it and the Gentleman's motion fails. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Very seldom do we see a Bill come into this House that shows creativity, imagination. I am really amazed, I think this is an excellent Bill. It's too bad we have to reward voters to get out and vote, but if that's the way it has to be, so be it. I commend my colleague on the other side of the aisle for being the Sponsor of this Bill and very seldom do we agree on anything. But I think this is an excellent Bill and it shows imagination which we don't see very often around here. So I hope everybody votes for it."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Cunningham, will you tell me why the primary election was chosen as a base as opposed to the general election?"

Cunningham: "It was thought that we ought to get people in the habit, started to vote early in the season and then they would vote... let me finish. Then they would vote again in the fall. And others felt that the primary was the preferable place to begin because it would guarantee that the nominee in either party would be the choice of the majority members of that party. We think that it'll stimulate voter turnout for that purpose. We hope it would serve good government by that reason."

Madison: "Representative Cunningham, you are aware, of course, that at least in Cook County, I don't know about the other counties, but at least in Cook County in terms of the slating mechanism, Ward and Township Committeemen are both on slating based on a



weighted factor related to the turnout in the primary... the previous primary. Are you aware of that?"

Cunningham: "Yes, I am."

Madison: "Well then, it would seem to me that this Bill does more... is equally designed to reward Ward Committeemen and Township Committeemen as it is to reward others. Is that a fair analysis?"

Cunningham: "It will award... it will reward every community and every citizen who has enough civic pride to get out and vote and urge his neighbor to do likewise. It plays no favorites in the benefits it'll bestow."

Madison: "Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Madison: "Speaker, I al... too, commend the Sponsor for his foresight in the presentation of this kind of distribution of the motor fuel taxes. I think it might be not in the best interest that this be attached to the primaries, but rather the general election. I'm not opposed to the concept. I am, however, opposed to it, the basis being used for the primary election. And therefore, I'm going to vote 'present'."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can understand what the Gentleman is trying to do. If he would like to put in a Bill where the downstate rural areas would be paid according to the mileage or to the population whichever's the greater so that they'd get their fair share of motor fuel tax, I would go along with that. But can you imagine what this is going to do in the big metropolitan areas of this state? They're going to get that machine vote out and these municipalities are going to be getting less money and less money. Now if this Gentleman wants to put in a Bill for the rural areas like Tipword was talking about yesterday where they have miles they don't have people. I would be most happy to introduce a Bill to help the rural areas downstate to come up with a Bill like that - a prorational share of the mileage that you have instead of per capita. But this is nothing, this is nothing but a real boondoggle for these municipalities that will get the primary vote out and you people will get less and less



money downstate. This is a bad Bill. It should be defeated, Roscoe."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "Well, I think this Bill has a lot to commend it. First of all, we all know that in the City of Chicago the Democratic machine likes a low turnout because it means that it's mostly their voters who are voting and we saw in this last primary that because of that, Representatives Houlihan, Levin and Holewinski lost. Now I think if this goes into effect, a low turnout would punish Chicago and I think that when good Legislators like those are defeated, that Chicago's roads ought to go to pot. Secondly, I think that this may be exactly the kind of Bill that'll encourage some of those from Chicago who haven't voted for open primaries to support it so that there is a greater turnout in the primary election so that they get more of that road money. And so for those reasons, I'm going to support this Bill."

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

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent Bill and I think we can go for this because it would act as an inducement to get the people out to vote. It's a shame the way our people in our state here are so lacksi... lacksadicecal(sic) about coming out to vote and this would really spur 'em on to come out and vote. And it would act as a going-away present for the Sponsor, Mr. Cunningham. I think we ought to support this Bill to the hilt."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Minority Spokesman on the Appropriation I Committee knows how much I admire him and the fact that he has many unique ways about him. He has a talent about him and he is very innovative. But let me tell you what this Bill is really meant to do. This is... and you can't, you know, according to the rules, I cannot mention anybody's name in debate. This Bill is intended to bring somebody back to Congress that couldn't make it in his primary election. He knows that he needed a big voter turnout to get to Congress. He can't do it in any other way unless he can pass a



Bill that will bring more voters out in his district and then maybe he'll have a chance to go to Congress. If I knew that that would bring him there, I'd vote for it because I think he'd make an excellent Congressman although I believe we're going to have a Democrat in Congress so it wouldn't do him a damn bit of good anyhow. But Roscoe, I'm afraid I'm going to have to vote against you but I know what your intent is and I'm sorry I can't help you with it."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Willer commended the Sponsor for his thoughtfulness and imagination and Representative Madison for his ingenuity. I would commend him for his sense of humor. I think this is the funniest, kinkiest Bill that I have seen this Session or any Session almost. Think of the Amendments we could have put on it at the Second Reading. We could have put any, maybe the district that has more people under 5'6", it would be... more redheads or more any... 5'7". Okay, 5'7", or any outrageous kind of criteria. I think Roscoe Cunningham has one of the great sense of humor and I think that... I'd like to vote 'aye', but I'm going to have to vote 'no' on this Bill. It's just an outrageously funny Bill. I'm going to vote 'no' on it, but with a smile."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, on the Bill."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative, do you have some kind of a printout that would indicate to us how the distribution under your Bill would compare to the current distribution in terms of percentage of the money?"

Cunningham: "Yes, we checked the figures on the 1976... '78 election that just passed and it depended upon the areas where there were races. In the Winnebago area they had a particularly fine turnout because they had a sharp race and the vote was, in Chicago, was rather strong this past time."

Satterthwaite: "So I guess I'm more concerned with the particular



counties in my district. Then can you tell me what would happen to Champaign, Moultrie and Douglas Counties under your Bill?"

Cunningham: "Your turnout was just average in those counties. State-wide..."

Satterthwaite: "I'm not asking what the turnout was. I'm asking how the percentage of the distribution of funds would change if this Bill passed."

Cunningham: "I would hope that you would get more money because..."

Satterthwaite: "I would hope so, too, but I want to know if you have those figures."

Cunningham: "On the '78 election, you would just break even where you are in Champaign County. Now I guarantee that answer to you. The state-wide total is 24.6 and you were there."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know that in the past when we have had Education Bills before us that changed the distribution of state funds for those services we have demanded that we have some kinds of figures as to how the distribution will change. Lacking any really concrete information about how this would change the distribution of funds, I feel that I cannot support this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr. Cunningham to close the debate."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there isn't one of us when we have been asked in any kind of a civic gathering whether we believe that voter apathy is a serious problem has failed to respond immediately that it is a serious problem. We watch after one election after another, one primary after another as the total percentage of voters diminishes. We set a new record here in Illinois in the last election and it wasn't a very proud record. It's 24.6 percent of the people that are civic minded enough, concerned enough to go to the polls and vote. That's the lowest it's every been and I predict that in 1980, unless some



new approach is brought it'll go lower. I would ask those of you who have reservations, what is your solution to this problem? We've had people say that the solution is to move it back to better weather. Well, I submit there's nothing to show in past records that that brings anyone... any additional voters to the polls. We've had people say it's an educational problem. A hundred years we've had compulsory education in Illinois and we've shown no progress whatever in persuading the citizens that it is the duty of that citizenship to go to the polls. You've got to have some form of incentive to have the citizenry discharge their duties. Patriotic oratory about a free man's sacred right and duty to vote being cherished forever just doesn't get the job done. I ask you to look at the record in that regard. I ask you to ask yourself in your own mind, what can I do to change it? And if you have a better solution, introduce the Bill. If you have it, let's give it a green light and give it a try. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote for one minute."

Skinner: "Well, I'm sure everybody that lives along Route 51 is going to vote for this because we know that people want that road fixed so badly that they will turn out and vote if they know that there is a direct causal relationship. They've been voting for Governors for six, six Governors and nothing... no Governor but Governor Thompson's going to deliver on the promise to build Route 51. And this is going to help him build it."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, to explain his vote for one minute."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of ways to get more people out in primaries. One way would be to pass the Bill that Dave Robinson has for an open primary. I think that this method possibly would work, too, to get more people to turn out in primaries. Roscoe Cunningham should be commended. I think this is Roscoe's last Bill that he has, so why don't we pass it over to the Senate and let them work on it over there?"

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook,





J. Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is a rare opportunity to rise to be able to speak in support of one of the Gentleman's Bills. I think it's the first time for me personally. But I think this Bill is a good Bill. It doesn't, as one of the previous speakers talked about, doesn't gear the funding mechanism to an arbitrary kind of characteristic like size or height or color of hair, but rather on local initiative. This is...(microphone turned off)."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 'ayes', 75 'nays'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Amendment... or Constitutional Majority is hereby declared... the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "The Bill is lost. 2903."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2903. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, arise?"

Telcser: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your inquiry."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I asked the Chair what your intent is regarding the rest of the Calendar for the rest of this week. Now rumors are abounding around the floor that either there's going to be user lists thrust upon us or that you are going to adjourn tomorrow and leave the Member's Bills on the Calendars to die. Now, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2903 is a Bill that I'm sure is going to take a great deal of time, a great deal of debate and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members are entitled to know what your plans are. Now I understand that because of the President's visit tomorrow we're going to have to adjourn at three or four o'clock today so that the security people can come into the chamber and get set up for the presidential visit tomorrow. I also am sure that their visit tomorrow will cause a great deal of delay and wasted time. So for all practical purposes, Mr. Speaker, we've



got about two hours left in this year's Session to deal with House Bills. Now I think you have an obligation to the Members of both sides of the aisle to let them know now what your plans are."

Speaker Bradley: "All those things you referred to are rumors."

Telcser: "Well, if you could allay, could allay the fears or the rumors that..."

Speaker Bradley: "2903. Mr. Telcser, it's the intention... the intent of the Chair very shortly to give all the Members a schedule for, not only for the rest of this week, for next week also and we're working on that. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, it's not just a schedule. It's the fate of their Bills. Democratic Members are coming to me and to Representative Ryan and asking us to help them with their Bills. Now what is your intent, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "We're going to find out who those Members are. House Bill 2903. Would... everybody on our side, the Democratic side of the aisle quit going to Mr. Telcser. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Ryan: "An hour or so ago I asked you what the intent of the Chair was for today's schedule. I haven't heard a word yet and now we're going to go into a Bill that I'm sure is going to take a great deal of time and debate. And I really think it's very unfair for you to treat the Members the way you're treating them. And I want it understood now, Mr. Speaker that we will oppose your users list, we'll have no part of it. You did it to us two years ago, you're not going to do it to us again. So don't come out with a users list and try and ram all these Bills down our throat cause it isn't going to happen."

Speaker Bradley: "The record will so show that Mr. Ryan objects to any usury list being prepared. And if anybody's preparing one, stop preparing. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, on 2903. And incidentally, I think on the last Bill, Education Bill, there were only two lights flashing for two Members to speak on the Bill



and we went to the motion on whether it would pass or not. So 2903, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I think that point is well taken given the fact we only had two speakers on that Bill. This particular Bill is as well as the Bill, two Bills ago, an Amendment to the school aid formula. It differs somewhat from the previous Bill in that it costs less, but it distributes money, I believe, on a fair basis. As all you know in voting here the other day and casting a hundred and twelve affirmative votes for the Amendment offered by Representative Kane to my Bill that that Amendment and the other provisions of this Bill provide for redistribution of money under the school aid formula in a manner that is beneficial especially to downstate and suburban areas. I will submit, too, however, that the City of Chicago still gets 31 percent of the new revenue generated by this Bill over the cost of the formula last year. We have talked about, I think, all of the issues involved with this Bill. I would not burden the Membership going through the technicalities unless there are questions. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call pointing out that this Bill is, has a cost factor of some eighty-three million dollars above last year's school aid funding level as opposed to the previous Bill which cost a hundred and twenty million dollars above last year's level. I would be willing to answer questions."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as Joint Sponsor on this Bill, I would like to just say to the Members of the Body that it was my understanding that I had a commitment that we were going to go with the Bill as it was produced in Committee and going out to the floor. This has been entirely changed by Amendments and I stand in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to point out that this Bill is significantly different from the Bill that we just passed - 2757. There is no three-year payback in this Bill and that could significantly affect a number of districts in a very major way that are in some

of your representative districts. I might also point out that the Amendment that was adopted to provide a flat grant increase for Strayer-Haig Districts from a base of forty-eight dollars to two hundred dollars is the kind of Amendment that can really help a lot of your downstate districts. And this is not included in this Bill. We have passed a formula Bill out over in the Senate which addresses a... more needs that this particular Bill does and for that reason, I rise in opposition to 2903."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. There is only... there wasn't anybody else anyway. The question is... all right. On the... the Gentleman's motion, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment's... or the motion is adopted. The question is... Mr. Stuffle to close the debate."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, very briefly. I think it should be pointed out somewhat in contradiction to two of the previous speakers that they were aware that this Amendment was coming along, aware all the time. The Amendment was on their desks. It was adopted by 112 Members which is effectively the Bill now. The Bill does address the problems of the school districts in this state, I believe, in a fair manner. It does as I pointed out, can cost eighty-three million dollars versus a hundred and twenty million dollars in the previous Gentleman's Bill and it does, it does, I reiterate, address the problems of the Strayer-Haig Districts. It is supported, I might add, by the Illinois School Board Association, School Administrators Association, Farm Bureau, two hundred and seventy-nine letters from school superintendents by the three hundred and twelve member Elementary District Consortium by the Illinois Education Association and by a number of people who want to see fair share funding for once in Illinois under the school aid formula. I would ask for passage of 2903."

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



Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

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

I'd just like to point out to the Members of the House this is exactly the kind of treatment you're going to get and this is just the beginning. We got a Bill with eighty-two million dollars and we're now going to invoke the gag rule on the Members of the House. No debate, not a chance to discuss the Bill, move the previous question and gag everybody in the chambers."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ryan, just a minute. For what purpose the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise? Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I rise for a point of order. Nobody invoked the gag rule. There were no lights up there according to what the Speaker said. Secondly, we voted on a motion to prevail. I didn't hear any noise of anybody voting against that motion that prevailed... to close debate. The Members here have a right to vote any way they want when a person makes a motion. And I object to anybody telling me that I can't vote 'yes' or 'no' on a motion that's pending on the floor. I and all of the Members have that right. No Leader, Democrat or Republican, can tell me I can't vote the way I want. Nobody invokes the gag rule here."

Speaker Bradley: "The point's well taken. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, to explain his vote."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think his point is well taken at all. I think it's a terrible point. But that's the way you fellows are used to operating. We've already voted on one school Bill here today and we don't need another. You want to confuse the issue, you haven't had a chance to debate a Bill that's worth eighty-two million dollars and I think you ought to vote 'no' on this issue just based on the principle and the treatment that has just begun for each of you individual Members of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I find it amusing considering some of the previous statements by the Gentleman from Kankakee and from suburban Cook is that we just passed out a Bill that appropriated a hundred and... or a hundred and twenty million

dollars with very little debate. This Bill contains most of the provisions of that other Bill, costs forty-million dollars less. And I think what's happening here is it sounds like the... some of the Republican side of the aisle wanted to break the bank. But I do think that the provisions of the, of the formula Bills in both Bills, provisions of the formula are important in that we are looking for a fair share of the school aid dollar for down-state, suburban Cook. Both of those Bills, the one that we just passed and this one, provide that. This, I think, is a cleaner Bill in that it does not contain some of the provisions of the other Bill, most of which designate money for a very small number of districts and I would urge an 'aye' vote on here if we are going to have a choice on school aid formulas this year. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted recognition to let you know that it get a... should this Bill have 89 votes, I'd like a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that this Bill doesn't have that the other one has is a three-year payback. Now the previous speaker pointed out that in the school boards know that they are being overpaid and the answer is absolutely right. They knew they were being overpaid, but they were so far in the hole that they had to pay and use what was being advanced. Now this will give the school districts that were overpaid three years to pay that back and I think this is a very important feature that was in the last Bill that isn't in this Bill. Therefore, I think we should go with the last Bill, send one Bill over to the Senate and defeat this one."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes' and 60 'nays' and 13 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."



Stuffle: "Put that on Postponed please."

Speaker Bradley: "Place the Bill on Postponed Consideration. Mr. David Jones wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye', Sir? 2946."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2946. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2946 does two things. The original Bill amends the Orphanage Act and allows districts that have children placed by the state in state residential units to claim reimbursement for children in the residential units or if they're forced to receive private special education facilities in the district, to also claim under that section. It's supported by the Office of Education and it clears up a misunderstanding and discrepancy in Article XIV and I don't believe there would be anyone in opposition to it. The final Amendment we put on this Bill, Amendment #3, was quite simple. It took a concept that Representative Hoffman had and that Representative Yourell had and extended the limitation, the present eight-year limitation on the special education building tax and to remove the eight-year limitation. It does not allow the districts to spend the money for any purpose, additional purpose than the ones they could have spent earlier and that is building, maintenance and operations of buildings for special education. There's no state funds involved in that concept and the fiscal note filed by the Office of Education shows no fiscal impact on the state. I believe the Bill as it now stands, Amendment #1 having been tabled, is basically noncontroversial and should pass the House today."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner. Would somebody turn off J. Houlihan's light? It continues to flash. Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Skinner: "Is Amendment #3 still on?"

Pierce: "Yes, Amendment #3 is on. Amendment #1 was tabled and Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Amendment #3 is still on, yes."

Skinner: "Amendment #3 seems to allow the imposition of a tax law



to referendum. Is that correct?"

Pierce: "Yeah, it extends the eight-year education building tax that had existed heretofore and I believe you're correct. There's no referendum on that tax."

Skinner: "Well, I'm not sure anybody heard you so let me repeat it again. The Sponsor has answered that this Bill contains a tax rate increase without a referendum. Now it's not actually an increase, it's the maintenance of a tax that has been levied by the General Assembly for eight years and is now automatically self-destructing, something that doesn't often happen to local property taxes. It seems to me that if special education has sold itself, it ought to be able to self itself at the polls. Seems to me that it ought to be able, we ought, the people who support special education have had eight years to build the buildings and if they're not built yet, they ought to be able to go to the voters and to sell that concept that they need extra money to build the building. I see no reason for the General Assembly to vote for a tax increase that is a... It really is a tax increase because it would be decreased otherwise without a referendum. And for that reasons, I shall not support the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to close the debate."

Pierce: "The Gentleman pointed out correctly..."

Speaker Bradley: "Turn on Mr. Pierce. He's on."

Pierce: "Okay. The Gentleman pointed out correctly that all we're doing here is continuing an existing levy. Some districts levy it and some don't and that's a matter of local option. The levy is only two cents for elementary districts and for unit districts, four cents. That's a maximum. We've lived with it for eight years. All the buildings were not completed and were not build and, therefore, the Office of Education agreed to the extension. I talked to the Bureau of the Budget. They have no disagreement with the extension. The basic part of the Bill amends the Orphanage Act in a way that is needed by many districts that have children placed there by the State of Illinois and have to educate those children. I don't believe this concept is controversial at all. The House





adopted the Amendment and, therefore, I ask you to pass House Bill 2946 which only maintains the existing special education levy where the districts choose to maintain it on a local option basis."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 110 'ayes', thirty... 109 'ayes', 35 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3051."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3051. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale on credit and the lending of money. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Please don't read into this Bill any more than it is. It's a very simple piece of legislation. Last Session, last Session, I had House Bill 548 which provided for refinancing of first mortgages and for contract for deeds. If you recall in that piece of legislation, we said for written contracts and refinancing, in other words, contract for deed, those real estate loans could be two and a half percent above the monthly index of long-term United States Government Bond yields. Well, what we did... what I failed to do in House Bill 548 was to provide for some exemptions. All this Bill does is say that the.. that present law which is two and a half percent above the monthly index of long-term United States Government Bond yields certain contracts or certain sales would be exempted and those exemptions would be real estate used to secure a loan to a business association or co-partnership, loans made in accordance with the United States Housing and Renovation and Modernization Act, loans issued under the National Housing Act, V.A. loans, loans made under the Consumer Installment Loan Act, loans made under the Housing Act of 1949, loans made under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. Those were exemptions under Section 4(a) that should have been amended in that



Bill, House Bill 548, that I failed to do. And I'd move for the passage of House Bill 3051."

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

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, I thank you. One of those Members who was just talking to Mr. Telcser is Mr. Brady. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, what rate of interest will these loans go to now? It'll go much higher than nine and half percent will it not?"

McClain: "Mr. Darrow, those are all loans that are already... or should have been exempted before. Those loans are also loans negotiated between, for instance, V.A. loan and the purchaser which are federal loans that are direct... usually below the two and a half percent above the monthly index of long-term United States Government Bond yields. In fact, these are exemptions to that and the confusion is that some of the lawyers in the state and banks in the state were confused whether or not they would have to start being the conduit, for instance, on the National Housing Act would have to abide by the two and a half percent above the monthly index of long-term United States Government Bond yields which would be larger, higher percentage of interest than what the National Housing Act loan would have been."

Darrow: "Well, now that you evaded my question, I'll go back to it. How high a rate of interest will you be charging on these loans? It'll be higher than nine and a half percent. How high will it go? Eighteen percent, twenty-one percent or how high?"

McClain: "Well, obviously, Mr. Darrow, you didn't pay any attention to me. They will not be."

Darrow: "There'll be no limit on it whatsoever, will there?"

McClain: "Sir, again, these are exemptions that had been provided for before House Bill 548 which are basically federal loans to purchasers..."

Darrow: "Yes, but as long as we have them included in this, we have a limit on how high they can go. Don't we?"

McClain: "Well, the limit is sort of a double-edged blade because most of those loans are below two and a half percent of the monthly



yield."

Darrow: "Well, then they can charge below that amount and there's no need for us to change this. The maximum would be above two and a half percent."

McClain: "But as you know, Clarence, they end up not doing that."

Darrow: "Thank you. I'd like to address this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Darrow: "Briefly, I don't see any need for this legislation at the present time. We've gone through this before. We've gone through it two or three years and what we're doing now is excluding certain types of loans from the usury rate that we set. We had quite a fight down here over setting this and establishing it. We are now removing a limit on a certain class of loans. We don't have any idea how high they can go. The poor fellow that's going to go out and have to borrow money will have to pay an extremely high rate of interest. And I would urge my Members... my fellow Legislators to vote against this legislation and not raise this rate for the poor little guy. Thank you."

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

Hanahan: "The Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Hanahan: "Representative, could you demonstrate the emergency? I mean, we're in an emergency Session. Could you demonstrate to the Members of the House who there is an existing emergency for this Bill?"

McClain: "Well, for two main reasons. One, there's a... with House Bill 548 which is my Bill I failed to exempt these loans from the interest rate so the confusion there is that they don't know exactly what interest rate to charge when they are going to the purchasers. The second one is, as you probably know, the front page of the Chicago Sun Times a couple of weeks ago, money's drying up anyway and this would... would like, for instance, V.A. loans would not dry up that V.A. loan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for the life of me I can't figure out any emergency being, you know, evident today by any statement made by the Sponsor of the legislation except



that somebody wants to charge a little more money for certain types of loans that are money borrowed by working people in this state. I might point out that some people think that industry is dried up or industry moves from a state or industry somehow doesn't expand because of workmen's compensation or unemployment insurance taxes. Well, I say to those Gentlemen that if you ever want to see industry dry up, if you ever want to see construction slow down, if you want to see people refusing to purchase long-term loans made in this state, just keep allowing the interests to rise. The facts remain today that we have done nothing to curb the high spiral of the cost of money in this state. Now somewhere, somehow there must have been a valid reason a hundred years ago when the usury limitation laws were first addressed by a state Legislature. Not everyone looks to Washington to curb the high costs of borrowing money. Sometimes, we in this General Assembly, are going to have to address ourselves to saying 'no' to the greed and to the constant pressure that's put to bear on this General Assembly to sell money at a higher interest rate and that's all we're talking about here. And if you continue to allow interest rates to rise in Illinois, pretty soon nobody will borrow so we won't care about where the money is deposited because there won't be any borrowing, there won't be any building. And when you shut down your construction industry because of the high cost of interest, let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, you're shutting down your biggest single industry in this state. And when that's shut down, you'll see a depression and you could only blame yourself for one reason - the high cost of borrowing money is what's going to ruin the business community and the free enterprise system in this state. America and Illinois was founded on the principle of cheap money, where not like in England, not like in Italy or Germany or Ireland where it's common to charge eighteen percent for money. In America it was very common to borrow money at six percent. Now we're talking about removing any limitation on some of these types of loans just to provide for the greed of some people who want to charge eighteen percent, thirty percent or any other kind of amount. Abraham Lincoln served in the



Illinois General Assembly and it's part of history that while he served in the General Assembly, he stood for a limit on the amount of interest to be charged on loans in this state at twelve percent. He wasn't wrong, people who continue to raise the interest rates of this state are absolutely wrong and contrary to a free enterprise system. They're going to destroy it with their greed."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, may I address a query to the Sponsor?"

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly, indicates he'll yield."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, I'd like to make a query of you. If I recall correctly, was that House Bill 548 the one sponsored which made the floating interest rate possible?"

McClain: "That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "Now, but wasn't there a limitation on it?"

McClain: "Two and a half percent above the monthly yield index."

Geo-Karis: "And when you say that your Bill wants to make installments loans secured by residential real estate be exempt from this rate, what exactly do you mean?"

McClain: "Well, previously before House Bill 548 on the user, usury, we exempted certain loans from that usury and those loans were, for instance, V.A. loans or loans made to the Consumer Installment Loan Act or loans made under like the Housing Act of 1949."

Geo-Karis: "The V.I. loans, the V.A. loans."

McClain: "Yeah, we exempted all those from our usury."

Geo-Karis: "But those are the only ones, were they not?"

McClain: "And that's all I'm trying to do is include those exemptions again."

Geo-Karis: "So if your Bill were to pass today and you would exempt residential real estate from the floating usury ceiling Bill which was made into law, which was 548, then what you're saying in effect is that if someone buys real estate, residential real estate on a land contract and the present floating usury ceiling is about ten and one-fourth percent, then they'd have to pay ten and one-fourth percent. But if your Bill does not pass, the most they would have to pay would be, what is it? Nine and a half percent?"

McClain: "No, you're talking about different kinds of things there."



Geo-Karis: "Well, that's what I'd like to have differentiated."

McClain: "You kind of amalgamated contract for deed and, for instance, those loans that were exempt that I wanted to exempt again, like a V.A. loan. A V.A. loan would not be, would not be part of a contract for deed. It would be part of financing for mortgage."

Geo-Karis: "That's right. Well, the V.A...."

McClain: "But your confusion, your confusion... you're confusing contract for deed and the financing of mortgage."

Geo-Karis: "Yeah, but the V.A. and F.H.A. loans are exempt automatically by the prior Bill anyway."

McClain: "No, they weren't. I failed to exempt those."

Geo-Karis: "But those are federal loans and..."

McClain: "I know, but I failed... that's what it is. This is just a clean-up Bill. All this does is exempt those loans that should be exempted."

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will have to vote 'present' on this because I have a conflict of interest. But I would like to say that this Bill by exempting these installment loans secured by residential real estate will make it possible for loans for real estate...for land contracts to be charged ten and a half percent interest, even twelve percent interest if it becomes necessary and I don't know that we're ready at this time."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

J. Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

J. Dunn: "Under the provisions of this Bill, Representative, will it be possible to make, to secure home improvement loans by mortgages on real estate? That's what the synopsis indicates."

McClain: "Excuse me, only if it's a refinancing of the mortgage."

J. Dunn: "It can't be..."

McClain: "...an additional loan, that's wouldn't be."

J. Dunn: "Well, the synopsis says that and the analysis says that this Bill accepts interest rates established in this Act in



certain installment loans secured by real estate from the general interest rate limitations..."

McClain: "The only two, John..."

J. Dunn: "At the present time, I don't think you can put a real estate mortgage on a home improvement loan. I wonder if your Bill will now permit that."

McClain: "No, the only two... the only two issues that we're concerned with are the contract for deed, a written contract and a refinancing of a mortgage."

J. Dunn: "Well, in answer to my question, will your Bill permit a real estate mortgage to be placed on a home improvement loan?"

McClain: "No."

J. Dunn: "Thank you."

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

W. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that the Bill does exactly what the last Gentleman questioned. It does permit real estate to be used as security for a home improvement loan. And while that may not technically be a mortgage, it comes very close to it. And it, my objection to this Bill is that it permits that usage to increase the usury rate from the present what would be ten or ten and a quarter percent to perhaps fifteen percent. And I object to the Gentleman's Bill not for the reasons that some of the other people do. I... there is indeed a shortage of money, but that shortage ought to be addressed by increasing perhaps the usury level. I believe money like everything else is a supply and demand situation and I see no point in passing this Bill because the effect of it is going to be to raise interest rates for the people who can least afford to, the unsophisticated home improvement buyer or the unsophisticated borrower. So I think perhaps we ought to address this question, the shortage of money, in a different way and I would oppose this Bill and so does W. Timothy Simms and Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All



in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to close the debate."

McClain: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think I've over-educated Tom Hanahan on the user... usury and I think also there are some other problems whenever you amend the Interest Act. People see red herrings. Basically all this Bill does is clarify what we should have done last Session by, in House Bill 548 exempting certain federal loans and other loans that, from the two and a half percent above the monthly index of long-term United States Government yields. Basically that's all it does. It was previously exempted. All we're trying to do is place that back in as before. I know that a lot of people see Interest Act and they see a red herring. This Bill is endorsed by the Association for Modern Banking in Illinois and by the Illinois Banks Association. And I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the... whether this Bill should pass. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote." Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "...that the Gentleman may have said it, an exemption, for an exemption. And when you exempt an exemption, you may be back to where you are. So as a matter of fact, I think that it may well be that if this Bill were to pass and be law, they would be bound by eight percent, by their regular contract. So I don't even think that the Bill would be good for passing even if you agreed with Mr. McClain. He's not listening, but he may hope that this Bill doesn't pass."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 38 'ayes', 72 'nays'. This Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was off the floor for the vote on 2757 and 2903. I'd like leave to be recorded as 'aye'. It won't change the result in either case."





Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, he'll be so... That 2903, there's no Roll Call on 2903... It's on Postponed Consideration. What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, arise?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for that same consideration on House Bill 2757, leave of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "2757, does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 2757? Hearing no objection, he'll so be...be so recorded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Pechous."

Pechous: "I, too, Mr. Speaker, would ask leave to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 2757 which again will not influence the final result."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman... hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 2757. Mr. Byers, what purpose do you rise?"

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the Members when they add their names to the Roll Call, it makes a lot of extra work for the Clerk of the House and for the secretaries and I think they should be here to vote on the Bills and if they're not, just leave it blank. And I think they should remember these other people."

Speaker Bradley: "Point's well taken. 3119."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3119. A Bill for an Act relating to the filing of returns under Retailers Occupation Tax Act and Use Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien on the floor. Out of the record. Resolutions, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read House Joint Resolution 91 please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Clerk will read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 91, Madigan. Be it resolved by the House of Representative of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that the time set by Senate Joint Resolution 88 for the Joint Session on Friday, May 26, 1978 be, and is hereby, reset for 8:30 a.m."

D. Houlihan: "I move the adoption of House Joint Resolution 91, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of House Joint Resolution 91. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Jim Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be appropriate to amend that Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "Do you have an Amendment?"

J. Houlihan: "Oh, the Amendment has to be written? I wonder maybe we could hold it. We had some trouble with Bills and the schedule and that. Maybe we should amend that Resolution in terms of what we do."

Speaker Bradley: "It's not a House Resolution, it's a House Joint Resolution."

J. Houlihan: "Right."

Speaker Bradley: "And what do you want to do with it, Sir?"

J. Houlihan: "We want to hold it and maybe we'll amend that, maybe we can consider amending that so that we might conduct an orderly adjournment before the holiday and..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady. Mr. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I would persist in my motion and I move the adoption of House Joint Resolution 91."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion on House Joint Resolution 95 signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. There are 104 'ayes', 14 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and House Joint Resolution 91 is adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 892. Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois that the provisions of subsections (f) and (g) of Rule 9.1 be readopted; and be it further resolved, that all House Bills on the Order of Third Reading be placed on the Short Debate Calendar and be considered under Rule 9.1 (f); and be it further resolved, that this reinstatement of Rule 9.1 (g) and (f) be rescinded as of the deadline for passage of House Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think this is a procedure



which has served the House well in the past especially the time when House Members were concerned about not being able to hear their particular Bill before a deadline. I think I might also reinforce my position on this is that I don't have a piece of legislation now pending before the House that will be caught by the deadline. But I have been in that position before and I know that every Member in this House would like to hear his Bill before the deadline. I think that the Short Debate Calendar that we put together a year or so ago did serve the House well and I would ask the House to adopt this Resolution. It is presently assigned to Rules and I move at this time to discharge the Committee on Rules for immediate consideration of House Resolution 892."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to arise to oppose the Gentleman's Resolution. I don't know why Members simply because their Bills were delayed for a variety of reasons should be caught without a fair hearing regarding their Bills. This is obviously a Resolution intended to speed up the closing moments of a Calendar deadline situation which I really believe is not fair to all of the Members of the House, particularly those who have Bills yet remaining on the Calendar. And so I think we ought to, as I said earlier, I'd like to know from the Speaker what his intent is regarding the deadlines. I see he's distributed a House schedule for next week in which he brings us back into Session on Thursday. Now prior to his decision to do this, we were under the impression that we were going to have no Session at all next week, that we would be adjourning tomorrow and coming back hopefully on Monday, June 5th so the Members could have a week off for the holidays and to take a rest before the hectic closing weeks of the Session. It seems to me, it seems to me that if the Speaker's going to insist upon bringing us back on Thursday, June 1 and all the Bills are dead as of tomorrow night which really means dead the next hour, there's no reason why we could not perhaps consider extending the deadline until Friday, June 2 in view of the fact that the Speaker's already bringing us in. And it is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I'm opposing House Resolution 892 because I still



think that it ought to be opportunity for a number of the Members and Leaders to meet and discuss the scheduling problems."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I rise to urge support for the Gentleman's motion in support of this Resolution. It is quite obvious that we are confronted with a Calendar that is loaded with Bills, quite obviously we will have a difficult time considering all of these Bills. We have moved to a logjam situation as Representative Mudd has explained. This technique has worked to facilitate the consideration of Bills in the past. All it simply says is that one person will speak as a proponent, another person will speak as an opponent and then we will close the debate. It has worked successfully before and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is... Mr. Mudd, do you wish to close?"

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, again, I think that every Member in the House, his particular piece of legislation is important to him. It's also important to me. It's important to the people of Illinois. And I think that this is an opportunity to speed up the procedure of the House, to give the opportunity to the people of Illinois to have their particular problems addressed prior to a deadline. It requires 107 votes to do this. It does not cut off the explanation of votes. Everyone will have an opportunity. I think that it provides for a good, orderly debate and also remarks from the other Members of the House and I would ask each and every one to think very seriously about this regardless of when we put off the deadline, whatever we do. I think it's time now that we do adopt this and give every Member of this House regardless of his political party an opportunity to address his legislation before the people of Illinois and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall the Committee on Rules be discharged for immediate consideration of House Resolution 392? All those in... or 892. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. And the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."



Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to necessarily oppose this motion, but I want to call attention to the Membership of once more agreement among Leadership without consultation with the Membership. What if some of us among the Membership had important reason for extending the deadline? Would we be consulted, we be given the same opportunity? It's because there are interests, vested interests in Bills like off-track betting that this arrangement has been made. I only wish that our Leadership and it is enlightened on both sides of the aisle, it is enlightened Leadership. Why can't we as Members be consulted so that we have a voice in the decision making? I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners. It takes 107 votes."

Kempiners: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If I understand correctly, the motion is to discharge this Resolution from the Rules Committee, is that correct?"

Speaker Bradley: "That's correct."

Kempiners: "All right, my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is what provision in the rule allows us to discharge anything from Rules Committee? The reason I ask that question is that there are Members of this Body who have had motions before this Body to discharge Bills from that Committee and the Speaker has ruled that there is no provision in the rules for discharge from Rules Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "On Bills, you're right. There isn't any provision, but this is a Resolution and go to 72(d) and look at 72(d)."

Kempiners: "Well, would you like to explain what 72(d) is, Mr. Speaker, while I..."

Speaker Bradley: "Look in your rule book."

Kempiners: "I've got a green book."

Speaker Bradley: "72(d). Any Resolution proposing to amend a House Rule or Joint Rule which is offered by a Member on the floor shall be referred to the Committee on Rules, notwithstanding the provision of Rule 66. The Committee on Rules may be discharged from consideration of a Resolution only upon the affirmative vote of 107 Members. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 66 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. House Bill...  
The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask at this time that this be placed upon Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "The Resolution's in the Rules, you're in the same place anyway. Mr. Collins."

Collins: "I... inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if my light is broken up there or are you just ignoring me as usual?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, the light's on."

Collins: "Thank you, I'm being ignored again. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "3119. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, don't you think now is the appropriate time since Representative Mudd brought up the question in a sense as to how we're going to dispose of all the Bills on the Calendar in about one more hour of Session as a practical matter? We're going to be asked to leave this chamber shortly, I understand, because of security problems for tomorrow."

Speaker Bradley: "2119. Oh, took it out of the record? 3168. Yes, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that Representative Telcser's comments or questions were out of line at all. It's now been two hours since I've asked about today's schedule and I've been totally ignored. I want to know where the real Speaker is. Why isn't he out here if we got so much work to do? Why isn't he here? Is he out wowing everybody, all the stars and the Presidents and everybody? Why isn't the real Speaker in that Chair? Why isn't he out here taking care of business where he belongs? Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair that you tell the Members of this House and this chamber what our schedule is today. Today, Mr. Speaker. Two hours I've waited for your answer."

Speaker Bradley: "Speaker will be out shortly. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks of the Minority



Leader, he may feel a little frustrated because his efforts to disrupt this Session and to disrupt the program of the Democratic Party have gone somewhat awry and they appear to be going further awry, but I don't feel that he should attempt to slander the Speaker of the House. Mr. Redmond has been a good Speaker. Any Speaker has duties beyond those of a normal Member and beyond those of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader. He has obligations which will require him to leave the podium at times and that is the only reason why he leaves the podium because he is called off the podium because of serious legislative business. And I find it rather comical to hear the Republican Leadership complain about surrogate Speakers in light of performances that were offered to us on several occasions by Mr. Telcser in his role of hatchetman for Speaker Blair."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add to those remarks that the points of order that the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle have made also are anticipatory. They fail to realize that we're also going to be here tomorrow. There's time to do work tomorrow. But it's obvious to some of us that their... they... somebody has rubbed them the wrong way just because the President of the United State is going to be here tomorrow. We find the Governor of the State of Illinois travelling to Washington time and time and time again at taxpayers' expense. I've never yet heard one of them tell me that that bothers them. Finally we come to the time that the President of the United States is coming to honor the people of Springfield, the people of Illinois, coming to Illinois. I think that's a great honor. It shouldn't bother Republicans or Democrats. It surely doesn't bother me."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair has to, unfortunately, admonish the Majority Leader. I didn't catch him in time. I thought he used Mr. Telcser's name in debate which we've talked about this morning that we wouldn't do. And Mr. Telcser, we'll now recognize you on a point of personal privilege."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me tell you that I consider the remarks of the Majority Leader a very



high compliment because I remember well when this Session started and the Gentleman for the first time took on the responsibility and the reins of Leadership. He was inexperienced and green. And he was having a very difficult time handling the Members of his side of the aisle because many of them had very different ideas about how this Assembly should function and about what should be done to the people of the state. Now the other side of the aisle is relatively calm and they're standing behind their candidate for Governor by turning this Session into a partisan political one. I attribute a good deal of that to the Majority Leader's ability to lead his followers. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure that as he observed my performance as a Leader over the years, he learned a few things. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and the Majority Leader in particular, I want you to know that my door is always open so that I may continue to teach you and show you and set an example for you as to how to lead your troops. You have done a magnificent job this Session turning a sincere legislative year into a partisan, trite, cheap, nonsensical, political one. You have made this Session simply a campaign and a faltering one, for that matter, a faltering campaign for your candidate for Governor. We came into this Session with the feeling that this would be an appropriation and revenue year."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close please?"

Telcser: "Members of this House with a feeling of sincerity and concern for their district from both sides of the aisle fought to get their Bills out of the Rules Committee so that they could have their Bills and their problems of their constituency heard this year. And because you have made this a cheap, political partisan year, hundreds of Bills are going to die on the Calendar tomorrow night at midnight because the Majority Leader, the Majority Leader wanted to turn this Session into a political Session. And, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Telcser, would you bring your... would you please bring your remarks to a close? There are objections."

Telcser: "There are people in this chamber today whose first concern are the people who live in their districts, not their political





Leadership. They want to know..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mautino on a point of order."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. What order of business are we on right now?"

Speaker Bradley: "We're trying to get to House Bill 3168."

Mautino: "Would you please go to the order of business and proceed with it?"

Speaker Bradley: "Point's well taken."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Bradley: "...House Bill 3168."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3168, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "I hope we don't....I hope we don't have any more points of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3168 amends the Retailers' Occupation Tax, the Service Use Tax, the Use Tax and the Service Occupation Tax, and it exempts from these taxes the proceeds of sales of machinery...equipment, and repair and replacement parts used directly and exclusively in the manufacturing process. House Bill 3168 also features a four year phase-in beginning July 1, 1978, so that the revenue impact will be lessened. The Bill is aimed at encouraging existing Illinois manufacturers to remain in the state. By including repair and replacement parts we would further encourage existing Illinois manufacturers to modernize and expand their production. The Bill offers the same tax inducement to new and out-of-state manufacturers to locate in Illinois; all of which would lead to the creation of new jobs in Illinois. The economic studies have shown that some danger signals in the Illinois economic picture, growth has slowed and we have become a net exporter of job opportunities. There are many reasons for this. One important factor is our failure to provide tax related incentives for location and expansion in Illinois. House Bill 3168 follows extensive economic research. Competitive industrial states, particularly those adjacent to Illinois, have tax incentive programs. The affect is to help create a business climate which does not penalize business investments. Illinois business is ... business is capital intensive. The impact of the sales tax on capital goods increases cost, reduces profit, and reduces job opportunities. This Bill has the support of the State Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Illinois Taxpayers' Federation, as well as from the news media. I've read where Governor Thompson backs industry tax cuts to provide more jobs for the people of the State of Illinois. And I would urge support of House Bill 3168."

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



Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Dean of the House would agree that the mission of a church is to afflict the comfortable and to comfort the afflicted. One mission of a Legislator may be to make uncomfortable those of us who are committed to the passage of a bad Bill. I want those of you who are going to vote 'yes' on this Bill to know what you are really voting for. This Bill is being sold as a 'job' Bill. Now how many jobs will this Bill create? ... Now let's first look at the cost estimates. The cost estimates of this Bill - in revenue to the state - are 25 million dollars in the first year or one hundred dollars....100 million dollars for the full implementation....the full phase-in. Another estimate is that the full implementation will cost - over the four years - 180 million dollars. Will this Bill create a thousand new jobs, or a hundred new jobs? Well, we had just one witness in the Revenue Committee and I asked him if he had any way to tell us what this Bill would do toward saving a job or creating a new job. There was absolutely no testimony that he could give to support the proposition that jobs would be increased in number. But I did ask him if he did not agree that the most important thing we could do for business...or more important thing would be to make some reform in Workmen's Comp. He said, 'absolutely yes'. I asked, 'How about Unemployment Comp?' He said, 'absolutely yes'. Same answer as to products liability. Now this Bill will not create or save a job in Illinois...it can't. If you look at the economics of this Bill and the economics of Illinois you will know why. But it will swell corporate profits. Just take for example a corporation that might have ten percent of its cost in new equipment. That's a very high figure. Five percent of ten percent is one half percent....and after corporate U. S. Income Taxes, you're talking about one quarter of one percent as its total cost or expenses. Now an out-of-state vendor of equipment is favored by this Bill. How can that create jobs in Illinois? There is no way to prevent a vendor of equipment from raising his price five percent. But what this Bill will really do, Ladies and Gentlemen, it will comfort the comfortable even more, it will afflict the afflicted even more and it will take away either 100 million dollars or 180



million dollars presently available for mental health or schools or welfare recipients; or, meaningful tax relief to all segments of our citizenry....and it will just fatten the coffers of our large national and multinational corporations. You will vote the way you will but if you vote 'yes' you are not helping to create jobs in Illinois, you are taking current state revenues and donating them to a special class of entrepreneurs. Not the entire business community...just equipment manufacturers and/or their vendee. A more honest way, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, a more honest way to do what this Bill does is to reduce, by the same amount, the State Income Tax as to this favored class. How about a Roll Call on that kind of Bill? I don't know if this is a Democratic Party proposal or a Republican Party proposal; but if it's a Democratic Party proposal we better revise our history books. But I couldn't care less. The Emperor has no clothes whether he's a Democrat or a Republican."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives I rise in support of this Bill and at the outset I wish to compliment Representative Terzich for his ingenuity in sponsorship of this Bill, and for his perseverance in pursuit of the cause of this Bill. The history of the Bill is very interesting. It was introduced last year under a different number, reported out of the House Revenue Committee and then passed out of the House of Representatives to the Senate. At the same time there was another version of this concept which was introduced in the Senate and if my memory is correct...never left the Senate or came to the House and never was acted favorably upon by the House of Representatives. The Bill in the concept states that we ought to exempt the purchase of manufacturing equipment because if we exempt the sales tax on those purchases it will act as an incentive to large manufacturers either to remain within the State of Illinois or to locate within Illinois. During the pendency of this proposal before the Legislature last year, Governor Thompson maintained a firm position. He stated that there was not enough money in the budget to afford this proposal. Because of his opposition those Bills never became law. At the very same time Governor Rhoades



of Ohio, in the Ohio Legislature,.....Mr. Speaker, could I have some order? Could I have some order?"

Speaker Bradley: "Give the Gentleman some order, please."

Madigan: "At the same time that Governor Thompson was opposing the passage of this legislation, Governor Rhoades of Ohio, in the Ohio Legislature, successfully passed and adopted a similar exemption on sales taxes for the purchase of manufacturing equipment. The significance of this history can be directly related to the recent decision of the Ford Motor Company to locate a new plant near Cincinnati, Ohio. During last year's consideration, by the Illinois Legislature, and the successful adoption by the Ohio Legislature, the Ford Motor Company was receiving bids from various states for the construction of a new transmission plant. That plant would entail 100 million dollars of land costs and 400 million dollars for the purchase of the manufacturing equipment. At the time of that decision Illinois would have placed a tax on that 400 million dollar purchase; Ohio, through its legislative action would not have placed a tax on that 400 million dollar purchase. There were other factors that led to the Ford Motor Company decision, however, if you were an official at the Ford Motor Company and you were presented with two alternatives; one alternative would place a sales tax on the 400 million dollar purchase, the other alternative would not have placed a tax on that purchase, then quite obviously you would have been inclined to favor the state which would have not taxed the 400 million dollar purchase. I think it is significant that while that decision was being made, Governor Thompson and his Republican assistants in this Legislature defeated Representative Terzich's Bill and a similar Senate version. Today we are presented with an opportunity to rectify our misdeeds of last year. Representative Terzich's proposal is a genuine exemption on the sales tax. It is a good Bill. If enacted into law it will act as a good incentive for manufacturers to remain in our state. At the same time the most recent proposal of the Governor is a folly. It states, 'Make your purchase, pay the tax and then file a refund with the Department of Revenue.' ...who, as they usually do with my tax returns, will probably lose the application in a wastepaper basket somewhere.



The time has come for us to act responsibly in this area. I know there are some of you who feel that there are better ways to provide tax relief, but I think you must recognize that today the people of our state feel that it is incumbent upon us to provide more incentive for industry, manufacturing industry to remain in our state. This is the way to do it. Vote for this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can understand why this Bill has real appeal to the business and industrial community in this state. Business, of course, is in favor of getting a tax break on the purchase of their manufacturing equipment, but there are some problems. We're going to have other segments of business that want the same break. Already the manuf... the sales for farm machinery want to take...sales tax taken off of the sale of their machinery. Just last year I stood on this House floor and opposed taking the sales tax off of fertilizer and farm chemicals. And I come from a farm district. But we will continue to erode the tax base of this state and yet we haven't helped the poor or those who are raising families, by taking sales tax off of food and clothing. Surely their coalitions will be down here next and what will our alternative be but to raise the income tax. It takes so much money to run the State of Illinois each year. You can't continue to give it away piece by piece and not replace it. And finally I would say that this Bill is a bail-out for all of those people who have refused to vote for meaningful modification in Workmen's Comp and Unemployment Comp. This is a bail-out so they can go back and lull business to sleep again...and get their votes in November. And I'm going to vote against it for it's bad for the State of Illinois. It's bad for our financial health and I don't intend to prop...bail out so that we can continue with our ridiculous Workmen's Comp and Unemployment Compensation and business can go back to sleep and forget about the General Assembly."

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

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's been a lot of opposition regarding this Bill. I can't understand why



the opposition is here when what we're trying to do is create an incentive for business to either stay in the state or else expand .... in a new fashion. This is all this Bill will do. It'll give the businesses an incentive to either expand their present businesses or to go into some new fashion of manufacturing. This is what we need. For the last ten years we have lost 19 hundred businesses that have gone down to the sun belt climate ..... 19 hundred, which amounts to about 225 thousand jobs. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is time that we start looking at some way to induce the businesses in the State of Illinois to stay here. I ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, all of the arguments that have been used in favor of this Bill and the advantages it will be to business, could be applied equally to the amendatory process that we tried to go through here a few days ago, in terms of the need of the people of the State of Illinois, for a more general kind of sales tax relief. I am going to support this Bill whether it will create more jobs or not. I believe the people of the State of Illinois have now been brainwashed into thinking that it will create more jobs and will provide a better business climate. However, I will bow to the majority will of the House as we went through that amendatory process. I will bow to them but I will also say that I think that it is time that we serve notice on this House that the next sales tax exemption that we support ought to be one that is of an advantage to the general population of the state, to the common people of the state, to the families who have been the backbone of our society, and we ought to be providing them with relief in the form of sales tax on their food; so that they do not have to pay sales tax on the very substance of their lives. As a member of the Democratic Party, I want to serve notice on the Leadership of my party that I will not again support any kind of sales tax relief unless it goes directly to the people. I am very surprised at my party Leadership that we are finding ourselves in support of this measure, worthy as it may be, without giving some kind of similar tax



relief to the common people. I believe the Democratic Party, in the past, has been the representative of the common people and I hope that we can continue to do that. I will support this Bill, but I want my Leadership to know that I will not support any other kind of sales tax exemption until it applies broadly to all of the people of the state."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it; the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to close the debate."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've listened to the debates and apparently there's some misconceptions involved here. This is where the State of Illinois can show that they have leadership in providing incentive. Illinois is one of the only states that does not supply this type of a tax incentive. If you want to go to Ohio, Indiana, Cincinnati,.... as a matter of fact, Connecticut just passed it. It says, 'Added to last year's fifty percent reduction this action represents a signal that the Members of the General Assembly and the administration understand the relationship between the economic climate and the creation of jobs.' This is a tax incentive that will create more jobs to expand our tax bases. We need people working so they can pay taxes, so they can buy goods, so they can buy food. This is not a tax where we are not going to get anything in return. We hope that we will get more jobs. We hope we will retain them in the State of Illinois. If we continue to lack in the Leadership in providing this type of incentive, I think we're letting all the people of the State of Illinois down. I had taken into consideration the Governor's position about the tax laws and I wish I had the figures that Representative Mugalian had, I don't want them to do my taxes at 180 million dollars, however, the Department...er..State Chamber of Commerce rep...states that the impact would be 40 million dollars. The Department of Revenue estimated at 80 million dollars. With the braiding in, that that would only amount to between 10 and 20 million





dollars, and during that time, that's within the Governor's budget, he said that he had the money set aside for that, that will signal business and labor that we intend to do something in the State of Illinois. It does cover the manufacturing equipment, the milling equipment, this is what we want in the State of Illinois. I would urge support of House Bill 3168."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to keep the jobs in Illinois. And I think it's high time that we do everything we can to keep them in Illinois. I think this is a good Bill. I'm tired of seeing our industries going to the sun belt states. There's no question they are going there. The Representative who spoke from the back of the room is absolutely right. We've got to keep jobs in Illinois and bring more jobs in here and we cannot just break the back of the manufacturers. We need them if we want to have labor work and it's as simple as that. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that the issue has been debated quite clearly. The issue is - as far as providing an incentive to business - to update their equipment and providing resource from the state, stating to business throughout the nation ...that Illinois is cognizant of your needs and hopefully you will place your business in this state providing employment for our people. I think that this is a Bill that's been discussed on this House floor last year and passed this House floor. It was killed in the Senate. I think that the Membership has agreed with its purpose and I thank you for your serious consideration and an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. We passed a Bill not too long ago that increased school aid funding by 118 million dollars. I don't know how we're going to pay for these Bills if we continue to give



away the resources. We're going to have to make some choices; and I think we're making....you can't have it both ways. These are what are called mutually exclusive votes that you just made here, if this passes."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be very briefly (sic) too. I don't think there's been anybody been more of a champion in the business industry in the State of Illinois as I have. But looking at this Bill I noticed that in 1979 it's going to cost 40 million dollars, 1980 it's going to cost 40 million dollars, 1981 it's going to cost 40 million dollars. And then the Democrats are going to have a candidate in 1982, I wonder how many of those green lights are going to help me support a state income tax so we can make up the difference in the loss. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Ms. Willer, to explain her vote."

Willer: "Briefly. I'm supporting this Bill, not because I think it's going to do great things for business, I'm afraid Representative Mugalian might just be right. But, I think, if we're desperate enough it's sort of like finding a bleeding body; you know if someone hands you nothing more than a bandaid you're going to use it. I hope it's more than that. But if I figure it out - and I'm not that great about business - at about the most...ten percent of business costs go to replace machinery and this would affect one half of one percent of the total cost of business before taxes. If this can lure business in and keep business here, fine, but I have my doubts. But I'll try anything."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'ayes', 28 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison. Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Madison: "On the Calendar, on House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1773. The Digest indicates that this Bill went to Interim Study



in the Personnel and Pensions Commis... in Committee. There is no indication on yesterday's Calendar or previous days before that of this Bill even appearing on the Calendar and I wonder if the Chair might indicate how this Bill got on Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "As I recall, it was a Supplemental Calendar yesterday and the motion to discharge, that that's Representative Vinson's Bill as I recall."

Madison: "The Digest indicates that it's sponsored by Representative McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, it's Vinson's motion. There was... last night."

Madison: "...is a motion on a Supplemental Calendar?"

Speaker Bradley: "There was a Calendar issued, a Supplemental yesterday."

Madison: "Is it usual procedure... this was a motion to move it from Interim Study to what... to what status, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. And the Bill was exempted by the rules... the Rules Committee this year. What purpose the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, arise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, prior to the announcement of the Roll Call, I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "On 3168? The Gentleman have leave? Record him as voting 'aye' on 3168. 3220."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3220. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, 1976 the Congress of the United States passed a thing called the Railroad Revitalization and Reform Act. Its purpose was to avert a collapse of the railroads in the Midwest like that that happened in the East and the Northeast. One of the things that Bill did was to provide for the Secretary of Transportation to make long-term low-interest loans to railroads. By a quirk of fate, the mechanism chosen for those long-term low-interest loans was a purchase by the Secretary of Transportation of preference shares in the railroad. Those preference shares are subject to a redeemable schedule... certain so that they will be repaid just as a long-term loan would be. Because of the way



the Illinois Business Corporation Law Act operates unless we provide for an exemption on the corporate franchise and licensing tax on that share...sale of stocks to the Secretary of Transportation, that money will not go for railway rehabilitation but will be paid in tax to the state. This is an effort to make all of that money go for railroad right-of-way rehabilitation to solve some of the problems we have with bad railroad conditions in the state."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tipsword: "How does... how does this move that money when it says it exempts from our preference shares from the license fees and franchise taxes, how does that get the money to railroad rebuilding and repair?"

Vinson: "The money that would be bled off for payment of those taxes, that part of the long-term low-interest loan that would be bled off for the franchise and licensing fee tax will be available instead because of the Bill for railroad right-of-way rehabilitation."

Tipsword: "You mean available to the railroad itself?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Tipsword: "How do we have any assurance that it would be so used?"

Vinson: "In the contract that the railroad has to sign with the Secretary of Transportation to get the money from the Federal Government, it is specified as it is also in the federal law that it has to be used for that purpose."

Tipsword: "Now does this refer specifically to ConRail?"

Vinson: "No, Sir. This is for... this is to prevent midwestern railroads from suffering the fate of the eastern railroads that led to the creation of ConRail."

Tipsword: "We're already in that."

Vinson: "Well, not completely yet. We still have some railroads in a very marginal situation but still capable of operating as private enterprises. And this is to try to keep that from going under."



Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further?"

Tipsword: "...out a franchise tax is going to keep them from going under?"

Vinson: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the question."

Tipsword: "You say this small amount of franchise tax is going to keep them from going under?"

Vinson: "No, Sir. I'm just saying that all of that long-term low-interest loan should be available for right-of-way rehabilitation for the railroads because we badly need in it in this state for right-of-way rehabilitation."

Tipsword: "This does not apply in any way to ConRail, the federal railroad that has replaced the Penn Central and certain other lines then?"

Vinson: "No, Sir. This applies to the marginally alive railroads in the state right now."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "There anything further? Representative Giorgi.

Just a moment here, I don't know whether Representative Bradley declared House Bill 3168 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. If he didn't, I will. Now, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Vinson, I see you didn't file a fiscal note. How much will this cost the State of Illinois in your estimation?"

Vinson: "There is a fiscal note filed. The Secretary of State who collects the tax has a difficult estimating because it depends on how much the Secretary of Transportation will make available. The best estimates we can get indicate that we're talking about approximately a hundred, hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is... Representative Dunn."

J. Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

J. Dunn: "I have one further question and that is by way of clarification, in the event money becomes available to the railroads by reason of this legislation, would you please explain again what assurance we have that that money will be used for the purpose



of railroad revitalization and repayment of these government loans?"

Vinson: "Every dollar that the railroads get under the railroad revitalization..."

J. Dunn: "No, I don't mean... excuse me, I don't mean dollars coming from the Federal Government to the railroad. I mean the money they will save by being exempted from taxes. Where does that money go and how do we know it will be paid, used in repayment of these loans?"

Vinson: "The only money that we're exempting on the tax is money coming from the Federal Government under this loan program. That's the only money we're exempting. We're not exempting any money if a railroad were able to sell a stock issue to private investors. That would not be exempted by this Bill. Only money coming from the Federal Government under this long-term loan program and by terms of the federal law and by terms of the contract the Secretary of Transportation has to sign with the railroad. It has to be spent on right-of-way rehabilitation."

J. Dunn: "And do we have assurance that these funds will be spent inside the State of Illinois?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

J. Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137, 141 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "...House Bills, Second Reading. On House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 1333, Representative Daniels is recognized."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1333, a Bill for an Act in relation to the liability of manufacturers and sellers of products in actions brought for recovery of dangerous...damages sustained by reason of defective products, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to table Amendment #1. We will get to Amendment #6 which we will ask the Body to adopt."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the...to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 1333. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it; the motion carries and Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Schlickman, amends House Bill 1333, as amended, in the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #2 is in anticipation of the adoption of Amendment #1. Inasmuch as Amendment #1 has been tabled, at this time I ask for leave to withdraw it... withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Daniels, amends House Bill 1333, as amended, by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I would move to withdraw Amendments #3 and 4."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3 and Amendment #4. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Schlickman, amends House Bill 1333, as amended, in Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #5 was drawn in a form in anticipation of the adoption of Amendment #4. Inasmuch



as Amendment #4 has been withdrawn, at this time I ask for leave to withdraw Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman withdraws Amendment #5. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Daniels-Dan Houlihan, amends House Bill 1333 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 would become House Bill 1333 and contains the agreed upon language between the parties of interest that have been negotiating for some period of ...of time...weeks and months on the subject of products liability. Amendment #6 is comprehensive in the sense that it includes both insurance gathering information as well as a statute of repose, a statute that this Body determined it wanted to address when it discharged Committee on this subject. I emphasize that Amendment #6, in all of its form, has been approved by the various parties of interest. Basically what Amendment #6 does is in Section 1, it requires insurance companies to gather data information in the assistance of the determination of premiums as it relates to products liability. Amendment...Section 2 of the Amendment regards an Act regarding limitations or more commonly described in our discussions as the statute of repose. Generally, the statute of repose contained in Amendment #6 applies to strict liability actions only. It does not exclude actions in negligence or warranty. What it provides, under strict liability only, is that an action may be brought within 12 years from the time that the manufacturer parts with possession, or 10 years from its first possession by an initial. Unless that period is ex...expressly warranted by the sale or possession of the machine, those will be the periods of limitation. Now the statute of repose regarding alteration or modification is for a period of 10 years unless there is an expressed warranty differently. Regarding the statute of limitations, it would be a 2 year period from the date of discovery of an injury or an accident, with an outside limitation of 8 years. In other words





It must be discovered within an 8 year period from the time that the injury occurs. There is a minor's exclusion in there and the statute of limitations does not begin to run until the minor reaches age 18. There are also other provisions regarding replacement and I would emphasize that this Amendment has been agreed upon in language and in form by all the parties of interest; and that the statute of repose applies to a 12 or 10 year period from the date of injury.

I would move the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan....then I'll be back to you."

Houlihan: "I join with Representative Daniels in the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "You indicate that in this very...very important area, an area that has been termed as a crises, that this Amendment is the product of extensive negotiations by the interested parties? Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "And who are those....interested parties?"

Daniels: "The parties that have negotiated regarding the subject of products liability include the Illinois Manufacturer's Association, the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Trial Lawyer's Association, the Wholesalers and Distributors and various other business groups."

Schlickman: "Well, I just talked with the attorney for the taskforce in product liability and he advises me that that agency or organization, representing about 15 thousand distributors, was not a part of the final negotiation."

Daniels: "Mr. Schlickman, what you say as far as not a part of the final negotiations is not inaccurate. Your question was, 'Who participated in negotiations?' I was in a meeting with the wholesalers and distributors where we discussed the various items of interest to their organization. It was determined at that time that since we wanted to address the area of statute of repose that the best way to proceed would be in accordance with the Amendment that we have before



you right now."

Schlickman: "Okay. Now this Amendment ... is in two parts; one part representing the product of the work of the Subcommittee on product liability of Judiciary I. Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "And the other part is the result of the extensive negotiations? Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Now, for my review and for the information of the Members of the House, would you please give a definition of strict liability? Inasmuch as the statute of repose applies only to strict liability cases."

Daniels: "I'd be happy to make an effort to give a definition of strict liability. Strict liability involves no negligence and is based upon the fitness of a product as opposed to the conduct of a manufacturer. In other words the product must be unreasonably dangerous - those are the key words - when it left the manufacturer's control."

Schlickman: "In other words, under strict liability, you've got to have a defect in a product which results in unreasonable hazard or danger? You've got to have knowledge on the part of the manufacturer of that defect? You've got to have an injury? You've got to have an injury which was a...approximate...which was caused by this defect? Is that correct?"

Daniels: "Well not completely. It must be unreasonably dangerous when it left the manufacturer.....and then there must be resulting injury."

Schlickman: "How does the statute of repose differ from a statute of limitations?"

Daniels: "The statute of repose, in essence, cuts off a right before it accrues. That's why we're dealing with, at the present time, a 10 year and a 12 year split; as we have here in this Bill. Statute of limitations would be a period of time in which you can sue after an injury has occurred."

Schlickman: "Section 12 of the Bill of Rights of the Illinois Constitution



reads as follows: Every person shall find a certain remedy in the laws for all injuries and wrongs which he receives to his person, privacy, property or reputation. He shall obtain justice by law, freely, completely, and promptly. How can a statute of repose, which arbitrarily cuts off a person's right to seek a remedy or redress for an injury, be constitutional ... if you accept the literal meaning of that statement?"

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Schlickman, this of course has been a subject of much discussion between the parties of interest. And we feel that based upon the Oregon case decision which addressed the subject of statute of repose similar to what we have here and ruled it to be constitutional; coupled with a ruling by Justice Stephens, in a statement regarding medical malpractice statute of limitations and statute of repose, that we feel in our expert opinion and the opinion of the many lawyers that are involved in this that this will withstand a constitutional challenge."

Schlickman: "Wasn't the statute of repose in the medical malpractice case found to be unconstitutional inasmuch as it constituted class legislation?"

Daniels: "Not as far as Justice Stephens ruling on the...in the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals relating to the current statute of limitations, statute of repose within the current laws that exist right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, do you desire to speak to the Amendment?"

Schlickman: "I got some questions here. This is a very...very important subject, Mr. Speaker.... Now...Mr...With respect to your statute of repose, you make no distinction between items of...types of products? Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "In other words, you don't take into account the useful life of the product?"

Daniels: "Not completely. There could be an expressed warranty as to the useful life in which case that would extend the statute of repose.... in connection with the language in our Amendment."

Schlickman: "But you make no distinction between a football helmet and a



747 or a Fairchild turbojet?"

Daniels: "There is no distinction in the Bill; primarily because we feel and it was felt by many of the people that were negotiating this Amendment, that the classification that you're referring to would be unconstitutional."

Schlickman: "Do you have a basis for that suggestion of unconstitutionality?"

Daniels: "Well, we have a.."

Schlickman: "...A case that would not constitute reasonable classification?"

Daniels: "We do not have an actual court ruling in the State of Illinois, but it's our opinion based upon the expert lawyers that we had on both sides of the issue...that the question very likely would be unconstitutional."

Schlickman: "The concern on the part of manufacturers and distributors - sellers - is not with the right of people to recover for injuries that they have sustained, but rather the dramatic increase in their insurance rates and in some cases the unavailability of insurance at all. Do you have any...any information...any study...that would suggest, would be somewhat indicative of the effect of this statute of repose on insurance rates or the availability of product liability insurance?"

Daniels: "Your question, as I understand it, is 'Do we have any studies which would indicate that the passage of this statute of repose would cause a reduction of premiums?' Is that correct? Is that your question?"

Schlickman: "Not a reduction, but would have any affect on rates and/or availability of product liability insurance. In other words, is this statute of repose going to do any good?"

Daniels: "Well, in answer to your question, there are some studies that would indicate that the setting of a reasonable statute of repose would have an affect on premiums, a favorable affect. As far as the question relating to, and I think you're asking my opinion as to whether or not there would be a reduction; I feel it's only logical to assume that if we put a reasonable statute of repose, a statute of limitations, on a action that there would be a favorable affect on the premium. And we believe, in our opinion, that there will be



a favorable affect on premiums by the adoption of this Amendment."

Schlickman: "One final question. And I do appreciate your bearing with me in responding to these, what I consider to be very important questions. There is vital to the economy of Illinois, distribution... there are thousands and thousands of companies in this state that sell products but have nothing to do with the manufacturing of these products, have nothing to do with the specifications by which these products were manufactured; distributors who in fact in many...many cases don't even see the products and don't handle it. Now, under the present case law, these companies, having nothing to do with the manufacturer of the product, having never seen it, having no knowledge of any defect; are being sued in countless and countless numbers of cases and subject to unwarranted...unnecessary litigation including court costs, and as a consequence an increase in insurance premiums. Does this Amendment do anything about giving necessary relief to these companies, preventing them from being subject to unnecessary suits and keeping them out of our clogged courtrooms?"

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Schlickman, it does have some affect because the statute of repose applies to the distributors and the wholesalers alike as it does to the manufacturers. We feel that it will have a favorable affect in that regard. Now regarding the provisions that are contained in your Amendment, which is Amendment 7, on the sellers exclusion, we just feel that at this particular time that we cannot support that particular Amendment. And if that's what you're... the basic question you're asking to exclude, the distributors and wholesalers completely from the chain of distribution, we don't feel that we can support that at this time."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I had the opportunity of serving on the Product Liability Subcommittee of Judiciary I. Extensive hearings were conducted by that Subcommittee and ultimately recommendations were made by a split vote to the full Judiciary I Committee. The report to the Judiciary I Committee, which was adopted, is contained in Amendment #6; however, in my opinion it was not



substantive - sufficiently substantive - in nature with respect to needed reform, needed alleviation or relief, in the product liability area. Now I am for a statute of repose. I do think a statute of repose can be considered constitutional; so long, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, so long as the statute of repose is not arbitrary, so long as it is reasonable in nature, has some relationship to the solution to be...solution to be solved. Certainly the welfare of the people of the State of Illinois as a whole sometimes has to be concluded to prevail over the interests of an individual. Respecting this particular statute of repose, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it's a sop, I don't think it does what is necessary to be done in this area. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is a start and hopefully with its adoption and the subsequent adoption of Amendment #7, which is substantive and which will give needed relief, I will join with the Cosponsor of this Amendment in asking you for your favorable vote for its adoption."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matula: "Mr. Daniels, if a salesman is working for a distributor selling a piece of equipment manufactured by the manufacturer, is he going to be held liable?"

Daniels: "Would you...Mr. Speaker...could you repeat that?"

Matula: "If a salesman is selling for a distributor...distributing his piece of machinery manufactured by a manufacturer, will he be held liable, the salesman?"

Daniels: "Well, it would depend upon the individual case, but in the...the chain of distribution the wholesaler-distributor would...could potentially be held liable under the existing case law, but not the salesman, unless he made representations to the contrary."

Matula: "Would that be under the 12 year..."

Daniels: "The statute of repose would apply to all products liability actions under strict liability."

Matula: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is on the Gentleman's



motion for the adoption of Amendment #6. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Schlickman, amends House Bill 1333, as amended, in Section 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the doctrine of strict liability permits a distributor to make...to be made a defendant in a product liability case merely because he sold the product. Once a party, the distributor must defend in the main action, a product without knowledge of its design and manufacturer. Second, the distributor must prosecute his claim for indemnity against the manufacturer of the product. In most instances a distributor or other non-manufacturer is an unnecessary party to a strict liability case. Including the distributor in such a case wastes scarce judicial and legal resources and generates litigation costs with no corresponding benefits. Amendment #7 to House Bill 1333 is an Amendment to the Civil Practice Act. Specifically it provides, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that a seller or a distributor who did not manufacture the product, a seller or distributor who had no knowledge of the defect in the product, a seller or distributor who had nothing to do with the design of the product, a seller or distributor who did not hold itself out as a manufacturer, will not - cannot - be sued against. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as an exception to those rules, if the manufacturer cannot be brought within a suit on account of jurisdictional matters, the seller will be subject to a suit on account of strict liability. Also, he would be subject to a suit in the event that the manufacturer was bankrupt or otherwise insolvent (sic). Finally he would be subject to a suit if the manufacturer had sold its assets without assigning the liability for any claim on account of product liability. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the distributors and sellers in this state - a vital... vital part of our economy - are deserving of some relief; relief from unnecessary litigation. Now they won't be relieved under this Bill for having contributed to any product liability and they will not



be relieved, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if they have in any way proved to be negligent. They're just being exempted as a general rule from the principle of strict liability. They will be kept out of cases where they don't belong on account of the fact that they had nothing...nothing to do with the product liability. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an Amendment that constitutes true reform and it's an Amendment that unquestionably, undoubtedly is constitutional and will not have to come back to us later when litigation .... considers what we are about to do today and tomorrow on...Third Reading. I earnestly solicit your support for this Amendment as a form of real reform in the area of product liability. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #7 to the Bill. While I am aware of the issue and the seriousness of the issue as addressed by the Amendment proposed by Representative Schlickman, I think that it should be pointed out as far as the problems that the manufacturer-distributor faces, that that problem is substantially minimized by the fact that they do have a right of indemnification against the manufacturer. The issue that we're talking about here, the whole issue of product liability is easily, I think, one of the most complex issues that we as a Legislative Body have faced in the last several years. There are enormous competing interests here at stake. It has been, extremely difficult and frustrating to attempt to fashion an agreement that finally was fashioned and is embodied in Amendment #6. Some relief is provided for manufacturer-distributors because they also will be the beneficiaries of the statute of repose and the limited statute of limitations which is embodied now in the Bill. But the agreement here - as hammered out - is candidly a fragile one; and any changes which would be embodied in subsequent Amendments will, in my opinion, destroy the agreed Bill in effect by way of Amendment #6. What Representative Schlickman has said is that Amendment #6 is not a solution to product liability in this state; but no Sponsor or proponent of the Bill, as amended, would tell you that it is. It is





a start, as Representative Schlickman acknowledges. It is a substantial start, in my opinion, a start that I feel should not be jeopardized by this Amendment before us today; because I think that that Amendment is, frankly, premature. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that Amendment #6 is one that is a reasonable approach and a reasonable conclusion to all of the problems that face us in the field of products liability at this time. I think it's a solid legislative approach. I think that that approach will be severely jeopardized by Amendment #7 and in consequence I would urge you to defeat Amendment #7, and move the Bill to third and then tomorrow to move this Bill to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, one of the things that Representative Schlickman suggested was that there will be a substantial savings in attorney's fees. I think there are so many factual issues that a defendant would have to show to get out of the litigation that you would spend the same kind of attorney's fees - and you really have to do the same kind of file work-up if you are a lawyer for any defendant - so that the savings of the cost would be minimal; it would not be a substantial cost. Obviously liability ... would be cut down, but clearly the cost would be not much different. The other question that one might consider is whether we really, as a policy matter, want to let Sears Roebuck - the big distributor or retailer - out, who may be always solvent; and the manufacturer - years later - who may be out of business? Do we want to reduce the economic ... places where a defendant ... or a plaintiff who's injured can go? I think that I agree that this is somewhat premature and perhaps Amendment #7 should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matula."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Amendment #7. How can you hold a salesman or distributor liable for a piece of equipment that he hasn't even put a screw or a nut to? All he does is go to various concerns and try to sell the equipment. He has nothing to do with designing the equipment; yet to hold him liable, I can't understand why the distributor or the salesman should be held liable for this piece of equipment. In the



process of manufacturing this equipment many...many things can go wrong. In the manufacturer's plant alone, you may have a party that may overlook something that is his liability, yet you are going to state that a distributor or a salesman is going to be held. I, for one .... to see that the Amendment 7 is favorably passed and I am going to vote for Amendment 7."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,...Mr. Speaker, some week or two ago we brought House Bill 1333 out of the ....discharged the Committee with over....as I recall 126 votes. A strong indication that there was a great desire by this Body to do something with product liability. There's been a great deal of work gone into the Amendment that was adopted and offered by Representative Dan.... the Representative from DuPage, and I would like to say this that I think it is a good Amendment. And as another Representative said earlier, it is a start in the right direction to bring about some kind of equity in the product liability situation that we have throughout the country. It doesn't do - Amendment #6 - everything that we would like it to do, but let me say this to the Members here, that if Amendment...Amendment #7 that we are addressing ourselves to now, if Amendment #7 is adopted, I think we will jeopardize completely House Bill 1333. It is my understanding that we have an agreement between both sides of the aisle, in 1333, in the way...in the condition that it is in, prior to the Amendment; and without the Amendment we are addressing ourselves to. While I might think that Amendment #7 ...certainly shows some justification for adopting it, I realize that if I would support it I would be jeopardizing the whole Bill. We would not be successful in adopting and passing 1333 if this Amendment is adopted. So I ask you to give your serious consideration to take part of a package in the condition that 1333 is in without Amendment #7, so that we can make a beginning ...a start in the right direction on bringing some sort of ....semblance from chaos that we presently have with the product liability situation throughout the United States. So I urge you to vote 'no' and defeat Amendment #7 to House Bill 1333."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, to close."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I find the debate or I should say the opposition to Amendment #7 quite interesting. There are two bases for the opposition from those who have been most involved in the consideration of the product liability crises. Number one, Amendment #7 wasn't part of the deal. I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and again I refer to the Constitution of the State of Illinois, The Legislative Article, Section 8, Passage of Bills; The enacting clause of the laws of this state shall be: 'Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly.' It doesn't say represented in a room away from this hall. Number two, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the criticism is and the second criticism is, that Amendment #7 is premature - it's before its time. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, those are not rational bases for opposing Amendment #7 either because it's not part of the deal or number two, it's ahead of its time. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, how...how can we continue to allow a distributor, in Illinois, who on behalf of a customer in Arizona, secured for that customer in Arizona, a product manufactured in Texas? And has the product shipped directly from Texas to Arizona and under the strict liability principle, that Illinois distributor who had nothing ... nothing to do with the manufacture of the product...had nothing to do with the specifications by which that product was manufactured, in fact, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...didn't even see it. All he did was to serve as a middle-man, that Illinois company. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment simply provides that that distributor will not be subject to a ...will not be subject to a product liability suit on account of strict liability. If the plaintiff, if the agreed party, feels that he or she can sue on the basis of negligence, some affirmative action by that distributor... that suit will lie. I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you want to do something meaningful, if you want to provide some needed reform in the area of product liability, and if you want to help this economy in Illinois, then give a vote



'aye' to Amendment #7. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. You have? Okay. The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #7. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Daniels, are you seeking recognition?"

Daniels: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, reluctantly we have to oppose this Amendment. When we discharged Committee we said we addressed the subject of statute of repose only, and that's what we've done by Amendment #6."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am in sympathy with the idea behind this Amendment but I cannot support it because while I would like to exempt sellers from product liability suits, this Amendment does not go far enough in doing that. It allows some exceptions, some of which are proper and some of which are improper. And because it does not complete the principle involved in the exemption, I must vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 16 'aye' and 127 'no', and the Gentleman's motion fails and the Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading." On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, category of consolidation of elections, House Bill 2554. Representative... Representative Dan O'Brien. Representative Daniel O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise on a point of privilege of the Assembly as a whole."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

O'Brien: "My point is the decorum that the House will operate under when the President speaks tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, it's been brought to my attention and that of a couple of other Members of the House that a decision has been made in relation to who will be allowed to be president... present when the President speaks before a Joint



Session of the Illinois General Assembly tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that you are responsible for a decision that prohibits the Pages of the House, Republicans and Democrats, from the opportunity to take part when Illinois history is made tomorrow. The Pages are a loyal group of Republicans and Democrats, young men and women who are underpaid, who work long and hard hours while we're in Session, who put up with our ill-tempered moods, our outrageous requests for whatever and at any time. If any group is getting a raw deal or the short end of the stick, Mr. Speaker, it's the Pages in the House. The first time that they get a chance to be part of something that really counts, Mr. Speaker, they're excluded. Who runs the House? You or the Secret service? I, for one, am tired of pushing this button for some program that's mandated out of Washington. If the President doesn't want our Pages, then you as our Leader ought to tell him and the secret service that we want the Pages. E.R.A. begins at home, right here and in our own House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien, continue."

O'Brien: "I understand your request requiring only elected officials to be present on the House floor, but in my estimation and that of other Members, there is ample room for the Pages. I'm sure that they can clear security and some place can be found for them when the President makes his presentation. If you don't make the decision, Mr. Speaker, then maybe this Body ought to make the decision. And if necessary, I will move at the proper time to suspend the rule, Rule 4(k) so that the Members of the... the Pages in this House can be present when the President speaks."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to second Representative O'Brien's position. I mean we're going to be finding room for fifty-nine Senators. Now this isn't their House. We're going to be finding room for the Governor and the other constitutional officers. In fact, I'm even going to have to give up my seat to the constitutional officers and the Supreme Court. Now they don't belong in this House so why can't we let the Pages who do belong in this House to have a little



room, too. I'd give up my seat for them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell. 2554."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2554. A Bill for an Act to revise the law governing local governmental..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, I indicates... I made a motion, Mr. Speaker, to suspend the Rule 4(k)..."

Speaker Redmond: "You arose on the point of personal privilege..."

O'Brien: "No, I rose on a point of privilege..."

Speaker Redmond: "You were not recognized for that purpose, Mr. O'Brien. The order is House Bill 2554 on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Yourell. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I have supported House Bill 2554 in Committee and through the Amendment stage and have no problem with that Bill. But as a point of personal privilege as one of the perhaps seventy-five Members who still have Bills on Third Reading someplace, I question why we're going out of order here, why we're not following the call. I would hope that if, that if we are going to do this that we could suspend the rules or there would at least be an agreement from the Leadership that every Bill that's on Third Reading will get its chance. I have no problem, particular problem with voting for this Bill anytime, but I don't want..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson, bring your point of personal privilege to a close. Representative Yourell. Read the Bill."

(con't on next page)



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2554. A Bill for an Act to revise the law governing local government in school elections to implement consolidation of elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

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

I do not do this of my own volition. I have talked to Members on the Republican side. I have talked to the Minority Leader and I believe that this is a subject matter that has been studied for a good number of years. We're at the point now where action must be taken on this legislation and I would ask now that we have leave to consider House Bill 2554."

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

Representative Robinson objects. You make... do you move..."

Yourell: "Now, Mr. Speaker, in light of the objection by the Representative, I would move now to waive the appropriate rule to have House Bill 2554 heard."

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

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the remarks of the Sponsor but we have had a discussion. I'm assured by the Sponsor that when this Bill gets to the Senate if it does, that there will be a two-year extension placed on the Bill and I think that will make the Bill acceptable to me and it should be to most people. We have consolidations of elections, we have no machinery by which to work those consolidations. We need this implementation Bill. It's far from perfect in its present form but there has been much, much work put into it over the period of years and I would hate like heck to see that work go down the drain by killing this Bill. The Bill can be corrected, can be put into workable forum within the next two years and I would ask that we all vote for this, send it over to the Senate and let them put that Amendment on it. I urge the support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Yourell's motion to suspend the rules in order that House Bill 2554 be heard. Representative Robinson has withdrawn his objection. Leave is granted?"



Proceed, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the subject matter of consolidation of elections is nothing new to any Member of this House. As you know it's been a product of much controversy. It's also been an item and a subject matter that's been studied extensively not only by the Election Laws Commission of this House and the General Assembly but also in public hearings held throughout the state. And at those public hearings held throughout the State of Illinois in this year and other years and we can go back and talk about consolidation of elections with Senator Keegan in the Senate, was the original Sponsor of the legislation. We have done, I think, what we've had to do to satisfy the concerns of those who had legitimate concerns. We have as you know the consolidation of elections, that's a public act. It was signed into law by the Governor. In the Spring Session we passed House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session which implemented to a certain degree the provisions of Senate Bill 1149. Now we're in a position where we have to implement the acts that were signed into law by the Governor. The Governor as you know returned, acted on the Election Consolidation Schedule Bills without an amendatory veto and he said he had great confidence in the talents and abilities of the Members of the General Assembly to provide the necessary implementation legislation. We've done that, we think we have a Bill that meets the criteria of most Members of the General Assembly, at least of the House at the present. I'm going to tell you that we considered twenty-five Amendments to this Bill, most of which were adopted. We talked to school peoples, we talked to County Clerks, we talked to Municipal Clerks, Township Clerks and local elected officials on all levels of government and we've come to the conclusion that a Consolidation of Election Bill is something that has to be dealt with. If there's some concern on the part of the local elected officials that have some concern about the Bill, I think they ignore the fact that consolidation of elections is designed not to benefit local officials but to benefit the inconvenience and frustrated voter presently confronted with a number of elections and referenda each





year. One of the most viable parts of this consolidation and implementation of elections legislation is the fact that we've dealt with the referendum. And I think that's most important. Do you know that seventy percent of your tax dollar is spent because local units of government, particularly school districts, have had the opportunity year after year for the past ten years to conduct illegal elections in Illinois where all you have to do is walk in, sign a piece of paper and you're allowed to vote. Ten or eleven or twelve percent of the people come out to vote on seventy percent of your tax bills. I think that's an important subject matter to have a genuine concern with by the Members of this General Assembly. You know what this Bill's all about, you know that it's good legislation, you know that Illinois has been in the background in developing legislation of this nature and passing it into law. And I ask you now to consider the people of the State of Illinois who have asked repeatedly, why do we have so many elections? Let's consolidate elections. Let's do something who are providing the service to the people of Illinois and their most precious franchise and that's the right to vote. And I would urge a favorable response to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't share the same..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "I don't share the same concern as my colleague, Ed Bluthardt, does in having confidence in the House of Lords. I've been here long enough to know that when you send a Bill over to the House of Lords and you tell them they'll take care of that Amendment for you, just get it passed out of here and see what we can do to get it amended over at the House of Lords. I've been told that too many times. I came here to represent the people in this chamber and I'm not a bit concerned what they're going to do in the House of Lords. Therefore, I can't in good conscience vote for this Bill in its present stage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you find me in something of a quandry."



I'm very proud of the shape that this Bill is in now. We worked long and we've worked hard to get it in shape. I think we could have met the timetable outlined in the Consolidated Elections Bill. This two-year extension came as a complete shock to me. I intend to support the Bill although I certainly have lost all of my enthusiasm and I will promise you, I wouldn't lie to anybody on the floor of this House, then when that Bill comes back if it gets out of here today with that extension on, I'll fight that extension with everything I've got. I'm going to find it hard to vote for the Bill today. I really, sincerely did everything I could to provide input into getting this Bill in shape. We kept our word, we held it on Second Reading, we considered all of the Amendments that were offered by opponent and proponent alike and I sincerely believe that we have a good Bill before you today. It is so good that I wouldn't ask anybody to vote 'no' or to lay off, but I certainly intend to fight any extension. I would only agree to an extension when I was convinced, which I am not, that we could not meet the timetable. I think we can. I think we should work towards that end and reluctantly I will ask everyone in the House to vote for this Bill today, but again emphasizing that I'll do everything I can to fight it when it comes back."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Representative Yourell yield for a question? Bus, do I understand you to say that now you agree to a two-year extension, is this correct?"

Yourell: "I have indicated to Representative Bluthardt and to others that if that is the only way that this Bill will become law, that I have agreed to."

Mahar: "In other words you don't, you agree only if it will pass. Is that correct?"

Yourell: "Pardon me?"

Mahar: "Does... has the Senate agreed to put the Amendment on if they get the Bill in the present form?"

Yourell: "I shall talk to the Senate Sponsor, you know what's going to happen to this Bill."



Mahar: "You haven't talked to them as yet then?"

Yourell: "Yes, I have."

Mahar: "And he has agreed to try to do that?"

Yourell: "He has agreed, yes."

Mahar: "All right then, in effect, you've agreed to do it. Do you recognize the fact of the need for an extension?"

Yourell: "I can tell you this, that I'm opposed to the two-years extension as Representative Collins. But I'm a realist and I'm a practical person and I know that this Bill has a very difficult choice not only with its present form without the extension, but along with the fact that we're faced with a deadline."

Mahar: "Then I would like to make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill if necessary go on Postponed Consideration and we put that Amendment on right here in the House and then send it over to them. We'll be sure we have it. I along with Representative Conti am not too sure what's going to happen in the Senate. For that reason, I'd like to see it right on... right on here in the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, feel as my colleague here, Representative Conti and Representative Mahar, even though I have the greatest of respect for Representative Bluthardt or Representative Yourell. I don't think they're going to put that extension on and I got back from a meeting last week with the Municipal League in Proviso and only on the basis of the fact that we get the two-year extension would they allow me to support this Bill. And if we don't have that Amendment on here in this House, I have to vote 'no' on this Bill cause I don't believe it's going to get on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Previous question."

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

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that the time is getting late and I don't want to take the time of the House. This Bill's been debated on many



occasions and for many years. I suggested that I would support the Amendment for a two-year extension in the Senate. I have never in my twelve years in this House ever reneged on my word. Those of you who served with me for twelve years are well aware of that. Now I can tell you this, it's up to the House Members when this Bill gets back to either adopt and concur in the Senate Amendments or to nonconcur. That's the business of the House. I think this subject matter is so important that we have to act on it today and I would ask a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2554."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Corneal Davis is in the middle aisle. He's all dressed. Have all voted who wished? Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, if this Bill, if we have to wait two years and putting an Amendment on to extend the time limit to two years, why can't we hold this Bill and work out the faults of the Bill now rather than shotgun it through this House with just a mere promise? So therefore, Mr. Speaker, by not having the Bill in the proper shape, which admittedly it's wrong or they wouldn't be asking for the extension of two years, I will vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 20 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. The same subject matter of consolidation of elections, 3337. Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3337."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess it's Representative Bluthardt, pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to make certain revisions in the consolidation schedule of elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill would move the village elections, the elections of units of government that are coterminous with the municipality and park district elections from the nonpartisan election in November and place them in the consolidation election in April. And the main reason for that



is in many instances these, especially village libraries are an integral part of municipal government, their budgets, their tax levies and most of their operations are part of the municipal operations. It makes sense to have the trustees of the library districts elected at the same time as the municipal officials are.

I ask you support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

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

This Bill is a very excellent Bill because in our conversations again with the people who are interested in school elections in Illinois, the elementary, secondary and junior colleges, we decided that this would be a good, a good approach to holding those park district and other elections on a different date and I would ask you to vote in favor of House Bill 3337."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. We'll go back to the regular order, House Bill 3228."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3228. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code and the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli. Capparelli on 3228? Representative Stiehl."

C.M. Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3228 is sponsored jointly by myself and Representative Capparelli and I will carry it for him. All House Bill 3228 does is simply transfer the statistical record-keeping functions on juvenile delinquents from the Department... to the Department of Law Enforcement from the Commission on Delinquency Prevention. This is, has the approval of the Chairman of the Council... of the Commission on Delinquency Prevention and also of the Director of the Department of Law Enforcement. It is...we are transferring these functions simply to consolidate the record keeping and to insure the confidentiality of juvenile records. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Will the Lady yield for a question please? Representative Stiehl, the concern I have about this is just merely to inquire whether or not the Department of Corrections or is it Law Enforcement this goes to?"

C.M. Stiehl: "Law Enforcement."

Tipsword: "Law Enforcement in keeping these records of juveniles. Will they do what the Commission has never done although we're required to and that is to glean the files, to remove the names of those youngsters who are investigated but against whom charges are never brought of any kind?"

C.M. Stiehl: "Oh, absolutely. These are only for, they will have records only on adjudicated cases."

Tipsword: "That's very good because the Delinquency Commission has never fully met their obligations in that regard. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote... pardon me. Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Stiehl, there has been a lot of criticism of the Delinquency Prevention Commission in terms of their budget and I wonder if there is to be a concurrence provision in their budget since we are relieving them of this responsibility."

C.M. Stiehl: "Representative 'Beet', I'm not familiar with the Commission's budget. The fact remains that the Commission really does not have the facilities to keep these records and to maintain the confidentiality and that's why we felt it was necessary to transfer them."

Satterthwaite: "But if this Bill passes, we will be relieving them of the responsibility that they have had in the past, is that accurate?"

C.M. Stiehl: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question."

Satterthwaite: "If this Bill passes, however, we will be relieving them of the responsibilities that they have carried in the past."

C.M. Stiehl: "That's right."



Satterthwaite: "It seems to me then, Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber, that we need to see that when that Appropriation Bill comes before us that the appropriation is adjusted in accordance with relieving them of these responsibilities. If there is additional funding that needs to follow this function, it should be also transferred to the Department of Law Enforcement."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 162 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3233, Representative McMaster."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 32... House Bill 3233. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Local Governmental Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMasters."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3233 is merely a Bill that adds four million dollars to the Department of Local Government Affairs for distribution to local governments. This extra four million dollars is due to more money coming in from state income tax and as you know one-twelfth of that is supposed to be distributed to local governments. This four million dollars is money that they didn't know they were going to get and now they would like to distribute it to the local governments involved."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, if I understood the Gentleman correctly, the... this distribution represents one-twelfth of additional income tax collections. Now if my arithmetic is correct, that means that we're getting an additional forty-eight million dollars in new income tax receipts. I'd like to ask if the Gentleman would confirm my arithmetic. Is that correct, Representative McMaster? Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's talking? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, I would like to ask if the Gentleman would yield for the purpose of confirming my arithmetic. Will the Gentleman



please respond?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Bowman: "Okay. Well, I mean, it seems to me that we've been doing a lot of arguing on the floor of the House here about availability of cash. I wanted the Membership to be aware that we've got an extra forty-eight million dollars that we haven't counted on and here we are distributing four million of it to local governments. I support the Bill because, you know, we're required by law to do this. I have no problem with it, but I thought people would just like to be made aware that there is an extra forty-eight million dollars floating around here somewhere."

McMaster: "I would like to have the previous speaker know that he and the other side of the aisle have spent that forty-eight million dollars many times the last several weeks."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know, I know it's late and we're trying to get out of here, but I wish everybody would pay attention to what Representative McMaster has here. He is saying and the Republican side of the aisle is saying that the Governor's taken in forty-eight million dollars more than they anticipated in general revenue funds this year. That means that after this appropriation there is going to be thirty-six million dollars or four million, there's going to be forty-four million dollars that indeed we could have available to the school aid formula or whatever. This is really phenomenal when we continually talk or hear harangues from the other side of the aisle about... that we're fiscally irresponsible, we're just not getting specific general revenue counts from the Republican administration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMasters."

McMaster: "Again, I would inform the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle the same as I told the previous speaker, that you fellows over there have spent that money many times over in the last several weeks."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMasters, where do we stand here?"

McMaster: "In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would urge a 'yes' vote on





this. We're required to do so by law."

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

Matijevich: "Well, first of all I was going to intro... I was going to wonder who this distinguished guest is here dressed like this. We don't allow people to dress like this here. Look at the way he's dressed over here. Take a look at Deacon Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "That's the uniform of the day in the Marine Corps."

Matijevich: "But in explaining my vote, I also want to make it clear and I thought I made it clear on Second Reading. We've been looking all over... every nook and cranny for forty-five million dollars. Here it is, here's that additional revenue that we've been looking for all over. We didn't even need the Governor's task force to find the additional revenue. This is the proof of the pudding. The fact that the local distributive fund, that they need four million more dollars, multiply that by twelve, that's forty-eight million dollars. On top of that if you follow that same logic there's probably more sales tax revenue, also there's a lot more money than anybody anticipated. The Governor ought to admit it, we have it right here and now. There are the monies available for education that we have all been looking for. I'm voting 'aye', but I want everybody to know that the revenue is there just like we said that there would be additional revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Representative McMaster, it's too late to ask questions, either shake your head yes or no. Will any of this money be used to fix potholes?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 164 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 3233. Representative Cunningham for what purpose do you rise?"

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we ought to correct the record even in our haste. The amount of money involved is four million dollars and not forty-four million dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "3234. 3234, Representative Mahar."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3234. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Military and Naval Department. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3234 is a supplemental appropriation for the Military and soon to be defunct Naval Department in the amount of a hundred and forty-two thousand, one hundred dollars to pay the energy costs and continue the minor armor repairs. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 131 'aye' and 14 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3235, Representative Ralph Dunn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3235..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3259."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3259. A Bill for an Act in relation to off-track pari-mutuel system of wagering on horse races. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I request leave of the House to return House Bill 3259 to Second Reading for the purposes of two, two Amendments which the Members have on their desks at present."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, objection has been raised."

E.M. Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, with that objection, I would move to suspend the proper rule to return House Bill 3259 to Second Reading for the purposes of two Amendments, as I indicated, which is resting on the Member's desks at present."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor



vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative James Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise? Have all voted who wished?"

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Could you indicate how many votes this takes? I believe on our Rule 35 it may be 107."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian. David. 35(d) - 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, I would like a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative... Have all voted who wish on this one? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye' and 63 'no', the motion prevails. Representative Holewinski has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Please poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes, Don Brummet, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewing, Friedrich, Emil Jones, Laurino, Levin, Peggy Smith Martin, Porter, Robinson, Schisler, Waddell, and Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "I hear a noise. Where is it? Representative Walsh."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes."

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

Bennett: "Would you change me to 'yes' please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'yes'. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

P. Martin: "I'd like to be recorded as 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Bartulis, Beatty, Bennett, Birchler, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Conti, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn,



Epton, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis."

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

I didn't hear you. Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, please change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Schuneman as 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, change my 'no' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "'No' to 'aye'. Representative Steele."

E.G. Steele: "Please change me 'no' to 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "'No' to 'aye'. Representative Cissy Stiehl."

C.M. Stiehl: "Please change me to 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cissy Stiehl 'aye'. The message has come from the second floor. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Please change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "From 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Mahar 'aye'.

Gene Hoffman 'aye'. Campbell 'aye'. Hoxsey 'aye'. Representative Margalus, Margalus 'aye'. Representative Ralph Dunn 'aye'. Representative Skinner 'no'. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Where do we stand, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? In a pothole."

Holewinski: "Besides in a pothole."

Speaker Redmond: "115 'aye'."

Holewinski: "I'd just like to know what everybody got. I'll withdraw my request."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdraw... Gentleman has withdrawn his request for a verification. House Bill 3259 is on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #36, E.M. Barnes. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in Section 26.16 and so forth."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, these are two Amendments that in consultation with Representative Conti and some of the other Gentleman on the other side of the aisle has recommended. I concur with them. Amendment #36 makes a change relative to the Section 26.16 which deals with



employees and other portions of the corporations. And what it does in fact is change the language such that the regional corporation from a list submitted by the municipality of available and qualified personnel residing in each such municipality and training for these employees will be provided by the regional corporations will be the people that will be hired from... for those municipalities from the corporations. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #36."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

J. Houlihan: "Representative, under this Amendment if I understand it correctly what you're saying is that any particular employee will have to be recommended and put on a list that would be available from the municipality in which the corporation exists?"

E.M. Barnes: "Well, Representative, maybe what I should do at this point is yield to Representative Conti who could probably explain this more fully. But I concur with his Amendment, so if I may I would yield for that answer to Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, yes, Jim. What we're trying to do is to make sure that this doesn't become a patronage army for any of the core cities and that the... first... the first from the available qualified persons residing in that municipality. In other words, we're not trying to build a patronage army for any of the core cities. Must come from that municipality."

J. Houlihan: "Representative Conti, wouldn't it be more accurate to say that what you're trying to do is limit the patronage to each municipality that has particular facilities within it so that the patronage..."

Conti: "Well..."

J. Houlihan: "For example, the patronage from the municipality of which I believe you're Mayor, you and the organization which you belong to would control the patronage by being able to control the lists which would go to the corporations. And in the patronage in Schaumburg would be also controlled..."

Conti: "Using the word 'patronage' in a highly respected form that



I do, I'll accept that explanation. I don't see anything wrong with patronage for a good day's work and a good day's pay."

J. Houlihan: "I'm not arguing, I just wanted to be clear. You were indicated that it was just to limit their patronage, but really what you're saying in this Amendment is that each to get his own spoils in patronage. Is that correct?"

Conti: "I'd be seeing that the people who are unemployed in my community would be getting a fair piece of the pie."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this indicates one of the, I would suggest, glaring defects of the Bill as drafted because what it relies upon in terms of its employee system is not a merit selection or a professional standard and we're talking about a very sensitive business. We're talking about a business where there is a potential for graft, corruption and possibly misuse of public funds. Now what we're doing is we're acknowledging by this Amendment the fact that this corporation will rely almost exclusively on a patronage system. Now I don't have serious problems with patronage as Representative Conti has raised. It has a lot of benefits to it. What Representative Conti wants to do is to make sure that his municipality gets its share. What I'm trying to point out is that the Bill as amended now clearly indicates that it will rely for its functioning on a patronage army, not on a large number of professional administrators. And I think that would give some serious questions to whether this Bill and this Amendment, if it's adopted, would be in the best interests of the people of the State of Illinois."

Conti: "And while in closing, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all..."

J. Houlihan: "Representative Conti, you're not closing yet."

Conti: "All right. To answer your question, I'm very proud of the personnel code that I had and after this, if this Bill passes, I'm not even going to say I'm voting for this Bill, but if this Bill does pass, you can put this under the merit selection, you can do anything that you want that you've done before and I think, Mr. Houlihan, you were here when you gave these municipalities home rule powers. But we are taking the home rule powers away from



these municipalities when you come in with a core city that's going to control this patronage or personnel or whatever you want to call it."

J. Houlihan: "I believe it was the Constitutional Convention which gave the home rule powers and I was not a Member of the Constitutional Convention, Representative. The Majority Leader was, but I was not."

Conti: "You voted on it."

J. Houlihan: "Yeah, but you don't know how I voted."

Conti: "I've got a good record."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as this deals with employees, I'd like to quote from the Chicago Crime Commission summary on its position on this Bill in which the Executive Director Stephen Schiller added that most industrial or merchandising companies considering either location or expansion of facilities in our area would count the promotion of gambling amongst potential employees as a very negative factor. Now the following businessmen signed that statement - William B. Browder, Vice-President of the General Counsel to the Transunion Corporation; O. Clifford Davis, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of People's Gas Company; Robert M. Drieves, Chairman, retired, People's Gas Company; Gordan Gilke, Vice-President Carson, Pirie, Scott and Company."

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

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Chair in all due respect. I think I've extended my patience beyond its limits. I just don't see what the reading of these names has to do with this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "I sure will, Mr. Speaker. I mean, the Governor is really in the tank this time, but I don't even know whether he's in the tank before the Republican Members of the aisle. But he must be getting a lot of phone calls from the four hundred thousand labor union in the City of Chicago that are going to support him in exchange for this sellout on this Bill. But at the same time, the employers that I mentioned, these chief executives who form the nucleus of



this fund raising are also trying to call the Governor. Wow, he must be in heck of a shape, one heck of a shape at this time, Ladies and Gentlemen, trying to decide what to do as he goes into the tank once again with Mayor Bilandic in the tank, in the tank again. Government by executive fiat, what do we have to say about this, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Illinois General Assembly? Nothin'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hole... or Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #36."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I raise to... I rise to oppose this Amendment because all it says is that it's 'where's mine?' time again in the Illinois General Assembly. What it says is that we're willing to accept a bad Bill that's going to be very destructive to Illinois society as long there's something in it for each one of us. It's a bad Bill and the Amendment doesn't make it any better."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 30 'no'. The motion carries and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #37, E.M. Barnes. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in the title in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if this is the appropriate time but I would like to move to defer consideration of this Amendment till a fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe he needs 89 votes to accomplish that."

Speaker Redmond: "The question on 32(f), Representative Holewinski





has moved that the consideration of Amendment #37 be deferred until a fiscal note has been filed. It requires an affirmative vote of 89 to carry that motion. The question is on his motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on the motion this Amendment would obviously add to the state's responsibility in policing this operation. It very obviously has a fiscal impact and I think it's only reasonable that we do know the costs and I would urge and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, where are the champions of fiscal integrity? When we get on the floor and talk about helping hungry people, yes, we'd love to do it, but fiscal integrity. When we get on the floor of the House and talk about matters to promote criminal justice and a decent, humane system of education, we talk about fiscal integrity. And there they are, there they are, the party of fiscal integrity, 73 'noes' and 48 'ayes', in the tank again, the party of fiscal integrity."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'aye' and 72 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope that all of the purists, purists here can support this Amendment since this Amendment merely says that the Bureau of Racetrack Security will provide the investigative service to all the regional corporations in their off-track pari-mutuel wagering facilities. In essence what it says and what it will deem is that the Bureau of Security of the Racetrack will have people on the spot at those facilities at all times. And it says that services will be paid from the appropriation from the General Revenue Fund which is now, I believe, already involved in the fiscal note. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #37."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

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

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

Wait a minute, we're on the vote here for... Question is,



Representative Barnes moves the adoption of Amendment #37. Representative James Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise?"

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I realize that's within Representative Terzich's... the Representative over there's right, but I think it's going to just tie up the House. I think it's inappropriate. I think a number of people want to raise questions about this Amendment and I would ask for a Roll Call if we're going to have Representative Terzich's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I'm very considerate of the Member's time and I would withdraw that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved... has withdrawn the motion for previous question. Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Representative, you indicated some hope that maybe the purists would support this Amendment. I'm not sure who you're addressing that at, but I'm concerned when you talk about the Bureau of Racetrack Security, you're talking about the already established bureau within the Department of Law Enforcement?"

E.M. Barnes: "That's correct."

J. Houlihan: "Well, is there any reason that you chose to fund that differently than the way it's currently funded?"

E.M. Barnes: "Representative, as I indicated to you earlier in trying to be accommodating to all the Members of the House, I did not draft this Amendment, but I agree with the concept. So the Amendment was drafted by, I believe, the Minority Staff. So that question you would have to direct to them."

J. Houlihan: "Well, the drafter of this Amendment has changed the funding..."

E.M. Barnes: "Representative Conti perhaps can answer that question."

J. Houlihan: "The drafter of the Amendment has... whoever this is to be directed to, I don't want... is it you, Representative Conti? The draft... in drafting this, you changed the funding of the Bureau of Racetrack Security. As you know, that is not funded from the General Revenue Fund currently."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Now, what is your question, Representative Houlihan? The



intent... can I tell you what the intent is behind the... the Amendment? It's not to have the local police department regulate or police these off-track betting parlors. I would like to have the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement handle that and be regulated by the state instead of by the local police authority."

J. Houlihan: "Representative Conti, once again we're in agreement as to your intention and I think it's a good idea to have that Bureau provide the internal security. What I was raising was why did you choose to change the funding of the Bureau of Racetrack Security and make it from the General Revenue Fund?"

Conti: "I certainly don't want to deplete the other funds. We want to work on the appropriation that they now have."

J. Houlihan: "Could you repeat that?"

Conti: "We didn't want to deplete the other funds and we will be working on the mechanism that this will be... this proposition will be making if it's passed."

J. Houlihan: "Well, Representative Conti, I think you've made a serious mistake in this Amendment because the way this is funded now and I believe Representative who is the Minority Whip can support me on this, is that the racetracks pay in to provide some of the security. They pay into the fund - the Agricultural Premium Fund - and then that fund is then used to finance the security that they have at the track. Now my question is, we're using the General Revenue Fund, I think that's a mistake. Secondly, I think the corporation ought to be paying in for the security just as we've established the policy with the racetracks that the security is important to them. You know, we've made some strides in racing in Illinois over the last four or five years under the directorship of the new Racing Board, Tony Scariano, who is the Chairman. I think..."

Conti: "I think Representative Barnes can answer that. I think he'd like to answer that. Gene. Turn on Gene Barnes, will ya', Ed?"

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. In answer to your question, right now you're correct that the normal services avail by the Bureau is out of the Ag. Premium Fund, but I understand with the drafting of this Amendment according to the way the Bill is now intact which



I am going to support on Third and I hope you do also, approximately forty million dollars will be going... forty million new dollars will be going into the General Revenue Fund, Common School Fund, will be going into the Common School Fund. Of that forty-million, approximately two hundred thousand which this cost will be will be taken for the services of security at these various facilities which will leave somewhere in the neighborhood of thirty-nine million, eight hundred thousand for the Common School Fund."

J. Houlihan: "Representative Barnes, two hundred thousand is not being taken from the Common School Fund."

E.M. Barnes: "Two hundred thousand, approximately is estimated the amount of costs that would be involved in there. According to the way the Bill is drafted now, they will accrue approximately forty million dollars or thereabouts for the... going to the Common School Fund. This will cost approximately two hundred thousand dollars so the only deficit or subtraction, if any, from the amount of money that will be accrued by this, by this operation would be minus two hundred thousand dollars. That's all I'm saying."

J. Houlihan: "Representative, I think what we're doing is reversing a policy which was established which I think most of the Members in the House would want to support and that is that the racing interests, those who were involved with the operations of the race-track and then now under this Bill, those who'd be involved with the operations of the off-track betting centers ought to be responsible for the security. I think we're in agreement that Representative Conti has raised a valid point that the best way to provide that security is to use the law enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Racetrack Security. But I think what we've done is change the important principle that then take these operations and corporations off of the hook. They are no longer responsible financially for the funding of this particular security. Let me raise another point. Currently, you're projecting two hundred thousand dollar costs and I would estimate that that would be... about how many employees would you think that would be, Representative Barnes?"



E.M. Barnes: "What this Amendment does and let's keep things clear and straight. This is the amount that I'm estimating would be the cost for the additional services of the now already available employees that are doing this very thing right now. Would be on-track facilities."

J. Houlihan: "Right. The... they're doing it now so those people are busy doing that. We're talking about the additional people that are needed..."

E.M. Barnes: "Representative, if you..."

J. Houlihan: "...for the off-track centers."

E.M. Barnes: "If you will, Representative, try not to interrupt anyone and if you will not interrupt me, perhaps we can understand where we're trying to go here. What this estimate that I gave you is the estimate of the additional costs involved for the now, the employees of the Bureau of Security that is performing this service as of now. We do not anticipate, we do not anticipate any additional people. Now to determine how, to determine how their schedules are, that is something that we don't do now. We simply appropriate money, we simply appropriate money for the purpose of the work that they will perform. That's all we're doing in this Amendment. We cannot tell them how their schedules will be. I really... I don't see how you can tell that."

J. Houlihan: "Representative Barnes, it seems to me if we're talking about two hundred thousand dollar costs, we ought to know how many people that would be. At least we ought to have some idea of how many additional people..."

E.M. Barnes: "It would be about according to our estimation, about fifteen or sixteen people."

J. Houlihan: "Fifteen to sixteen people and I believe..."

E.M. Barnes: "Now of the number that are there. Now there's about, I guess about thirty-seven altogether that are there."

J. Houlihan: "Right, and I assume the number that are there are there because they're needed in doing work now. And because they're doing work now, they can't be put on this project and that's why we need new people..."

E.M. Barnes: "Representative Houlihan, one of the things that I have



never attempted to do on this House floor now will I, perhaps you have far greater information and insights to the operation of the various departments than I, but I have never suggested to any department how they should use their money for what purposes once it leaves our hands. As I understand, that is the function for the Executive Branch which is a distinct and separate part of... apart from the Legislative Branch. The only thing that I'm trying to do as I understand this Amendment here is give him the financial wherewithall to perform this service. Now I believe that it is then the function of the department to determine how that wherewithall will be used."

J. Houlihan: "I won't prolong this, but I would like to make two points in closing as I address the Amendment. The first point..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to close on the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "This is the presidential microphone. Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Two points in closing as I would argue that this Amendment should be redrafted. I agree with the purpose of the Amendment and would be happy to work with the Sponsor to redraft it. I think one thing ought to be done is change the sources of funding. I think, secondly, we ought to have a more accurate figure or a more complete explanation of what will be needed in terms of personnel. I don't mean to suggest I know what the department will do and I take Representative or the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee admonition to heart. I'm not suggesting that we tell the Law Enforcement Department what to do, but fifteen people would seem to be very few if we need thirty-seven to monitor the security at the track. We're talking about many more locations than we have at the tracks currently and I think we may need more people so it may be a larger dollar amount that we would need and consequently would have more of an impact on the General Revenue Fund and that would heighten the reason to change the source of funding. And so at this point, I would have to stand in opposition to the Amendment as drafted but would support and Amendment with those changes."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

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

Will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mahar: "With the passage of this Amendment, will the original corporation still be appointing special policemen? The Act calls for special policemen to be appointed from time to time to... to... with the powers of police officers to work in and around the facility under their jurisdiction. Now will they still be doing that?"

E.M. Barnes: "Yes, those will be sworn personnel."

Mahar: "Appointed by the regional corporation?"

E.M. Barnes: "Yes."

Mahar: "Why are they needed with the... with your Amendment and with local police? Why are they needed? Did you hear me?"

Conti: "Bill, the intent is to take the authority away from the local police. That's what I don't want in the Bill."

E.M. Barnes: "Right. Bill, I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you totally. The idea, the reason that they are needed is so that the local police departments wherever they are will not be overburdened for this purpose. These people will be sworn personnel that will be appointed in conjunction as I understand by the regional corporation. The regional corporation will pay for it so that you will not add any additional burden to the local police department."

Mahar: "Well if the local municipalities are getting funding and getting money from the corporation, I don't understand why they don't operate in the same way as they do now. I've lived in a town with a racetrack for many, many years and there's been no special policemen appointed beyond the internal security to roam the streets around the facility with powers of police appointed by the regional corporation. I don't see what the need for it is."

E.M. Barnes: "Well, Bill, I'm not necessarily opposed to what you're saying. I'm merely saying that the people from the local municipalities indicated in the drafting of this Bill that they would not do... want to take on an additional burden of this purpose. And so, we said, fine, we will work in conjunction with you to



insure that that don't happen. The regional corporation will be appointing in conjunction with the municipality the local... sworn personnel as you said and will pay for them. I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm merely saying that in working with the municipalities that did not want to take on additional financial burden, we included this language."

Mahar: "Well, if there's going to be any... May I speak to... Mr. Speaker. If there's going to be any special policemen appointed, they ought to be appointed by the municipality, directly from the municipalities and not...and not by the corporations as long as you have, if you have Amendment #37 adopted."

Conti: "That's why 36 was adopted."

E.M. Barnes: "That's right. That's the reason 36 was adopted and..."

Mahar: "But it doesn't cover... it doesn't cover Section 26.15. It covers a different Section. 26.15 is left intact."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richard Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, 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 say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Barnes, to close."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the whole point of this Amendment is to insure that we have the kinds of people that is already involved in the Bureau of Security that are experienced, the kinds of people that we know are above any reproach to insure that these facilities will be ran and maintained in a proper manner. That's all this Amendment is about. I'm not arguing anything beyond that. I think that this is a good Amendment to insure that we will have the kinds of people that has experience in this area, that will be policing these facilities and I ask the support of the House on Amendment 37."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #37. Those in favor say 'aye', those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult





to believe the two hundred thousand dollar estimate that the Sponsor has provided us with especially if you're talking about the addition of fifteen new employees. What that, I think, says is that what we're going to do is have investigators who will be working for nine or ten thousand dollars a year, a problem that we have sought to address in recent legislative sessions in order to avoid the corrupt... the corruptness that's attendant to the investigatory or regulatory process. I think that there's really probably, it's really probably going to involve a... many more dollars than what is estimated here and those are dollars according to this Amendment that are coming out of the General Revenue Fund."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 40 'no'. The motion prevails and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Any announcements, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any announcements? Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank everybody for participating in today's Poppy Day program. I want to especially thank Chairman Phil Collins, Co-Chairman Jacob Wolf, Co-Chairperson Adeline Geo-Karis, and Co-Chairperson Mary Lou Summer, Taylor Pouncey, Eddie Kornowicz, Chairperson Genie Chapman, Chairperson Peggy Smith Martin. And also I want to name those that donated five dollars for the poppies - Lee Daniels, Adeline Geo-Karis, Bruce Waddell, Jake Wolf, Ted Meyer, Phil Collins, E.R.A. Jim Taylor, Pete Peters, Tom Hanahan, Roger Keats, John Ryan, Jeffrey Holden from the Illinois State Medical Society and Tom Duffy. Thank each and every one of you for helping the hospitalized veterans."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if it would be too much to ask the staff on the last Bill being that there's so many Amendments been adopted, really it's kind of hard to understand what position that the Bill would be in. Would it be too much of a problem to have an update on the synopsis of that Bill available for us tomorrow morning?"



Madigan: "No problem at all. Any other announcements?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Van Duyne: "Did you answer my question, Speaker?"

Madigan: "There's no problem at all, Leroy."

Van Duyne: "Okay, I thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on your desk is the House schedule for next week. It shows Rules Committee meetings on Thursday at 2 p.m. and Friday at 9 a.m. It is not anticipated that there will be any other meetings of the House Rules Committee with regard to Senate Bills. Now Sponsors who are handling Senate Nonappropriation Bills that require Rules Committee clearance should go into the Speaker's office and see Nancy Fritzsche and get a copy of the form and fill it out and that should be done today or tomorrow. And once again, it is the responsibility of the individual Legislator to present his or her Senate Bill on the first or the second, next Thursday or Friday or they may not have their Bills considered this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other announcements? Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we had a special order of business that was set for three o'clock today. There was some printing problems and I realize we got into other matters we couldn't interrupt those, so we passed over that special order of business. I wonder if it would be appropriate at this time to move to reset that special order of business to noon tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for what reason? It's only quarter to five. I don't understand why we got a recess. Why aren't we going on with the business of the House? What's going on here?"

J. Houlihan: "Representative Ryan, I..."

Ryan: "Why can't we go ahead with the business of the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Representative Houlihan. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker..."



J. Houlihan: "Representative Minority Leader, let me make two things very clear: One, I'm not the one who is moving this House towards what appears to be an adjournment. Secondly... secondly..."

Ryan: "Just cause they're all standing over there with their coat on, we know what's that mean."

J. Houlihan: "Secondly, it seems to me inappropriate for you to raise those kind of procedural questions when you've been in the tank that last half hour."

Ryan: "That's out of order, that's not..."

J. Houlihan: "Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I move that we reset this special order of business is we have to act on the Executive Order within the sixty day deadline so we are required to act before Monday."

Ryan: "Why don't you change it to nine o'clock in the morning?"

J. Houlihan: "I will change in deference to the Minority Leader to change it to 11:55."

Speaker Redmond: "That conflicts with the Resolution adopted by the House."

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

J. Houlihan: "11:55, Speaker, in deference to the Minority..."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, at 1:15 this afternoon, I asked the intention of the Chair for today's activities. To this point, I don't know what they are, haven't been told and certainly now that you..."

J. Houlihan: "You don't deserve to know."

Ryan: "the real Speaker are in the Chair, you could certainly relay that information only as a mere courtesy, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of the House so we as the Minority Party know what you're going to do and what your plans are. Do you mind telling us? We're part of this Assembly, too, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Ryan: "What's the program, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "The program is to recognize people seeking recognition and then to abide by the wishes of the General Assembly. James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "I would suggest to the Minority Leader that maybe the order of business is that what we'll do is adjourn, we'll hear



the President and then we'll go to a special order and then we'll go to the off-track betting Bill and then we'll probably dwindle away and kill every other Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll be back in Session at ten o'clock tomorrow.

How about setting it for eleven o'clock?"

J. Houlihan: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll set... it's too late. Representative Houlihan has moved that the special order of business set for today at three be reset for eleven o'clock tomorrow. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Houlihan... I mean Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have two Bills on Second Reading I'd like to move to Third Reading, have read in Third Reading. I'll bring them back tomorrow because there are Amendments filed and I think it would be only fair to those that filed the Amendments to address themselves to those Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Just read them and hold them on Second was the request. Well, Second Reading. We'll read them and hold them. You can't object to the order of business of Second Reading. Read the Bills, call the Bill. 2593."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2593. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "2594."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second."

Clerk O'Brien: "2594. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Minimum Wage Law. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I would like... I have the same request on a Bill that Senator Hall sent over. It's an emergency appropriation on Senate Bill 1569 if we could read to Second..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well wait a minute. That's a Senate Bill, Second, isn't it?"

Bradley: "Yes, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any other House Bills, Second that want to..."



Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "House Bill 2951."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2951. A Bill for an Act relating to conducting of pull tabs and jar games by certain nonprofit organizations. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bills, Second, it's 1569."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1569. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Board of Regents for the development of a parking facility of Northern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

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

Robinson: "Well a number of people who have Bills are concerned whether their Bills will be called before the deadline. Representative Byers and I have filed a motion to extend the deadline for a week..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we aren't going to take that up now. Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I had intended to move for adjournment of the House of Representatives, but I have just been presented with evidence of despicable political act. For day after day we have heard the Republican Party criticize the efforts of the Democratic Party to provide a legislative initiative to repair potholes in this state. I personally and every other Democrat have been subjected to unending and severe criticism and ridicule by the Republican Members of this House and by their Republican boss, Governor Thompson. And now, Mr. Speaker, let me read to you the first paragraph from a news release which has been released just today. Governor James R. Thompson announced a \$75.6 million program to begin immediate repair of winter damaged roads and bridges on state and local highways."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not finished."



Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, Pardon me. Representative Madigan. Finish, finish."

Madigan: "To all you Republicans who cheer so enthusiastically, think of yourselves and your colleagues who are totally embarrassed because you stood on the floor of this House of Representatives and told us point after point after point there is no money available. This is silly, this is foolish, we don't have the money to spend on potholes. Representative Daniels was one of them. Representative Ryan was another and your Governor once again has done you in. Here he is, he didn't have thirty million dollars, but he's got seventy-five million dollars. All of you should see the light of day and abandon his candidacy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan in rebuttal."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm certainly glad to hear that the Governor has a program that's going... that's been in the mill and it's been in the making for some time and has finally announced it. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not concerned with those issues now. I'm concerned with the Members of this chambers and their legislation, Mr. Speaker. We don't have to stand here and listen to this kind of stuff, this political nonsense from the Majority Leader and yourself. Scream if you want, Mr. Speaker, but you have lost total control over this chamber and your obligation is to keep us here and to keep us working instead of going to the dinner in Chicago. We got Bills that have to be heard, the people's business must go on and you're not going to allow it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I hear all of this concern about House Bills. I would like to point out that every spring we have a death ritual in the Senate and it is known as the Senate Rules. The House Bills will die by the hundreds and I think what we really ought to do is just mercifully put our own Bills to death and allow the Senate to run us as they usually do."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was interested in the comments of the Majority Leader when he indicated



some of the past statements that were made by Members on this side of the aisle. And I do recall a situation, Mr. Majority Leader, in which we had a problem and we pointed out certain things to you and you stood up and you said, 'That was yesterday.' I think that the Governor probably had some consultations with the President who is coming in here tomorrow. The Federal Government, I think, has released some extra funds. And if I recall, last night at the Grid Iron Affair he did indicate to all of us that we would have a safe trip home because his Director had assured him that by nine o'clock last night all the potholes were filled. And it should come as no surprise and I don't want to be surprised, Mr. Chair... Speaker, as I know you don't like to be surprised, but it was announced last night at the Grid Iron Affair. The news people certainly know that the Governor's not one to make light of any kind of problems. And so when he did indicate yesterday that the potholes were filled at nine o'clock, I think if anyone walked out to any street in any township anywhere, anywhere in the State of Illinois, at nine o'clock last night them potholes were filled. It is no longer an issue. It's over, the potholes are... is over with and we now go on to whatever is next on the agenda and tomorrow's news conference."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I was the Sponsor yesterday of the Bill that was the Pothole Bill. And I remember the abuse I took from the Leadership on the other side of the aisle that there couldn't possibly be that much money and how shocked they were when there was a letter indicating that it would cost at least that much to fill the potholes in the State of Illinois which was presented to them. I was chastised because there was no fund for this money to go into. They couldn't possibly get to the potholes. And if there's going to be... if anyone should do it, the Federal Government ought to do it. Well, it just indicates to me that our Governor is what he has been all along, a Governor who never acts, but who only reacts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of Mr. Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "He yields."

Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, Governor Thompson supported a pay increase. Now he opposes it. He opposed cost of living increase for welfare recipients. Now he's in favor of it. He opposed pothole repairs. Now he's in favor of pothole repairs. Mr. Ryan, can you tell us tomorrow morning at the beginning of Session, will you have available for us the Governor's report from the cost control task force?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I'll certainly do my best, Mr. Madigan. I understand..."

Madigan: "You're the first Republican to say that."

Ryan: "I understand though that, I certainly... I understand that you've made all the demands possible on those people, the private individuals that have... that make up these... the task force. And I don't know where... where do you stand with all of your demands that you wanted these people to come back from their lunch hour and avoid their lunch hour? Did you make those demands on those people personally? The Mayor's funding-raising people and those kind of people, did you make those kind of demands?"

Speaker Redmond: "Has he responded to the question, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "A nonresponsive answer, an evasive answer."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll have to strike the answer as not being responsive."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if there are no further announcements, I move that we adjourn by allowing five minutes for the Clerk till eight o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The motion carries."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolutions, to wit: House Joint Resolution #91; concurred in by the Senate May 25, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Committee Reports. Representative J.M. Houlihan, Chairman of the Committee on State Government Organization to which the





following Bills were referred; action taken May 25, 1978. Reported the same back with the following recommendation: do pass as amended House Bill 3316. Messages from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate passed Bills of the following title and passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills #252, 255, 386, 388, 38... 93, 395, 1055, 1423, 1523, 1535, 1576, 1577, 1581, 1582, 1584, 1586, 1592, 1596, 1597, 1598, 1600, 1611, 1841, 1845, 1866, 311, 430, 460, 771, 1083, 1408, 1510, 1573, 1583, and 1589; passed by the Senate May 25, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 309, Robinson-Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1641, Winchester. A Bill for an Act to make appropriation to the Commission on Visits and Exam. State Institutions. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1528, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Park District Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 386, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 388, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 393, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 395, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1055, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1845, Matijevich. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 460, Kornowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Bingo License and Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 771, Getty. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1408, Lainenweber-Waddell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1589, Macdonald. A Bill for an Act to make appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Institute for Environmental



Quality. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the  
House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	10:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Clerk O'Brien	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call	
		Mann		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kempiners		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolution	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien		
2		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2538, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2753, 2nd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2843, 2nd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2851, 2nd Rdg., No C.A.	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd Rdg.	
3		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2911, 2nd Rdg. Am. #1 adopted in Committee	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2951, 2nd Rdg., No C.A.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #1	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kornowicz		
4		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Kornowicz		
		Speaker Redmond	Take out of record	
	10:17	Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2973, 2nd Rdg. Am. #1, 2, 3 adopted in Com.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	Take out of record	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2978, 2nd Rdg. Am. #1, 2, 3, 4 adopted in Com.	
5		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Beatty	Question	
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion	
		J. Houlihan	Move to reconsider	
		Speaker Redmond		
6	1:24	E.M. Barnes		
		Speaker Redmond	Take out of record	
		J. Houlihan	Point of personal privilege	
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion	
		Kozubowski	Point of order	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		J. Houlihan	Continues with Point
7		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 788, 3rd Rdg.
8		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Edgar	
9		Speaker Redmond	
		Giorgi	
10		Speaker Redmond	
	10:38	Brady	Yield
		Edgar	Discussion
11		Speaker Redmond	
		Hudson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	Addresses the Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hudson	Opposes
12		Madigan in the Chair	
		Stuffle	Urges no
13		Bradley in the Chair	
		Van Duyne	Question
14		Edgar	Discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Question
		Speaker Bradley	
		Tipsword	Support
15		Speaker Bradley	
		Kosinski	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	
16		Edgar	To close
17		Speaker Bradley	
	1:53	Schneider	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Reilly	Explains vote
18		Speaker Bradley	
		Pierce	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners	Explains vote
19		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Dunn	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewing	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Explains vote
20		Speaker Bradley	
		R. Dunn	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
21		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Edgar		
		Speaker Bradley	Bill lost	
		DiPrima		
		Catania	Recitation	
22		DiPrima		
		Geo-Karis		
	11:07	DiPrima		
23		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman	Point of personal privilege	
24		Speaker Bradley		
		Reilly		
25		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3380, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mudd		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Pullen	Question	
		Reilly	Discussion	
26		Speaker Bradley		
		E.M. Barnes		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mulcahey	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Reilly		
		Speaker Bradley		
		E.M. Barnes		
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
27		Matijeovich	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley	passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3049, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd Rdg	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3062, 2nd Rdg. Am. #1 adopted in Committee	
28	11:20	Speaker Bradley	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3128, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3231, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3287, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	AM. #1	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Chapman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kempiners		
29		Speaker Bradley		
		E.M. Barnes	Question	
30		Chapman	Discussion	
31		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Houlihan	Discussion	
		Chapman	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kempiners		
		Speaker Bradley	Am. adopted	





7.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #2
		Speaker Bradley	
	11:30	D. Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Houlihan	Question
32, 33		D. Houlihan	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners	Opposes
34		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Anderson	Question
35		D. Houlihan	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		E.M. Barnes	
36		Speaker Bradley	
		Gaines	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McGrew	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	
		D. Houlihan	To close
37		Speaker Bradley	Am. #2 adopted, 3rd Rdg.
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3347, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matejek	Leave to commit to Interim Study Calendar
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
38		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3368, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3377, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3384, 2nd Rdg. No C.A.	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1238, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		E.M. Barnes	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley	Objections raised	
		E.M. Barnes	Mokes Motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
39		W. Walsh	Point of Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman	Discussion	
		E.M. Barnes		
40		Speaker Bradley		
		Mann		
		Speaker Bradley		
		E.M. Barnes		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Holewinski	Question	
41		Speaker Bradley		
	11:54	Conti		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	Question	
42		Speaker Bradley	Discussion	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
		Hoffman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Walsh		
		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Houlihan	Moves Barnes' motion lie on table	
		Speaker Bradley		
43		Mann		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Conti		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan		
44		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Houlihan		
45		Speaker Bradley		
	12:04	E.M. Barnes	On the motion	
46		Speaker Bradley	Motion to table prevails	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B.-2591,--3rd-Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Greiman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tipsword	Move to reinstate 55(i)	
47		Speaker Bradley	Discussion	
		Schlickman		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Greiman	Introduces Carol Burnett	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tipsword		
		Geo-Karis		
48		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Davis	Announcement	
49		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2555, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan	Discussion	
50		Speaker Bradley		
		Robinson	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Levin		
		Speaker Bradley		
51		Schuneman	Question	
		Levin	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Epton	Yield	
52		Levin	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Holewinski	Point of order	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Epton		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
53		Speaker Bradley		
		Levin		
		Epton	Speaks to Bill	
54		Speaker Bradley		
		Huff		
55		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kempiners	Point of order	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Continues	
56		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Epton	Personal privilege	
57		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schuneman	Point of personal privilege	
58		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Houlihan	Personal privilege	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Collins	Objects	
		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Houlihan	Continues	
59		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Gaines	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tipword		
	12:35	Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2555 passed	
		Kane		
60		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2560, 3rd Rdg.	
		Levin		
		Speaker Bradley		
61		Katz	Question	
		Levin	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
62		Schneider	Yield?	
		Levin	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
	12:45	Collins	Supports	
63		Speaker Bradley		
		Vitek	Supports	
64		Speaker Bradley		
		Keats	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Van Duyne	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Levin	To close on H.B. 2560	
65		Speaker Bradley		
		Pierce	Explains vote	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2560 is passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2591, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Van Duynes	Votes 'aye' on H.B. 2560	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Polk	Votes 'aye' on H.B. 788	
		Speaker Bradley		
66		Flinn	Asks to take H.B. 2595 out of the record	
		Speaker Bradley	Take out of record	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2619	
		Speaker Bradley		
	12:52	E. Jones	Explains H.B. 2619	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Brady	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2619 is passed	
67		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2650	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Katz	Explains Bill	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2650 is passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2707	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kornowitz	Explains Bill	
68		Speaker Bradley		
		Schoeberlein		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mann		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mann	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2707 is passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2736	
		Speaker Bradley	Take out of record	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2757, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman	Explains Bill	
69		Speaker Bradley		
	1:00	Brady	Opposes	
70		Speaker Matijevich		
		Kane	Yield?	
71		Hoffman	Discussion	
		Kane		
72		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman	To close	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2844, 3rd Rdg.	
73		Cunningham		
74		Speaker Bradley		
	1:13	J. Dunn	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley	Motion fails	
		Willer		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison	Question	
75		Cunningham	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
		Conti	Opposes	
76		Speaker Bradley		
		Tobinson		
		Speaker Bradley		
		DiPrima		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevec		
77		Speaker Bradley		
		Greiman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Satterthwaite	Question	
78		Cunningham	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tuerk	Previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Cunningham	To close	
79		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Byers		
		Speaker Bradley		
80		J. Houlihan		
		Speaker Bradley	Bill is lost	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2903	
		Speaker Bradley		
81		Telcser	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
		Ryan	Inquiry of the Chair	
		Speaker Bradley	Discussion	
82		Stuffle	Sponsor of H.B. 2903	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Brady	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman		
83		Speaker Bradley		
		Byers	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Stuffle		
	1:37	Speaker Bradley		
84		Ryan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane		
85		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser	Possible verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Anderson		
		Speaker Bradley		
86		Stuffle	Postponed Consideration	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2946, 3rd Rdg.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
		Pierce		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	Questions	
87		Pierce	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Pierce	To close	
88		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
	1:47	Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3051, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McClain		
89		Speaker Bradley		
		Friedland		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Darrow	Yield?	
90		McClain	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
91		Hanahan	Yield?	
		McClain	Discussion	
92		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis	Question	
93		McClain	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Dunn	Question	
94		McClain	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		W. Walsh		
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Tuerk	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
95		McClain	To close	
	2:03	Speaker Bradley		
		Greiman	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2051 lost	
		Johnson	Aye on H.B. 2757	
96		Speaker Bradley		
		Kelly	Same request	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Pechous	Same request	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Byers		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3119, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		D. Houlihan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.J.R. #91	
		D. Houlihan		
97		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Houlihan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		D. Houlihan	Moves for adoption	
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted	
	2:10	Clerk O'Brien	H.R. 892	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	19.
		Mudd		
98		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser	Opposes	
99		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan		
		Bradley		
		Mudd	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		
100		Mann	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kempiners	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley	Motion fails	
101		Mudd	Postponed Consideration	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Collins		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Responds	
102		Speaker Bradley		
	2:22	Matijevich		
		Speaker Bradley		
103		Telcser	Point of personal privilege	
104		Speaker Bradley		
		Mautino	Parliamentary inquiry	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20.
105		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3168, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Terzich		
		Speaker Bradley		
106		Muglaian	Oppose	
107		Speaker Bradley		
108		Madigan	Support	
109		Speaker Bradley		
		Ewing		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matula		
110		Speaker Bradley		
		Satterthwaite		
111		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Davis	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
	12:43	Terzich	To close	
112		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Lechowicz	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman	Explains vote	
113		Speaker Bradley		
		Conti		
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Willer	
		Speaker Bradley	Did declare it passed here.
		Madison	
114		Speaker Bradley	
		Waddell	Vote 'aye' on 3168
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3220, 3rd Rdg.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Vinson	
115		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	Question
116		Vinson	
		Speaker Redmond	Declares 3168 passed
		Giorgi	
		Vinson	Discussion
117		J. Dunn	
		Vinson	Discussion
118		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1333, 2nd Rdg.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Table Am. #1
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #3, 4
		Daniels	Move to withdraw 3 and 4



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	22.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #5	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	Move to withdraw #5	
119		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #6	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Daniels		
120		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan	Moves adoption	
		Speaker Redmond		
121, 122		Schlickman	Question	
123, 124	3:08	Daniels	Discussion	
125		Speaker Redmond		
		Matula		
		Daniels	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond	Am. adopted	
126		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #7	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman		
127		Speaker Redmond		
		D. Houlihan	Opposes	
128		Speaker Redmond		
		Greiman		
		Speaker Redmond		
	3:25	Matula		
129		Speaker Redmond		





23.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Bradley	
130		Schlickman	
131		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	Am. #7 fails, 3rd Rdg.
		O'Brien	Point of personal privilege about the Pages seating
132		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
133		Speaker Redmond	
		Yurell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2554
	3:35	Speaker Redmond	
		O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
134		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2554, 3rd Rdg.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Yurell	Leave to hear it
		Speaker Redmond	Robinson objects
		Yurell	Move to hear H.B. 2554
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bluthardt	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
135		Speaker Redmond Yourell		
136		Speaker Redmond Conti Speaker Redmond Collins	Votes 'no'	
137	3:44	Speaker Redmond Mahar	Question	
138		Yourell Speaker Redmond Williams Speaker Redmond Brummer Speaker Redmond Yourell	Discussion Votes 'no' Moves previous question	
139		Speaker Redmond Huskey Speaker Redmond	Passed	
	3:50	Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Bluthardt	H.B. 3337, 3rd Rdg.	
140		Speaker Redmond Yourell Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond C.M. Stiehl	Passed H.B. 3228, 3rd Rdg.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	25.
141		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipswrpd	Question	
		Stiehl	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Satterthwaite	Question	
		Stiehl	Discussion	
142	3:56	Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk Hall	H.B. 3233, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McMaster		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
143		McMaster		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McMaster	Discussion	
144		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich	Explains	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Byers		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Cunningham		
		Speaker Redmond		
145		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3234, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
		Speaker Mahar		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
	4:05	Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3259, 3rd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Barnes	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		J. Houlihan	Objects	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Barnes	Moves to suspend rules	
		Speaker Redmond		
146.		J. Houlihan	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski	Verification	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Lechowicz	Poll absentees	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bennett	Change to 'yes'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		P. Martin		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds	
147		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewing	Votes 'aye'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schuneman	No to aye	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Winchester	No to aye
		Speaker Redmond	
		Steele	No to aye
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stiehl	No to aye
		Spaker Redmond	
		Stanley	No to aye
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	Withdraws request
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 3259, 2nd Rdg.
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #36
		Speaker Redmond	
	4:15	E. Barnes	On Amendment
148		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Houlihan	Yield?
		E. Barnes	Yields to Conti
		Conti	Answers J. Houlihan
149, 150		J. Houlihan	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
		E. Barnes	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mann	Continues
151		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	28.
		E. Barnes	To close on Amendment #36	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski	Opposes	
		Speaker Redmond	Am. #36 is adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Am. #37	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski	Fiscal note on #37	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lechowicz	He needs 89 votes	
		Speaker Redmond		
152		Holewinski	Urges aye vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mann		
		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails	
		E. Barnes	Explains Am. #37	
		Speaker Redmond		
	4:30	Terzich	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Redmond		
153		J. Houlihan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Terzich	Withdraws previous question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		J. Houlihan	Yield?	
		E. Barnes	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
154		Conti		
		J. Houlihan	Discussion	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	29.
155, 156, 157		E. Barnes		
158		Speaker Redmond		
		Mahar	Am. #37	
159		E. Barnes	Discussion	
	4:40	Speaker Redmond		
		Brummer	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Redmond		
		E. Barnes	To close	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski	Opposes	
160		Speaker Redmond	Am. #37 is adopted, 3rd Rdg.	
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		DiPrima	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Van Duyne	Inquiry	
161		Madigan	Answers Van Duyne	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Katz	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
162		J. Houlihan		
163		Speaker Redmond	Special Order of Business	
		Ryan	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond		
	4:50	Hanahan		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2593, 2nd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond	Held on 2nd Rdg.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	30.
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2594, 2nd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond	Held on 2nd Rdg.	
		Bradley	S.B. 1569	
		Speaker Redmond		
164		Kornowicz	H.B. 2591	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2591, 2nd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond	Held on 2nd Rdg.	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1569, 2nd Rdg.	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd Rdg.	
		Robinson		
		Speaker Redmond		
165		Madigan	Refers to Pot Holes	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan	For the Republicans	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ewell		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Peters		
166		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipword		
		Speaker Redmond		
167		Madigan	Question for Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan		
		Madigan	Task Force	
	5:00	Speaker Redmond		





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Madigan	Adjournment
		Speaker Redmond	The 'ayes' have it
168, 169		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate Senate Bills, 1st Rdg. House stands adjourned.

