

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Shailer Mathews said: Love that seeks to do men good is cowardice when it refuses to prevent them from doing wrong. Let us pray. Almighty God, the well-spring of all knowledge; Who hast taught us that we would love our neighbour as ourselves; we ask that Thou would give to us such knowledge that we may proclaim fearlessly and boldly Thy law of love in all our doings, in all our action, and in all our speaking. Help us, O Lord, as Members of this House of Representatives, to enact only such laws that are in harmony with this greatest of gifts, that the people of the State of Illinois may be governed in equity and in peace; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 275 Dave Jones, 276 Wikoff, 277 Huskey, 278 Younge, 279 Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 275 congratulates Mrs. May Ruddick Cooley on her 100th Birthday. House Resolution 276 congratulates Eric Mayfield upon receiving an Eagle Scout Award. 277 Huskey, congratulates Mr. and Mrs. Fred Millward on their 50th Wedding Anniversary. House Resolution 278 Younge, commends those at Scott Air Force Base who are participating in the Armed Forces Day Celebration. House Resolution 279 Mautino, asks that the House, Labor and Commerce Committee be directed to conduct an investigation into the reasonableness of premium rates for Workmen's Compensation. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich, has moved the



adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the Resolutions are adopted. Committee Reports. We're honored today by Senator Weaver's presence. In the middle aisle, Senator Weaver, formerly the Chief Executive Officer of Champaign-Urbana. He's the first man that combined the two communities. Welcome! You're always welcome, Senator Weaver. Convey the message to the Senate and maybe they will extend the same warm greetings to the House Members. Okay. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 25, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation. 'Do pass' House Bill 1349, House Bill 1369, House Bill 2001, House Bill 2126, House Bill 2296, House Bill 2356 and House Bill 2359. 'Do pass as amended', House Bills 1090, 1834, 2181, and 2213. Representative E. M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 18, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation. 'Do pass' House Bill 2364. 'Do pass as amended', House Bill 1538."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago we adopted House Resolution 279 and it does direct an investigation and that should require 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll get back to it again. 279?"

Matijevich: "House Resolution 279."

Speaker Redmond: "Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading.

House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 27. Representative Schoeberlein, do you want to handle that? House Joint Resolution 27. Equal Rights Amendment. Is there anybody speaking in opposition? Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "I think it's ironic you should call this Amendment



at this time, but I think it's worthwhile to note that a higher percentage of the women Members are on the floor than of the men Members."

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

Terzich: "Well....since no one wants to volunteer, I will, and I'd like to make a motion to table House Joint Resolution 27."

Speaker Redmond: "We have a quorum. The rule says that you have to rise. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I'm sorry, I have my cold pack on my toe. Mr. Speaker, I question the quorum."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich is not being timid at all but he wants to be sure that everybody has an opportunity to be on the Roll Call. Withdraws his motion. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 900, a Bill for an Act to create the General Assembly Library Study Commission, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 918, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1144, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1189, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 730, Representative Pierce, having voted on the prevailing side, moves that the vote by which House Bill 730 failed be reconsidered. Is there any discussion? Representative Pierce, what was the subject matter of that Bill?"

Pierce: "That was a return deposit on old Legislators. If you bring them back to your voting machine and grind them up in the voting machine and return them to Legislature then you get two bits back. Which is about what some of them are worth who voted against House Bill 730. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."



Tipsword: "How old do they have to be?"

Speaker Redmond: "...Ha...Ha...In their tenth term. Representative Katz, do you think that it would be a good time for a Rules Committee meeting today? Do you want to discuss it with the Minority Leader and ..."

Katz: "Yes...."

Speaker Redmond: "...see if we can't. I think it would be a good idea do do that.....before we go home today."

Katz: "Fine. I will do that immediately, Mr. Speaker. It's always a pleasure to talk to the distinguished Minority Leader."

Speaker Redmond: "That's one man's opinion. I say, that's one man's opinion."

Katz: "Well, I was going to say, that's George Ryan. I wanted you to understand who I was talking about in case you were misled by my glowing statement. That's also one in the same, the distinguished George Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Keats, we now have a clear track. Do you want to be recognized for the...to get anything off your system today? Representative Keats. He's been straining at the leash here for four or five months. Now I think we have a chance to let him get it all out of his system."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the losing side in Coastal Zone Management, could I move to reconsider?"

Speaker Redmond: "Somebody that's keeping record of the number of times that you could make that motion,it would be legions... Representative Cunningham, this would be a good time for you to give us a speech. Representative Cunningham on everything."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, it isn't often that words fail me, but this opportunity to say publicly the affection and high regard at which all the constituents of the 54th District hold the Honored Speaker of this House, should not go unuttered. I want you to know when the people of DuPage find you out and throw you out, you come down to



the 54th District and I will vacate this seat that I am cherished to hold, that the people might be better represented there than they are now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to tell you and the other Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that the reason he is so willing to invite you to Lawrenceville...that is to...yeah, Lawrenceville, is because he will have a room for you. He intends to get a penitentiary there. That's the only reason he's doing it. He's not being that gratuitous and benign. The only time he's gratuitous and benign to any of us is when he wants to pass a Bill. Then he promises me everything, the stars and the moon, but he won't promise me himself...and I'm glad."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether this...I hope I'm not betraying a confidence, but Representative Cunningham told me that he wanted that prison down in Lawrence County so he could visit his clients more frequently. For anybody else that feels that they have to give a speech today... to explain something... We have some House Bills, Second Reading. Is there any Member with a House Bill on Second Reading that...could be moved along at this time? Representative Kane. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2369, which is an Act to make Appropriations to the State Treasurer. We could move that Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Which one is that?"

Kane: "2369."

Speaker Redmond: "What order is it on?"

Kane: "Second Reading, First Legislative Day. I'm sorry. 2397 and 98 we'll hold on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll hold those, you say? Okay. Representative Leinenweber, do you have a Third Reading Bill that you want called? House Bill 2365. The order is House Bills, Third Reading. Roll Call for attendance. Senate Bills, First Reading."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 824, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I'd like to call the Member's attention to the Senate Bills, First Reading. Appearing, beginning on page five there's a lot of Bills awaiting House Sponsors. If you have a Bill that you're looking for please identify yourself to the Clerk. Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'd like to have leave to take 409 back to Second Reading when you get to that kind of business."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart, will you please repeat that?"

Hart: "409, it's on Third, I'd like to take it back to Second."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 409, Representative Hart has requested that that be returned to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Hart, amends House Bill 409 on page one, line one, by changing an appropriation and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "This provides planning money for the Law School at SIU. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Now, 2365, House Bill, Third Reading. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2365 is the annual appropriation for the commission for uniformity of legislation in the United States. This agency has been



in statutory existence in Illinois since 1907 and the appropriation is for thirty thousand dollars. I would not move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Oh! Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2365, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Commission on the uniformity of Legislation in the United States. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 6 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2366."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2366, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Legislative Reference Bureau, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is the annual appropriation for the Legislative Reference Bureau...which I'm sure all of you are familiar with and which serves us all. I'd appreciate your support on this Appropriation Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and no 'nay', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2367."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2367, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation of the Secretary of State, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson. Christensen..."

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



This is a deficiency appropriation for fuel and electricity. Appropriates funds to the Secretary of State. Increases the item for gas, oil and coal from \$1,076,000 to \$1,236,569. And the item for electricity from \$1,555,000 to \$1,814,237. For a total increase of \$413,806."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Cunningham: "Ray, we note an item there for coal in your description of the Bill. Is that inadvertent or is there any place the State of Illinois is burning coal and paying for it?"

Christensen: "I can't give you the answer to that right now, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Our Staff study indicated it was limited only to electricity and fuel oil. It seems, normally, in the State of Illinois, where coal is such an important factor that it is not being burned by the state. I bring that to your suggestion for relaying to the Secretary of State."

Christensen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Representative Let me observe that the amount that the electricity is increasing is approximately the same percentage that the auditing firm of Ernst and Ernst has indicated that the Springfield, City Water, Light and Power Electric Company rates are in excess for commercial users. That is the commercial users are being forced to subsidize the residential users in the City of Springfield, according to this outside auditor. When I was in Committee, the representatives of the Secretary of State's Office said that they would ask Secretary of State Dixon if he would approach the City Council of Springfield and ask them to revise the rates so we would not have a similar supplemental next year should the need arise....to the 17 percent increase in the cost arise."



Has the Secretary made a decision on that?"

Christensen: "The Secretary has been informed as to that and he plans to carry it out."

Skinner: "He plans...The Secretary of State plans to go to the City Council and press for a rate revision? Is that correct?"

Christensen: "He hasn't had time to do it yet, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I'm very happy to hear that the Secretary of State is coming down on the side of my constituents in Northern Illinois who have to subsidize the...the people who use electricity in Springfield homes and apartments, which includes myself."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say in answer to a remark that was made by Representative Cunningham. Our lack of use of coal in state institutions in the State of Illinois is because of legislation passed by this General Assembly over the opposition of several of us from coal producing areas in the State of Illinois, which was a great tragedy that we performed a few years ago. I certainly hope I can work with him to rectify this situation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Well, I think all we need is a quick Roll Call. This is a deficiency that has to be paid and Roscoe Cunningham's reference to coal, that is in the present Act and this Bill does nothing changing that at all. I suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye', no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2373. Skinner. Do you want to handle that, Representative Skinner? 2373.



Well....Is there any problem between you and your hyphenated Sponsor, with respect to this Bill? what? There's a difference, there's no problem between you and Sparky, Okay. 2373."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2373, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Legislative Advisory Committee and the Regional Transportation Authority, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that Representative Garmisa and I ever have any problems. Serving on this Commission together has lessened the problems that may have ever existed. You will notice, my colleagues, there is only \$5000 for this ... this little Legislative Advisory Commission, which is statutorily established as a result of the very close passage of RTA. I would ask for your unanimous approval.....we may continue to watch..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2376."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2376, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Little Calumet River Flood Control Coordinating Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, House Bill 2376 appropriates \$2000 for the work of the bipartisan Little Calumet River Flood Control Coordinating Commission that has been in existence for four years. During that four year's time we have been successful in working with the Congress of the United States in getting federal funding for a cleanup of the twelve mile Little Calumet River. We



11.

were also successful, as a Commission, in getting the Illinois National Guard to come in and do some further debris removal work. Presently, we coordinate our activities with the Metropolitan Sanitary District and local units of government to develop water retention ponds in our area and we're vitally interested in the deep tunnel plan. We envision a phase two dredging of the Little Calumet River and Representative Getty and I and the Members of the Commission would appreciate your favorable vote on our continuance."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 6 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2377."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2377, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Illinois Parent Education and Assistance Authority, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer. Ted Meyer. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Point of order. This Bill...the Bill that makes this ...thing happen is tabled. Can you go ahead and pass an appropriation Bill on that?..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer?"

Meyer: "I have a pending motion on the substance of the Bill. Take it out of the record, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2393."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2393, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Department of Labor, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan. Representative Catania. Out of the record? House Bill 48, Representative Mautino, do you want that one called? 48, Mr. Clerk, will you read the Bill?"



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 48, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Agricultural Fair Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 48 was amended, cut in half, yesterday. The appropriation is \$12,500. The substantive Bill is now in the Senate and I'd appreciate an affirmative Roll Call on this appropriation."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...Representative Totten, do you have an inquiry? Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Has this appropriation been line-itemed as to what you are going to spend it on?"

Mautino: "I'm sorry, Don, I was reading correspondence. I didn't hear you. What was it again?"

Totten: "Has this appropriation been line itemed as to where you are going to spend the money?...or is it just a lump sum?"

Mautino: "No. It's the ...It's a lump sum for the per diem for the members of the Commission, Sir...\$12,500."

Totten: "That's all that's going to be spent on it; the whole thing?" Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye' and 18 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 107..Representative Hart, can you handle that Bill? 107..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 107, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Department of Public Health, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."



Hart: "This is the appropriation for House Bill 106 which passed out of here last week, 142 to nothing, for scholarships and residency programs for doctors who would agree to practice in the State of Illinois, in medically underserved areas, for three years after they begin their practice. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 613, Representative Von Boeckman, do you want that one called? 613? Out of the record. 1115, Representative Friedrich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1115, Friedrich, a Bill for an ActOut of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1180."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 11...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor's proxy. 1418."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1418, Kane, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane on the floor? Out of the record. 1595, J. David Jones. Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave of the House to be recorded as voting 'yes' on House Bill 107. I was off of the floor at a meeting at the time....that.."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1515, Representative Jones? Out of the record. 2355, out of the record."



2362, Representative Giglio. Representative Giglio.

Out of the record. House Bills, Second Reading. Representative Ryan, are you ready to proceed on 962?"

Ryan: "I am, Mr. Speaker, if Representative Mulcahey is ready."

Speaker Redmond: Is Representative Mulcahey on the floor? Representative Mulcahey? What's your pleasure, Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "Well, I...I told Representative Mulcahey I'd hold this Bill to give him an opportunity to get some answers to questions he wanted. I've had it now for about three weeks, I've held the Bill. Obviously he's not here this morning. I'll hold it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I've spoken with Representative Mulcahey about this Bill. It seems like he's having trouble getting the answer, so I think it ought to be pulled out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "All right. We'll take it out of the record. Again I want to caution every Member of any...of Amendments that I don't think it's fair to hold a Sponsor's Bill up indefinitely until we're ready to proceed with some Amendments. Representative Ryan desires to have the Bill called, we'll call it. That same thing is true with respect to any other Sponsor. It's your wish to take it out of the record at this time; but I want to encourage all Sponsors, you know, we're coming into the last month of the Session and that's really not fair to a Sponsor to hold their Bills up indefinitely. 966, Representative Sandquist."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 966..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Same situation, I'm waiting on Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Whose Amendments are they?"

Sandquist: "Robinson's. We're working together."

Speaker Redmond: "You're not going to work together much longer"



because I'm going to call the Bills and get 'em out of here. 1593, Representative Deavers. Out of the record. 1594, Representative Simms. Out of the record. I understand 2397 and 2398 will be held. Giorgi..... Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resoluiton 43, Giorgi, resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, May 26, 1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 31, 1977, at 12 o'clock noon. And when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 27, 1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 31, 1977, at 1 o'clock p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, are you seeking recognition? Representative Giorgi on the Adjournment Resolution."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Resolution is adopted. Order is.... Speaker's Table. The Order of Agreed Resolutions. We passed Resolution 279 and inasmuch as it requests an investigation we need a Roll Call vote on that. So the question is on the adoption of Resolution 279. Those in favor of the motion of the adoption vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Totten. Representative Mautino to explain the Amendment. Mautino."

Mautino: "I was....Was the question posed, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, we're voting on something that hasn't been explained. I wonder if the Sponsor would explain what we're voting on?"



Mautino: "Be most happy to, Representative. This Resolution, 279, directs the House Labor and Commerce Committee to investigate the increased cost in premiums as they reflect theincreased benefits under the Workmen's Compensation . . . the Statute of the State of Illinois. I think there's been much discussion concerning this particular issue and the Labor and Commerce Committee would like to have the authority to investigate this area and come back with a comparison of benefit levels and cost increases."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, I wonder....it seems to me we just had a study done by the Insurance Commission on this and I thought that maybe Intergovernmental may have been doing something on it too. Why are we duplicating what's already been done on various studies which the information is already available for the General Assembly. . . And second of all, what's your anticipated cost of doing this?"

Mautino: "Well, first of all, Representative, there has been no correlation. There has been a lot of investigation concerning what House Bill 234 and 235 of the 79th General Assembly did as it compared to the previous year's Statutes. This Resolution was brought about because Representative Tipword of the Insurance Committee and, of course, the Labor and Commerce Committee could not receive facts and figures from the insurance industry or a breakdown between different businesses in the Workmen's Compensation area, Schedule A and Schedule B. So, my original intention was to have that Committee have subpoena powers. Since that was not possible under the rules, since it was a Subcommittee, the Chairman of the Labor Committee, Representative Jacobs, asked that we have this Resolution and do nothing but zero in on the cost and the benefit levels as they now sit before us. That's the only reason for the Resolution."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suggest that it's incredible and irresponsible that this Resolution should get 9 votes let alone 91. It's a classic case of labeling the obvious rather than an effort to elucidate the obscure. The people who voted 'aye' on SB-235 need look no farther than into the mirror than to see why the Workmen's Compensation rates in Illinois have gone so high as to drive thousands of jobs beyond the borders of the State of Illinois. And.."

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

Mautino: "He's not addressing himself to the Resolution, Sir, he's talking about previous legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Address yourself to the question of the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of House Resolution 279."

Cunningham: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker. Your name appears as an 'aye' vote on SB-235 also."

Speaker Redmond: "That's right."

Cunningham: "Now it needs to be pointed out here that there's a limit to what the taxpayers can endure; and to say that they are going to spend money to find who it was who made business climate so.....an inhospitable mistake... is a negation. We need to do something to reduce the Workmen's Compensation benefits, that the rates might be within the limits of the employers to pay. And to waste money on this Resolution is to compound the crime that's been committed against the employers of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Epton: "As you can see, Representative, I have voted for this Resolution but I can't help but ask; no one better than



you probably knows the study and effort that went in to determine these costs. Is it your intention, if this Resolution is passed, that your...whatever Committee or group is selected will work with the Insurance Study Committee and have the benefit of all of our...work without additional cost to anyone?"

Mautino: "Absolutely. Yes, Sir."

Epton: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, last evening the Speaker was kind enough to allow us to leave early before our work was completed so we had an opportunity to eat with some of our friends from the Illinois Manufacturer's Association. At that time it was brought to my attention very vividly by quite a few people that they were very concerned over product liability. And we were wondering why their insurance rates had gone up so high. We pointed out to them that the General Assembly had not taken any action in relation to that, that was not covered under 235 and 285, Senate Bills. Obviously we hadn't made that mistake but for some reason their insurance rates had gone up. For once in our life we weren't to blame for something that happened. ...So I think the idea of this Resolution, of doing this study, has merit. Let's find out exactly why it's being done. And I agree that the Insurance Commission has their responsibility, but let's also give another Commission an opportunity to look into it, taking it out of the hands of those who might have vested interests."

Speaker Redmond: "Incidentally, as a point of information, Representative Polk. Earlier in the Session, the Judiciary I Committee, I believe it was, was requested to undertake a study with respect to products liability. The Subcommittee has been appointed. Representative Houlihan is Chairman and he's scheduled a meeting, I don't recall whether it's June or July, but anyway the Subcommittee



of Judiciary is going to go into the question of products liability. And, again, the House Judiciary Committee was a self-starter. This wasn't in response to anything. So you might as well tell your friends that we are going to look into that subject matter. Anything further? Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schuneman: "Representative Mautino, what question is it that you want answered?"

Mautino: "The specific question, Representative Schuneman, is this, through the last month and a half many employers of the State of Illinois have stated to me, and have stated to you also, that they have had no experience losses in Workmen's Compensation, yet their claims increased one and two hundred percent. It was also brought before our Labor Committee, that those people not involved in, let's say asbestosis and silicosis, let's say a gas station, are paying a portion of their premiums towards the benefit level for those people in that specific industry. So, therefore, I think it's important that we find out exactly the experience factor for the small employers, how that rate increase came about..."

Schuneman: "Can you tell me what you mean by experience factor for small employers?"

Mautino: "Yes, a person who has no claims, whatsoever, on Workmen's Compensation in the past two or three years and there are many employers in that specific category, yet their increases were one hundred and two hundred percent."

Schuneman: "Well, might I ask why you don't direct these questions to the Insurance Department, they have the statistics. You, Representative, have heard the statistics and the figures from the National Council on Workmen's Compensation that prepares the rates and the experience factors. Much of this information came before the



Insurance Laws Study Commission, of which you are a member. Why don't you ask the Insurance Department."

Mautino: "We have asked the Insurance Department, as did Representative Tipsword, of the Insurance Committee."

Schuneman: "And...What did they tell you?"

Mautino: "They informed methey do not have those specific numbers and, therefore, I don't believe the Department gave our Insurance Laws Study Commission those same answers either, Sir."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?...er...to the Resolution?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have no objection to an investigation of the insurance industry at all. But I think that this particular Resolution is somewhat of a sham. The experience figures for Workmen's Compensation Insurance are gathered by the National Council on Workmen's Compensation. We do not have a free and open rating market on Workmen's Compensation Insurance in Illinois. The National Council must file their experience and rating factors with the Insurance Department before they can charge the rates that are charged. I submit to you that this Resolution is merely one way of many people who voted for 234 and 235 to salve their conscience in some manner and pass the blame on to somebody else. The information that they seek to find is readily available from the National Council on Workmen's Compensation and from our own Illinois Department of Insurance and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well....Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't, for the life of me, understand why not everyone up there has not a green light to find out some information that Representatives from around the state and business communities



have been wanting. This is an excellent opportunity to get some answers to some questions and I feel that this Resolution will do that. I think everybody should be voting 'aye'. I do believe that there is some people that do not want the answers because this will directly show the people that the legislation we passed was not the results of the high insurance rates but was the fault of the insurance companies as in the product liability and other areas. I think this is a definite attempt of the people who are voting 'no' to keep us from finding out the truth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I had to step out a moment when the distinguished Sponsor was explaining his resolution. I wonder if he could just give me a quick picture of it because I don't have it."

Speaker Redmond: "He's explaining it to Representative Epton right at the moment."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I wonder if...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, Representative Geo-Karis has an inquiry."

Geo-Karis: "Would you please explain your Resolutions? I had stepped out. I don't have it."

Mautino: "Explain the Resolutions? Basicallythere's no basic cost to it and it resolved that we examine...."

Geo-Karis: "What does it do? That's what I...."

Mautino: "Pardon?"

Geo-Karis: "What does it do, Dick?"

Mautino: "It directs the Subcommittee of the Labor and Commerce Committee to investigate the correlation of the increased premiums and benefit levels for Workmen's Compensation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am going to support this Resolution because I've had some very strong doubts in my mind as for why insurance companies have to



triple their cost for Workmen's Comp if the company has not had any loss for the last two years. I think it is a very good Resolution and I certainly am going to endorse it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'aye' vote I heard Representative Epton get up, ... who's the Chairman of the ... Insurance Commission and Representative Mautino said that he would work very cooperatively with him relating to what the Insurance Commission already has on its report that we're supposed to be receiving on June 15. Perhaps this Resolution is adopted and as far as any additional work, maybe Representative Mautino and that Subcommittee from Labor and Commerce will find out that some of the answers that they are looking for are already there and I certainly would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Are we voting on the adoption of the Resolution now?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Telcser: "Well, has it been referred to a Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Telcser: "Well then we should be suspending the rule"

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Agreed Resolutions, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well it shouldn't be an Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Well.....Now....."

Telcser: "Well, now....Representative Giorgi...."

Speaker Redmond: "....I don't like to call the attentions of some people who weren't here when we called the Agreed Resolutions and the Resolution was read and the Resolution was adopted and Representative Matijevich called the attention of the Body that since it causes an investigation



that there should be a Roll Call vote. So it's out of... Representative Matijevich is the Gentleman who called it to our attention. Now Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor of this Resolution came to me yesterday and asked if he could put it on the Agreed list and I said absolutely not. He knew that and I think he'll probably confirm that. It was not agreed to. If it's agreed I'd like...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Ryan is absolutely correct. But I did not put it on Agreed Resolutions, George. I think your statement to me was that it shouldn't go on Agreed Resolution list but you would probably be voting for it, I think was your statement. But I didn't put it on the Agreed Resolution list."

Ryan: "No. No. I said that it should go through a Committee and through the normal channels and I said I didn't know how I would vote at that time but I certainly didn't want it on the agreed list."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it is before us. It is an Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "It is not before us as an Agreed Resolution. well yes it is...."

Telcser: "Well then the motion should be to suspend the rules with reference to a Committee for immediate consideration which requires 107 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the Resolution is on the table, we're debating it and the votes are up on the board and I think that we should progress and take the Roll Call and pass the Resolution. I'd like to say just a couple of words. I think we all agree that the problem of Workmen's Comp and insurance rate on the...on everybody's mind in Illinois. I want to specifically invite this Committee to Rockford



because of the abomination and the way the insurance industry has conducted themselves in the Rockfordland area, every time a merchant's premium increase comes due."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, confine your remarks to the question of the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. The point is this, that this matter is before us now, there's a Roll Call. The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Resolution 279. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think the question that should be asked and I raise the question, by whose authority is the Resolution agreed? I thought it took the Leadership...."

Speaker Redmond: "It's not being treated as an Agreed Resolution now, Representative Friedrich..."

Friedrich: "You just said that it was, Sir. You said that we were voting on an Agreed Resolution. Are we or aren't we?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, evidently I wasn't as lucid as I should have been. I said that the Agreed Resolutions included Resolution 279."

Friedrich: "If it is not..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, after the Agreed Resolutions had been adopted, called the attention of the Body to the fact that this required an investigation and therefore there should have been a Roll Call vote."

Friedrich: "If it is not an Agreed Resolution, then you have to suspend the Rules or else send it to Committee. You have no choice."

Speaker Redmond: "That objection was not raised at the time that Resolution ..."

Friedrich: "It is being raised right now, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "...that Resolution 279 was called. Now the question is....We're now in the middle of a Roll Call, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we're certainly not going



to continue for the next five weeks to operate in this manner. If when your Members come to me or one of my Leadership and ask if we can have an Agreed Resolution and we don't agree to it and we have to sit here and listen to every motion that you read for the Agreed Resolution, that's a bad way to play ball. I certainly think it's a pretty sneaky way to do things, if you want to know the truth. The motion ought to be to suspend the rules if that's what we have to do to get this into Committee and it is. And if I have to sit here and listen to every Resolution that you read...that's read, because they slip it on the Agreed list then that's no way to do it, Mr. Speaker. You know that and so do I."

Speaker Redmond: "The only thing that I'd like to call to the attention of the Minority Leader is that the Chair is not in a position to submit any motion or make any motion. All I can do is respond to what the Body does. What is before the House now is the Roll Call on the question of the adoption of House Resolution 279. Now there are parliamentary procedures that should be followed and can be followed. Now there's no point in screaming at me about what happened on Agreed Resolutions. You weren't on the floor at the time...nor was Representative Telcser. Representative Matijevich realized that an error had been made and he's the Gentleman that called it to our attention and it would seem to me that you'd discuss this matter with Representative Mautino and Representative Matijevich and get it straightened out...."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the leader of the Democrat Party in this chamber, and the Speaker of the Illinois House, I think that you've got an obligation to follow the rules if you don't do any thing else. Now certainly you can't.."

Speaker Redmond: "You point out what rule I'm..."

Ryan: "...from that Chair, Mr. Speaker. You do have an obligation to follow the rules."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich." 26.

Matijeovich: "Let's face it. If we hadn't called attention to the fact that this required the 89 votes, that Bill would have sailed out of here. The men objecting to it, the Leaders on the other side, weren't even here. It'd been out of here, it'd been agreed and nothing would have been said about it. So I think that there was no objection raised. We're on a Roll Call. It's implicit in that that we should hear it. So I think all of the objections raised are really not timely."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, certainly you don't spend every minute on this floor when we're in Session and there's an occasion when I have to be off of the floor. This morning happened to be one of those occasions; however, I don't think that the Resolution would have been agreed and as I said, if I have to stand here on this floor and listen to every Resolution that is read, to see if it has been slipped in on the Agreed list or not, that's certainly no way to do things. You know that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the only suggestion that I make is..."

Ryan: "You ought to take it out of the record..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's improper to suggest that it was slipped in, because that isn't what happened. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly am in favor of this Resolution. But Representative Mautino, himself, indicated that in speaking to Representative Ryan, he was told it was not agreed to. Now, it seems to me, again, if we are going to have an Agreed Resolution procedure, that that has to be adhered to. If there is a motion to suspend the rules to 107, I certainly will vote for it because I'm in favor of this Resolution. I think we're starting an awful bad precedent here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I'm agreeable, Sir. Let's take this out of the



record at this time and I'll see if I can put it in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to take it out of the record? Dump the Roll Call. We'll take it out of the record. Now if you really want to know who flubbed on this one, I can tell you, confidentially. I'm not going to tell you. You come back in the back room and it isn't somebody on our side, in case you don't know it. You don't want me to tell all I know about you, do you S....Cal? Representative Wolf. I can't see Representative Wolf, Representative Keats."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a few days ago there was a vote taken on House Bill 1354, which I'm the Cosponsor. I was off the floor. I would ask unanimous consent to be recorded as voting 'yes'. It does not change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "The Journal has gone to the printer, Representative Wolf. House Bills, Third Reading. There's House Bill 2362, Representative Katz, Matijevich, Giorgi sit down, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2362, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the appropriation for the Motor Vehicle Law Commission. Was line itemed by the amendment yesterday and it's under \$100,000 and I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, about two years ago this appropriation was \$50,000 and now it's \$93,000 and the major recommendations that this Commission has made, to the best of my knowledge, is that we ought to raise the weight limit of trucks. I frankly think the money could be put to much better use if it were in the Speaker's budget,



or the Minority Leader's budget so that we could pay our staffers on Motor Vehicles and or the Transportation Committees, more money. Certainly I would elicit the opposition to this Bill from anyone who doesn't think Commissions are needed in general and I would suggest that the scope of this Commission is far narrower than the RTA Legislative Advisory Commission, and our budget was \$5,000. Certainly I think \$5,000 ought to be able to do it for this one too. Not \$93,000 as is indicated."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Mr. Speaker, it's been a practice, on appropriation Bills, that the Sponsor explain the Bill, what the amount is, how much it was increased over the preceeding year, so that we may have an idea of what we're voting on. Today and yesterday we've not been doing that. I wish you would insist. If not, I'm going to get up on every Bill and ask them to do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Were you whistling? Proceed. The answer is 'no'."

Totten: "Well, what I asked..."

Speaker Redmond: "With one head on one side and one head on the other."

Totten: "What I'd ask, Mr. Speaker, is it's been the practice in the past, on appropriation Bills, the Sponsor gets up, explains the Bill, what the amount is, how much it's been increased over the preceding year and.....so we have a little idea of what we're voting on, and today and yesterday we haven't been doing that. I wish you would insist that the Sponsors do that. It'd only take a few minutes more."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio indicates that he will follow that suggestion. Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "If they want to start with House Bill 2362, I'd be most happy to. And, with response to the remarks of

This is
what he
said



but very close. What is the reason for this drastic increase?"

Giglio: "Well the increase is because we didn't get the things we wanted to the....the previous year. The Personal Service has gone up because they anticipate, with the new director, there will be an increase in the workload and the personnel."

Deuster: "My second question is, as I remember from my service on the Motor Vehicles Committee my first term, quite often suggestions for legislation were first heard by the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission and then after they've been kicked around awhile they came to the Committee. Why, Representative Giglio, do we have to have this double process in the area of motor vehicles? Why couldn't we just reduce the activities of this Commission and have the interested people come directly to the Committee like anyone else does....for legislation?"

Giglio: "Well, I think if you're familiar, the Commission works like any other Commission. The Commission is the hearing place where we can really get into the meat of the Bill and we listen, not only for an hour, which we can't do in the Committee, we listen for hours and sometimes days. Sometimes we have our meetings in three or four parts of the state. Usually the people that are on the Commission, if you notice, are the same....some of the people that are on the Committee, where they have the expertise of all of the testimony that is heard by the Commission. When they come into the Committee, then the Bill is prepared, they are the ones that could testify and the testifying is not as long as the normal practice during the Commission hearing."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if I might speak briefly on the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Deuster: "I would urge Members to vote 'no' on House Bill 2362 for this purpose. I don't think that we see here the



signs of any self-restraint or control. We have a Commission expenditure almost doubling. I would think that they would be able to scale back. This is the time when we are looking for funds to finance our schools and everything else. This is the time when we are trying to show some self-restraint and control. I think that if you vote 'no' or if you vote 'present', this would go on Postponed Consideration, then the Sponsors would get the message that perhaps a little economy ought to be invoked. They might come in with an Amendment to cut this back a little and I think this is an area where we can exercise our legislative initiative to control spending. So I urge either a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission is probably the hardest working Commission that I've served on. I've served on many Commissions. We have more things probably come into this Commission than any other Commission that we have here in the Legislature. IIt's a hard working Commission and if any of you have had an opportunity to attend some of the hearings and so forth, you realize what this Commission has done over the years. There's no question, of all of the Commissions here, I personally think it has accomplished more to inform the Legislators ... than any other Commission we have. Therefore I would hope that we would all give a green vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Von Boeckman. Representative McPike, Pierce, Madigan, will you please sit down?"

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Chairman of the Motor Vehicles Committee, I wholeheartedly agree with the previous speaker, that this Committee....Commission has done fabulous work in trying to promulgate most of the rules and we work hard and



long and we need the expertise of executive director and I think it is a good Bill and the money is much needed and I urge your favorable vote."

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

Giglio: "Well, we need a couple more, Mr. Speaker. I wish some of the people who have not heard the statements here by both sides of the aisle. I think Clarence Neff just reiterated the...what's going on with the Commission.... the work that we do. I think, once the report comes out you'll be satisfied that you did vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye', 34 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1418."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Comptroller, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1418 is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Comptroller's Office for fiscal 1978. It includes, not only the operating expenditures for the Comptroller's Office, which is down two percent from last year's appropriation, but also the State Officer's Salary Bill and others. I would ask favorable approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, in fairness from this side of the aisle, it must be said that this is the only budget that has come from a state office before Appropriations I, of any size this season, where there's an actual reduction from the prior year. I



think that should be noted in this year of great financial problems. Some things the Comptroller did say, before Appropriations I, were particularly interesting. He's come up with a new scheme to conceal the fact that we stand on the verge of bankruptcy. That scheme is to come up with...use the average income over the month rather than the beginning...the balance at the end of each day. It's not conventional, it's not recognized by the banks, it won't be recognized in your own personal account. But it did indicate the ingenuity of the Comptroller. I just wish that it were possible that we could wish away our financial difficulties. I thought the scheme...er...the new system that he proposed was somewhat at variance with the economy that he demonstrated. I urge that we copy the first part of his act, that is of keeping the costs lower, rather than to try to use bookkeeping to conceal how desperate the Illinois financial plight....I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 2 'no'....The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 11....Representative Taylor: 1198 is that? What's that number, Representative Taylor, I've scribbled over it, I can't read it. 1180."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1180, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for Medley's Moving and Storage, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1180 appropriates \$43,550.88 to Medley Moving and Storage of Chicago, Illinois, for relocating of Public Aid recipients over the past two years. This Bill has



been heard in the Appropriation II, Subcommittee and in the Committee and has passed out favorably and I solicit your support for House Bill 1180."

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

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "Representative, is this the Bill that we had in Appropriations Committee which regards a claim which was adjudicated by the Court of Claims?"

Taylor: "Yes."

Kempiners: "And....does this Bill provide an appropriation which was not allowed by the Court of Claims?"

Taylor: "Yes."

Kempiners: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kempiners: "Reluctantly, I would like to oppose my good friend on the other side of the aisle. However, what we have here is a precedent setting Bill that could have far reaching implications for every Member of the General Assembly. What has happened is that a constituent has presented a series of Bills to the Department of Public Aid and quite frankly I think those Bills were justified in Committee. I don't question the man's right to submit these Bills. The Department did not pay them, they went to the Court of Claims, which adjudicated the case, and awarded him \$11,000. I, for one, voted 'present' in the Committee because I feel that the man did receive a bad deal through the Department of Public Aid. I think the Department was at fault. However, what he is asking us to do is to become an Appeals Court for the Court of Claims. I don't think we want to do that. Every provider for the Department of Public Aid services in our districts, who has not paid, what they consider to be a reasonable judgment will be coming to us and asking us to appropriate



the money that they feel that they were denied by that Department. I think that this is a bad precedent to set. I would hope that the Members of the General Assembly and this House will take cognizance of that bad precedent."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Robinson: "Is the, Mr. Medley's Moving Company, ... is Mr. Medley a member of the Chicago Election Commission?"

Taylor: "Yes he is."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw attention to House Bill 972, I have risen in support of a number of Mr. Taylor's Bills over the year and this one is one that I cannot support. House Bill 972 passed this House. It passed the Elections Committee; on which I'm a Member. This issue was never brought up. House Bill 972 says that it allows members of the Chicago Election Commission to have outside income. Presently that outside income is prohibited. Now I feel that we were kinda taken for a ride here. House Bill 972 allows Mr. Medley to make money off of this appropriation which we're now called upon to pass. I think that every Member of the House of Representatives ought to examine his vote very closely here. 972 has not been signed into law. I think it was a mistake that it passed here in the first place. But it has not been signed into law. It is not yet legal for Mr. Medley, as a member of that Chicago Board of Elections Commission to get outside income and yet right here we're being...."

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

Lechowicz: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. We're discussing 1180, not 972."

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the question of the passage of 1180, Mr. Robinson."



Robinson: "I think we're being asked, through this Bill, to be a party to a payment that is presently illegal under the law. I think that we were kinda taken for a ride on 972 and I don't think we ought to be taken for the same ride here.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "You Sponsored a Bill, I think that passed yesterday, which provided for the payment of the Court of Claims awards. And the Court of Claims award is Mr. Medley, at eleven thousand and some odd dollars. Was that claim in the Bill, blanket Bill, for the Court of Claims awards?"

Taylor: "That Bill was....what the Court of Claims had heard the cases over the years and what it did have records of what had actually taken place. And the Court of Claims did agree that that portion of the Bill, however, they never said that the things that happened in Mr. Medley's bill was not true. The fact is that we are here trying to do what I think is what the state should do; and that is take care of the business of the people and this is the only place they can come to for help."

Friedrich: "Well, being specific, was there eleven thousand dollars for Mr. Medley in the Bill that you passed previously?"

Taylor: "Eleven thousand dollars was in the House Bill 2355."

Friedrich: "Well, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, reluctantly, I have to oppose this Bill because I think that is what the Court of Claims is for, to determine what moneys are due from the state when there is a question about them. Mr. Medley's case was taken before the Court of Claims and they decided that he was owed \$11,000. The truth of the matter, as I understand, is Mr. Medley never even appeared on his own behalf



to substantiate any larger amount than \$77,000. I don't know why, but there must have been some reason. Now, we are here appropriating state money for an individual who has not substantiated his claim to the state. I think it is a very bad precedent."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Emil Jones."

Jones, E.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1180 was heard in Appropriations II. And it was brought to my attention and this is something that I had known prior to hearing this Bill, that the Illinois Department of Public Aid do not pay its providers on time. Any bills that are incurred after June 30....I mean any bills that they receive after June 30, for the previous fiscal year, they tell these providers to go to the Court of Claims. Well, the Court of Claims, after hearing evidence and not calling all the witnesses in the case, cannotand I emphasize, they cannot render a fair decision. Now I happen to know this individual personally and I'm quite sure that he wouldn't come before this Body asking for an award that the Court of Claims turned down. Now the Court of Claims did not as I said, did not listen to all of the evidence. The Illinois Department of Public Aid made oral agreements with providers of service and when the service is provided, they in turn tell the person that they have to go to the Court of Claims to get their money. It is not the providers fault because he did render the service. I solicit an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor to close."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that there should be some things cleared up here... when he spoke about House Bill 972. One thing that's for certain is that Mr. Medley was not a member of the Board of Election Commission at the time that this deficit was incurred. One other thing is very true, is



what Representative Jones said, is that the fiscal year had ran....the approp....the Public Aid Department did not have the money to pay for this moving at the time. And time....did you know that the state and the county went into....Public Aid was made a part of the state and not of the county? This Bill goes back to 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972, when Mr. Medley was not a member of the Chicago County Board...Cook County Board of Elections. One other thing is that Representative Kempiners said that since the Court of Claims had rendered that decision where else could a man go when he feels that he has been unjustly discriminated against? Section V of the State Constitution ... 'The Right to Assembly and Petition; The people have the right to assembly in a peaceable manner, to consult for the common good, to make known their opinions to their Representative and to apply for redress of grievances.' That's all that I'm asking here. This man rightfully deserves this money. He has provided the services. The Public Aid Department has not did their fair share and seen that he was paid. I do not think that the State of Illinois wants to go on record as putting people out of business. The State of Illinois should be on record as trying to help those persons who need the help. This man provides jobs, he provides services, and he provides help for people in areas where you cannot get movers to come every day. I need your help on this particular Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of this august Body. I solicit your support for House Bill 1180."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having been a Member of the Advisory Committee on Public



Aid for many years, let me tell you that every single person that Medley moved, he didn't move them until he got the okay from the Department of Public Aid and from the Director. He didn't move until he got that okay. Now the question is whether or not the Department paid their bills. The Department did not pay their bills. He isn't the only one who moved people out there and the Department didn't pay them.....and he went to the only place that he could go and that's to the Court of Claims. And you mean to tell me you're going to wreck a black business simply because the Department of Public Aid didn't keep their word. I plead to you, with all decency and with all fairness....he got an order.... he's got an order to move every single one of those people on Public Aid and you want to put him out of business. He's been to the court, he's been everywhere he can go and this is the only course he could come to now for equity, for reasonableness. You mean to tell me you're going to turn him down. I plead with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'no' vote, I don't have any question in my mind that the work was done, that the service was provided, but I think Representative Kempiners has hit this right on the head when we take the General Assembly and start to make a Court of Appeals out of the General Assembly and this House, to the Court of Claims, I think that's a very dangerous precedent to be establishing. Now, this money, if it is in fact that the Department of Public Aid authorized this move and that expenditure should be taken out of all the millions of dollars that we put in Public Aid we certainly ought to be able to find the necessary money to pay this legitimate claim through the ordinary procedures. I certainly would encourage everyone to be



voting 'no' on this legislation. There shouldn't be one green light up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much....Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. I said in Committee, when we heard this Bill, and frankly, I share the concerns that some on the other side of the aisle have expressed.... about us overriding the Court of Claims, however, let me point out to you that Representative Hoffman loves to tell me in Elementary and Secondary Education Committee that consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds. What we have here is a bureaucratic bungling, frankly. The Department of Public Aid testified that they indeed had okayed every single move for the individuals that this man ended up moving. They indeed testify that he had the money coming. The problem was, they are so unorganized they couldn't even run 'em all down through the computer and give them the verification on the day the Court of Claims heard the case. I submit to you that while this is perhaps not the best precedent, it is the only recourse that we have available.....to see justice done. And I ask all of you to reconsider and think of the many times that you have tried to help constituents and give us an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis."

Davis: "It has been stated here on this floor that you don't come here. But I've been here a long time and I've seen you come here with claims that the Court of Claims didn't pay. I've seen you vote out that money. Is it because this is a black businessman you're treating him like that? You want to destroy him? I've seen you do it and you know you do it and I make the point of personal privilege because you are guilty of paying others and now you don't want to pay him."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it disturbs me to see the House, over the two years I've been here, automatically and routinely pass claims that the court said were justified and then they don't pass this one. Now, either the Court of Claims,....they'll pay it or they'll not....and you talk about, in the black community there were two large moving companies, Brad Movers and Medley Movers, who did most of the moving for the Welfare Department. Brad Movers went out of business because they couldn't collect from the Department of Public Aid. Now, you're going to have it so that no one will be able to trust a billing from the state.....and the integrity of the state is also at stake. When you deny, justice delayed is justice denied. When a man can't pay his bills because he can't collect his debt, even when he goes to court, it's a sad state of affairs. So I'm asking for some more green lights up there because when you destroy the business of a community you destroy the community. You're always talking about black folks raising themselves up by their bootstraps, well you are cutting one of the bootstraps by refusing to vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think most of the red votes are sincere votes because they listened to the logic of Representative Kempiners and I can see that. Except that I recall us spending our time in the Legislature past the deadline and allowing contracts of the State Fair to be paid. This is really no different than that. This is a Bill that has been justified and everybody that's heard it in Committee said that it was justified and it's only a matter of the state living up to its obligations. We did it with the State Fair contracts, we spent a lot of



time after we were supposed to adjourn to do it and I see no reason why we should do it in this case and I would urge those who are voting 'no', even though I understand their logic, to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Peters to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I did not intend to rise on this particular motion, but I find now that I have to because of one or two or the statements made here. Just in terms of correction.... and let each Member of this House makeup his own mind as to how he wants to vote on this. But in reply to one of the statements that was made, this part of this claim was not approved....not approved by the Court of Claims. Representative Taylor, on behalf of Medley Moving, brought the rest of that appropriation to the Committee for their consideration. Secondly, the Department of Public Aid did appear in the Subcommittee Hearing to oppose....to oppose this particular claim on the basis that it was not substantiated. Some members of the Committee agreed with the Department, other Members of the Committee disagreed with the Department, this Bill was not voted out on a unanimous vote in Committee. I'm sorry I don't have the total vote here, but let me also say that that vote in Committee, 'yes' and 'no', was not strictly on a party line basis either. I just say those things for the purposes of the record and let everyone here makeup their mind how they want to vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know I've been around this House a good many years now. This is my fifth term. I've voted for an awful lot of Bills....because many of them....was because of a Member of this House who sponsored the legislation and their integrity I had faith and trust in. I voted, I remember, on Salt Creek,



something that I didn't have any interest in at all, but because of the needs there and because of our Members here, I thought that he knew what was best for his district and for his people and I tried to help. I would hate to think that the State of Illinois and Members of this General Assembly can sit here and say they know that the Public Aid Department is wrong and then vote the opposite way. I just don't understand that. I think that this House should go on record today and tell the Public Aid Department that they ought to get their house in order because this man has a legitimate business and if the State of Illinois wants to go on record as putting men out of work and business out of business, then so let it be. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I haven't been here as long as either one of the two previous Gentlemen who spoke to their longevity, but notwithstanding that I've been here, I think, I do recall.....a transaction of this nature passing the House. All I should say is that I plea with the House to show the same compassion for this Gentleman that was shown in other cases in the past. Thank you."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to have this Bill placed on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. The order of business is the Speaker's Table. House Joint Resolution 1, out of the record, request of the Sponsor;

(See Special Request, page 44.)



Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. The order of business is Speaker's Table. House Joint Resolution 1 out of the record at the request of the Sponsor; 25 out of the record at the request of the Sponsor; House Joint Resolution 74 out of the record at the request of the Sponsor; 112 out of the record at the request of the Sponsor; House Resolution 274."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 274, Kane-J. M. Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Be in order, please. Proceed, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "...the House Select Committee on Government Organization has before you two reports. The first dealing with Executive Order #1; the second dealing with Executive Order #2. With regard to Executive Order #1, which I would ask the Speaker that we consider first, there is a majority and minority report. And I would like to briefly summarize the majority report, and then allow Representative Brummer to present the minority report to the full House. Mr. Speaker, the framers of the Constitution had in mind the creation of a strong executive branch of government. They did this by giving the Governor the amendatory veto and by the executive reorganization powers. In doing this, they wish to address the all too often and all too frequent inertia that exists when the Governor is dealing with the bureaucracy that has been established over time. But I think we have demonstrated in the House of Representatives a general willingness to work with the Governor and with other interests in accomplishing executive reorganization."

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

Totten: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor indicated he wanted to talk about Executive Order #1, I think this Resolution that we're on only deals with Executive Order #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I had asked you if we would move to the business, which are the reports from the Committee; Executive Order #1



is the first report. The Resolution deals with Executive Order #2."
Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Clearly, the desire to overcome the potential inertia has been accomplished by the submission of Executive Orders #1 and 2, and the creation of the House and the Senate of select Committees on Government Organization. In fact, the House Committee now has before itself legislative proposals to establish a cabinet level post to the Department of Energy and legislation to consolidate and reorganize our system of...system of systems at higher education. It was the intention of this Committee to review the executive recommendations for reorganization, but not to be limited to those recommendations. We also intend to recommend legislative proposals that would make government more efficient and more directly accountable to the citizens of Illinois. In this effort, it will be our intention not merely to consider government reorganization in the terms of a manager and his flow chart but, rather, to review these recommendations from the vantage point of those who must rely upon the services rendered by the state, the consumers. Executive Order #1 was assigned to the House Select Committee on Government Organization. And the hearings that followed established that there was no substantive disagreement with the Governor's intention included in Executive Order #1. I might point out that it was the feeling of the Committee that Executive Order #1's only lack was in the fact that it did not go far enough. The Committee did indicate its desire to have all of the service functions located in the newly created Department of Administrative Services, not merely those of Finance and General Services. For example, we recommended to Director Pekoris that he consider including the Department of Personnel. The Director indicated his willingness to work with the Committee to accomplish this goal. While the substance of the Executive Order created little debate, the form and procedure concerning the Order did raise significant issues beyond those that were mentioned in the report. Clearly, it was the feeling of the Committee that the Executive Order steps beyond the constitutional authority in Article V, Section 2, of the 1970



Constitution in that it attempts to reorganize these functions by abolishing two existing agencies and, subsequently, creating a new agency. Very serious constitutional and legal questions would be raised and a potential precedent that would be established led the Subcommittee to recommend to the full Committee a rejection of Executive Order #1 and the adoption of the substance of those recommendations by legislation. At that time, the Governor took the position that accompanying legislation at this time would not be advisable and indicated through his representatives that his office would oppose implementing legislation, even to codify or rectify certain omissions in the Executive Order. Given this position the Subcommittee was left with no alternative but to recommend to the full Committee a rejection of the Executive Order and enactment of legislation. Subsequently, the Governor changed that position and indicated his support of implementing legislation adopting the Committee's position. This legislation is embodied in House Bill 2392, which now rests on Second Reading. We believe that there are no substantive arguments with this legislation and with the expected adoption of this legislation there appears then to be no need to reject the Executive Order. In conclusion, the Committee's objections, which concern the manner in which the Executive Order attempts to accomplish its goals will be mute with the enactment of House Bill 2398. In this context then the legislative decision of whether or not to reject Executive Order #1 reduces to a question of principle, whether the Executive Order is so offensive to the prerogatives of the General Assembly that it should be rejected in order to avoid establishing a bad precedent. The Committee concludes that the Executive Order need not be rejected since the codifying legislation will be enacted, and they have every confidence that this will be moved through both the House and the Senate and signed by the Governor. And, therefore, it would not establish a bad precedent of having an Executive Order reach beyond its scope and powers. The Committee concludes by this recommendation that it should be understood that the Committee does not approve or concede the Governor's authority to create a new



department or to create a new state officer. Executive Order #1 would've avoided these issues if it had simply merged the Department of Finance into the existing Department of General Services and then changed that name. That result, however, is identical in substance to the Order before us. And the codifying language will insure the result; and, therefore, there will be little doubt in the minds of those who view this Executive Order that that is our intent in the Legislature and also the Governor's intent. And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, the full Committee recommended that the Executive Order be allowed to stand and that codifying or implementing legislation be enacted immediately by the full House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. The minority report deals with a question of procedure more than substance. There is no disagreement, I believe, with regard to the substantive provisions that the Governor intended to enact with regard to Executive Order #1, and that was merging the Department of Finance and General Services. However, Article V, Section 11, of the Constitution clearly states that the Governor within its executive reorganization powers has the power to reassign functions among or to reorganize agencies. I do not believe that it was intended by the framers of the Constitution that the Governor under that executive reorganization power would have the authority to create a new agency. Executive Order #1 does create a new agency which in my opinion is beyond the scope of the executive reorganization power granted to the Executive Department under the Constitution. Because this is the first Executive Order and the first attempt to utilize the powers granted to the Governor under Article V, Section 11. I feel that Executive Order #1 will be used as precedent in the future and in interpretation of the...of the scope of the Governor's executive power. Because there is no substantive disagreement with regard to the Executive Order and because the Committee has recommended that the Governor's proposals be adopted by legislation, I feel that we ought to reject the Executive Order



because of its value as precedent and in interpretation of whether or not the Governor can create a new agency. And I think this is a distinction that's more than formal. The...when the Governor has authority to reorganize into an existing department we have statutory language which deals with that department setting forth a manner in which the director is to be appointed with confirmation of the Senate setting forth salaries and a number of other statutory reasons. For these reasons, I believe that the framers of the Constitution did not intend that the Governor be able to...to create a new agency totally outside of the scope of existing statutory language dealing with an existing agency. For that reason the dissent was filed with regard to Executive Order #1."

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

Ryan: "Stiehl."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we concur with Representative Houlihan in the majority report that this Executive Order should stand because it is an honest effort at streamlining state government. It will improve the functioning of the two departments and it is clearly within the prerogatives of Article V, Section 11, of the Constitution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also urge that we reject House Resolution 274. Our Session thus far has been called by some..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're a little bit previous, Mr. Ryan. We're just discussing the report with respect to Executive Order #1, and we haven't come to the question of vote on...now, if you want to discuss whether we...Executive Order 1, why we're very happy to listen to it."

Ryan: "Well, the board shows 274, House Resolution 274, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, those of us who've paid close attention know what we were doing..."

Ryan: "...I appreciate that kind comment, thank you, another one I owe you."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Tiptword."



Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to make it perfectly clear that I agree with the recommendations that are made by the Governor in his Executive Order #1. But I think serious questions have been raised by the dissent of Representative Brummer in this situation. And I think the very fact of this discussion upon the floor of the House which becomes a part of the record of the General Assembly will point out the question, and in our approval therefore of this Executive Order #1; I think we may be tacitly approving this kind of procedure that I think is ... as Representative Brummer points out, a violation of the Constitutional provision. And it appears to me that we should be very, very careful how we do this no matter how much we agree, as I certainly do, with the recommendations that are made by the Governor here. I believe that our actions should be either to take no action upon this Order at this moment or to reject this Executive Order and immediately proceed to legislation embodying the Governor's.... the principles that the Governor sets down in this Orders. Otherwise, I think that we put ourselves in the most untenable position in regard to Executive Orders heretofore I mean hereafter that will... that may create new agencies of government. And I think by our very action on this one, no matter how much we agree with it, we are going to thereby set a precedent that will govern the General Assembly under this Constitution from here on. And I think it would be most regrettable if we give up another measure of legislative authority. Far too much legislative authority was stripped from the Legislature in the New Constitution. And I certainly hate to see us agree with further eroding of the powers of the Legislative Branch of Government. Thank you. "

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion with respect to Amendment #, I mean Executive Order #1? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are talking about House Resolution 274, am I correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well,..... Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Adeline, we're referring to the report



of the Committee of which 274 is the second half of the report.

The initial report which was with regard to Executive Order #1."

Geo-Karis: "Is this #1 then that we're talking about?"

Houlihan: "That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "All right, that's all then."

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

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

Do I understand that we're proceeding under Rule 44.6?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're just discussing the Executive Order #1. There will be no vote on that."

Dunn: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "When the discussion is concluded we will go to Representative Houlihan with respect to Executive Order #2 and House Resolution 274."

Dunn: "May I speak to the Executive Order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to add my support to the Minority Report of Representative Brummer. As I understand the Article in the Constitution, the Constitution provides that the Governor, by Executive Order, may reassign functions among or reorganize executive agencies which are directly responsible to him. However, the Constitution goes on to point out that if such a reassignment or such a reorganization would contravene the Statute, the Executive Order shall be delivered to the General Assembly. It is my understanding that there may be some Statutes that are contravened here. And I think that despite the fact that there is agreement in substance between the Executive Branch and the scope of the legislation which is pending on Second Reading in this chamber, that we... as previous speakers have indicated, should be particularly careful to avoid erosion of our constitutional powers delegated to us by the people of the State of Illinois at the time that the 1970 Constitution was adopted. We can, by proceeding with this Order, in support of the Order, raise an issue that was not there before the Order came about. If we reject the Order and proceed with the legislation, the issue goes



away altogether. It seems to me like that's the practical thing to do. And I suggest that we proceed with the legislation and reject the Executive Order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, prior to moving to Executive Order #2, let me make it very clear that it is not the intention of the Majority Report to affirm the Governor's action to create a new agency. We reject that philosophy, but we believe by implementing legislation we have not set that precedent. And there is agreement in the Majority Report that the Governor has in fact created a new agency and that would be on.... be beyond his powers, but that by enacting this implementing legislation we would make that question moot. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the report on Executive Order #2; the Subcommittee found some of the same questions, technical and constitutional questions that were raised with regard to Executive Order #1 in some of the procedural questions. The Subcommittee recommended that that Executive Order be rejected and that legislation be enacted to implement the best aspect of the Governor's Executive Order. The Governor, in changing his position on implementing or conforming legislation and allowing that to be enacted, has resolved the question we believe with regard to Executive Order #1. But with regard to Executive Order #2, there are substances and policy issues that remain. It is the feeling of the Committee in the Majority Report"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Houlihan: "It is the feeling of the Committee in the Majority Report that the Governor has not proposed the best or most effective way to organize law enforcement in the State of Illinois. And for the foll..... and for those reasons, which will be delineated by Representative Kane, the Majority Report recommended a rejection of Executive Order #2 and adoption in lieu thereof House Bill 2397. And I would, Mr. Speaker, yield to Representative Kane for a discussion of the Executive Order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

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



on State Government Reorganization put a lot of hours into deliberating Executive Order #2 which reorganizes the Department of Law Enforcement. And in that deliberation we received the full cooperation of both the Department of Law Enforcement, the new director, Director Fonner, and also representatives of the Governor's Office. The stated purpose for reorganizing the Department of Law Enforcement has been to eliminate the disarray the inefficiency and the competition between the state police officers and the IBI. And also to remove the duplication of administrative services within the Department of Law Enforcement. All of those purposes, which I'm sure you will hear a great deal about this morning are laudatory and are supported wholeheartedly by the Committee and all of the Members of the Committee. Many of these problems within the Department of Law Enforcement have been mentioned on the floor of this House ever since the IBI was created in 1969. The purpose of Executive Order #2 is laudatory. Many of the constitutional problems that arise with Executive Order #2 are made moot with the Governor's agreement to proceed with conforming legislation at the same time that the Executive Order is being considered. However, today we are faced with the merits of Executive Order #2 and we're faced with the merits of Executive Order #2 as Executive Order #2 is written.... not as Executive Order #2 is described by either the Governor's Office or the Director of Law Enforcement as to the purposes and intent of the present administration. In a number of cases when we were deliberating the Committee, representatives of the Governor's Office and the Director of Law Enforcement stated, that their intent was not as Executive Order #2 was written. We do not have the prerogative however of amending Executive Order #2 and so we have to proceed with deliberating Executive Order #2 as it is written and not as to the specific intent of the Director or the administration. And there are a number of objectionable parts to Executive Order #2 which I think that this Legislature has to consider very carefully. And they give the Director of Law Enforcement and the Governor more power than they say that they want; and I believe more power than we should grant to them under



the terms of Executive Order #2. Let me make a number of points specifically. Executive Order #2 gives to the Director of Law Enforcement the power to appoint and promote all investigators within the Department of Law Enforcement and that will number under the proposed reorganization, approximately three hundred and fifty. The Director of Law Enforcement would have..... the Director of the Department would have the full power to appoint and promote those investigators for a period of three years; from the time that the Executive Order goes into effect, until 1980. The Director has stated that his intentions are solely to use that power to hire some twelve to fourteen specially trained investigators to deal with financial crimes and organized crime. The Governor, in speaking with some members of the Committee, said that he wanted to use that limited power solely to hire investigators that were trained in the investigation of official corruption. And that he intended to use that power only to hire some twelve or fourteen individuals that were specially trained. However, that's not what the Executive Order says. The Executive Order does not limit the power of the Director to appoint and promote only twelve to fourteen investigators. It gives the sole power to the Director over three hundred and fifty investigators, to appoint them or to promote them for a period of three years with no limitation. This is coupled with the provision in the Executive Order also that present employees in the Department of Law Enforcement may be transferred to the new division. Not shall be transferred to the new division, but may be transferred to the new division. And any of you who know what the political history of the State of Illinois has been, knows that the process of reorganization has been used as a facade time and time again to get rid of personnel for political reasons. And what the combination of the permissive transfer of personnel, and the sole power of the Director to appoint and promote for a period of three years; those two powers together raise the possibility of within the next three years, this administration completely restructuring the Division of Investigations within the Department of Law Enforcement



and gives them the power to remove all of the existing investigators and hire all new ones. In the Minority Report, the Minority says that use of the mandatory shell... and this is for the transfer of personnel, might have created an enforceable right in an employee to be assigned to a new division based on individual skills with no consideration of department need..... and unacceptable result. However, in Executive Order #1, which deals with the Department of General Services and with the Department of Finance, the same Chief Executive used the mandatory shell for the transfer of personnel. In Executive Order #2 however, dealing with law enforcement, the Executive says that mandatory shell would result in enforceable rights for personnel which would be unreasonable. I would suggest that if it's unreasonable for the Department of Personnel, it's also unreasonable for the Department of General Services. And I believe that... even though the intention of the Director at the present time, the stated intention of the Director is to transfer all members of the investigating unit to the new division. That is not what the Executive Order says. The Executive Order says, is only permissive and not mandatory. The second objection to the Executive Order #2 is that the existing State Police Merit Board is abolished by Executive Order #2 and is recreated by a Department of Law Enforcement Merit Board which has the same essential powers and duties of the existing Merit Board. This raises a number of issues. The first one is constitutional. The Constitution specifically limits the power of the Governor to reorganize by Executive Order to agencies who are directly responsible to the Governor. And I believe that it should be the position of this Legislature that agencies such as a Merit Board are not directly responsible to the Governor. The Governor cannot call the Merit Board up like he can a Director and order that Merit Board to promote a particular individual or to hire a particular individual or to do anything in particular. The Governor does not have direct responsibility over this agency. This agency is semiautonomous. It also provides semijudicial functions. It oversees the actions of the Executive Branch. And since it oversees



Executive Order of appointment and promotion of investigators for a three year period and also the permissive transfer of personnel along with a completely restructured Merit Board removes all of the internal restraints to creating a personal police force and I think that that is bad. I'm not saying that it's the intent of the Director to do that or the intent of the Governor to do that. I'm sure that it's not, but I believe that it's incumbent upon this Legislature to keep those internal restraints that are presently in Statute to keep Governors and Directors away from the temptation of creating their own personal police forces. But Executive Order #2 also does . . . it repeals the statutory authority that is given to the State Police Merit Board to increase penalties meted out to state police officers by the Director or the Superintendent. Now regardless of the merits of that proposal, what Executive Order #2 purports to do is to repeal the Statute. And I think that it's incumbent upon the Legislature, if we are going to be an equal and separate branch of government, that we do not allow the Executive to legislate by Executive Order, that we cannot allow the Executive to repeal or create statutory authority by Executive Order. In an amazing dialogue in the Department in the Committee on State Government Organization, the Governor's Council argued to the Committee that the power given to the Governor to reorganize also gives to the Governor the power to repeal statutory authority and also to create statutory authority. And I think that this Legislature should go on record as saying, 'No, that you do have the power to reorganize, but you do not have the power to repeal Statute'. The fourth objection to the Governor's Executive Order is that the stated purpose of the Executive Order which is to remove the competition and the duplication between the IBI and the State Police by merging them is that the Executive Order does not merge the IBI with the State Police. It brings them side by side, but does not merge them. The IBI investigators and the state police under Executive Order #2 maintain their separate identities. They will be known by different titles. There will be state police officers. And there will also be Department



of Law Enforcement officers. There will be different ranks for the state police officers. There will be trouper, sergeant, corporal, and all of those. For the investigators, there will be investigator senior agents, squad leaders and inspectors... so that there will be different ranks and different identities. The different pay scales will be maintained. Different career paths will be maintained. And the means of achieving promotion will also remain separate. And I would argue that the purpose of the Executive Order will not be served by maintaining the separate identities and the separate paths of these two agencies. And that we should reject Executive Order #2 for all of these reasons that I have gone through. There is legislation before this House at the present time that is on Second Reading, which achieves all of the goals of the Executive Order, but removes these objections which I have raised. And I would urge that the Executive Order be rejected and that we proceed with legislation to protect the legislative prerogatives and also to maintain the integrity of the Executive Branch. And I would urge the adoption of House Resolution 274 and reject Executive Order #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan. Please give the Gentleman order."

Ryan: "Stiehl first, Mr. Speaker, and then me, if you would please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

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

I rise to oppose this Resolution. The Governor has submitted his Executive Order exercising his constitutional power to reorganize executive agencies and to reassign executive functions. That Executive Order should be allowed to go into effect so that we can have a modern law enforcement structure in Illinois. The Governor's proposal offers solutions to the problems law enforcement faces. I believe that his proposal will result in better delivery of law enforcement services. I would like to address today three main questions. First, the need for reorganization. Second, the meaning of the Executive Order. And finally, the constitutional power of the Governor in the area of reorganization. Let me first address the need for reorganization. As was pointed out in testi-



mony before the Select Committee on State Government Organization, the present structure of the Department of Law Enforcement is inefficient. It results in internal competition and a lack of direction. The organizational chart of the Department clearly illustrates the problem. The span of executive control of the Director is simply too broad. There are too many divisions. As a result, there are too many subordinates for the Director to deal effectively with. This results in a lack of attention to planning microphone trouble..... A second result of the number of divisions is that too many similar functions are exercised independently by the nine divisions. Investigating functions are performed by the State Police, the IBI, the Division of Fire Protection, the Office of Special Investigations, and the Bureau of Race Track Security. At times the same crime is investigated by several divisions with very little cooperation. This creates a competitive rather than a cooperative situation, wasting time and hampering the state's law enforcement effort. Combining these functions into a division of investigation will eliminate duplication and result in smoother operating, and I believe, more effective state investigatory methods. The current structure of the Department of Law Enforcement makes record keeping and budgetary matters anything but efficient. Purchasing is done on a division basis rather than a bulk basis. Each division has its own budget. A central division of administration with the power to set priorities is clearly needed. As another example of an inefficient and inequitable situation today, we have a dual personnel system for sworn law enforcement law officials. Now that is not rational. Our current problems involving salary disputes and low morale are at least partially the result of the fact that law enforcement officers are not all subject to the same rules. Several questions have been raised in regard to the meanings of the terms in the Executive Order. Now I believe that these questions have been satisfactorily answered in Committee. One of the questions involved the power of the Director to discharge employees. I believe the question has been satisfactorily answered and that we can



be assured that any personnel action which results from this Order will be subject to the Personnel Code and to the Merit Board.

Finally, questions have been raised about the Governor's constitutional power to accomplish this reorganization. The meaning of the Constitution is clear. The power is not absolute. The fact that this Legislature has the power to disapprove any Order indicates that. The Governor clearly respects legislative prerogative and he has said so. And that is why he has agreed to support conforming legislation, but he believes as I do, that exercising his constitutional power is the quickest way to get the job done. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you, please vote 'no' on this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

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

I also urge that we reject Resolution 274. This Session of the General Assembly has been labeled as the Law and Order Session. We approve legislation for restoring the death penalty for certain types of murder. We approve legislation setting specific prison terms for specific crimes. And we've recognized that crime is a serious problem in our state and in the last analysis the people of the State of Illinois look to us to make our streets safe. The Governor's proposed reorganization is consistent with what we have done thus far. The goal of the proposed reorganization is simple. The Governor wants the law enforcement effort to be efficient and effective and I believe that we should support him in his request. Representative Stiehl has outlined some of the problems within the Department of Law Enforcement that result in inefficiency, waste and competition rather than cooperation. I believe that when crime continues to be a problem throughout this state, we must do everything we can to make sure that the state assumes an effective role in fighting it. This proposal from the Governor's Office will do this. This reorganization will not be a lone venture of the Executive Branch. The Governor, in his message to us on May 18th, asked us to join him so we could move Illinois down the path of more simple and responsive government. He said that he will sign



accompanying legislation. The Governor said that reorganization is a critical tool for putting into practice good public administration and I certainly agree with him. This year more than any other, we must watch every dollar that we spend. All of us have felt the pressure of many diverse groups asking us to appropriate more money than we could afford. If additional funds were suddenly to become available, we would all have our ideas on how such funds should be spent.... certainly law enforcement would be near the top. There'll be no surprise or budgetary bonanza this year, I can guarantee that. Our agencies are going to have to live within the confines of the appropriation as outlined in the Governor's Budget. Those limits apply to the Department of Law Enforcement as well as all state government. If services and law enforcement are to be improved, we can't do it by spending more money. We have to improve service by making the agency more efficient. We can't afford to spend money on needless duplication. If there's any agency where we cannot afford duplication and inefficiency, it's in the Department of Law Enforcement. The Department is the primary state agency responsible for enforcing our highways and criminal laws and providing public safety throughout the state. As a primary law enforcement agency, it should be a model of efficiency for all state agencies. The Governor, through his Executive Order, has attempted to make it just that. And therefore, I would urge a 'no' vote on this Resolution. This is the time to go forward with reorganization and not to cripple the Governor in his efforts to keep crime under control in the State of Illinois. I also urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Madigan? Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today when I walked over to the House, I was on the elevator and I saw Ron Messina, who was an aide to Governor Walker; and as I sit here I was thinking about the many times that Governor Walker would send Ron and his aide to help out on various matters. And very often I did and there were different times though when the



issue was the 'Governor versus the Legislature'. And in each of those instances I would tell Ron or Caravello, I'd say listen this is where I've got to stand up for the Legislature. I can't help you. And I thought about that as we are...we are debating this issue here, that this is not an issue as to the Governor's powers and whether we should approve or disapprove. To me it's a matter where we ought to stand up for the legislative process. Many times Governor Walker confronted the Legislature, they were personal, political confrontations. And I realize that most of the time they served no real good purpose. But I want to tell you that this Executive Order, both 1 and 2, are a confrontation as between the Executive and the Legislative branches of government. This is a classic confrontation. I recall quite vividly a former Speaker, John Lewis, who many of us admired on the floor. I didn't serve under him when he was the Speaker; but his closing shot when he spoke to the Legislature, and I can still see him back there telling us as a Legislature, 'Never let anybody take away your powers as a Legislature to represent the people'. And to me that's the issue. I think that the Committee has done a commendable job in this majority report, and on both reports. I'm a little disappointed even as to the report on...on Executive Order #1. I happen to agree with Representative Brummer; and I would've liked a Resolution on that. So at least I can be recorded in saying that I never once wanted to give up the powers of the Legislature. We can do by implementing legislation all that the Governor wants by that Executive Order; but I think that the matter of doing it by Executive Order is a very dangerous precedent. Now, some of us ought to realize where we've been and where we're going. How many of us remember that when the issue we had with the Department of Mental Health, for example? Why did we become a Department of Mental Health...and then we became the Mental Health and Developmentally Disabled. I remember Bill Walsh and the strong fight that he had because the Department of Mental Health didn't meet the needs of the mentally retarded. That's where we came to that issue. We as the Legislature have got to respond to needs. And reorganization as



far as I'm concerned will not meet those needs. You know, you can say you're going to save money, you can say you're going to do a lot of things; but when you create an umbrella organization all you're doing is you're going to give more places for the agency to hide. So I would...just based on what I feel is a very basic premise that we in the Legislature ought to be the final authority that we should not allow, and I say this sincerely, not as a Democrat and not as opposed to Republicans, because believe me if Governor Walker had used this tool for reorganization I would've been fighting here and saying the same thing because every time when he confronted the Legislature I did not support him in those issues. And I say that we ought to stand as a Legislature and uphold and vote for this Resolution. Otherwise, every time we give more power to the executive it diminishes our power. And in turn, it diminishes the power of the people. So I urge an 'aye' vote on the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have had a long acquaintance with agency reorganization. It was our Executive Article Committee of the Constitutional Convention that placed this particular section in the 1970 Constitution that the people of the State of Illinois adopted by a rather substantial margin. You know, I can think about a lot of things that we hassled over in that Convention, a lot of very highly controversial things that we debated; but this was not one of them. It just made good simple horse sense to let the Chief Administrative Officer of this state have some rather broad powers to reorganize agencies that he was responsible for. I remember some of our good friends that served on that Committee with me. Dwight Friedrich was a Member of that Committee. Our old friend Johnny Leon was a Member of that Committee. We had a very conservative Committee. We didn't put a lot of things into that Executive Article that have caused trouble in years to come. And I'll assure you that this is not a troublesome feature of that new Constitution. Rather, I think we should look at the Governor's plan and either accept it or reject it based upon



whether the plan is actually going to accomplish what it is designed to do. And I've got enough faith that the Governor has given this thing enough study, along with some of the help that he has received from the General Assembly, that they have made a sound decision, that this is a reorganization that makes sense. And for that reason, I'm going to ask all of you to uphold what the Governor has done under the terms of this Executive Order. I think we should vote 'no' on the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I served on the Subcommittee which reviewed the Governor's Executive Order #2. And I want to say on the floor of this House that I commend the Director of Law Enforcement for the very fine manner in which he presented the program of the Governor, his program, and in what they intended to do, what they intend to do, what they want to do by this Executive Order. Unfortunately, there were many areas where the Executive Order just didn't quite conform to what the intention was. It's regrettable. And all of us here have introduced Bills where we have amended...we've amended our own Bills. I think there would be no controversy on the floor of this House today if the Governor were permitted under the Constitution to amend his own Executive Order. I think he would've done it. He would've had the Executive Order, the language of it, conformed to what he intends to do, what the Director of Law Enforcement intends to do and what the Governor intends to do. Unfortunately, he can't, he can't do that. To ask us to not take action in the face of the problems that rise under the Executive Order as it stands is to ask us to abdicate our responsibilities. I will just speak to a couple of problems which I consider a serious constitutional question and also a serious question of policy. There's no question but that under the Executive Order #2, the State Police Merit Board is abolished and a new Law Enforcement Board is created. There is a serious constitutional question as to whether the Governor can create a new independent state agency. There is also a serious policy question as to whether we should permit the State Merit Board to be abolished



because that's exactly what it does. Notwithstanding the fact that the Director of Law Enforcement says and the Governor would say, 'Well, what we really meant...what we really wanted to do was to expand the State Police Merit Board'. But this Executive Order just doesn't do it. Now, let me tell you what can happen. Just one employee under that State Police Merit Board who feels that he has been discriminated against, his rights have been abridged or any other thing could bring an action, an action that can tie up the du...duly created Law Enforcement Merit Board, that can raise serious question as to any promotion, demotion and disciplinary action as to any appointments under that Law Enforcement Merit Board. As a matter of fact, as regards the entire working of the State Police as regards the Merit Board. For those two points, a constitutional issue, and also a serious public policy issue, I say we cannot abdicate our responsibilities to review this and vote against the Executive Order and adopt the Resolution. The Governor, if he got a Bill of ours that was defective in some constitutional matter or affected a serious public policy, would amendatorily veto it. We can't do that. We only have this one alternative. The alternative is let a constitutionally defective and public policy unwise Resolu...Executive Order go into effect and take the consequences or to vote 'aye' on the Resolution and have legislation which will substantially do what the Governor and the Director want it to do. And for that reason, I strongly urge an 'aye' vote on the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose this Resolution also. I would like to address the issues that the Majority Report raises regarding the Governor's use of the Executive Order as a tool for reorganization. First let me say, the Constitution is clear. The Governor has the power. Second, the Majority Report argues that the phrase, 'Executive agencies directly responsible to the Governor is limited to the Code Departments'. If that is so, then the Governor's power to streamline our state government is rendered too weak to be effective. In our Minority Report we



set two criteria as being the standards we should use to determine which agencies beyond the Code Department are effected by the Governor's power to reorganize. The first is whether the agency exercises executive rather than legislative or judicial functions. And secondly, is the agency responsible to the Governor rather than another constitutional officer, or the Legislature or the courts. Both the Department of Law Enforcement and the Department of Finance and General Services clearly fall within the scope of that criteria. The Majority Report also argues that the Governor does not have the power under Article V, Section 11, to abolish an agency or transfer functions between divisions of an agency. Denying the Governor of that power would, in effect, nullify the purpose of organization; and that clearly has...was not the purpose of the Constitutional Convention. The Constitution uses the word, 'reorganize', which clearly implies that he has the ability to do more than transfer functions. In conclusion, let me say that this Resolution should not be approved. Approval of this Resolution will slow much needed reorganization of the state's law enforcement capabilities. And the people of Illinois clearly deserve the best Law Enforcement protection that they can be provided. The Governor has recognized that fact and has constitutionally provided for a dramatic overhaul of our law enforcement system that will clearly help us in our fight against crime. Let us support him in these efforts. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, was a Member of the Select Committee on Government Reorganization. And when this Executive Order came before us, I, too, shared many of the misgivings that the Members on the other side of the aisle had, not as a Republican or a Democrat, but as a Member of the Legislative Branch of Government. The Minority Report, which was submitted to you yesterday, had my name listed on it. That was by mistake. I don't agree with many of the comments in the Minority Report. And it was my intention to pose the Executive Order as it stood originally. However, as Representative Striehl has mentioned, the Governor has



agreed to support implementing legislation. And I feel the legislation he's agreed to would answer many of the questions and the problems of the people who have spoke against this order have. He's agreed to support legislation...accompanying legislation to the Executive Order which would retain the State Police Merit Board, expand it to five Members. I think the major problem between the people who oppose this Executive Order and those of us who support the Executive Order deals in the question of merging the State Police and the I.B.I. And I'd agree too it would be nice if we could do that now; but I think we have some financial responsibilities this year that we cannot do that merger. If we put those two groups together, the I.B.I. agents would have...either have to take a \$2,500 pay cut. We'd have to come up with \$6,000,000 to pay the State Police the comparable wages of the I.B.I. So I think there's more to it than just a question of Legislative-Executive branch. I think the Governor has gone more than half way to resolve the problem with the Legislative branch. I'm convinced that we have had our input into this process. We haven't just taken his Executive Order and approved it. He has agreed to accompanying legislation; and as Representative Kane mentioned there is House Bill 2397, which will be heard later this week or next week, which along with this Executive Order and with the proper Amendments on that legislation, I think will carry out the Governor's intent and also preserve the legislative rights in this matter. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor of the Resolution yield..."

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Houlihan."

Geo-Karis: "...Representative, in your Resolution you say that whereas Executive Order #2 contravenes statutes. Will you tell me what statutes that this Executive Order #2 contravenes?"

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I would yield to Representative Kane for this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "The number...issues...what it does is it contravenes statute by



abolishing the State Police Merit Board, it contravenes statute by eliminating some of the powers of the State Police Merit Board, and it contravenes statute by merging the I.B.I. into the State Police."

Geo-Karis: "Now, Mr....Representative, I'm looking at Section 11 of Article V in the Constitution. Does it not so state that the Governor by Executive Order may reassign...reassign functions 'among' or reorganize executive agencies which are directly responsible to him?"

Kane: "That's the language of the Constitution, yes."

Geo-Karis: "Well, then I'd like to speak on this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm opposing this Resolution because what we are doing by this Resolution is absolutely trying to nullify the powers given to the Governor by the Constitution in Article V. Certainly we have passed many laws. I can remember during the fuel crisis Governor Walker passed an Executive Order...signed an Executive Order making a Division of Energy in the Business and Economic Agency. And no one did a thing about it. It was perfectly legal. I think Governor Thompson is in the same position today. He's trying to do what we're trying to do...some of us have been trying to do for the time that we've been here. That is, to cut out overlapping of monies spent uselessly, waste in government funds. And trying to coordinate agencies to do a better job than they're doing now because they're spread out. There's duplication of efforts in both agencies. There's no doubt about it. I think we should support Governor Walker's... Governor Thompson's Executive Order #2. And I feel we should oppose this Resolution because if we don't oppose this Resolution then what we're saying to the taxpayers of Illinois is that we don't care how we spend your money, we don't care how many agencies overlap each other. We're just going to sit back because we already have some statutes that shouldn't be changed. Well, you and I both know there are statutes that should be changed and we should start thinking of implementing the cost of government in a more wasteless



fashion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

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

Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative James Houlihan to close."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will be brief. I think it's unfair to characterize this Resolution as an effort to cripple the Governor. I think the Minority Leader has misspoke himself when he says that we are trying to impede the Governor's effort to deal with the issue of crime. We have before us on Second Reading legislative proposals that the Director... the Governor's own Director of Law Enforcement says are good, implement some things he would've liked to have seen in the Executive Order. And, in fact, go beyond where the Executive Order does. We are not trying to tie the Governor's hands. The major issue here is, do we want real government reorganization with regard to law enforcement or do we want partial reorganization? By maintaining the I.B.I. and the State Police separate, we are opting for a partial reorganization, which will maintain the division and the petty bickering between those two agencies. Mr. Speaker, I would urge an 'aye' vote for Resolution 274; and I would respectfully ask for a Verified Oral Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a Verified Oral Roll Call and, although, this rule has been in the rules ever since we started we have never really used it the way it was originally intended. So we will have an Oral Roll Call, which requires that every Member be in his seat, that his named be called and at the time his name is called he rise, indicate orally how he votes and at the same time depress his switch to indicate the manner in which he votes. After the Roll Call has been taken, it's permitted for Members to be added to the Roll Call or change the vote; but once the final tally is taken, under the rules, there is no provision



for anything further. Representative Darrow. Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, will we be allowed to explain our votes?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, you do."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The main thing is that the Members should be in their seat. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I think we ought to be aware, too, this is a Verified Roll Call that we're calling now."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. It's Rule 47, an Oral Roll Call, a Verified Royal...Oral Roll Call. So it's mandatory that every Member be in your seat, and when his name is called in conjunction with the...with the rule the Clerk will call the Roll alphabetically. And you only vote at the time that your named is called. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, if we proceed directly to Verified Oral Roll Call, can we explain our votes?"

Speaker Redmond: "You may explain your vote. The question...the question is, shall this Bill pass? We will have a Verified Oral Roll Call. The Clerk will call the Resolution. Shall the Resolution be adopted? An Oral Roll Call; and the Clerk will read the Roll Call alphabetically. And at the time your name is called, stand and indicate the way you desire to vote and depress your switch. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Adams, Abramson 'no', Adams 'no', Anderson 'no', Antonovych 'no', E. M. Barnes 'aye', Jane Barnes 'no', Bartulis... Bartulis..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis, according to the rules you must rise. Indicate..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...pass..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Bartulis does not vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Beatty..."

Speaker Redmond: "It looked to me that..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Beatty 'aye', Bennett 'no', Birchler 'aye', Bluthardt 'no', Boucek 'no', Bowman...Bowman..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."



Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, the thing that troubles me very much about this Resolution is that if we adopt it we are tacitly acknowledging that something like a State Police Merit Board is under the direct authority of the Governor and I...I think that that really contravenes the intent of setting up such merit boards. So, therefore, I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Bowman 'aye', Bradley 'aye', Brady 'aye', Brandt... Brandt pass, Breslin 'aye', Rich Brummer..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, in explaining my vote I'd first like to point out that the State Police Merit Board was established for the purpose of taking the politics out of the State Police or the State Police out of politics. I do not think we should endanger that possibility of reoccurring. I would point out that the State Police have operated under a proud tradition as Illinois State Police. They are almost without exception opposed to Executive Order #2. And thirdly, if you feel that the Governor ought to be able to create new agencies, and that ought not to be within the jurisdiction and authority of the General Assembly, then you should vote 'no'. However, if you feel that the General Assembly has the authority, the exclusive authority to create new agencies and not reassign functions among existing agencies, but this is the creation of a new agency, then you should vote 'aye'. I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Rich Brummer 'aye', Don Brummet 'aye', Byers 'aye', Caldwell 'aye', Campbell 'no', Capparelli...Capparelli..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli: Representative Brummet, did you depress your switch? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Capparelli pass, Catania 'no', Chapman 'aye', Christensen 'aye', Collins 'no', Conti 'no', Cunningham pass, Daniels 'no', Darrow..."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Article V, Section 11, of our Constitution requires that an Executive Order be delivered to the General Assembly by April 1st or that Order lays over until the following year. The Senate of the State of Illinois had adjourned when the delivery of the Executive Order



was attempted. And it was not until after that time that they received it. Therefore, I would contend that we have nothing before us to be considering at this time that would be appropriate for next year. And, therefore, I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Darrow votes 'aye', Corneal Davis..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was a Member of the Democratic caucus when the great Governor, a blessed memory, walked into that caucus and insisted that we establish the Merit Board. And his name was Adlai Stevenson, a blessed memory. And I can remember the debate, I can remember the debate. Some Democrats were really opposed to it. I can remember the hard fight he had to put our State Police under the Merit Board because before that time, and I'm not going to say that I wasn't guilty because I had a fellow I wanted to put on the police force. I can remember the distinguished Leader of the Democratic Party. At that time I had a fellow, he wanted to put on...the police force because he said, I'm not going to call his name, but he said that some policemen was tearing down his signs down there. But, after all, we did put it under the Merit Board. And I heard somebody say that this is a threat. Now, I don't believe, and I have the greatest respect for his excellency the Governor, I don't believe that the Governor wants to supersede any laws by an Executive Order; but I think we need a check. And I'm going to vote 'aye' simply as a check. I have the greatest respect for him."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Corneal..."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote?"

Davis, C.: "'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Corneal Davis votes 'aye', Jack Davis 'no', Dawson 'aye', Deavers 'no', Deuster pass, DiPrima 'aye', Domico pass, Doyle 'aye', John Dunn 'aye', Ralph Dunn pass, Dyer 'no', Ebbesen pass, Edgar 'no', Epton 'no', Ewell 'aye', Ewing..."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you vote your switch, Representative Ewing or Ewell?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...Ewing pass, Farley pass, Flinn 'aye', Friedland 'no',



Friedrich 'no', Gaines 'no', Garmisa 'aye', Geo-Karis 'no', Getty 'aye', Giglio 'aye', Giorgi 'aye', Greiman 'aye', Griesheimer..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote.

as we had a number of the state patrolmen from my area come down here. This state's waited over 50 years for some degree of reorganization in the executive end. And whether this be a Republican or a Democratic Governor, we finally have a Governor with the implementation through the Constitution to do something about this. One of the unfortunate things about this reorganization effort on the part of the Governor is that someone has leaked out absolutely incorrect information to the State Patrol right down the line. I had no prior information about this particular reorganization Resolution until I spoke to these policemen. Thereafter, I discussed it with the Governor's representatives and I find out that they've been given absolutely incorrect information. I think we should give this man the opportunity for his reorganization. And I don't see that this Resolution does anything except stop for another period of time the effort to reorganize our state. It's about time we did something with this state to get it back in line with modern techniques of government. I think our Governor's trying to do it. I'm voting 'no' on this Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Griesheimer votes 'no', Hanahan 'aye', Harris 'aye', Hart..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "One of the previous Gentlemen that spoke implied at least that the State Police supported this Governor's Executive Order. If that information is true, it certainly surprises me. All the State Police that I've talked to oppose it; and I think for valid reasons. I think the implementation of the Governor's Executive Order would create...create one of the largest morale problems in the State Police that we have had in my lifetime. I support the concept of consolidation of the agencies. The Democrats took the position when Governor Ogilvie created the I.B.I. We had an Amendment suggested on the floor of this House to put the I.B.I. under the



State Police. It was defeated on a party-line vote, Republicans having the majority at that time in the House of Representatives. I think there is some merit to what the Governor is trying to do; but I think that what proper way to do it is through the legislation that came out of the Select Committee. And so I'm going to vote 'aye' to reject the Governor's Order and to implement the program properly through legislation."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Hart vote 'aye', Hoffman..."

Speaker Redmond: "Stand, stand and announce your vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "...'no', Holewinski 'aye', Dan Houlihan 'aye', Jim Houlihan 'aye', Hoxsey 'no', Hudson 'no', Huff..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff votes 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...'present', Huskey 'no', Jacobs 'aye', Jaffe 'aye', Johnson..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...'no', Dave Jones 'no', Emil Jones...Emil Jones pass, Kane 'aye', Katz..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Like a previous speaker, I have the greatest admiration for the role of Governor in state government. Like a previous speaker indicated, I have personally voted at the time the I.B.I. was created to make that and the State Police in the same agency. I have the greatest sympathy also for the constitutional provision which recognizes the inherent inefficiency of state government and clothe a chief executive with broad powers to try to do something about it. The Governor has here sought to do that. The Legislature can act in its own way without nullifying what the Governor has here done. I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Katz votes 'no', Keats..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to call everyone's attention to one point that we seem to have a mistake on and a minor disagreement concerning the Merit Board. The Merit Board's position has not really changed. It's under the same authority it was before. The Director does not control the Merit Board. The Merit Board's



under the same authority, the same position. There is no change. And I wanted to stress that to make sure if there's any confusion in anyone's mind. And the Governor has agreed to accompanying legislation that will do exactly what we want. He said he'll sign it if we want it. So I think what we're getting into is a moot point. And I wish everyone would remember to vote 'no' because the Governor is well within his rights and taking a very reasonable position with this. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Keats votes 'no', Kelly 'aye', Kempiners 'no', Kent 'no', Klosak 'no', Kornowicz pass, Kosinski..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with the full knowledge of the very laudable intent of the Governor and the Director of the Department of Law Enforcement and with the assurance that the proposed legislation now held in Amendment stage will more effectively insure...assure that intent without the alleged dangers of imperfections in the Executive Order, which by Constitution the Governor unfortunately has no way of amending, but to assure his intent being executed through legislation, I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Kosinski votes 'aye', Kozubowski 'aye', Kucharski 'no', Lauer 'no', Laurino 'aye', Lechowicz 'aye', Leinenweber 'no', Leverenz 'aye', Levin 'aye', Lucco 'aye', Luft 'aye', Macdonald..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had my light on for about 15 minutes during the debate before the question was called; but I wasn't recognized. I couldn't have made a better presentation than did Representative Rigney, so I won't take the time of the House to reiterate his point. The Governor is absolutely within his constitutional rights to use the executive power he has exercised in reorganizing the state departments that we've been discussing. I hope that we do not establish a precedent of engaging in a power struggle every time any Governor moves to improve state government. Our mutual goal should be a more efficient and more economic operation of our government. And I commend



Governor Thompson for his dedication and wisdom in proposing the changes that he has presented to us. I vote 'no' on this Resolution and I urge you to join me."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Macdonald votes 'no', Madigan 'aye', Madison...Madison pass, Mahar 'no', Mann pass, Marovitz...Marovitz 'aye', Lynn Martin ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin. She votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...no', Peggy Smith Martin pass, Matejek 'aye', Matijevec 'aye', Mautino 'aye', McAuliffe 'no', McAvoy 'no', McBroom 'no', McClain 'aye', McCourt 'no', McGrew 'aye', McLendon 'aye', McMaster 'no', McPike 'aye', Meyer 'no', Miller 'no', Molloy 'no', Mudd...Mudd pass, Mugalian 'aye', Mulcahey 'aye', Murphy 'aye', Nardulli 'aye', Neff 'no', O'Brien..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...aye', O'Daniel..."

Speaker Redmond: "'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...aye', Pechous 'aye', Peters 'no', Pierce 'aye', Polk 'no', Porter...'no'..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...Porter votes 'no', Pouncey 'present', Pullen 'no', Reed pass, Reilly 'no', Richmond 'aye', Rigney 'no', Robinson 'no', Ryan 'no', Sandquist 'no', Satterthwaite 'aye', Schisler...Schisler pass, Schlickman pass, Schneider 'aye', Schoeberlein 'no', Schuneman 'no', Sevcik 'no', Sharp 'aye', Shumpert 'present', Simms 'no', Skinner 'no', Stanley 'no', Stearney...Stearney pass, Steczo 'aye', E. G. Steele 'no', C. M. Stiehl 'no', Stuffle 'aye', Sumner 'no', Taylor 'present', Telcser 'no', Terzich...Terzich 'aye', Tipword 'aye', Totten 'no', Tuerk...Tuerk pass, Van Duyne pass; Vitek 'aye', Von Boeckman..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vitek, did you vote the machine?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...Von Boeckman votes 'aye', Waddell 'no', Wall 'no', Walsh 'no', Wikoff 'no', Willer...what did Willer do?...no', Williams 'aye', Winchester 'no', Wolf 'no', Younge 'aye', Yourell 'aye', Mr. Speaker 'aye'."



Speaker Redmond: "'Aye'. Mr. Clerk, will you call the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis pass, Brandt pass, Capparelli...Capparelli votes 'aye', Cunningham pass, Deuster...Deuster pass, Domico pass, Ralph Dunn pass, Ebbesen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, you know, we all recall that the Governor campaigned all over this state and told the people that areas where government needed reorganization that he was going to make every effort to do it...to streamline it. And to me it appears he has...definitely has the constitutional right. And here's the chance to see government for once operate like a business and perhaps give people a dollars worth of service for every tax dollar that's being spent. And for that reason, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Ebbesen 'no', Ewing votes 'no', Farley...Farley votes 'aye', Emil Jones pass, Kornowicz..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones, you're out of your seat. According to the rule you're supposed to be in your seat."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Kornowicz pass, Madison pass, Mann pass, Peggy Smith Martin pass, Mudd pass, Reed pass, Schisler pass, Schlickman pass, Stearney pass, Tuerk pass, Van Duyne pass...completes the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Does any Member desire to be recognized to change his vote? Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't always like to do this type of thing, but I think there comes a time when any good Democrat should show another good Democrat that we all ought to stick together or we all are going to die together. At this point here, being the Democrat that I am, I'm going to change my 'present' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Does any other Member desire to be recognized to change his vote? Representative Huff."

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

Speaker Redmond: "'Present'."



Huff: "Switch my 'present' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Does any other Member desire to be recognized to change his vote? Representative Pouncey."

Pouncey: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote to 'yes!'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone who voted and changed their vote, don't forget to depress your switch. Representative Shumpert."

Shumpert: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change from 'present' to 'aye!'."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Change the Gentleman from 'present' to 'aye'."

Is there any other Member. Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, R.: "Change my pass to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'no'. Any other Member desire to be recognized? Representative Emil Jones."

Jones, E.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will you record me as 'aye', please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Any other Member desire to be recorded to change his vote? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'aye' and 79 'no'. It requires 89 votes. This Resolution fails. How did the system work? Was it any good or was it bad? Representative Capparelli, do you have an announcement of some kind? Don't misunderstand the meaning of this; but Representative Capparelli has been getting himself measured for baseball uniforms and he may have some announcement."



Capparelli: "All right. I just talked with coach Lucco, we're going to have a practice next Tuesday and Wednesday. We're going to try to play the Young Democrats. So bring your spikes and we'll have the shirts for you next week. Okay?"

Speaker Redmond: "What do you want now, Jack? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to congratulate Representative Capparelli on his miraculous recovery."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. We're not winding up yet so....stay in your seat."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you were indicating, Mr. Speaker, the Oral Roll Call worked well in the House...worked extremely well. I rise to commend us all, really, on the way the deadlines have been kept and the expeditious way that business has been carried out. The next deadline facing the House, under our rules, is the deadline for getting Senate Bills, that are in the House, out of House Committees. That's a tremendously important date because the House Committee consideration is the last important thing, really, before these matters are likely to be enacted. Now the Speaker... that deadline is June 11, as it now stands. A problem has been presented because of the fact that June 7 of that week is the day in which elections will be held in Chicago. The Speaker indicates that barring absolute unforeseen circumstances he would propose that the House would not be in Session that day and perhaps the day before as well. That will not give us as many days as had been anticipated. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the appropriate rule so that June 11, which is the current date for having house Committees consider Senate Bills, will be extended to June 15, that is Wednesday of the following week, which will makeup for the time that will be lost due to the Chicago elections. This has been discussed with the Minority Leader, who



is in support of this move for suspension. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully so move the rule so that we may have the additional time to makeup for the Chicago election and still permit us to operate in the very excellent atmosphere in which the House has been operating this Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative Katz's motion. In effect, what it does, it gives us three more days of the Committee consideration of Senate Bills. In light of the continued Senate consideration of Senate Bills and the fact that they will not complete their consideration until sometime tomorrow and also in light of the Chicago election, I think that we do need the three additional days and therefore I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am also in agreement with Representative Katz and support his motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is interesting to me that for the Chicago election, and so that the Members over there can get into their precincts and really do that for which they are serving here, we are willing to suspend the rules; but for the purpose of producing a better product, for the purpose of deliberating on thousands, literally thousands of Bills that are before us, we cannot do that. I suggest to you that we ought to defeat this motion. We ought to be here on the sixth and on the seventh and do the job that we were elected to do. I don't think we ought to take those two days off for the Chicago election."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this is your way of telling us we won't be here Monday and Tuesday of that week in June?"



Speaker Redmond: "This isn't my way of telling you anything.

This is my way of suggesting that in order to prevent the crunch at the end and the perpetual standing up and suspending rules so that you can post Bills that

It's our judgment that this is the best way to do it.

Skinner: "Well, will you tell us that we will not be here that Monday and Tuesday so that we may make plans in our district?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I will tell you when I know. I don't know yet."

Skinner: "Well, if you don't know, Sir, who will know?"

Speaker Redmond: "Only God."

Skinner: "Only....I thought you were God. ...And she isn't talking."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the motion? Representative Katz has moved to suspend the deadline for Committee action on Senate Bills, Rule 26 (d), until 11:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 15, 1977. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 107 votes is required. Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, never let it be said that a Republican could not quote a Democrat when his wisdom was superior to that expressed by the other individual. The illustrious Representative Ewell, who regrettably is not here to defend his position, once made a statement that most of the Bills coming out of the House would go to the Senate and be killed like hogs in a slaughter house. Well, I would tend to think there's probably good reason for it because many of the Bills we pass deserve that sort of ending. Most of these Senate Bills probably deserve the same here. There probably aren't ten Bills in the Senate that we could waste ten minutes talking about and I think if we were smart we'll keep this rule, we will not vote to expand it and we'll kill those Bills and save the taxpayers of this state billions of dollars the Senate is throwing away."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course all elections are important but.....and the City of Chicago does have millions of people there, but I think we were elected to serve in the General Assembly and serve the people of the State of Illinois and that we could best serve our purposes by being here and working for those days. And I think we should defeat this motion and vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have....remaining consistent with my 'yes' vote here, I have opposed deadlines. Contrary to what a previous speaker has said, it does improve the products. We all know that we're going to adjourn for the ...recess or adjourn for the Chicago elections anyway so if we don't extend the deadlines we're again going to cram excessive and extensive legislation in a short time, where it gets to the point where we don't realize what we're voting on. I think it's a good vote is to vote 'yes' and extend the deadline."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, last week this House broke its back complying with arbitrary deadlines which, I think, we all agree are pretty ridiculous. Now, suddenly, to accommodate people that can't use an absentee voting system, we're talking about releasing those deadlines and for all purposes the Senate Bills. I can see no reason for this at the present time. Each and every Member on the opposite side of the aisle and those few Republicans that live in the City, can vote absentee just like anyone else. I think we should be down here working and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I see this motion is going to pass, unfortunately."



I think this motion is an insult to every Member of this House. I think it is an insult to everyone of us who worked long hours last week and the week before and in past Sessions to comply with arbitrary and needless deadlines. I certainly agree with Representative Wolf, we shouldn't have any at all; but we were forced to work in this House, under these deadlines when we could have very easily suspended them or thrown them right out. We had plenty of time to do so, but we didn't. We whipped ourselves and did whip the Calendar and we all dragged ourselves out of here last week in a state of fatigue. Now, for the most specious of reasons, to suspend the... deadline in consideration of Senate Bills, I think is the grossest form of insult to every Member of this House. I think we ought to turn this motion down...out of hand. If you want to abolish deadlines, which I certainly would concur in, I'd vote for that motion. But on this motion, I think everyone of us should feel compelled to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, in view of your constant demand that we meet deadlines, I'd be glad to yield my microphone while you explain your vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye', and 36 'no', the Gentleman's motion prevails. Senate Bills, First Reading. Supplemental Calendar. Again I want to caution.....I don't know....After all of the rhetoric, whether any House Member wants to Sponsor any Senate Bill at all, but there are many Senate Bills here that do not have Senate Sponsors.....er...I mean House Sponsors. It's the policy not to post a Bill until the Sponsor identifies himself. So I would encourage you, if you want to be in good with your Senator, that be sure that you identify yourself as the House Sponsor of a Senate Bill. Mr. Clerk. Advise that we don't have to do that



right at the moment. Representative, on the Order of Motions. Representative Deuster, do you want to take the motion with respect to 239? Meyer, the motion with respect to 1051, 1059. Out of the record. Representative Barnes, with respect to 528. Out of the record. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Would the Clerk like to read the Agreed Resolutions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 280, Kelly; House Resolution 281, Catania; House Resolution 282, Polk; House Resolution 283, Richmond; and House Resolution 284, Pechous."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 280 by Kelly, honors the retirement of the Maitre d' at the Wrigley Buiding Restaurant. House Resolution 281, by Catania, honors the Mother of the Year. House Resolution 282, by Polk, notes that the East Moline High School Women's Track Team won the State Track Title. House Resolution 283, by Richmond, honors the Flying Salukis of Southern Illinois University. House Resolution 284, by Who is 284?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 284 is Pechous."

Giorgi: "...honors Captian Krzyzowski. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. House Bills, Second Reading. On House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 2397. Representative Kane on the floor? Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2397, a Bill for an Act reorganizing the Department...of Law Enforcement..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Does any Member have a Bill...Representative Taylor, did you want to return 2355 to the Order of Second Reading? Representative



Jones. What Bill do you have?"

Jones, J. David: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to return 1595 to Second Reading for purposes of an...."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? 1595 is on the Order of Third Reading. He requests leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Dave Jones, amends House Bill 1595 on page one by deleting all of line 27 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment was one that ...a Committee Amendment that was incorrectly drawn and was called to our attention by Representative Lechowicz...yesterday. The Amendment has now been properly prepared and we move for its adoption."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Taylor. 2355, Is that correct?"

Taylor: "That's correct."

Speaker Redmond: "2355. The Gentleman has asked leave to have 2355 returned to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Taylor, amends House Bill 2355, as Amended, by inserting immediately after the last line in Section 1, the following, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment, Amendment #6 adds one claim for \$11,140, from



the Road Fund. This claim was dropped from the court last award Bill because of an objection by the Attorney General. This objection has been removed and the Court of Claims has approved payment of this award. I solicit your support for Amendment #6 to House Bill 2359."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Mr. Taylor, I don't have the Amendment before me, what is the Amendment for?"

Taylor: "The Amendment is concerning an individual in Representative Tipsword's district that, last year, we had some problems with, and because at that time the Attorney General had objections to the Amendment, we had taken it out of the award. These were cases that have been approved for payment by the Court of Claims and now that the Court ...the Attorney General has removed the objections, we decided to go ahead with the Amendment."

McClain: "All right. Second question, is the money coming out of Road Fund moneys or General Revenue?"

Taylor: "Road Fund."

McClain: "And the damage came from poorly designed construction of a levy and therefore we're taking the money from the Road Fund?"

Taylor: "Well, I didn't prepare the Amendment, Representative McClain. It came to me from the Court of Claims and I'm presenting it as it was prepared and given to me."

McClain: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may? I'm sure that Mr. Tipsword's two constituents rightly deserve these awards and ...but the only problem that I have is ... you know when we talk about State Police having awards from the Court of Claims and that comes from the Road Fund. I can see, maybe some legitimate discussion on validating that the money comes from the Road Fund, but



here we have a case of about \$11,000 plus, coming from the Road Fund, which I don't see any connection with actual Road Construction or road usage and I'm going to vote 'present', just because of that fact."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword. Representative Brady, please sit down."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I think I can clear this point up for Representative McClain. These damages comes from.... by virtue of the building of a bridge and improper engineering in the construction of a bridge and the use of the Road Funds in the State of Illinois. So consequently the damages are caused byoperation in which the Road Fund was participating. It was ...it was the fund from which the construction came....That is why the Court of Claims would put this in the Road Fun. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #6,....is it, to House Bill 2355. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Reilly, do you seek recognition?"

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I seek leave to table Senate Bill 1199. This was the concurrence of the Senate Sponsor and the Department which asked for the Bill in the first place."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Senate Bill 1199, is that correct, is tabled. Anything further? Any other Bills the Sponsors desire to have returned to Second Reading? Any Sponsor want a motion or anything on the Speaker's Table called? Representative, oh yes, the lost and found department, Mr. Clerk."



Clerk O'Brien: "There's been a ballpoint pen found in the vicinity of Representative Conti's desk, that has been turned in to me. If anybody lost a ballpoint pen, please come and identify it."

Speaker Redmond: "Very expensive. It looks like it might have belonged to a lady lawyer from Zion. Real expensive. Representative Kozubowski, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kozubowski: "For an announcement, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Announcements."

Kozubowski: "I'd like to announce that the Executive Committee on Resolutions Subcommittee will meet promptly after adjournment in Room 114."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further announcements? Representative Madigan. Mr. Clerk, will you tell the Body the needs of the Clerk's office?"

Clerk O'Brien: "About fifteen minutes in Perfunctory to read Messages from the Senate and Senate Bills on First Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Any further Announcements, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, before the Body? I guess not."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn until Tuesday."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk finally decided he has an announcement."

Polk: "No, Sir. Just a question of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Polk: "Have you given the schedule for next week? Are we going to be in next Friday? Have you indicated that yet?"

Speaker Redmond: "I would think so. We won't be back in until Tuesday at noon. I would think it would be ... Representative Madigan has the schedule. We're going to send the proposed schedule to everybody...to their



office, but it looks like four days. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the proposed schedule for next week provides that we will come into Session on Tuesday at 12 o'clock and at 2 o'clock we will begin the normal Committee schedule for a Tuesday and there will be the normal Committee schedule for Wednesday and Thursday and then on Friday, June 3, in the morning we will have a Committee schedule for the normal Tuesday Committees. So Friday, June 3, Judiciary II, Revenue, Elementary and Secondary Education, Financial Institutions, City and Villages, Insurance and Transportation...will all meet in the morning with a one o'clock Session. To repeat,Could we have some attention, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please."

Madigan: "We can't do that... To repeat....could we have Mr. Schlickman's attention? Please?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentlemen want to know the schedule. Representative McBroom, please be quiet."

Madigan: "Next week, on Tuesday, we shall have the normal Tuesday Committee's schedule. On Wednesday, the normal Wednesday Committee schedule. On Thursday, the normal Thursday Committee schedule. On Friday morning, the normal Tuesday Committees will meet on Friday morning, June 3.....With a one o'clock Session on Friday."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other questions? I would like to encourage the Committee Chairmen to be sure that you accommodate your posting requirements because six and a half days is a long time. I think most of the Bills have been assigned to Committees. The ones that aren't are having problems with House Sponsors. I'd like to finish the last two weeks as well as we finished Saturday and today Ready for the motion? The question is on Representative Madigan's motion that after the 15 minute Perfunct, that the House adjourn until Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon?"



May 26, 1977

89.

Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
'ayes' have it, the House stands adjourned until ...
Have a good weekend."



1.

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit:

Senate Bills #40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 85, 159, 169, 205, 206, 207, 241, 245, 293, 305, 312, 314, 326, 232, 382, 384, 401, 408, 413, 429, 433, 467, 511, 512, 513, 516, 517, 521, 533, 539, 569, 574, 591, 598, 615, 622, 626, 634, 635 and 643 passed by the Senate May 25, 1977, Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 112, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Alcoholic Liquors, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 310, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 367, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for management operation control of state colleges and university systems, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 368, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to state finance, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 369, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for management control of state colleges and university systems, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 450, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 560, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with sales on credit and lending of money, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 561, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the



commission on children, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 741, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Capital Development Board to convey certain real property in Jersey County, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 751, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 932, a Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Clark County, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 933, a Bill for an Act relating to an easement in Clark Count, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1148, a Bill for an Act relating to conservation right and real property, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1156, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1188, a Bill for an Act to amend the Purchasing Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1357, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act revising the law in relation to coroners, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1367, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Alcoholic Liquors, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1271, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cemetery Care Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 40, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 41, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 42, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.



3.

Senate Bill 43, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 44, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 45, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 46, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 47, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 48, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 49, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 50, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 51, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 53, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 54, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 56, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 57, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 58, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 59, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 60, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 85, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Capital Development Fund to the Capital Development Board, University of Illinois, First Reading of the Bill.



Senate Bill 159, a Bill for an Act to create an Act relating to Executive Orders, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 206, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 207, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning mechanics' liens, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 241, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 245, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 293, a Bill for an Act to provide for payment of general state aid for schools, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 305, a Bill for an Act concerning inheritance tax, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 314, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Capital Development Board, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 326, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Finance, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 332, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois Racing Board, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 382, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 401, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Services Bureau for Hearing Impaired Persons Act, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 408, a Bill for an Act to repeal an Act in relation to garnishments, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 413, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation of motor fuel for motor vehicles and boats, First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 467, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to



- revise the law in relation to clerks of courts, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 511, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 512, a Bill for an Act concerning fees and salaries, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 513, a Bill for an Act concerning rates and forms of publications, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 533, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Public School Teacher's Pension and Retirement Fund, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 569, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 591, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Industrial Pollution Control Financing Act, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 598, a Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of the Highway Code, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 622, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 615, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code in the State Finance Act, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 622, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 626, a Bill for an Act to regulate the profession of landscape architecture, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 634, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 635, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill.
- Senate Bill 643, a Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Code, First Reading of the Bill.



6.

Senate Bill 543, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the higher education institutions and agencies, First Reading of the Bill.

Nothing else? No further business, the House now stands adjourned.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.			
1	9:30	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Father Krueger	Invocation
1		Speaker Redmond	
1		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
1		Speaker Redmond	
1		Matijeovich	Explains & moves resolutions
1		Speaker Redmond	Agreed Resolutions are adopted
2		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Matijeovich	Reference to HR 279
2		Speaker Redmond	Constitutional Amendment 3rd HJRCA 27
2		Skinner	
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Terzich	Motion to table
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Geo-Karis	Questions quorum
3		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bills First
3		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bills First
3		Speaker Redmond	HB 730
3		Pierce	Old Legislators
3		Speaker Redmond	
4		Tipsword	
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Katz	Committees
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Keats	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
2.			
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Cunningham	54th District Speech
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Geo-Karis	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Kane	HB 2369—hold on 2nd
5		Speaker Redmond	House Bills Third—Roll Call for attendance
6		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bills First
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		Hart	Leave to take 409 back to 2nd
6		Speaker Redmond	House Bills 3rd—leave granted
6		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #1—HB 409
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		Hart	Explains Amendment #1
6		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted—3rd
7		Leinenweber	Explains HB 2365
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2365
7		Speaker Redmond	HB 2365 passed
7		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2366
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Friedrich	Explains HB 2366
7		Speaker Redmond	HB 2366 passed
7		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2367
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Christensen	Explains HB 2367
7		Speaker Redmond	



3.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
8		Cunningham))	
8		Christensen)	
8		Speaker Redmond	
9		Skinner))	
9		Christensen)	
9	9:50	Speaker Redmond	
9		Tipsword	
9		Speaker Redmond	
9		Matijeich	
9		Speaker Redmond	
9		Tipsword	
9		Speaker Redmond	
9		Matijeich	
9		Speaker Redmond	Passed
10		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2373 - 3rd Reading
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Skinner	
10	9:55	Speaker Redmond	HB 2373 passed
10		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2376 - 3rd Reading
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Miller	
10		Speaker Redmond	
11		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2377 - 3rd Reading
11		Speaker Redmond	
11		Byers	Point of order
11		Speaker Redmond	
11		Meyer	Out of record



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	11		Speaker Redmond	
	11		Clerk O'Brien	HB 48 - 3rd Reading
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	12		Mautino	
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	12		Totten	
	12		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	12		Clerk O'Brien	HB 107 - 3rd Reading
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	13		Hart	
	13		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	13		Clerk O'Brien	HB-1115
	13		Speaker Redmond	
	13		Friedrich	Out of record
	13	10:00	Clerk O'Brien	
	13		Speaker Redmond	
	13		Dunn, J.	Leave of House
	13		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Ryan	
	14		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Giorgi	
	14		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Sandquist	
	14		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Clerk O'Brien	HJR 43
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Giorgi	Moves to adopt



<u>5.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Mautino	
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Totten)	Asks explanation of question
)	
	16		Mautino)	
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Totten	
	16		Mautino	
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	17		Cunningham	
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	18		Epton	
	18		Mautino	
	18		Speaker Redmond	
	19		Polk	
	19		Speaker Redmond	
	19	10:12	Schuneman)	
)	
	20		Mautino)	
	20		Speaker Redmond	
	21		Byers	
	21		Speaker Redmond	
	21		Geo-Karis)	
)	
	21		Mautino)	
	22		Speaker Redmond	
	22		Ebbesen	
	22		Speaker Redmond	
	22		Telcser	Parliamentary Inquiry



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
6.			
22		Speaker Redmond	
23	10:20	Ryan	
23		Mautino	
23		Speaker Redmond	
23		Telcser	
23		Speaker Redmond	
23		Giorgi	
24		Speaker Redmond	
24		Friedrichs	
25		Speaker Redmond	
25		Ryan	
25		Speaker Redmond	
26		Matijevich	
26		Speaker Redmond	
26		Ryan	
26		Speaker Redmond	
26		Peters	
27		Speaker Redmond	
27		Mautino	Out of record
27		Speaker Redmond	Dump Roll Call
27		Wolf	HB 1354 leave to vote yes
27		Speaker Redmond	Journal gone
27		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2362 - 3rd
27		Giglio	
28		Speaker Redmond	
28	10:30	Skinner	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
28		Speaker Redmond)	
28		Totten)	
28		Speaker Redmond	
29		Giglio	
29		Speaker Redmond	
30		Deuster)	
30		Giglio)	
30		Speaker Redmond	
30		Speaker Redmond	
30		Deuster	Urge 'no' vote
30		Speaker Redmond	
31		Neff	
31		Speaker Redmond	
31		Von Boeckman	
32		Speaker Redmond	
32		Giglio	
32		Speaker Redmond	HB 2362 passed
32		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1918 - 3rd Reading
32		Speaker Redmond	
32		Kane	
32		Speaker Redmond	
33	10:40	Cunningham	
33		Speaker Redmond	Passed
33		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1180 - 3rd Reading
33		Speaker Redmond	
34		Taylor	
34		Speaker Redmond	



8.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	34		Kempiners	
	35		Speaker Redmond	
	35		Robinson	
	35		Speaker Redmond	
	35		Lechowicz	Point of order
	35		Speaker Redmond	
	36		Robinson	Continues
	36		Speaker Redmond	
	36		Friedrichs)	
	37		Taylor)	
	37		Speaker Redmond	
	37		Jones, E.	
	37		Speaker Redmond	
	38		Taylor	To close
	38		Speaker Redmond	
	39		Davis, C.	
	39		Speaker Redmond	
	39	10:52	Ebbesen	Explains vote
	40		Speaker Redmond	
	40		McGrew	" "
	40		Davis, C.	Point of personal privilege
	41		Speaker Redmond	
	41		Gaines	
	41		Speaker Redmond	
	42		Matijevich	
	42		Speaker Redmond	
	42		Peters	



<u>10.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
50		Speaker Redmond	
51		Houlihan, J.	
51		Speaker Redmond	
52,53,54;55,56		Kane	
56		Speaker Redmond	
57,58		Stiehl	Urges 'no' vote
59		Speaker Redmond	
60	11:47	Ryan	'No'
60		Speaker Redmond	
61		Matijevich	
61		Speaker Redmond	
62		Rigney	
63		Speaker Redmond	
63		Getty	
64		Speaker Redmond	
65		Winchester	Oppose
65		Speaker Redmond	
66	12:03	Edgar	
66		Speaker Redmond	
66		Geo-Karis)	
66)	
66		Houlihan)	
66		Speaker Redmond)	
67)	
67		Kane)	
68		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
68		Speaker Redmond	
68		Houlihan, J.	To close-requests oral roll call
68		Speaker Redmond	



<u>ll.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	69		Darrow	
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69	12:10	Matijeovich	
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69		Bowman	
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69		Clerk O'Brien	Oral Roll Call
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	70		Bowman	Explains 'aye'
	70		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	70		Speaker Redmond	
	70		Brummer	Explains 'aye'
	70		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	70		Speaker Redmond	
	70		Darrow	Explains 'aye'
	71		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	71		Davis, C.	Explains 'aye'
	71		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	72		Greisheimer	Explains 'no'
	72		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	72		Speaker Redmond	
	73		Hart	Explains 'aye'
	73		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	73		Speaker Redmond	
	73		Katz	Explains 'no'
	73		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	73	12:25	Keats	



12. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
74		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
74		Speaker Redmond	
74		Kosinski	Explains 'no'
74		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
74		Macdonald	Votes 'no'
75		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
76		Speaker Redmond	
76		Ebbesen	Explains 'no'
76		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
76		Speaker Redmond	
76		Taylor	Change to 'aye'
76		Speaker Redmond	
77		Huff	Change to 'aye'
77		Speaker Redmond	
77		Pouncey	Change to 'aye'
77		Speaker Redmond	
78		Shumpert	'Aye'
78		Speaker Redmond	
77		Dunn, R.	Change to 'no'
77		Speaker Redmond	
77		Jones, E.	'Aye'
78		Speaker Redmond	Resolution fails
78	12:38	Capparelli	
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Collins	
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Katz	MOVE to suspend rules-SB deadline



<u>13.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	79		Speaker Redmond	
	79		Madigan	
	79		Speaker Redmond	
	79		Ryan	
	79		Speaker Redmond	
	79		Walsh	
	79		Speaker Redmond	
	80		Skinner	
	80		Speaker Redmond	Katz motion
	80		Keats	Oppose
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Byers	Votes 'no'
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Wolf	
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Greisheimer	Votes 'no'
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	82	12:47	Collins	Votes 'no'
	82		Speaker Redmond	
	83		Friedrich	
	82		Speaker Redmond	Katz motion prevails
	83		Clerk O'Brien	
	83		Speaker Redmond	
	83		Giorgi	
	83		Speaker Redmond	
	83		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolution



<u>14.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
83		Giorgi	
83		Speaker Redmond	Resolutions adopted. HB 1595- return to 2nd-adopted-3rd
84		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6
84		Taylor	
84		Speaker Redmond	
84		McClain)	
)	
85		Taylor)	
86		Speaker Redmond	
86		Tipsword	
86		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
86	12:55	Reilly	Leave to table SB 1199
86		Speaker Redmond	
87		Clerk O'Brien	Lost and found
87		Speaker Redmond	
87		Kozubowski	Announcement
87		Speaker Redmond	
88		Clerk O'Brien	
88		Madigan	Move to adjourn
89		Polk	Question
89		Speaker Redmond	
89		Madigan	Schedule
89		Speaker Redmond	House adjourns-15 minute Perfunctory



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES