

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Adlai E. Stevenson said: 'Let us present once more the true face of America - warm and modest and friendly, dedicated to the welfare of all mankind, and demanding nothing except a chance for all to live and let live, to grow and govern as they wish, free from interference, free from intimidation, free from fear. Let us pray. For the President of the United States and all in civil authority. Almighty God, whose kingdom is everlasting and power infinite; have mercy upon this whole land; and so rule the hearts of Thy servants, the President of the United States, and all others in authority, that they, knowing whose ministers they are, may above all things seek Thy honor and glory; and that we and all the people, duly considering whose authority they bear, may faithfully and obediently honor them, according to Thy blessed word and ordinance; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever, one God, world without end. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Stand at ease until 8:20. Representative McPike, will you come up here, please?"

EASE

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. The Members please be in their seats. I want to advise the...our guests in the gallery that the use of signs or any other demonstration in the House chambers is forbidden. We hope that...we hope that the rules of the quorum of the House will prevail. Roll Call for attendance. We will be at ease, pending the arrival of the Members of the Senate. Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, President Hynes and the Members of the Senate are at the door and desire admission to the chamber."

Speaker Redmond: "The House, extending its usual welcome to the Senate... Admit the Senate to the chambers. Members of the House and our



guests from the Senate, please be seated. Mr. Clerk, is there a quorum of the House present?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, the Roll shows 169 Members present in the chamber and a quorum is in attendance."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. President, is a quorum of the Senate present?"

Senator Hynes: "Mr. Speaker, a quorum of the Senate is in attendance."

Speaker Redmond: "There being a quorum of the House and of the Senate in attendance, the Joint Session is convened. We now stand at ease for about ten minutes." Where's Representative Ryan?"

EASE

Speaker Redmond: "The Joint Session will come to order, please. Is the Committee of Escort in place? It consists of Representative Eugenia Chapman, Representative Corneal Davis, Representative Monroe Flinn, Representative Elroy Sandquist, Representative Glenn Schneider. Mr. President, who are the Members of the Committee of Escort from the Senate? The Committee of Escort from the Senate, Senator Charles Chew, Senator Jerome Joyce, Senator Robert Lane, Senator Fred Smith, Senator Sam Vadalabene."



Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper, are you seeking attention?"

Doorkeeper: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Chief Justice Ward and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of Illinois are at the door and desire admission to the chamber."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper, admit the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois. Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson, United States Senator of Illinois, is at the door and desires admittance."

Speaker Redmond: "Admit the Senator. Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor Thompson, Secretary of State Dixon, Comptroller Bakalis, and Treasurer Smith are at the door and desire admission to the chamber."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper, admit His Excellency James K. Thompson, the Governor of the State of Illinois, Secretary Dixon, Comptroller Bakalis and Treasurer Smith. The Joint Session will be...take your seats and the Joint Session will be at ease for a few minutes, pending the arrival of our distinguished guest."

EASE

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper, please admit the President of the United States."

Senator Hynes: "Mr. President, on behalf of the Members of the Illinois Senate, it is my great pleasure to welcome you here to Springfield and to this Joint Session. It is truly a great honor for all of us and we are very grateful that you are with us."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. President, on behalf of my colleagues in the House, I welcome you to the Joint Session of the General Assembly. Members of the Joint Session, the President of the United States."

President Carter: "Thank you. Thank you very much. Governor Thompson, Senator Stevenson, President Hynes, Speaker Redmond, Mr. Chief Justice, other distinguished leaders of the great State of Illinois,



it's an honor for me to be here with you in this historic place, from whence has come so many profound statements and deliberations in the history of our country; and from which came perhaps the greatest leader who has ever lived in the President's House. I'm very grateful, too, for the political wisdom concentrated here, as well as the governmental wisdom. When I began to plan my own campaign I talked to present Speaker Redmond, he told me how to win an election easily and quickly. And I know that appearances here have proven to be very good in future presidential elections, I think the last President who spoke here, according to the news media, was Herbert Hoover...who came here in 1931 just before his election, or campaign, against Franklin Roosevelt. This morning I had prepared a speech text which has been distributed, or will be, to you. I prepared it myself and I think perhaps you might want to read it over. But I thought, in order to have a more constructive Session for me, that I would make a very few impromptu remarks and then spend what time we have together answering your questions. And just to be sure we are completely fair, I'll ask the Speaker to recognize you for questions a little bit later on. I've been a Member of a State Legislature, my first elective office was to the Georgia State Senate, where I served two terms. And I came to realize then the extreme importance of state government, the difficulties of public service, the courage required to make decisions on controversial issues; because almost every issue that comes here is difficult to resolve. If a matter is easy it's solved in a family's home, or perhaps in a neighborhood, or city hall, or county courthouse. If it's much more difficult, it comes to your desk and eventually comes to the attention of the Congress of the United States and the President. I know the pressures that come on members of government, to try to deal fairly with your own constituents and still look at state-wide problems and needs, and even those at the national and international scene. We've dealt, in the last sixteen months in Washington, with these kinds of issues. Tax reform sounds easy, but it is extremely difficult to hammer out



with competing interest groups, focusing their attention on every Member of the Congress, a means by which we can reduce taxes on the American people which are presently too high and have a tax system that is simple and fair. The welfare system is condemned from almost every vantage point, but it's almost impossible to hammer out a welfare system that gives needy people an adequate income to preserve their human dignity, and at the same time can be a constant inducement for those who are able to work, to go to work. Our country is the greatest consumer of energy on earth. And we're also one of the greatest producers of energy. The Congress has been debating energy problems; natural gas pricing, deregulation, for thirty years. And the focusing of pressures on the Members of Congress, in trying to give our country a vision of what we can and must do to cut down on extraordinary energy imports is almost an impossible task. But they're making good progress. In the last 16 months we have done well in cutting down the unemployment rate, which was the crucial domestic issue in January of 1977. We've added a net increase, with your help, of five and a half million jobs in our country. And the unemployment rate has been dropped from 8 percent to 6 percent. But we are now faced with the much more tenacious and difficult problem of dealing with inflation. And I am determined, as President, to do all I can in spite of the adverse political consequences. And I believe the Congress will join in with me in standing up against the pressures from very benevolent groups, people whom we care about; farmers, I'm one of them; older people, veterans, those interested in space, those interested in better roads. But there's a limit to what we can do, at the Federal Government level, in financing these programs. But it is very difficult to stand up against those pressures and have a sound businesslike administration of a complicated government. We are faced, at the national level, with additional responsibilities. On defense, how to keep our nation strong, the strongest on earth. To provide for the rapidly changing technology that gives the unforeseen challenges in the future. And you have to anticipate those and correlate research, development,



demonstration programs, construction programs to give us adequate weapons. - At the same time, seek for a reduction in those weapons and to kind of work with other countries, in various forms of success, to get them to join in removing the threat of complete nuclear annihilation. It's not easy to negotiate with the Russians on a S.A.L.T. agreement, which is crucial to our country, and at the same time, not let that be prevented by the unwarranted Soviet intrusion, with their Cuban surrogates, into Africa. The Congress has dealt historically and courageously with the question of a Panama Canal Treaty, not a popular thing in the United States. But one I think that's absolutely important to our proper dealing with small countries around the world who look upon us to demonstrate that we believe in equality, that we believe in fairness, that we believe in human rights - a very difficult vote. We've had another one recently on the Mideast arms sale, almost impossible to resolve to the satisfaction of the American people. It took a lot of courage to make those decisions, how to move toward peace in the Middle East, retain our total commitment to the security of Israel and at the same time not sever our relationship with the moderate Arab countries, who also want peace, so that they won't have to turn to the Soviet Union or other eastern blocked countries for their friendship and military needs. Difficult questions. I recognize how hard it is to be a good State Legislator, Governor or Member of Congress. This afternoon I go back from here to West Virginia. I'll be talking about a subject that's important to Illinois, coal; and to study the technical aspects of the evolution of coals used in the future...To correlate it with Environmental Protection, liquefaction, gasification, its competition with other energy sources. It's very very complicated and it's important for me to understand that subject, just as it is for you here in Illinois, a great coal producing state. Later tonight I'll be meeting with President Giscard D'Estaing from France. Tomorrow morning I'm tentatively scheduled to meet with Foreign Minister Groyenko of the Soviet Union. I'll be getting tonight, late, a report



from Doctor Zbigniew Brzezinski, who's just come back from days of negotiation and communication with the leaders of the People's Republic of China. So, I'm not saying these things to deplore the responsibility that I have to share with you, but to indicate to you that quite often the difficulties of public service are not adequately understood by the American people. And the best way to let them understand is to keep an open mind and an open heart and an open door and to reach out for them for advice and counsel. Because I believe that all these subjects can be best resolved, successfully, to the extent that the American people, the People of Illinois, are involved in the deliberative process - that the debates are open... But when you make a decision in isolation you have a tendency to create a Watergate or a Vietnam War or a C.I.A. embarrassment. But the American people are basically decent, basically honest, basically have great common sense and to the extent that they are involved in the process we can avoid a potential pitfall of making an improper decision. The eyes of the nation, now, are focused on the men and women in this chamber. Illinois has a great tradition of insisting upon equality of opportunity. Lincoln conducted his debates in this very place. Illinois was the first state that voted to ratify the Constitutional Amendment giving women a right to vote. You have written into your own Constitution, 'equal rights for women'. Thirty-five other states have now ratified the Equal Rights Amendment. And what you do here, in this chamber, in the next few weeks might very well determine whether women do have those equal rights, guaranteed in the United States Constitution, or whether they don't. And I know the focusing of political pressures on you. It's not easy to make that decision. And quite often you might fear; I can't be reelected, or, I can't please the more vocal groups in my district. If I vote what I know my conscience says is right. So you share with me that kind of decision that is never easy. You and I share a partnership because almost everything that we decided in Washington in giving American people fairness, equality, opportunity to enjoy the privileges of a citizenship, are administered by you. And we've



tried to evolve programs recently recognizing that partnership. A new urban policy was hammered out with Members of your Legislature, county officials, your Governor, obviously your Congressional delegation. Well, I'm very proud to be here to share with you this morning, some of my thoughts about the responsibilities of public service, the difficulties of it; but the gratification of knowing that we are helping to shape the character of our nation. And we're trying to make sure that Illinois represents, in its government, the finest possible aspects of our people; that we're trying to inspire them to reach for greatness, to honor ideals and principles in spite, sometimes, of the political consequences. And now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like for your Joint Session to ask me any questions that you might have concerning national or international affairs. I'll do the best I can to answer the questions. If I don't know one of those difficult political decisions is to admit that I don't know the answer. But I'll let the Speaker recognize you and I'll try to keep my answers brief."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike, like the President, a graduate of the United States Naval Academy."

McPike: "Thank you. Mr. President, Roy Sandquist and I, as graduates of the Naval Academy, share your feelings on the Equal Rights Amendment. But on another important subject - Illinois, as a northern industrial state, in the past ten years has lost many manufacturing jobs to the South. To a large degree we feel that this is due to non-union wages that are prevalent in the sun belt. We therefore feel that passage of the Labor Law Reform Bill, now in Congress, is very important. Could you comment on its importance and on its chance of passage?"

President Carter: "I'm, as you know, I'm from the South and have been a Governor. And I would say that I spent twenty-five percent of my time, as do other southeastern Governors, in recruiting investments in our state. Not only from the rest of the nation, including Illinois, but also from foreign countries; Japan, Germany and others... and trying to sell Georgia products overseas. It is a major responsibility of a southern Governor. We have now narrowed, however,



wage differentials between the south, which used to be very low wage regions compared to the rest of the country. The year I went out of office as Governor, the difference was only eleven percent, because as the major nationwide companies had moved into Georgia, South Carolina, other southeastern states, they can not afford to pay their own employees a different wage scale in Georgia than they do in Illinois. Locally grown, non-unionized companies, of course, have attempted and have sometimes succeeded in not meeting that competition and have very low wage rates. I favor the Labor Law Reform Legislation. I think it is a very modest Bill. I read every provision of it before I would send it to the Congress with my approval. I'm a very conservative southern businessman by heritage and I think the National Labor Relations Act, which was a major step forward when it was passed, has been the basis for harmony, for higher productivities; for less conflict between business and labor for a long time. There are a few defects in the law that ought to be corrected; unnecessary delay, deprivation of employee rights. And although I think it might contribute, as you said, to a more stable labor base throughout the country and eliminate some advantages that the South does have, in that respect, I still favor the legislation. And as you know, the House passed it overwhelmingly. There's a majority in the Senate for it already. The question is, whether or not 60 votes can be obtained for cloture to stop the filibuster. My prediction is that the law will be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you. Mr. President, we are honored by your visit here in Illinois today, and we hope you enjoy it. As you know, Mr. President, inflation is the enemy of all of us as elected officials. And I was wondering how you felt the increase in the Social Security Tax affected your long-range fight on inflation?"

President Carter: "There's no doubt that the passage of a Social Security Tax will contribute to inflation to some degree. I think though, that the compensating tax reduction, which we are proposing now - originally 25 billion dollars now lowered to 19 or 20 billion



dollars - would much more than compensate for any increase in Social Security Taxes. Also, as you well know, the average working family in our county will not have their Social Security payments increased because of the recent legislation. That legislation was absolutely mandatory. Two of the three reserve funds for the Social Security system were faced with immediate bankruptcy. One of them would have gone bankrupt next year, the other one three years later. So, the Congress had to increase income going into those reserve funds to keep the Social Security system sound for all of us. The primary increase in Social Security payments will fall on those who are in an income bracket of 20, 30, 40 thousand dollars up the high range of the working families of our country. But I think one thing that has been forgotten is, that as they pay higher Social Security Taxes in the future, and they're modest increases, they will also get higher benefits if there should be a death or if they live until retirement. So there a compensation is made. So, although does contribute slightly to inflation, there is no alternative to it. The only alternative being considered by Congress is whether to finance the Social Security system from general funds. And the Congress feels, certainly the Senate feels much more strongly, that the Social Security system should stand on its own and should not be financed by general funds. So, I think that I've explained it as best I can. I was in favor of the Bill and glad the Congress is not going to undo it. We have set up, or are setting up, a long term analysis of the Social Security system that will be ready for me and the Congress, perhaps within a year. But this legislation now passed, moderate...moderate increases for the higher income families, will keep the Social Security system sound for the next 25 years. It's a good investment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barman... Just want to show the Senate that we really are fair in the House. Senator Barman."

Barman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. President, welcome to Springfield, we're honored to have you here."

President Carter: "Thank you."



Berman: "My question relates to the concerns of the Jewish community in relation to the State of Israel. Many of us who have Jewish constituents and are Jewish, in this Body, have great apprehension that there has been a deviation from the classic position of the United States of a special relationship and a total commitment to the security of Israel. We have heard of this apprehension from our own constituents and I appreciate... Your office has indicated that an aide would be willing to meet with the Jewish Legislators after your meeting but I don't think that's necessary because I think this is much more meaningful and I appreciate this opportunity. I think the Jewish community is going to be looking for deeds but I would ask you, this morning, to please comment on what type of message we can bring back to these people that are fearful of this deviation, to reassure them of the total commitment of your administration to the security of Israel."

President Carter: "This is one of those difficult questions that I mentioned earlier. The special relationship between the United States and Israel still stands. Our total commitment to Israel's security and our hope for peace is still preeminent among all the other considerations that our nation has in the Middle East. I have spent more time on the Middle Eastern question, since I've been in the White House, than any other subject. Not just in analysis within our own group and with the Members of Congress who are deeply interested in what our country's position ought to be, but having long, detailed, sometimes private conversations with all the leaders of nations participating in the potential or existing negotiations in the Middle East. Israel has dominant air capability in the Middle East and that dominance will even increase as a result of the recent approved arms sales. I don't know anyone in the world that I am more convinced wants peace than Anwar Sadat. When I met with him, for the first time early last year he said to me, 'Mr. President, what is it I can do to break the deadlock that has existed for years and years between us and Israel?' I said, 'First of all, you can negotiate directly with the leaders of Israel, not through us as intermediary.' He said, 'I don't believe



that's possible, Mr. President.' I said, 'You can break down the barriers that have existed between Egyptians and Israelis and the hatred that evolves from constant radio broadcast and propaganda efforts.' He said, 'I believe I can do that.' I said, 'You can put forth a proposal where in the future the borders between Israel and Egypt will be open for trade, tourism, student exchange, cultural exchange, even diplomatic recognition.' And he said, 'That will never come in my lifetime.' That was about a year ago and there has been a dramatic change since then. Most of it took place, as you know, during the November - December era, when Begin received Sadat with open arms and vice versa. And both those leaders have told me they were shocked at the warmth of the reception of Israeli negotiators when they arrived in Egypt and of Sadat and his negotiators when they arrived in Jerusalem. I think this proves that the people in Egypt and Israel genuinely want peace. Since then, I've met with both leaders extensively and I'm convinced that if we sever our relationship with the moderate Arab nations; with Egypt, by far the dominant nation as far as the Arab world goes; with the Saudi Arabians, who are not part of the negotiating process but who have a very good moderating influence; with King Hussein; and just isolate ourselves with a bi-level relationship with Israel, it would almost prevent any further future progress on peace. So, our commitment is to continue in spite of constant discouragement, in spite of political costs, to move toward a resolution of the issue. I think when Sadat went to Jerusalem that Begin responded with a very good proposal, which was a step in the right direction, a basis for good negotiations - how to withdraw from the Sinai - how to have some negotiations about home rule, so called, for the West Bank Gaza strip area. We're not trying to impose a settlement but we'll still have active negotiations going on, getting a message from the Israelis, delivering it to the Egyptians - they're always disappointed - getting a message from Sadat, delivering it back to the Israelis - they're always disappointed. We're kind of an unappreciated postman



going back and forth between leaders, who tried to open a door at the end of last year and have now seen the door close again. I believe that the confidence that Egypt now has, that we are concerned about their security, not against Israel, the F-5E's are no match for the Israeli Air Force. But against their other neighbors who are on the continent of Africa. I think it's a very sound insurance policy that in the future Sadat will trust me enough and trust our nation enough to continue to negotiate in good faith, even when the Syrians, the Iraqians, the Libyans and others are castigating him for keeping the peace doors open. And I believe that Israel can rest assured that there will never be any deviation, in our own country, of our total commitment to giving them adequate provisions to defend themselves. Prime Minister Began, I think, shares what I've just said to you. And I don't believe that Sadat would disagree with a word of it. But there need be no concern among the Israeli people, nor among Jews in this country, that our nation has changed or turned away from Israel. It was a difficult vote but I think it was an honoring of past commitments. And if we had violated our nation's word of honor to provide that modest amount of military capability to those two Arab countries, I think we would have driven them away from us permanently and driven permanently away any prospect for peace in the Middle East, which we pray for and which I am determined to pursue until the last day I'm in the White House. I believe we still have a good chance for success."

Speaker Redmond: "Senator Glass."

Glass: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. President, less you leave Illinois with the feeling that all Members of the chamber share the views of my esteemed colleague on the other side of the aisle, regarding the Labor Reform Act, let me assure you that that not only is not true, but I and I think a number of others feel it would be one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation for our free enterprise system as it exists today. And I don't intend to belabor the point because you have stated your position on the Bill



but I would like to be specific about it. There is a provision in the Bill that would require black listing of businesses who have violated the terms of the Act. And as I understand it, that would prohibit the Federal Government from engaging with those firms and signing contracts with them. I wondered if you would approve that provision and if so, why?"

President Carter: "Well, there are several provisions in the Bill that concern the Members of the Senate. I do favor the Bill, as it was passed by the House, which includes that particular aspect. I would not describe it in exactly the same words you used. But there is a...there is some need for a threat of punishment to any person in this country who violates a law. And if a business violates the laws of the United States there has to be some threat of consequence adverse to that business. It might be... it might be imprisonment in a penitentiary, it might be a very heavy fine, or it might be the threat of losing government business until they do come into compliance. There's a debate about how long an election might be delayed, whether it be 30 days, 45 days, or 60 days. There's a concern among many people, also, about the right of labor. If business campaigns against a labor organization that that labor organization has a right to access to that property. That bothers a lot of Americans. My guess, is that when the Senate gets through debating the Bill and it's...it's a fairly narrow vote, nobody knows the outcome of it yet, that some of the things that are of concern to you might very well be changed. But I know the controversy involved in this Bill. I think if the Bill had been radical in nature there would not have been mounted a more strong attack on it. In my opinion, as a businessman myself, coming from a very conservative region of our country, it is a very modest and moderate piece of legislation. But there's room for disagreement, which you've pointed out very well."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. President, the urban areas have become decadent in many ways, some are almost bankrupt and minority employment is about 30 percent or better in some areas. Considering these areas as man



made disasters, has your administration made any plans, let's say perhaps, to consider them man made disaster areas and thereby capable of receiving help or have...or perhaps you have taken the Humphrey - Hawkins plan under consideration or perhaps you have a plan of your own. Do you have a comment?"

President Carter: "Of course, one of the most severe problems in the ghetto areas have been deterioration of the quality of life, not just housing, transportation, law enforcement, health care, education, but also a matter that struck to the heart of those regions and that was the unemployment question. I think that Congress has made notable progress in the last 16 months, the programs have been administered well, too. And as I said earlier, we've cut down the unemployment rate substantially and we've increased employment opportunities and added five and a half million jobs, which has never been achieved before in the history of our country. Those programs are still ongoing. Since we've now cut down the general unemployment rate among those that are easier to employ, now, I think a special program, the Public Works Program, the CETA jobs and so forth, can be more narrowly focused upon those who are difficult to employ. We've also marshalled the support of the National Alliance of Businessmen. Sixteen months ago the highest unemployment rate among white and black young people was Vietnam veterans. We had a special program called HIRE where the business community volunteered to hire Vietnam veterans. We have now cut the unemployment down, among that particular group, so that is actually lower than the average of their age group throughout the country. I had a meeting at the White House this past week, this week, with about 150 top business and labor leaders and they've volunteered now to add a hundred thousand more jobs employing those that are most hard core at the time of unemployment. Those that are the last to be hired and the first to be fired. So...unemployment, we've made very good progress. We've hammered out now, for the first time in the history of our country, again, a comprehensive urban policy. We didn't do it in an isolated room or from an ivory



tower perspective in the White House. We worked closely with the Members of Congress, including Gus Hawkins and others. We've worked closely with Governors, Mayors, county officials all over the nation. And I think it's gotten almost unanimous rave reviews. We didn't add all that much money in total budget expenditures, it's a very modest finance program but it brings into cohesion, for the first time, the inner relationship among the different departments and agencies of government. And its thrust is, under Pat Harris, better houses; under the Transportation Department, better and more focused transportation systems. And it forms a partnership between state and local government and the Federal Government, and I think it will be very constructive in the future. It really preserves and enhances our system of federalism. I'm quite aware that when we have this general progress, when the GNP goes up 6 percent last year, when business profits are at an all time high, when lately the stock market has gone up and the unemployment rate goes down, that there are pockets of unemployment among young people, black people, women, that are still extremely high. And this preys on my mind constantly. and the Congress is very much aware of it. So, we have made some progress, in the short time I've been in the White House, but I intend to, obviously, make more progress and there. I think we can mutually support one another. Because the State Legislators, the Governors and others can do a great deal to point out to us, defects in how we administer those laws and make sure that jobs actually go to the people who deserve them and want them. And the housing programs, actually serve those who are most in need and so forth. Transportation, Education, all are very important. We've added more education dollars to the federal contribution than ever before in history, even under Lyndon Johnson. But...but you know, we don't administer the elementary and secondary schools, that's got to be done at the state level and the local level and that's the way it ought to be. So, we'll do our part, I'm sure you'll do your part, to make us...bring about some resolution of these long standing, chronic sufferings in our country that are unwarranted,



primarily because of past discriminations and present lack of knowledge or callousness about those who are less fortunate than all of us assembled here. Let me say this, in closing. I've enjoyed this very much and I think you might want to read over the speech that I had written earlier. It gives some additional points that I touched on briefly this morning. It's helpful to me to understand what questions are of concern to you. Illinois is our great agricultural producing state. I'll be meeting with Senator Bruce and a few others immediately after this meeting. They've gotten a group of farmers to give me questions about exports. We had our best export year in history last year, even with depressed prices. We're determined to have an even greater agricultural export year this year. And we're working very hard to make sure that we do have a sound program that affects, not only the country, but you. Now, I recognize, and quite often when I make a nationwide decision, that we leave gaps because of special local differences or aberrations from the average. We have to make, in Washington, the laws apply to the average. And that's where the State Legislators come in. Because to the extent that you understand the thrust of the federal program, you can either take full advantage of that, if it's adequate, and invest your money and your efforts somewhere else or if you have a special need that can't be recognized by nationwide law, then you can fill in the gaps and meet the needs of your own people. But to get back to my original premise, the insurance that we have that we make those decisions properly, is to stay close to the people who put us in office. And this is one of the elements, I think, that's been missing too much in our political structure in the last few years. Because there's been a building up of distrust against government and a chasm has opened between government and people and that can be resolved only by you and me. We live in the greatest nation on earth and I hope that with your help, the Congress's help, and the help of all American people that in the years ahead we can make it even greater than it is. Thank you very much."



Speaker Redmond: "Committee of Escort.. Is the Committee of Escort assembled? Senator Stevenson. Doorkeepers, will you assist... escort our honored guest from the chamber, please? The Joint Session will come to order, please. Mr. President is recognized for the purpose of a motion."

President of the Senate, Hynes: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Joint Session do now arise."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the motion. The question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. The Joint Session will now arise." The House will be at ease pending the call of the Chair, maybe we can get the lights turned off."



Speaker Redmond: "The House will be in order. Because of the early arrival of some of our later night owls, maybe they didn't get breakfast, so the plan is to stand in recess until 11:00 and then go and get your breakfast and lunch together and then we'll come back at 11:00 and we'll work from now until the witching hour. I'll stay here as long as there's 89 people out there and they want to do business. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. When we come back at 11:00..."

Speaker Redmond: "Special order of business. What's your second question?"

Houlihan: "The second question is, after that special order business... which I don't think will take too long, I assume that we'll begin on the Priority of Call after the last Bill that we called last time..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think...It will either be in Priority of Call or on Regular Calendar. The problem is, the call is dictated in some degree by the attendance on the floor and I try to call the Bills when the Sponsors are in the chambers. That.. With that leeway, we'll begin where we left off."

Houlihan: "So in other words the...if we begin on the Priority of Call we begin on the next Bill after the last one we considered..."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Houlihan: "I imagine that's 3272?"

Speaker Redmond: "I have no idea what it is."

Houlihan: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had the double pleasure of having the President visit our fine City of Elmhurst in the 40th Legislative District last night...here in Springfield... Thank you, Larry... I would ask though, since we didn't have an opportunity to... all of us address him and of course we all appreciated his answering our questions...you relay a message to him about the people from the collar counties and the need for water allocation and the distribution of water from Lake Michigan. And maybe you could



use your fine offices, if you have an opportunity to see him later on this morning to bring that message to him of how important that is to us in the collar counties, distributing Lake Michigan water to our areas."

Speaker Redmond: "The first thing that he said when he entered the Speaker's Office was, 'Good morning, Mr. Speaker, how is the Tree-Towns Water Commission fairing?'..."

Daniels: "That's very nice to know, we thank you for your efforts, Mr. Speaker."

Redmond

EASE

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order, the Members please be in their seats. The House will be in order. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1083. Ebbesen - Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1423. Schuneman - Friedrich - Waddell. A Bill for an Act in relation to auditing of the collection and disposition of certain taxes by the Regional Transportation Authority. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1523. Ebbesen. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1535. Ebbesen. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the higher education institutions and agencies. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1573. Simms. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Business and Economic Development. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1576. Ryan. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent of the Office of the Governor. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1577. Riley. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Judges Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill.



Senate Bill 1581. J. David Jones. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Employees Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1582. Dave Jones. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Fair Agency. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1583. Telcser. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1584. Ewing. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Revenue. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1586. Polk. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1592. Anderson. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for the Teacher's Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1596. Schuneman. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Civil Service Commission. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1597. Johnson. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Prison Review Board. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1598. Friedland. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1600. Telcser. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1611. Friedrich - Brady. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of the Auditor General. First Reading of the Bill.



Senate Bill 1866. Hoxsey. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I talked this over with both Chalkie and Jack O'Brien...I'd like leave to loosen my tie."

Speaker Redmond: "Does Representative Schneider have leave to remove his tie? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 129th Legislative Day, Tuesday, May 16, ..."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journal #129 of May 16, 130 of May 17, 131 of May 18 and 132 of May 19, 1978, be approved as read."

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

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear what the Gentleman had to say."

Speaker Redmond: "Repeat it, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "For him I'll do that. I move that we dispense with the readings of the Journal and that Journal #129 of May 16, 130 of May 17, 131 of May 18 and 132 of May 19, 1978, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

Ryan: "That's wonderful, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion...the reading of Journals 129 thru 132 be dispensed with and the Journals be approved. All those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. What else do you have, Mr. Clerk? Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do you know whether or not there's any



update on the O.T.B. Bill that I requested last night from the staff?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't have the slightest idea."

Van Duynes: "Well, somebody said, 'No problem' and I thought that they were going to distribute it instead of a synopsis out here on our desks today so we could make some kind of a conjured up idea of what that Bill turned out to be finally."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I would suggest that whoever...that you discussed that with, that you talk it over with him because I don't have the slightest idea. I don't know what's in O.T.B. or... Representative Matejek, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. In the gallery we have the Bloom Township High School, a high school in my district, in my hometown, represented by Senator Lane, Representative Getty, Representative Miller and myself. And with them is the Commissioner of the City of Chicago Heights, Mr. Eugene 'Sadis' and the Treasurer of the Polish-American Democratic Club of Chicago Heights, of which I am a proud Member and officer, Mr. Walter 'Curreck'."

Speaker Redmond: "Special order of business. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, could you be kind enough to tell the Members of the House what the program is for this day?"

Speaker Redmond: "Special order of business right now and then we'll go to House Bills Third Reading."

Ryan: "And what is your intention on adjournment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's up to the 89 people who vote 'aye' on the motion to adjourn."

Ryan: "You mean, what you're telling me is you don't have a schedule set for today's program, is that what you're telling me, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "I would say prior to 12:01, midnight."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, what time are you going to bring out the usery list?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't intend to bring out any user list."

Ryan: "Then you're going to work and hear everybody's Bills today, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "I'm going to try."



Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Special order of business. Page 13. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, if you could send one of the Pages for Representative Kane, I don't see him on the floor, I...I rise to give the Legislature the report of the House Select Committee on State Government Organization. I also have reason to indicate that the President was sorry that he could not stay and listen to the report on Executive Reorganization, since reorganization is one of his primary concerns, but I can assure you that he's in full agreement with this report. As most of the Members are probably aware, the Legislature, last year, passed a comprehensive report and legislation which implemented energy reorganization. It took, in fact, the Division of Energy and consolidated with the Department of Mines and Minerals in creating the new Department of Mines and Energy. That legislation was sent to the Governor and the Governor had some reservations with that and subsequently amendatorily vetoed it. We were not able to work out the differences with that Amendatory Veto and therefore the legislation was not effective, the veto was not accepted and the reorganization was dead. On March 31, Governor Thompson announced his own plan for energy reorganization and he announced his intentions to merge the Division of Energy with the Institute of Environmental Quality. He named the new agency the Institute of Energy and Environmental Resources and indicated that Mr. Frank Beal would be the Director of that agency. This merger was initiated and brought to out attention by Executive Order #1, 1978. Let me point out that there are several qualitative differences between the administration proposal and last years reorganization efforts and they're included in the report to the Members. The most fundamental difference though is one of emphasis. While the House reorganization focused on the promotional and regulatory aspects of the Division of Energy and its reorganization, the Governor's Executive Order stresses the research, conservation and alternative energy sources aspects of the



reorganization efforts. Executive Order #1 registers another difference which is important to the House and its deliberations of the other two Executive Orders last Session... In contrast to the previous years, no attempt has been made to reorganize agencies which are not directly responsible to the Governor, nor does the Governor attempt to create a new agency. And finally, the Governor has clearly indicated that implementing legislation is both necessary and desirable. As...as these events indicate, last years experience has established a procedural precedent for future reorganization. And it's the intention of the Committee to attempt to propose legislation which will codify this...codify this procedure. Let me...let me mention, during the deliberations of the Committee we found no problems with the Executive Order, as far as it went. And therefore, the House Committee Report recommends that the House do accept the Executive Order #1. Yet, the Committee is on record that the...reorganization did not go far enough and it recommends that the language which will implement the adoption of a permissive Energy Conservation Building and Construction Code be included in the implementing legislation. Additionally, the Committee concurs that necessary language to give the Executive Department the power to administer, coordinate and codify some energy plans which are now located in the Department... the Commission on Energy, which is a legislative Commission and which is improperly usurping some of the Executive powers...it recommends in this reorganization an inclusion of those...those powers. And finally, the majority of the Committee argues very strongly that while we are doing this energy reorganization and we have the implementing legislation before the Body in the form of House Bill 3316, it recommends that we include the natural surveys, that is the water, geological and history surveys and also the museums, which are now in the Department of Registration and Education. It was...it was the feeling...this is not the Water Resources, this is the surveys, Representative Williams... It is the feeling of the majority of the Committee that these would form a cornerstone to the new Institute for Natural Resources and



would give our surveys added stature, would give them the recognition that they so justly deserve and take them out of a department which they are really not properly located. And it is with this in mind that we have submitted...the Majority has submitted House Resolution, I'm not sure of the number but it's on the Clerk's desk, which approves the report and which approval would include acceptance of the Executive Order. I might add that there is a minority opinion with regard to the surveys, which is the major difference in terms of the report and I would at this time yield to Representative Stiehl to indicate that position and ask Representative Kane to close."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl. Please, give the Lady order."

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

I rise in support of the recommendation made by the Chairman of the Select Committee on Government Organization...the Members of this House do approve Executive Order #1. One of the most important issues state government faces today is establishing a workable relationship between our demands for energy and our need to care for our environment. The consolidation of the Division of Energy with the Illinois Institute of Environmental Quality is aimed at bringing this state's energy and environmental efforts into a working balance. The Governor has acted within the powers granted him under Article V, Section 11 of the Constitution. The Select Committee gave serious consideration to this Executive Order. And we believe that it was the intention of the framers of the Executive Article of the Constitution that a reorganization effort should be a joint Executive and Legislative effort. Since conforming legislation will follow this Executive Order, clearly this is a combined effort. And while the Members of the Committee gave serious consideration to enlarging the provisions that are in the Executive Order, it was considered by most of the Members of the Committee, in fact all of the Members of the Committee, that certain programs should be included in House Bill 3316. However, the Minority Members of the Committee strongly object to transferring



the state water quality survey, the state geological survey and the state national history survey into this new department. It was felt that this action would be precipitous. These surveys have a reputation that is excellent. And this excellence is based primarily on their independence of research. They are probably the most efficiently run agency in state government. and we in the Minority feel any proposal to move these surveys from their present position should be supported by evidence proving conclusively that the surveys would themselves be improved by such a move. It is our contention that the Majority has failed to produce such proof. In fact, in testimony from the directors of the survey, it was determined that this move might hurt, rather than enhance, the reputations of this survey and they presented concern...concerns based mainly on the fact that the people who presently utilize these surveys, such as... would lose confidence if they were transferred into a Department that is clearly mission oriented. They also expressed a concern that they were having problems keeping up with salaries...the salaries schedule paid by private industry for the technical expertise that they demanded. There is no indication whatsoever that transferring these surveys will in any way assist the economic problems the surveys are encountering. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope that when House Bill 3316 is presented to you, you will give serious consideration to the Minority recommendations and you will agree with us that...before we ever take any action in transferring the surveys into this new department that we consider all of the other energy related programs that are in all of the other departments scattered through state government and that we consider transferring these programs into this new department before we attempt to make any changes in the surveys. I would ask again, Members of this House, to join the Chairman of the Committee in adopting...in approving Executive Order #1. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

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



stand in support of Executive Order #1. As Chairman of the Illinois Energy Resources Commission and as the original Sponsor of the Bill which became Senate Bill 1142 last year, which would have combined the Energy Division with the Department of Mines and Minerals. I want to commend Representative Houlihan, Representative Kane and Representative Celeste Stiehl and other Members of the Committee on Energy Reorganization or Reorganization of Agencies... for the fine job that they have done and I certainly urge your support of Executive Order #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams.... Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't wish to take a lot of time but I wish to stand in support of the Minority Report here regarding the...surveys. Actually, to my knowledge the surveys have had a long established reputation, actually, for their independent research and I don't believe it was proved in any conclusive way that this would be any kind of a move that would help. So I certainly support Representative Stiehl and the Minority Report that when the Bill actually does come before us that we take a long hard look at that...contemplated move. I believe the state surveys, while there may be some question whether they should be in R and E, they should certainly have an independent image of their own. They have, in all of the history that I know, they have an absolutely untainted and have done an excellent job. And so I would support the Minority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I have not filed a motion to disapprove the Executive Order #1. However, I would like to reiterate the objection that I have that I stated last year with regard to Executive Order 1977-1. and that is that it appears again that the Governor, through Executive Order #1, 1978, is creating a new department. The formality of a new department is not set forth in the statutory... in the statutes currently. And in the absence of the legislation I submit that those goals that are attempted to be sought or attempted to be achieved in Executive Order #1, although while worthwhile, are



beyond the scope of the Governor's Constitutional authority and therefore I file the...Minority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having worked in the Energy Division of this Assembly for the past five years, I would like to commend Representative Kane and Representative Houlihan on...and their Committee for the fine work and time they've put towards the implementation of the Governor's Executive Order, by which the Division of Energy of the Business, Economic Development Agency and the Institute of Environmental Quality will be combined into one unit. I think the Executive Order was proper by Governor Thompson. I feel that he has the authority to make this Executive Order because I think we should recall that when the Division of Energy was set forth in Governor Walker's administration it was done by an Executive Order and this is no different from that one... as far as the ability of the Governor to issue such an order. Now, the...the fact of unity of the Division of Energy with the Institute of Environmental Quality will bring forth less competition between agencies, more efficiency, less waste and more progress in the field of energy. Energy is a very important item and if I had been permitted to ask President Carter today, I would have probably asked him a question on the possibilities of having a good national energy program finally pass. Because we in Illinois have taken the lead to do something about the energy needs and revisions of our state. I feel that this is a good implementation of a good Executive Order and I support the Majority opinion of the Committee in favor of the unification of the Division of Energy from the Institute ... the Business and Economic Development Agency with the Institute of Environmental Quality."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer, did you put a motion for the adoption of the Minority Report...the Resolution rather?"

Brummer: "The majority of the Democrats on the House Select Committee on Government Reorganization were in support of this. I felt it



was an exercise in futility and therefore, to avoid taking up the time of the House with regard to those questions which I would submit are important Constitutional distinctions but...I do not think, as a result of the Majority Report that was adopted, I felt that it was not advisable to take up the time of the House in a form of a Resolution on the Minority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has withdrawn the Resolution. Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this issue has been debated and talked about fully and I just urge the House to adopt the report approving the Governor's Order... Executive Order #1 on reorganization."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, then I would move to suspend the appropriate rule so that we could have immediate consideration of House Resolution 889, which is the..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been withdrawn. The Minority Report...House Resolution 889 was the Minority Report. The Minority Report was Resolution 889. Representative Brummer withdrew that Resolution."

Houlihan: "Then I have another Resolution there on the Clerk's desk. I thought 889 was the number of it."

Speaker Redmond: "What is your Resolution? As I understand the procedure we don't need any approval of the Majority Report."

Houlihan: "The Majority filed a Resolution for the House to indicate its approval and acceptance of the Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe you're correct. Our duty is to disapprove a report. When we are approving a report we do nothing. I believe that the time of the House can better be spent on Third Reading and that we should go ahead with the Third Reading. There's nothing for us to consider at the present time...an approval of this matter is just a waste of our time and we should go on. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, I was in error. 889 was the



Resolution for the approval of the Majority Report. However, I don't believe that that is necessary. You'd have to suspend rules and... Unless we disapprove, we approve. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it will take a great deal of time. Representative Darrow has raised an important point in terms of Third Reading. It was both...understanding by Representative Stiehl and myself that the Legislature, although not technically required to do anything if it wants to allow the Executive Order to stand, we would take an affirmative action in approving the report and it would help us in our deliberations on House Bill 3316. So I would ask for maybe immediate consideration and I think that would be a suspension of the rules and then a Roll call on House Resolution 889."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave for immediate consideration for a motion to adopt House Resolution 889? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, do you need to read the Resolution now?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 889. J. M. Houlihan. Whereas, the Governor has issued Executive Order 1978 - 1, entitled an Executive Order transferring the energy powers to the Department of Business and Economic Development and its Division of Energy to the Illinois Institute of Energy and Environmental Resources. And whereas, the House Select Committee on State Government Organization has studied Executive Order 1978 - 1 and finds the Executive Order does not go beyond the reorganization powers conferred on the Governor by the Constitution. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois that the report of the House Select Committee on State Government Organization, which approves the Executive Order 1978 - 1, is adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Mr. Houlihan, I appreciate and I know this is sort of off



your specific Resolution but it does affect your Committee. The one thing I wondered was, why would the Committee not address itself to the Department of Children and Family Services reorganization?"

Houlihan: "Representative McClain, we did address ourselves to that reorganization. That is an internal reorganization that doesn't come directly under the scope of the Committee as far as approving or disapproving an Executive Order. We did have the Director of the Department testify before the Committee and we've had staff and directed staff to work on the budget of the Department of Children and Family Services to review the consolidation of or the reorganization under the current Director."

McClain: "Well, Mr. Houlihan, one of the things that I'm most disturbed with and I think the Organization Committee ought to take specific action on is that some of the things that the internal reorganization has done in the Department of Children and Family Services is, for instance, it's deleted any reference to the Child Welfare Direct Staff in their organizational plan. Two, they've decentralized the guardianship segment of the reorganization, which in essence is in violation of the Illinois Revised Statutes. Thirdly, what they've done is they've put all the Deputy Directors under the Personnel Code without some additional postings. So some of those things, I think, are in direct violation with... with our laws and I think that your Organization Committee ought to specifically look at that Children and Family Services budget and into its internal reorganization."

Houlihan: "Representative, we will follow up on those points and issue a report on the reorganization."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matejek, are you seeking recognition? Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to vote against this Resolution like I did on the other agency reorganization. I think it's all a sham. I think we're going backwards. We had been in a centralized type of government and we had to go away from that because the government wasn't providing



the specific services necessary. And the logic for reorganization is that it's going to cost less money, it's going to provide more efficient government. I haven't seen that happen with the other departmental reorganizations. I think all we do is create an umbrella organization, allowing Governors, allowing Executive to hide under that umbrella when it either rains or gets too hot and they can't handle the situation. It's strictly a political ploy and I'm going to vote against this one like I did against the others last year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, are we on the Order of House Resolutions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Special Order of Business, page 13."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, given the fact that we have a deadline of midnight tonight to get these so-called emergency Bills out of this House, it was created by the Rules Committee in the first place when they decided that some of this junk was an emergency. I don't know why we ought to be on this order of business. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, that we ought to be on the Order of House Bills, Third Reading so that we can give each and every Member that's got a piece of legislation an opportunity to get that Bill heard in its final stage for either passage or killing it. I think we owe them that much since in the wisdom of the Rules Committee all of these Bills had an emergency nature, we ought to at least give them that kind of respect. And I would object very strongly to us being on this order of business, Mr. Speaker, if the House Resolutions are subject to the deadline then I'd just as soon they die."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... Ready for the motion? The question is on the adoption of House Resolution 889. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Cunningham. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, the House is honored to have a former Member, the finest Democrat that ever represented the 54th District, Charles Keller, in the well."

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



On this question there's 124 'aye' and 14 'no'. The motion carries and the Resolution is adopted. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution Amendment 86. Representative Peggy Smith-Martin."

Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, you caught me with my mouth full. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to seek your support for House Resolution #86. House Resolution 86 was introduced on February 24, 1977. Some of you might recall, in the 78th General Assembly I also had a Resolution after a one year long independent study of the correctional facilities in the State of Illinois. Because of an emergency situation involving the Stateville correctional officers I tried to bypass Committee with House Resolution 86 last June. This measure was tried only after I had reported the nature of the emergency to the Director of the Department of Corrections and to the Chairman of the Commission to visit and examine state institutions, of which I am a member. The emergency which arose were allegations that there had been set....excuse me...by the Stateville correctional officers, who are grossly underpaid, charging racial discrimination, criminal conspiracy, mismanagement and the fact that they have to work in the towers each day without a washroom break. Charges of correctional officers who...which are just too numerous to mention. After not being able to go through the normal procedures we then formed an ADHOC Committee, a non-partisan ADHOC Committee, to hear from the correctional officers of Stateville. We find that the conditions now are no better now than they were in 1974. The residents of the institution are charging unhealthy, unclean conditions..as well as the correctional officers, allege unfair disciplinary reports issued in many cases on correctional officers which parallel with that of residents. Because of the abuses of the correctional officers, charging mental cruelty as a result of these working conditions, some correctional officers feel that there is gross abuse of authority and federal money. Rape and extortion are hourly occurrences. They allege that they are not receiving full credit for their monies from the BEOG Program, the Illinois State Scholarship, State Military...Veterans Education Fund.



For this reason, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm asking you to please consider House Resolution 86. I would like to remind the Members of the House that for Fiscal 1977, the budget for the Department of Corrections was 212,171,900 dollars. Of this amount 121,000,000 came from the House of Representatives with a balance of the money coming from ILEC, HEW, CETA and the Department of Labor and the Capital Development Board. The other added costs that we tend to forget is the 23,000,225 dollars annually that it pays to the dependent children of mothers and fathers incarcerated. This brings this total to 235,396,900 dollars for the Department of Corrections for one year. Again, for these reasons, I respectfully request your 'aye' vote for House Resolution 86."

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

Leinenweber: "First, Mr. Speaker, may I address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "What is the vote requirement for this Resolution?"

Speaker Redmond: "89."

Leinenweber: "89, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, on House Resolution 86, I hope the Membership is paying attention because House Resolution 86 would create a special Committee on, quote, 'Prison Reform' to investigate the Department of Corrections. Therefore, this Resolution will create a new Committee, which of course will require additional expenditure of funds. I might also add that this situation...we already have standing commissions in this...of the Legislature, which is very adequate to look into any situations which might need looking into. As I understand Mrs. Martin's presentation, there was a Commission or a Committee of which she was a Member which already conducted an investigation and already came out with the report. The report was quite sensationally presented in newspapers throughout the state and... one day and then the rebuttal of the report by another Member of that Commission was presented the next day in somewhat lesser manner."



Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Your seatmate complains that you're not speaking directly into the microphone."

Leinenweber: "I'm trying to; I think there's a conspiracy to keep my remarks quiet. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, I just want the Membership to know that this is an attempt to create a new Committee or a new Commission of the Legislature when we already have Commissions capable and with the responsibility of looking into these situations. If we...on one hand we just attempted to streamline state government and right...the next matter of business immediately thereafter is an attempt to expand state government. We don't need this Commission. There are Commissions which have been looking into situations such as this and I think they're adequate and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson has moved the previous question."

The question is, shall the main question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Peggy Smith Martin, to close."

Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all I'd like to say that this is not a Commission, it's a Committee, a bipartisan Committee. Number one, the task force which was appointed by the Governor was mentioned and I'd just like to say that the Chairman of the task force is in full support of our Committee... if you so grant it here today. They feel that they...number one, that they did not have enough time to do what we're asking to be done here. And of course you know that only two correctional facilities was (sic) visited and we're talking about all nine of the eight adult correctional facilities and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion that we adopt House Resolution 86. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh, to explain his vote. Walsh, William. The better looking Walsh was in here earlier today."

Walsh: "He's with you still, Mr. Speaker, his name is Robert."



Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order on this Resolution. As I read it, it requires that the Speaker appoint the Sponsor of this Resolution as a Member of the Committee that is formed by this Resolution. That, Mr. Speaker, is in direct violation of our rules and I would ask you to rule as to whether this Resolution is appropriate."

Speaker Redmond: "To which rules do you refer? Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to explain my vote. I don't really believe that anyone has read the real significance of this Resolution. It is true that I'm a Member of the task force Committee, but I'm sure that each Member here heard me say that I went last June to the Committee of which I'm on, not only personally but I sent letters, and until this day I have never received a response. This is truly a very serious matter. When you have young men who are getting raped by the hundreds, who could probably be saved. When you have understaffing of correctional officers, a threat of correctional officers lives, that's a serious situation. When you have monies that are not accounted for, we don't know if they're there or where they're there... it's a serious situation. And it's your taxpayers money and I would think and hope that you would give us enough votes for a bipartisan Committee of just eight people and it's costing no great amount of money or you would see it on there and I'm appealing to you for your support. This is a very serious matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I know that people are anxious to get on to other legislation and that we don't want to spend a lot of time on this. But it is up on the board and if we can quickly put the remaining votes up there we can get on with the other business. This is an extremely important subject. I know that the Director of the Department of Corrections has always welcomed legislative investigation because it helps him to focus on problems that he too would like to bring to the attention of the general public. This is not in any



way a Resolution that is hostile to the Director or to the Governor because they understand the problems in bringing these kinds of situations to the attention of our constituents. They know that funding for prison reform is not a popular subject with our constituents and therefore, they are very happy whenever Legislators exhibit interest in the problems that they have there. So I think that this is something that you should regard as a constructive Resolution that is in no way hostile to anyone. We need to get a couple more votes up there and get on with the business of this House. We did have, it is true, an ADHOC Committee but we need an official investigation to support the charges that the people who are trying to work in the prisons are bringing. Thank you very much for your support, please keep those green lights on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson, Representative Walsh, the Parliamentarian and the Speaker have consulted the rules. I do not find the provision with respect to the appointment of the Sponsor inconsistent with the rules. I don't really feel that it's binding, however. So that merely because it's in there doesn't necessarily mean it's going to follow that way but I don't think..."

Walsh: "Well of course it's binding, Mr. Speaker, why else would it be in there? And I call your attention and the attention of the Parliamentarian to Rule 4(m) and 12(a), where it specifically says that the Speaker shall make appointments to Committees."

Speaker Redmond: "Well that's correct but there's nothing in there that says that says that the Sponsor shall..."

Walsh: "The Sponsor...the Resolution is in violation of those rules."

Speaker Redmond: "We don't so interpret it, Representative Walsh. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to this Resolution. I'm sure that the intent behind the Resolution is good but as a Member on the Commission to Examine and Visit Institutions I really believe that is something that we can handle



without the creation of an additional Committee. There are Members in the House of Representatives on the Committee who would be most happy to get with Mrs. Martin. And if she is having trouble in getting cooperation from Senate Members on an investigation we'll be more than happy to help her. There is a report that is being published or has been published which I think takes into consideration and addresses itself to the problems that she's outlined in her arguments. And I think that the Director of Corrections is well aware of the problems and that we are working in the direction of correcting those problems. I think that this is a Resolution that's not needed, Mr. Speaker, and I therefore would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that there are many green votes that are on the board who aren't here in their seats. So I suggest that they either be turned to 'present' or we dump this Roll Call and have a new one. And in any event, if the Roll Call as it now stands is neither dumped or people don't get on 'present' I'd like to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very important subject and I think it's something that we should look into. We're spending 140,000,000 dollars a year in corrections and we have about 10,000 people in the prisons and some of the situations are deplorable. I think we ought to support Representative Martin, take a look into this and... It's part of our jobs. I'm on this Commission to Visit and Examine State Institutions and I've been in some of the prisons. It's not a very pretty picture and I think it's something that we should recognize and take a look at. We're building...we're building two new prisons now but it's going to take another two years before they're finished and I think this Resolution should be passed and I think that we should vote 'aye' on this proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I



rise in opposition to this Resolution. I did so in the Executive Committee and I do so here and the reason being very simple, there is no evidence to substantiate any of the wild allegations posed in this Resolution. You notice that the Sponsor, in addressing this and making her presentation, alleged that there is a criminal conspiracy in the Department of Corrections. But nevertheless she has failed to substantiate that point by giving you any hard evidence or even in the Executive Committee of substantiating that point. Now, the Lady on my side of the aisle, in justification of this Resolution said, 'We should vote for it so we can get on to the point of proving those allegations.' Well I don't believe that to be the case. The burden is on the Sponsor to at least prove by a scintilla of evidence, by mere preponderance that there is some mismanagement and there is a criminal conspiracy in our Department of Corrections...but she has failed to do so and I don't think this House should waste any time or effort or money to try to substantiate wild and useless accusations. Thank you. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jessie Madison."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, it's very ironic that I stand here and I listen to individuals make...make statements like, there is not one thread of evidence to these charges, when I sat on that special ADHOC Committee that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please, give the Gentleman order."

Madison: "That listened to the testimony of these correctional officers, particularly at Stateville. Now, you can sit here in your pious way and ignore this Resolution. I served on the Committee to Visit and Examine State Institutions. I have not gotten one notice, after constant pleas to that Commission, to look into the situation at Stateville. I have not gotten one notice of any attempt on the part of that Commission to look into that situation. That is the reason that the task force was put together in the first place. I can tell you one thing, the situation at Stateville is pretty close to mutiny. Now, you've seen



prisons...you've seen riots in prisons where the inmates have rioted... You haven't seen anything until you've seen correctional officers go on a mutiny in a state prison...institution and you've got hell on your hands. You better take a good look at this Resolution, take a good look at the situation at Stateville and other prison...institutions, and I would suggest very strongly that you pass this Resolution so we can prove to this General Assembly that these are not wild charges."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to support this Resolution. I have had complaints from people in my district, who have relatives in the Joliet institution, of the problems in the prison. I think it's apparent that there are problems. Just the other day the Lieutenant Governor, O'Neal, conducted investigations and part of the problem has been uncovered by him. I think that the Governor is aware that there is a problem, I think that he wishes to correct the problem. I don't think that this is a political witch hunt. Since Representative...from the South side of Chicago, Martin, the Sponsor of this Resolution has been in the Legislature, she has put forth sincere efforts to try to improve the conditions in the prison. There are problems. We heard some of the testimony from the guards in our Executive Committee. There are not enough guards, they're not being assigned their duties properly. There is bias on the part of some of the supervision there. In Statesville they're using the black guards in the very worst spots in the prisons and not letting them have any of the easier assignments. There are a lot of problems there and as a result of the problems the prisoners are very content not...prisoners would be content but they're living under conditions they don't have to live under and I think that this is a nonpolitical effort. I think that the Lady with the Resolution is most sincere and I think that we should join efforts of the House, along with the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and with the people that are visiting the prisons. I think we need this Resolution."



I think that the Representative from the South side of Chicago, who is speaking sincerely for her people, should be given the opportunity to be a Member of this Commission and continue our efforts to have prison reform. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I'd like to know why we are on House Resolutions and if you intend to carry on with Resolutions after this rather than going to House Bills, which have a deadline today?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll probably go to House Bills. This was the order of business that was selected. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Peggy Smith Martin, to explain her vote. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber... Will you take the record? On this question there's 89 'aye' and 58 'no'. Representative Leinenweber requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Peggy Smith Martin requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. Jane Barnes. Blumhardt. Collins. Deavers. Ebbesen. Friedrich. Laurino. Meyer. Miller. Peters. Porter. Schisler. Schuneman and VonBoeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Breslin. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Darrow. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Lechowicz. Levin. Lucco. Madigan. Madison. Mann. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPike.



Molloy. Mudd. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Nardulli.
 O'Brien. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Richmond. Robinson.
 Sandquist. Schneider. Sharp. Shumpert. Skinner. Steczo.
 Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duynes. Vitek. R.V. Walsh.
 Willer. Williams. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Leinenweber: "Representative Birchler."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Birchler in the Chamber? How
 is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Leinenweber: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman is here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson is here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley...Farley. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Farley from the Roll Call."

Leinenweber: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Monroe Flinn, how is he recorded?"

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

Leinenweber: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio is here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris. How is Representative Harris
 recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Leinenweber: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz... How is Representative Katz
 recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "He's right here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Marovitz."



Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Marovitz on the floor?"

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Leinenweber: "Representative Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Schneider on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Schneider."

Leinenweber: "Representative Stuffle?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Leinenweber: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Leinenweber: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Murphy."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Leinenweber: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Leinenweber: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien. Daniel O'Brien. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Daniel O'Brien."

Leinenweber: "Representative Kozubowski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Leinenweber: "Representative Ewell."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell is in the center aisle."

Leinenweber: "That's all we have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the tally? On this question there's 80 'ayes' and 58 'nays'. Representative Peggy Smith Martin. Representative Kozubowski has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. That's 81 'ayes'. Any other..... Representative VonBoeckman. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'."

Leinenweber: "Take the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further additions to the Roll Call? Was Representative Byers removed? Representative Schneider has returned to the Chambers, put him back on. Was Representative Byers removed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Lechowicz recorded?"

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

Lechowicz: "That's right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I... what.... could you give us what the.... could the Clerk give us what the count is so we will know where we are?"

Speaker Redmond: "83 'aye'. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Any thing further? Was Representative Yourell removed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "How about Representative Dan Houlihan? Was he removed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further additions? What is the count, Mr. Clerk? 84 'ayes' and 58 'nays'. Representative Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like this Bill.... this Resolution placed on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. Representative Lee Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"



Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if the House will give us the indulgence to go to House Bill 1333, the Products Liability Bill. I think we debated that in complete substance yesterday. And we should be able to get that out as quickly as possible."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I join in the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lee Daniels has moved that House Bill 1333 be taken out of its regular order. That motion is concurred in by Representative Dan Houlihan. The question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion because I think it's unfair to other Sponsors who have Bills pending on the Calendar. If we're to get together and just work out deals and then make motions to pass out our favorite Bills and leave the other Members hanging, we're going to land up at 8:00 or 9:00 tonight with a handful of people here. And those will be the people with Bills remaining on the Calendar and don't have the votes left to pass them out. I think this is a bad procedure and should be opposed by the Membership."

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

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that we're really getting out of bounds now by pulling Bills out of order. We had an attempt yesterday to try to give everybody an opportunity to hear their Bills by going to an Order of Short Debate. And as far as I'm concerned, this is totally unfair to every Member of the House.... to start taking Bills out of order. This Bill will take a long time and there's Bills that would have took (sic) a lot shorter time and we could have got to this one here.... later on. But I can't support any Bill that we take out of order. I don't give a damn what it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that it's totally unfair to go to this special order of business at this time. I believe if you take a look at the Calendar.... it's



about three or four Bills away. I think that the Speaker has been trying to do a good job, not only yesterday but this entire Session.... to the Membership....."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker.... Mr. Speaker.... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "We appreciate the support of the House in having this heard. And because of the fact that people feel it would be unfair, we want to deal with the complete fairness of the House, we'll withdraw the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion is withdrawn. On House Bills, Third Reading, on the Calendar.... the last Bill that we heard was 302.... wait a minute now.... was 2986. The first one is 3013, Representative McGrew. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, could you rearticulate what was the last Bill we heard on Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Two days ago when we were on this order, the last one we voted out was 3010."

Houlihan: "Two days ago?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. We haven't been on this order before. So it has been researched by the Clerk's Office and 3013 is the next one on the Calendar."

Houlihan: "On Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Not priority.... just the regular order."

Houlihan: "Now let me see if I understand this, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry to be slow on this. We're on Third Reading, we're going by the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Houlihan: "And we're going by the last Bill we considered two days ago?"

Speaker Redmond: "The last time we were on this order.... the last one that we... the next one had we persisted in that order would be 3013. And that's where we are now. Representative McGrew."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3013. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Governors for state colleges and universities. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is an appropriation.

I wonder if it would be in order if I were to move that we exempt appropriation from whatever....."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'll take..... I will... not call the Appropriation Bills. 3027, Representative Getty."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3027. A Bill for an Act in relation to subsidies for probation officers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3027 is a Bill which is jointly sponsored by myself, Representative Johnson and Representative Tipsword. The Bill empowers the administrative office of the Illinois Courts to establish minimum hiring standards and promotional standards for state subsidized county probation officers. It's a system of..... it establishes a system of training such probation officers and systems informed. It also provides for statistical collecting..... collection of information. The most important thing, I think is, it will give a substantial boost to our.... our sorely beleagued (sic) probation services in that it will give an increase for juvenile probation officers from \$300 to \$500 a month subsidy. And of adult probation officers to \$500 a month from nothing. I believe at this time, this has now the support of the Governor's Office. And I would ask that the House join with the many organizations who have endorsed this, including the League of Women Voters, the Illinois Illinois Commission on Children, the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association, the Illinois Juvenile Detention Association, the Urban Council.... Counties Council, the Illinois Conference of Churches and the Illinois Prisons and Jails Project. When we passed Class X, House Bill 1500, our criminal justice reform, we also had inherent in that a commitment to support rehabilitation of offenders. And this is a step in furthering that commitment. And I would earnestly ask for your support."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor would yield for a question."



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Deuster: "Representative Getty, this involves money. I would like to ask you how much is needed and involved and where is the Appropriation Bill that normally would accompany this substantive proposal?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "There would be approximately 2.5 million dollars required for this. It is my understanding that the Governor's Office.... although.... they were not able to find the money for this subsidy last year, I believe is now support^{ing} the need for this and there will be an appropriation for it if this is passed."

Deuster: "I would make this suggestion. Why don't you save this until the Appropriation Bill is out here so we can look at it. I asked, 'Where is the Appropriation Bill'. And I thought you.... I didn't hear your answer. What's the number of the Appropriation Bill so we can check it and.... has it been introduced?"

Getty: "We would... we would just put an Amendment onto an Appropriation Bill. Representative, I don't think it's a secret. This Bill either passes tonight or it dies. And so.... I would ask for your support. Obviously if the General Assembly in its wisdom finds that it doesn't have the money, you've got the next thirty days over in the Senate to have the General Assembly find that. And in the meantime, I don't know that there's any opposition from the Governor's Office for this. Representative Johnson, and I'm sorry he's not on the floor right now, was certainly a strong proponent and had indicated to me that there was no opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would he yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Waddell: "Does the provision in here still exist that if eliminates the top salary limitation on probation officers? In other words, it's limitless?"

Getty: "I don't..... I think it sets a minimum salary, Representative, for the state subsidized probation officer. That was the purpose of it and....."

Waddell: "How about the maximum?"



Getty: "Well the maximum would be set by your individual county boards."

Waddell: "Well I still don't...what is the top salary then that each could make under this?"

Getty: "The provision is that there must be a minimum salary of 11,000 dollars for state subsidized probation officers."

Waddell: "And no maximum?"

Getty: "That...it would be in accordance with what the county board of your individual county would in its wisdom set. But the minimum is set in accordance with the law at 11,000 dollars if they're state subsidized, only if they're state subsidized."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, to avoid any possible misunderstanding the additional funds...required are not budget, I'm assured by the Governor's Office within the last few minutes, there's no plans to in any manner support the increased expenditure. So we would urge you to vote 'no' on the Bill, there's not money for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 3027. I would like to call the attention of the Membership to the fact that similar legislation was passed in the past legislative year and vetoed by the Governor. The background of that veto was to the effect that the individual counties would be responsible for the standards as far as hiring and promotion of the adult and juvenile probation officers. That became an issue of real concern as far as the Governor's Office and those who were opposed to the Bill. What was recommended was that the standards as far as promotion and hiring be set by the administrative director of the Illinois Court System. And that now is what is contained in this Bill. So, with that basic concern having been alleviated with the rewording and redrafting of this Bill, what we have here is a concept of a state subsidy which presently exists as to juvenile probation officers. What the Bill would do would be to extend that subsidy to adult probation officers. Now, for the last several years this Legislature has



considered the question of subsidies for probation officers across the state. We have been unsuccessful in achieving such legislation and there are a few issues, in my opinion, which are more serious to the criminal justice system of this state. I think that all of the problems respecting the phraseology of the Bill, as to the standards that are going to be set, have been met. This is now an agreed Bill on both sides of the aisle. It is reflected by the Sponsorship and I join with Representative Getty in urging an 'aye' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Pardon me, pardon me. The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Representative Getty, to close."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I regret that Representative Tim Johnson is not on the floor. It was our agreement that he would close this debate. But I know in closing that I speak for him in urging you, along with Representative Houlihan, who has worked on similar legislation over the past several years together with us, that you enact this. This was, as I said before, another step in the fight of the people of the State of Illinois against crime and for rehabilitation of offenders. So that we put people who should be incarcerated into penitentiaries and we give services to those who we place on probation meaningful services. To make a true meaning of our enactment of House Bill 1500, we have to get presentence investigation reports to the Judges so that they can make intelligent decisions when they sentence a person either to the penitentiary or to probation. That is what is done by your probation officers. I think there's probably no other segment that needs help as much as these probation officers need help. And you will be giving standards that will be statewide



standards set by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Court. This is truly, I believe, a bipartisan type of move, it is sorely needed and I hope that you would join me in moving this Bill along to the Senate and then we can consider the question of money. And I will tell you, Representative, it was my understanding that we did have the approval of the Governor's Office when I undertook to Cosponsor this Bill and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 16 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3038. Who's the Sponsor of that? Representative Jacobs."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3038. A Bill for an Act permitting raffles and chance games to be conducted by non for profit organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs. Representative Johnson desires to be added to the last Roll Call, is that correct? Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3038 is a Committee Bill of the House Veteran's Affairs Committee which would permit raffles and chances when conducted by a bonafide religious, charitable, labor, fraternal, education or veteran's organization that operates without profit to its members. When at least 50% of the net proceeds are used for charitable purposes. This Bill was requested by several state's attorneys as well as all veteran's organizations and auxiliary... The World War II Gold Star Mothers, the Elks, the K.C. Forresters, K.C., Forresters, the Illinois Wildlife, Shriners and many churches and the Muscular Distrophy Association and we ask your favorable consideration on House Bill 3038."

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 124 'aye' and 26 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3039."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of this Bill? Representative Dan Houlihan. Out of the record. 3041. Out of the record. The next one is an appropriation. 3057. Representative Chapman. 3057."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3057. A Bill for an Act in relation to clarification and enforcement of the rights of handicapped persons in regard to facilities accessibility to state owned and leased real property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and colleagues, about ten years ago the General Assembly passed a Bill which required all state leased facilities and state owned facilities to be accessible to the handicapped. This past year the Auditor General has conducted a survey and discovered that somewhere between 89 and 96 percent of the state owned and leased facilities are not accessible to the handicapped. That seems like progress that is much too slow to be stood for. So I have introduced...the Human Resources Committee has introduced this Bill which would form an accessibility advisory board consisting of nine members, the Director of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Director of the Department of Administrative Services, the Attorney General, the State Fire Marshall and five public members. They shall review the leases and report to us annually on the progress, hopefully putting enough pressure on the Executive Branch that they at least put it in the specifications for the leases around the state. If there are any questions I'd be happy to answer them. If not, I would accept a...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 127 'aye' and 5 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3062 is an appropriation Bill. Take it out of the record. 3083."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3083. A Bill for an Act relating to state government providing for the establishment of statewide forms management programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3083 is jointly sponsored by myself and Representative Matijevich. It is a Bill that's highly supported by the Chamber of Commerce. It is a Bill that was reported out of the House of Representatives last year on 128 to 3 vote. House Bill 3083 is the forms management program and as you know governmental paperwork and red tape is a major problem for all sectors of our society, business, local government, educational institutions, farmers and state government itself. And this Bill establishes a forms management center within the Department of Administrative Services. It gives the center the authority to work on such things as standardized forms, economical forms design, training of those managing forms, maintaining a cross index of all state forms, eliminating redundant forms and utilizing better procurement and storage techniques. It requires the department to conduct a periodic evaluation of the overall forms management program and report to the General Assembly on the dollar savings and the number of forms eliminated, simplified and standardized. It was part of the recommendation by the Illinois Task Force on Governmental Reorganization, which Mr. Thompson and Mr. Howlett jointly participated in the last year's campaign. In other states this program has realized millions and millions of dollars and I would...I would ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

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



Matijevich: "Only to add, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you read the address, the prepared text of the President's speech, he alluded to the avalanche of forms that we encounter in government and I commend this Bill as a vehicle to try to not only reduce the many forms that we have but also to, by the elimination thereof, so that more time and effort can be given to provide services and that we can do the business at hand in a more efficient manner and therefore, I commend an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Meyer: "Representative Winchester, why can't the Governor do this without a statute?"

Winchester: "Well, I can't answer that question, Ted. I assume that it might be...that it could be done through an Executive Order. I'm just not sure how to answer that question. The Governor... the Governor's Office is supporting this Bill in that in the Department of Administrative Services there is an appropriation for, I believe, 30,000 dollars that's been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. So consequently I guess we could say that the Governor's Office is supporting it. I suppose they could do it by Executive Order."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, this is just another example...why we're here and why we're probably going to be here at 12:00 tonight. If the Governor wants to do it he can do it. There's no need for this statute at all."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to close the debate."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...in response to Representative Meyer's question I...I'm sure that there's a good reason. I'm just not aware of it now. I would think that he would prefer that the Legislative Branch have some input as to how this important type of program would be set up. I would only like to echo again the comments by Representative Matijevich in that this is a



tremendous cost savings program. For the amount of money that we're spending to implement it compared to the cost savings of millions of dollar, I think it is well worth a green vote, Mr. Speaker."

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

Brandt: "Not in regards to explaining my vote, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to have leave to change my vote on House Bill 3057 from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "On which Bill, Sir?"

Brandt: "3057."

Speaker Bradley: "3057. Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye'? Hearing no objections he will be so recorded. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'aye', 3 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3088."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3088. A Bill for an Act in relation to township governments. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that to many of you House Bill 3088...some 70 to 75 pages is a lot to look at. And in just...and in one Session of the Illinois House. But let me go back a little bit in the history of the Township Laws Codification Commission. It has been a bipartisan Commission represented by Republicans and Democrats from both the House and the Senate. By Republicans and Democrats out in the rest of the State of Illinois from the public sector, who are knowledgeable about township government. We have, over the years, gone through various problems with failure to be funded or failure to be implemented. Until this year we were implemented, we were funded, we did finally get all of our appointments to the Commission and starting in January this Commission met once a week on Fridays. We would sit and go over the proposed township code



with the people from the Reference Bureau, let me say the people from the Reference Bureau have been extremely helpful in furnishing people from their staff to work with us. We deliberated each day from 9:00 in the morning till 4:00 in the afternoon, breaking for lunch sometimes. But it was a deliberative body. It was not political, it was strictly technical. I could go through a lot of things in regard to the new code but let me say that mainly we are nonpolitical in it, we are not Republican vs. Democrat. There is very little that is new in the township code. Mostly, it is a problem of pulling together things from other Sections of the code to put in one township Section of the Statutes of the State of Illinois. I'll grant you that some people might think that some of the things are new but they are not in most cases, they are things that people did not realize were in existence. We had several Amendments on the floor that were verifications of what has gone on and I certainly feel that now the Bill is in shape to send over to the Senate and I would appreciate your vote and support of what this excellent bipartisan Commission labored so long and hard to put out. I would answer any questions, if possible."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Jaffe: "I'm looking at a staff analysis, Tom, and under our staff analysis it says that townships for the first time would be able to establish their own police and fire departments and they would not be restricted to unincorporated areas, is that correct?"

McMaster: "Yes, Mr. Jaffe, they are restricted to unincorporated areas. Let me say that as far as Cook County is concerned they have had this opportunity already in existence in the statutes, it's not something new as far as your county is concerned, Aaron."

Jaffe: "Well, let me say this. Let me speak to the Bill, if I may."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Jaffe: "Our staff informs me that that answer is not correct. That in fact,



for the first time townships would be able to establish their own police and fire departments and they would not be restricted to unincorporated areas. For instance, in my township, my township could now form a police department or a fire department and supersede all the local municipalities. In other words, where you don't have any unincorporated area in Niles Township you would be able to have a police department that would have rule over Skokie, Niles, Morton Grove, Glenview, etc., etc., etc. In addition, this Bill is backed for a number of reasons. Take a look at the bonding powers. Under this Bill townships would have and I have to underline this, open and unlimited general obligation bonding powers and bonds can be issued for any township purpose which would include operations as well as the Capital type projects which are now only regarded as bondable projects. In addition to that, this Bill increases the powers of the townships in the area of fire, police, bonding, health and environment. It seems to me that whether we've had a bad township Bill, this is indeed the worse township Bill we've ever had and this Bill should be voted down with a great vote."

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

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

I want to ask the Sponsor if he would yield."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Yourell: "Tom, I know that you and I have discussed this Bill on not just recent occasions but from time to time and I want to you to know that I do sincerely appreciate the work that you and the Commission have done relative to straightening up Chapter 139. I do, however, as do some of your Republican colleagues, as evident by direct questions on our Committee session on this Bill, relative to zoning, police powers, referen...bonding power without referendum, creating a solid waste disposal district Act, a privilege that you presently enjoy under the provisions of the Constitution, the Inter-Governmental Cooperation Article of the Constitution. That takes away that. I think that if we pass this Bill, Tom, we're going to have a problem that will be designated as very severe as



it relates to municipalities in the State of Illinois and counties and townships. I think if this Bill becomes law you'll find that townships have more authority and power than municipalities in Illinois. I would like to ask you one question, Tom, presently counties have jurisdiction in the unincorporated areas of the township, is that correct?"

McMaster: "In what way, Mr. Yourell?"

Yourell: "Well counties presently enjoy zoning in the unincorporated areas of the townships, that's..."

McMaster: "But we currently have in the statutes the power for townships to adopt township zoning. It's already in existence, that's not new."

Yourell: "Do you have presently...do townships presently enjoy zoning authority?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Yourell: "All right, now what would be the conflict between county zoning and the unincorporated townships and in the townships themselves, would they be in conflict?"

McMaster: "Well, Bus, if there's conflict it would already be in existence because there has not been any change. All we did is take the zoning material out of the statutes and transfer it from that position over into the township code. It's not new language, it's already been in existence for several years."

Yourell: "All right, the language that I'm referring to relates to zoning but refers to a building code. Is that correct?"

McMaster: "I think probably this might be what you're getting at, Bus... Just a second...and we're checking it out. I think the building code would be new, Mr. Yourell, yes. But...not the zoning."

Yourell: "That's new language in Section 3-103...or 3-1031. What I'm suggesting to you is that for the first time we are allowing townships to adopt by Resolution or by ordinance, building codes in the State of Illinois that will certainly be in conflict with the municipal building codes and also county building codes. Did you...did you, by Amendment #3 take out...put in a referendum a direct referendum for bonding authority?"



McMaster: "Yes." Let me say, Bus, that if there are problems with building codes, certainly I'm willing to accept an Amendment to do away with that part of it. And I have been willing all along in any of this to discuss with you or anyone else, who wish to make Amendments and that's envisioned by the fact that we did in fact have three Amendments presented and adopted, Bus. And I'm certainly willing, either in the Senate if we should get that far with it, I'm willing to entertain that Amendment in the Senate."

Yourell: "Tom, one other question, if I may. Does...under the provisions of...of this Bill, would townships for the first time have condemnation powers?"

McMaster: "I think again, with a referendum only, Bus. And we're leaving these things to referendum. This is why we tried to stay noncontroversial."

Yourell: "Would then townships under this Bill be allowed to construct nursing homes and treatment facilities to alcoholics, drug addicted and the developmental disability?"

McMaster: "I think they already have that power, Mr. Yourell, under Inter-Governmental Cooperation, which we have not changed."

Yourell: "Then I would suggest to you that much of the language contained in House Bill 3088 can be handled by that provision of the Constitution that describes the method by which you can contract between townships, municipalities, townships and counties and so forth, to provide some of the services that are already in existence. I recall in Committee, as you do, Tom, that some people were very fearful that for the first time we were providing services and authority to townships that go far beyond, go far beyond what I think we ought to do in this area. And until that is cleaned up I'm afraid I'm going to have to oppose the Bill."

McMaster: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill along the same lines of questioning as the previous speaker. It just seems to me that while there may be an attempt to codify township laws and I look at them as they relate to Cook County, there's a tremendous amount of confusion in question as to who has authority



versus...the municipality versus the township in regard to police protection, in regard to fire protection, building code, zoning, building nursing homes. And I think until that area is cleared up and we're sure that there's no overlapping jurisdiction, which apparently there is in this Bill, it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to echo the same...

what was said by Representative Mahar and Representative Yourell.

And also, I'd like to say this, a couple of more things, this Bill

is 71 pages long and really...I suppose it's our own fault for

really...not delving into these things more deeply or being

cognizant of what's going on around us but it only really came

to our attention in the last few days when it was put on Third

Reading. And it's a very long Bill... Now as far as, Tom, as

far as you said these...the zoning. Now our townships in Will

County do not have zoning powers right now. We have county

zoning and so this would be a complete superimposition of their

power on the counties, as Bus pointed out. Now, another thing

I worry about in terms of police forces, our county is now

patrolled by ...the unincorporated areas is controlled by county

police. And when they make arrests and the fines are levied on

these people the county collects part of that fine back. Now

if you...if you superimpose or comingle the township people with

cities, with townships and with county, you may end up with three

people trying to get their proper...proper amount of fines.

And not only that, but as we come faced with the dog problem

over our...over the past five or six years, everybody says, 'Well

you've got your own dog war...you've got this and that, therefore

it's out of my jurisdiction.' Now we may end up without any

police force at all. So I...I really think that this Bill, because

of its lengthy stature, needs a heck of a lot more study and I

don't know where you'd put it to get that study but I think it

shouldn't...it should not be passed out of here the way it is."

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

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



Speaker Matiejvich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the previous question be moved? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, to close."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I will close but I regret very much the fact that Representative VonBoeckman, who was certainly... What were you, Jim, you were the Secretary of that Commission and had a great deal to do with it. I think he should be given the opportunity to speak and then I would like to have the opportunity to close, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matiejvich: "Well, I think that's outside the rules. However, he can explain his vote. In fact, his light wasn't on until later in the debate, at least when I saw it. So...if you don't want to close I'm going to pose the...go ahead, close, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again... Jim, I tried for you. But in closing, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very obvious from the questions that have been asked that so many of these things, zoning powers, the power to establish police departments, these things are already law. And it's amazing to me that previous speakers have not made the effort to examine the statute and where these laws came from. I have had in my office, I distributed to leadership a derivation chart showing where these came from in other Sections of the statutes. And I know, quite frankly, what organization has been battling this Bill because they have not taken the time to read it. And they did the same thing with this as they did with the election...recodification of the new elections consolidation law. They did not take the opportunity to put their input into it. They come out and then try to oppose it because they didn't make the effort to work on it in the first place. And I think that this is a very good codification of township law. There is very little that is new in there. Any bonding powers are limited to taxation, any police department or anything like that is limited to unincorporated areas as it currently is in the



statutes. The same is true of zoning. Zoning, the power of townships to zone, as Representative Van Dyne brought out, is something that... a power that they already have. It's just something that we are moving from one part of the statutes to another part. And before you call this Bill either way, one way or the other I wish you would keep an eye on me, Mr. Speaker, to recognize me."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, has moved for the passage of House Bill 3088. The question is, shall House Bill 3088 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. To explain his vote the Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Secretary of this Commission and a bipartisan Commission, I wholeheartedly endorse this legislation. What we have done is what Representative McMaster has said, we have went through the statutes page by page and codified the laws governing townships. We're not changing anything that's not now present law. The interpretation is there or misinterpretation is there now. I think we spent three long years in trying to get a piece of legislation together to codify these laws. I think it's...I think it's a good Bill, I think we ought to really pass it so that the people back home who are in townships can look at it and say there's the answer to our questions, rather than have to go through the statutes page by page. I suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Kane, the Minority Whip, Bruce Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think that establishing a transportation system is within the province of a township right now and I'm for township government. But unless somebody in their explanation of votes can tell me that we aren't going to have another layer of bureaucracy under the R.T.A. then I shall vote 'present' and stay there until such an answer."

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



Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you all know I'm a proponent of township government. This sure is a quite lengthy Bill, almost 70 pages, I want to extend my appreciation to Mr. McMaster for holding this on Second Reading for almost six weeks. He's accepted every Amendment, he's accepted every recommendation to try to put this Bill in condition so that we can pass this House. There aren't too many differences in the law that exists now. We do have to go by referendum, it's not giving them too much power and some of you downstaters and some of you rural people can understand that this might be a little extreme, but let me tell you, there are some entities in the County of Cook that are larger than some municipalities and they have to go downtown to get their zoning ordinance... their zoning from the Cook County Board, which takes 90 days before zoning is passed. I'm not saying that this is the cure all Bill but it's a Bill that the Sponsors and the people that put the Bill together have been trying to call the attention to the problems that we do have in Cook County. And I'm sure that Mr. McMaster does not want this Bill defeated. He certainly would like to get the expression of this House and if it needs further study at least let's give it a chance to get further study than kill this Bill outright."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Jack Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Minority Whip indicated that we might be adding another layer of bureaucracy. I don't think that's what we're doing here, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What we're trying to do is streamline and strengthen a layer of already existing government that is responsive. A layer of existing responsive government, to streamline it, to smooth out its processes and to give it its just due. The Commission worked very hard on this and I'm absolutely surprised and shocked at the Chairman of the Counties and Townships Commission for speaking against this Bill when the Bill passed out of his Committee 13 to 0. Please, vote for this very good Bill... Here we go again, the opposition to township government rises up and says, 'No,



you can't have it, no, you can't have it, no you can't have it.'
Let us have it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, I do appreciate the work the Commission did with this legislation. And the Representative who has proposed this legislation knows that during the Committee hearing there was suggested that there was a lot of things wrong with this Bill. Now, I don't know how many Amendments were put to the Bill but I think they were very few and they were lacking in the number that would make the Bill in the condition that it would be acceptable. You know, we've always prided ourself, Tom, and I want to support this concept, you know that. 'Cause contrary to popular belief I'm not an opponent to township government. I want to do what I can to strengthen it in certain areas but not to give it more authority than other levels of government. And Tom, I want you to know that I don't want this Bill killed, I want you to do something with it that will provide us with an opportunity to take care of one of the provisions that I find very distasteful. And you know we've always prided ourselves...those that have been proponents of township government have through the years prided themselves on the fact that here really is one form of government that extends back to the colonial days in New England and provided what is commonly known as 'grass roots government'. And that has been the plea for the continuation of township government. It's really the only level of government where the people have a say. Where they can go to an annual town meeting and pass Resolutions and okay Bills and do all of the things that they're not entitled to do in other levels of government. But this Bill completely strips that out. It takes away from the electors the power to exercise 29...29 functional powers that they've always had traditionally the authority to do...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...please bring your remarks to a close."



Yourell: "Yes, I... That is my one concern. I want to continue with that...that grass roots form of government. Tom, if we can put this in Interim Study or do something with it I'll be glad to work with you and we'll get it out when it's right."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Chairman of the Committee has stated the point quite adequately. I would ask that we give Representative McMaster the necessary votes so he can put this thing on Postponed Consideration. I appreciate the work that the Commission has done but I think if we would just give him a little help we could get the job done properly."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that. All I heard was that this was a bad Bill. By giving him enough votes to put it on Postponed Consideration, we don't have to do that. to put it in Interim Study. We can do that by unanimous consent. I would say don't give him enough votes to get it up to 70 votes. It's a horrible Bill. Everybody has told you it's a horrible Bill, it's a hell of a lot worse than they've even told you. So, I would say you ought to keep the votes under 70 because once you get it on Postponed Consideration you never know what happens around here, sometimes votes go on the board in strange and peculiar manners. So I...I think that's a bad idea."

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

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the previous speaker was so crass as to call this a horrible Bill. It is certainly not horrible, it's an excellent Bill and was a product of a bipartisan Commission. But I...I think it's obvious that we are not going to secure the votes for passage and I realize that. For that reason I would like to postpone this Bill and then ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to rerefer it to the Counties and Townships Committee or Study Committee."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider... I think we have to get leave of the House, are you asking for leave to return it to the Committee?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, does the Gentleman have leave that House Bill 3088 be returned to the Interim Study Calendar of the County and Townships Committee? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, on a point of order."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that Representative McMaster in his explanation, or in closing, he indicated that he would like to refer this back to Committee and I think that would be something better than putting it in Interim Study. Could he do that by motion? Is it the same thing?"

Speaker Bradley: "It would die tonight if we don't put it on Interim Study so we have to put it on Interim Study and we'll return it to the Committee on Interim Study. Are there any objections? Hearing none... Mr. Jaffe objects. Mr. Stearney objects. Then you'll have to so move and secure 89 votes. Just a minute here, we've got to take the Roll on this. On this question there are 75 'aye' and 59 'no'."

McMaster: "Now, Mr. Speaker...whatever the procedure is, I guess I ask for Consideration Postponed and then ask for permission of the House to return to Interim Study in Counties and Townships."

Speaker Bradley: "There have been heard...you have to get unanimous consent, there have been objections, there will have to be a Roll Call. You'll have to obtain... You can put it on Postponed...correct. He wants to go to Postponed and then he wants to..."

McMaster: "That's one motion, let's postpone first."

Speaker Bradley: "All right..."

McMaster: "And I think, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Hold it now, on this question there are 75 'aye', 59 'nay' and the Gentleman requests that it be placed on Postponed Consideration. So, with no objections it's on Postponed Consideration. Now, Mr. McMaster..."



McMaster: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I would move that this be returned to Interim Study in Counties and Township Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "And we do not have unanimous consent because there have been objections heard so this will take 89 votes."

McMaster: "Right."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of Mr. McMaster's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 146 'aye', 6 'nay', none voting 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and the Bill is returned to... House Bill 3097. The Chair would like to make an observation. It took us 25 minutes to get that Bill to Interim Study."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3097. A Bill for an Act relating to the establishment and maintenance of health departments and public health districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from White... The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Hopefully it won't take near as long to pass this Bill as it did to handle the previous Bill. House Bill 3097 is an emergency Bill. It was caused by a ruling by the Attorney General reversing an earlier opinion. The background is that in 1969 the County and District Health Department Statutes were amended to require them to provide services to the mentally ill and retarded. At the same time, the maximum levy was increased from one half mil. to one mil. However, no levy could be imposed without a successful referendum. In 1970 the Attorney General ruled that a county could increase its levy beyond the half mil. without holding a second referendum. Pursuant to that opinion most counties, 20 in fact, did increase their levies. In January of this year the Attorney General issued an opinion that a second referendum was necessary. Unless House Bill 3097 is enacted all health services will have to be cut back immediately by a total of three million seven hundred and seventy-nine thousand dollars."



The Bill is supported by the Department of Public Health, the Department of Mental Health, the Mental Health Association, the Association of Retarded Citizens and the Illinois Association of Community Mental Health Agencies. In Committee there was no opposition, the Committee of Townships reported it out on a 16 to 0 vote. And the counties which would be adversely affected and the dollars which are involved, Mr. Speaker, are as follows if I may take the time of the House. - Jo Daviess County would lose 51,000. Lee County would lose 50,000. Fulton County would lose 102,000. Peoria County 468,000. - "I think I would...and so on, Mr. Speaker. So I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman... The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 147 'aye', 7 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3119."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien. Is he on the floor? Take it out of the record. 3129."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3129. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record. 3134 for the Motor Vehicle Committee. Who's handling that Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3134. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the financing for state programs for the collection and disposal of unclaimed...vehicles."

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

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 3134, the Chairman of...VonBoeckman was handling that but we were going to take it out. And I would ask leave, Mr. Speaker, that 1970 was going to be called only after 3134 was heard and it was always passed over that we first hear 3134...and I was wondering if I could have leave... We're not going to hear 3134 but I'd like to have leave to



hear 1970 and vote it up or down."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to go to House Bill 1970?"

There are objections being heard. The Gentleman would have to so move and obtain 89 votes."

Giglio: "Well, I'd like to because I don't think we're going to get to it and it hinges on what 3134...through the request of Representative Totten at the time, that we bypass 1970 and now that we're not going to do 3134 we think that 1970 ought to have a fair chance."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, are you moving to...Mr. Giglio, did you just take it out of the record or are you making a motion or..."

Giglio: "Well I move that we hear 1970."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the rule so that... for the immediate consideration of House Bill 1970. There are objections. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, on his motion."

Totten: "Yeah, on the motion, is 1970 the Bill that abolishes the Motor Vehicle Recycling Fund?"

Giglio: "No. No, what 1970, Representative Totten, authorizes and directs the Motor Vehicle Law Commission to conduct the study into the whole vehicle recycling universe."

Totten: "Well, I have no objections. If we hear 3134 and if it doesn't pass that we go back to 1970."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, on the Gentleman's motion."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, this would be a parliamentary inquiry. If we consider 1970 with this legislation which is before us, will that affect where we are in terms of either the Calendar order or or the priority of call order..."

Speaker Bradley: "It would be the intent of the Chair to return to 3158."

Houlihan: "I understand the intent of the Chair, what I'm talking about is in terms of precedence. Would we then be able to pick up right after 1970, either on the Calendar or on the Priority of Call? At some point?"



Speaker Bradley: "I don't see how we could, Sir." Did you want me to do that?"

Houlihan: "No, I was just trying to get that information, whether we could or couldn't."

Speaker Bradley: "No... For what purpose does the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman, arise?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm in charge of House Bill 3134 and we've got problems with it and I would like to hold it up until we hear 1970."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giglio is suspending the appropriate rule for the immediate consideration of House Bill 1970. All...at this time, all in favor of his motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'aye' and 18 'nay' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Now, 3134. Do you want that out of the record then, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Well, I was Chairman..."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in advice from the Commission I think we'll just at this time table House Bill 3134."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman tables House Bill 3134. Is there leave? Hearing no objections the Bill is tabled. 3158."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3158. A Bill for an Act for requiring the Division of Investigation of the Department of Law Enforcement to investigate certain violations of the Illinois Public Aid Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3158 assigns the function of Public Aid Fraud Investigations to the Division of Investigation, an existing administrative unit within the Department of Law Enforcement. It is another in the series of Bills that speaks to the concern that we have with welfare fraud and abuse. I'm happy to say that this...view apparently made itself up to the Governor's desk because the Governor appointed a



special task force, the Governor's Fraud Investigation Commission, to come up with recommendations relating to welfare fraud and abuse. One of the recommendations of the Governor's Commission was to centralize all criminal investigations of recipients and provider fraud within the Department of Law Enforcement, rather than as it is now, within the Department of Public Aid. I'm sure that many of us anticipated that the Governor would be issuing an Executive Order, in order to do this in the proper way. Or that he might have a Bill, cause a Bill to be introduced into the General Assembly. Neither one of these events occurred. Therefore, I have introduced this Bill which is before you today that does what the Governor's Commission calls for and does it in the appropriate way, through legislative involvement. I was surprised to learn that the Department of Law Enforcement and the Department of Public Aid opposed this good Bill. Surely it couldn't be because it was part of the package that Mr. Bakalis had developed in cooperation with the legislative leaders. Certainly none of our administration would do anything of this nature. However, the Bill is before you today and I would surely hope that all of the Members of this House would support putting investigation where it belongs, within the Department of Law Enforcement. The Department of Public Aid should not be expected to be a policeman. The Department of Law Enforcement is the Department that has the expertise to properly deal with welfare fraud. I ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is unnecessary on a day when we've got a crowded calendar, when other Members have important Bills that they want to be heard...should be heard. This action has already been taken by the Governor, it's not necessary that we do it, it's not necessary that we waste any more time on it. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. I think not only does it conform to the recommendations of the task force but it conforms to the



executive reorganization within the department and I think it effectively implements some tighter controls and I think Representative Chapman has an excellent piece of legislation here and I would urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3158."

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

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

As Minority Spokesman on the Human Resources Committee I wish to say that this Bill, at the present time, in its present posture does not comply with federal regulations and we will lose federal matching funds if this becomes law. It includes more than just investigating medical fraud, it includes all fraud and there's no matching fund for all fraud investigators, only for medical provider fraud. And this opens up an area for...where social workers are needed as well as where investigators are needed. And this Bill is too broad to give the law enforcement agency this responsibility because it goes into areas where their expertise is not proper. So I ask a red vote on this."

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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question on this unnecessary Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to close the debate."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, in asking for your vote on this proposal, I'd like to disagree with previous speakers who said that this Bill is not needed. At the present time the statutes give to the Department of Public Aid the exclusive jurisdiction for investigating welfare fraud. If the Department of Law Enforcement is going to do this legally they must have authorization for this. Please vote 'yes'."

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



Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very disturbed at some Members of the Assembly that keep whistling and I think that is totally out of order and I think you should admonish those people to stop."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from...your point is well taken, Sir. Those people in the gallery that are whistling, I'd appreciate it if they'd stop. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote for one minute."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explanation of my vote I rise to support this whether or not I agree with it or not. The process has already been taken, the appropriations for this purpose is already over in the Department of Law Enforcement. Law Enforcement personnel have been carrying out this responsibility. I don't necessarily agree with the process but it has been accomplished and I feel that we should support this legislation to make it a fact legislatively."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was on the Committee that heard this Bill and there were no objections to this proposal. We do hear now some objections that what is being proposed be done by statute is already being done. But that is not a safe or good way to handle a matter of this importance. It is something that should be sanctioned and legitimized by our law so that this very important problem of ferreting our fraud and saving the taxpayers the million dollars involved, can be done under the direction of the Legislature and this mandate as described in our statutes. I'm voting 'yes'."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know if you understood what was said already. The action has already been moved into the Department of Law Enforcement. It's just a question of a formality, it seems perfectly legal to me to have investigative services of this type in the Department of Law Enforcement. I can't imagine situations where the Federal



Government...where the F.B.I. would be handled by H.E.W. This is a logical step and it's important that it be accomplished. Either the thing is not understood or something but this should have a hundred and some votes on the board."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski, to explain his vote...no."

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

I also served on the Human Resources Committee that reviewed this legislation and agree with the prior speakers that what we are asking that we do with this legislation is give the state the tools to make a thorough review of what's going on in this area. It's a reasonable attempt to keep control and review where state dollars are being spent and I would urge everyone to cast an affirmative vote for it."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote for one minute."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Mugalian, I think whimsically suggested that there was no objection in the Human Resources Committee. If you know anything about that Committee and you look at your synopsis and see that there were 4 'no' votes and 3 'present', that's a violent revolution in that Committee, there was strenuous objection."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, if this Bill should get 89 votes I would like a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "You're entitled to that. Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Chapman: "I'd like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may."

Chapman: "By way of a question, as I look at the board I wonder if the other side of the aisle really is interested in effective pursuing of welfare fraud. What the Bill speaks to is criminal investigations by the appropriate agency, the Department of Law



Enforcement. And I see very few Republican lights on and I just have some concern as to their commitment in this area. And I urge them to join me in voting 'yes' on this good Bill. Good and necessary Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to explain his vote for one minute."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one of the major issues is welfare fraud in our districts and we know it when we go to meetings and to other public events. And it seems to me that if you're concerned as you know that your constituency are... you ought to be voting 'yes' on this particular proposal, just as the Sponsor of this legislation indicated, because that would be a positive step in showing that you are strongly in favor of taking away from those who are stealing from the poor and those that are...the needy. And I think that it would be hard for you to go back to your district and justify voting against this legislation."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... I have sympathy with the Bill, the Department of Law Enforcement already has a special 30 member fraud investigation unit which has begun intensive efforts to deal with medicaid fraud and the Department of Law Enforcement contends that this Bill may, in effect, limit some of the fraud investigating powers it now holds. And it has requested time to review need after this new bureau has begun to process cases. And I think in view of the fact that the Department is an honorable one and is doing a good job, I think we should give them a chance without trying to tie their hands. I certainly want welfare fraud investigated and though I'm in sympathy with the Bill I feel we do have the means to do it now at the present time with the special 30 member fraud unit of the Department of Law Enforcement without an additional Bill."



Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 88 'aye' and 57 'nay' and the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman..."

Chapman: "Asks for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "She requests a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. Jane Barnes. Bluthardt. Collins. Daniels. Friedrich. Griesheimer. Hart. Hoffman. Laurino. McBroom. Peters. Porter. Ryan. Telcser."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 88 'aye' and 57 'nay' and 17 voting 'present' and this Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 3163."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3163. A Bill for an Act to require various departments of state government to approve or deny any applications made to them within 90 days of their receipt of such application. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Speaker of the House, Representative Redmond, at Joe Lucco's desk."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a simple Bill. It requires the various departments of state government to approve or deny an application made to them within 90 days of receipts. Failure to act on it, the application would be approved. -I ask you support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question, if none...the question is, shall this Bill pass? Art, your light is not on."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Telcser: "Does this Bill include applications for licenses for some of the professions, all of the professions?"

Redmond: "Take this Bill out of the record."

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

Redmond: "No, out of the record...out of the record."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record. 3164."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3164."



Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record... 3165. Out of the record. 3177."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3177. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3177 is an Amendment to the Unemployment Compensation Act. Due to the changes in some areas that we made with Senate Bill 6 in the November Session of last year, as well as Amendments that are needed, in my estimation, to make corrections and clarifications within the statutes. I'd like to explain this legislation in terms of where it came from, where the Amendments came from, how they got there and basically what they attempt to correct. When we passed Senate Bill 6, last year, we included within the coverage of Unemployment Compensation, local governments that were not specifically covered prior to that legislation. What we did was put forty-four hundred and seventy-five thousand people under that Act. And since there is no clarifying language I think that it is important in this legislation to point out that the governmental agencies, municipalities, cities, villages and counties needed correction on who was covered and who was not covered. The people that are included in this legislation that are not covered by this Amendment under Unemployment Compensation are, volunteer firemen, jurors, election judges, members of board of review of assessments, members of the county zoning commission or zoning board of appeals. Also, the Amendment, which is the Bill, has a provision that is of great importance to small business people, park district associations, subcontractors in the construction industry, that being that the term 'employment' does not include temporary employment of students during a customary school vacation period - that being June, July, August, September - so that the public and private sectors can hire young people for the summer, thereby putting them on payrolls and helping out the total economy and of course the work force in the State of Illinois. Within this Amendment #1 is



also the provision originally introduced under Senate Bill 1350, which was the legislation introduced by the Republican leadership on the Senate side. They took the cap off the category of a married person with dependents for maximum benefits. Within this legislation also is the provision on a voluntary quit, the voluntary quit being that if an individual leaves employer A for employer B and is subsequently laid off by employer B, under the existing formula whatever he draws is then reassessed back to employer A. I'm eliminating that provision and spreading that total cost over the whole U.C. benefit structure. This is from the Small Business Association, the Retail Merchants, most of those small people who have wholesale or retail businesses doing one and a half million dollars and less per year. There are other portions of that Amendment increasing the time of appeal from 7 days to 14 days and two very, very tough, stringent provisions for collection of benefits which were fraudulently received. We accepted an Amendment by Representative Brummer, tightening up once...once more that fraud provision and also the Amendment by Representative Simms that puts the governmental agencies back in the coverage on overpayment. I'd be happy to answer any questions that anyone may have on this legislation."

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

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "One of the provisions in this Bill is the elimination of the cap. As you know, I attempted to amend this Bill on Second Reading and I was gaveled down because somebody made the decision that the Amendment was not in proper order. As I recall, the Amendment that I was offering spoke to the point that this was going to add at least 35 to 40 million to an already deficit trust fund, which is at about one billion dollars. Now, how do you provide to pay for this additional deficit of some 35 to 40 million dollars?"

Mautino: "Well, first and foremost, Representative, when the Legislation that was introduced in Senate Bill 1350 was presented, the cost at



that time was between 12 and 20 million dollars. As we continually delay this provision under this legislation, the cost now could very well be 30 to 35 million. Next year I would recommend to you that probably the cost would be 59 or 60 million dollars. And the cost will come from an evaluation of the total system itself and how the...how the funding of the unemployment compensation has to be changed. In Senate Bill 6, as you well know, we put the burden of the substance of the new increases on the smaller employers of the State of Illinois, those employers with a good work record and left the three-tenths of one percent increase to the...the larger employers of the state. I think the whole formula has to be reworked and I'm...I'm certain that a Commission or a Committee will be set up to reevaluate the structure of the funding."

Tuerk: "Well isn't it a fact that this Bill, as good as you purport it to be, will in fact raise benefits by a pretty good percentage for those with dependents?"

Mautino: "I agree in total with your statement, it is the identical legislation that was introduced by Senators Glass, Shapiro, Michler, Soper...under Senate Bill 1350 in the Senate of this Session. It was part of the original package for compliance legislation that was introduced in this...this General Assembly."

Tuerk: "Why were you in a position to oppose the Amendment that I was going to offer which would have in fact raised benefits but not to the extent that your benefits are raised?"

Mautino: "As I understand that portion, at Second Reading, Representative, your Amendment was ruled out of order and we did not vote on that Amendment if I am correct."

Tuerk: "Well, that's right but you were chomping at the bit to oppose it, that's all I'm saying."

Mautino: "You're making an evaluation, Sir."

Tuerk: "I'm jumping to the right conclusion. Mr. Speaker, if I may address the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "Well, House Bill 3177 does in fact do a few of the things that the



Sponsor says it does. And in some respects it improves the administration and the provisions of the Act. However, encompassed with that are many other things that are not addressed which the Democrat side of the aisle would not even allow an Amendments to be heard relative to some real constructive Amendments to the Bill. Therefore, in all due conscience, even though there are parts of this Bill that I like, there are so many other parts that I don't like that I don't see how we can support the Bill."

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

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

I rise in support of this Bill. As Representative Mautino explained it does tighten up provisions that were neglected in past legislation. We did adopt and incorporate in this Bill fraud. We did in fact eliminate and correct the cap. I think that it's up to us to pass this Bill and be in a position to go back to our constituents and the people in this state, small businessmen and large industry and say we did in fact correct some inequities that heretofore did exist. Mr. Speaker, I would wholeheartedly support the adoption and the passage of this Bill."

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

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Schuneman: "Dick, there are some changes in this Bill that of course

I think everybody supports but one of my concerns has to do with the fact that it seems to me that prior employers are getting their requests for changes put off by the Bill. And I'm particularly concerned about the fact that it appears to me that we're once again increasing the benefits to be paid under Illinois Unemployment Comp. How much would this Bill increase the average benefits paid under Illinois Unemployment Comp? Do you have that figure?"

Mautino: "The differential between a married person with a nonworking spouse and that of a married person with a family with children, under this legislation, is a three dollar and four cents differential. That is three dollars..."



Schuneman: "No, I think you misunderstand my question. My question was, how much does this increase the average benefit?"

Mautino: "The average benefit? I'm not addressing the average benefit, I'm addressing only the maximum that can be recouped. And the maximum at this time, based on a statewide weekly average would be three dollars and four cents more than what they are currently receiving with the cap at 135 dollars a week."

Schuneman: "Well okay, can we get at this another way? For example, doesn't the Bill provide that the maximum under...under your Bill now will be 66 and 2/3 percent of the statewide average weekly wage?"

Mautino: "Yes, that is correct. It is identical to the other provisions within the categories, which are 60 percent of a prior weekly average for a single individual, 60 percent for an individual with a nonworking spouse and 66 and 2/3 with a family...with a wage earner and a spouse and children."

Schuneman: "How do you propose to pay for these increased benefits? Perhaps justified, but how do you propose to pay for them out of a trust fund which is already some 820 some million dollars in debt?"

Mautino: "With a total reevaluation of the financial structure and how the premiums are assessed to both the private and public sectors in the state. I don't have any magic wand that says here's 36 million dollars. But you know also that the...originally set up funding of the trust fund at 100 million dollars takes away the total penalty that we had to implement with Senate Bill 6. So, I feel within two years...increased premiums that were assessed to the private and the public sectors will more than offset what we're doing in this case."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "As I said before, I...I see some things in this Bill that I think are worthwhile. There are some changes in the public sector which...in the private...public sector rather which I think are... are needed. But this is what we have seen in the General Assembly in



the last few years, a response to public employers but no response to private employers. And I think what we're doing here is simply adding to the cost once again of the private employers of the State of Illinois. We should all be aware that it's been three years since the unemployment compensation benefits were increased in 1975. Since that time the State of Illinois has borrowed something like 800 million dollars from the United States Government to pay for those benefits. Last year we increased the Unemployment Compensation rates for most employers. And it seems a poor time to me to increase those benefits again. And I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. Let's hold the Bill here, something is coming over from the Senate. Perhaps we can come out of the two Houses with something that will answer the cries of private employers all over for some kind of equity under the unemployment compensation system. I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that most of the people that are rising to oppose this Bill or are talking against it have not come up with one thing that they can logically disagree with in this particular Bill, only that it might lack a few things that they would like to see in here. And I think that any change in the Workmen's Comp. or unemployment that comes through the House and the Senate is going to have to be small and piecemeal dealt out in order to achieve what we want to achieve. I think that everybody agrees that the things that we've done...that we've done them in such a fashion all at once is probably the reason that we got into trouble. And I think it's...it's time that we start looking at these things in small pieces and taking them as they come rather than to oppose a Bill just because it doesn't contain a few things they'd like to see in it. If that Bill coming over from the Senate is so good we can support it too. But there's no reason to hold this Bill up. The increases and the changes that we make in Workmen's Comp. and unemployment on various Bills that come through here are not going to change the rate increases significantly. But



they're going to offset those and balance those rates so that we do achieve some benefits for the changes that we are making. I think that Representative Mautino's Bill adds a great value to the public and private sectors in the State of Illinois and I think we should support it. Of course it doesn't contain everything we want but I think it contains enough good things that we should support it. If something else comes across that's got a few other things in it, we should support it also."

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

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield for a couple questions?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Simms: "Representative Mautino, under the provisions of your Bill would a striker be eligible for benefits under the Act?"

Speaker Bradley: "This legislation does not address that question, Sir."

Simms: "A striker then is not included treated under the terms of your Bill as those that voluntarily leave their jobs?"

Mautino: "If my memory is correct I didn't make that statement in my presentation and it is not a part of this particular Bill."

Simms: "Second question, Dick, who supports this Bill? Does the Illinois Chamber of Commerce support this legislation?"

Mautino: "That's a very interesting question. I don't quite understand the opposition that they have to this legislation. For example, I have accepted an Amendment, the Amendment from the General Electric, which is a private employer in the State of Illinois, to correct the situation on Unemployment Compensation and holiday pay. That's a part of this legislation, General Electric's Amendment. I...I don't know if General Electric, for example, is a member of the Chamber of Commerce but I would think that they are. I have in this legislation the recommendations and needs of the subcontractors and construction industry. Now I don't know if they're members of the Chamber of Commerce or not but I would assume that they are. I also have in this legislation the recommendations of the Small Business Association or retail merchants that came to me. Now, I don't know if they're members of the Chamber of Commerce, maybe they're not high paying members of the Chamber of Commerce, maybe



that's why they don't support this legislation... I'll answer your question, you've asked it. The private sector is considered in here very greatly. All right? And if the Chamber does not support it that's entirely up to them, but the point is, many of their Members support the changes that are in this legislation."

Simms: "Well, the official position of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce is, am I correct in assuming that they are in opposition to House Bill 3177?"

Mautino: "I've read some news releases, or what do you call it, that yellow sheet that we get, that their position was unopposed. They have not talked to me about this legislation before they put out that yellow sheet."

Simms: "That's all I'd like to know. Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

McMaster: "Representative Mautino, I see in the analysis that you're excluding several types of public employees, the jurors, the election judges, volunteer firemen, students employed during summer vacation, members of county zoning commissions, is that still in the Bill?"

Mautino: "Yes, Sir. I've excluded them at the request of the cities and townships and counties and municipal governments, yes Sir."

McMaster: "Dick, isn't it also true that Representative Yourell has another Bill that does exactly the same thing?"

Mautino: "That...His Bill was incorporated in this...in this Amendment. That is his legislation."

McMaster: "Where then has his Bill gone to? "

Mautino: "Pardon?"

McMaster: "Where has his Bill gone to then?"

Mautino: "His Bill didn't get out of Rules, if I remember correctly."

McMaster: "Well I think it would be un...well I understand what you're doing. You're trying to put a club over our heads that says in order to exclude these people we've got to accept the other things that you're trying to do, Dick. I think it's rather interesting to see so many Members from the other side of the aisle get up and admit



the mistakes that you people made in 1975 when you so greatly extended Unemployment Compensation benefits. I'm glad that you have finally come to your senses and realize what you have done to business in the State of Illinois. Unfortunately, I don't think that you're going to do it with this legislation to correct all that, Dick. But I'm certainly glad that you people finally realized your errors, you admit your errors and recognize that something has got to be done. I commend you for that but I don't think that you're going to get my vote on this Bill, Dick."

Mautino: "Tom, in answer to your remarks, if I may, Senate Bill 6, which included all public employees, left this House of Representatives I think with around 126 or 128 votes. That means...at least that many. That means that Members of both sides of the aisle supported that particular piece of legislation...."

McMaster: "Well, Dick, I'm not talking about the public employees that we passed last fall, we know we did that and we know it was bipartisan. What I'm talking about is the 1975 legislation, which you did not address in your reply to me."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you finished, Mr. McMaster?"

McMaster: "Oh, I suppose for the time being anyhow, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Good. The Gentleman from Cook, Jim Houlihan."

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

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think everyone knows what we're talking about at this point. I've tried to answer all the questions that were presented to me and address Unemployment Compensation which needed changes that are needed in our system. I would like to point out that Senate Bill 1744 did not pass the Senate and it died this morning, so therefore, this is a piece of legislation and I think if you want to make changes this will be your opportunity to do so. Corrective changes in the area of fraud and for the small business



people in municipalities, the general business person in the State of Illinois and still give adequate benefits to the workers in the State of Illinois. I ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 'aye', 60 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, for the purpose of an announcement."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of you who have picked up Senate Bills and desire that they be heard this Session should go into the Speaker's Office and secure the necessary forms for you to be heard next Thursday afternoon or next Friday morning, before the House Rules Committee to get a petition for exemption for them to be heard at this Session. It is not anticipated that there will be any meetings of the House Rules Committee after next Friday. You will have the responsibility of having your Senate Bills heard this coming week or it may very well not have any other opportunity to be heard this Session. So please, get into the Speaker's Office and get from Nancy the necessary forms, get it filed and then you'll have an opportunity to be heard next Thursday or Friday. This is on Senate Bills that you have picked up as a House Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "Those forms are also available here in the well. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "On that issue, I was not aware that we needed a petition for Senate Bills. I know they're a help to the Members of the Rules Committee but I thought it was taken for granted that anything that comes over from the Senate goes to Rules Committee and the Rules Committee acts on all of those Bills. Isn't that true, or not?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Well, the Senate has been maintaining an independent posture with regard to House Bills, Mr. Matijevich, and we want to maintain the



same independent posture. And we have been considering independently Senator's Bills just like we do House Members Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake."

Matijevich: "Well, it's all right to have an independent posture as long as it's in our rules. But I wasn't aware that that was in our rules, to petition on the Senate Bills."

Katz: "I'll be glad to discuss it with the Parliamentarian, but it is the procedure we have been following, Mr. Matijevich, to... special clearance of the Rules Committee on Senate Bills as well as House Bills."

Matijevich: "Okay."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bills, Third Reading, now appears House Bill 3190."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3190. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Houlihan, are you handling this Bill? The Gentleman from Cook, Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3190 would enact a new Act entitled the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act. Essentially, it would require contracts of Executive State Agencies for professional services involving more than five thousand dollars to be negotiated with prequalified individuals or firms. It also establishes procedures and criteria for the qualifications of interested individuals in firms. It prohibits finders fees contingent upon the award of professional conduct or professional contracts and makes related Amendments to the Illinois Purchasing Act. Amendments adopted to the Act specifically include leases in addition to contracts for professional services. Specifically, excludes Legislative and the Judicial Branches of Government. It requires that there be a disclosure of...of political contributions by the individual or firm for a two year period prior to the awarding of either a contract or a lease and emphasizes that the Act will not create an interference with existing or proposed affirmative action programs underway by the different Executive Branch agencies. That's what the Bill does. The purpose of it is to assure that quality



work is obtained for the state at the lowest possible costs and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand idly and watched this Bill brought back several times to be amended. I'm a little skeptical about the Bill. I know, as I said before, that in 29 years of public office I have never been able to get any professional people to bid against one another and I don't know whether this is just aimed at the Executive Branch of our...of the second floor, that he can't hire any professional people now without this. I don't know of any engineers or any professional people that would bid against one another. Somehow or other I feel that this is a shell Bill and I can't find what's wrong with it but I know it's...there's something very, very bad about this Bill and I can't just quite put my finger on it."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Telcser: "Representative, as I understand it, this Bill provides that an agency who want...an agency in the Executive Branch who wants to hire an attorney or any kind of a professional person has to prequalify them before they can bid on work for the agency or go to work for the agency? Is that the idea of the Bill?"

Houlihan: "Yes. There has...there would be three qualification procedures and criteria established by each of the individual agencies setting forth first of all what the professional experience and qualifications of the individual are and a contract for professional services and also setting forth what are in relation thereto, what are the needs of the particular state agency."

Telcser: "I couldn't hear everything you said, Representative, but ... If someone is an attorney, a licensed attorney to practice are you then saying that in...there are instances where licensed attorneys are not qualified to practice law?"



Houlihan: "Every attorney licensed in the state is licensed to practice law, obviously. But in setting forth that, obviously, as far as the attorney if that is your example, would be a fundamental requirement that he must be licensed to practice in the State of Illinois. What would be relevant though to the particular agency would be what has been..... the professional experience of the individual who seeks to engage into a contract for professional services with the agency. Additionally, that experience would have to be related to what are the particular needs of the agency as established by the agency for the work it seeks to engage the individual for."

Telcser: "Representative, and this only covers the Executive agencies?"

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could I speak to the Bill?"

Houlihan: "Proceed."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm really in a quandry in this piece of legislation. I'm not quite sure just what the ideology of it is. I must make the assumption that there have been instances where it have been discovered that people have been given contracts to do work for various Executive agencies, who weren't qualified. The Gentleman didn't say that but I assume that that's implicit in the thrust of the Bill. I am concerned, however, that the Bill only includes the Executive and doesn't include even our own hiring practices. We in the Legislature hire many attorneys for a great many areas of the work in which we're involved and in addition to that, I'm surprised that the Gentleman didn't also cover municipal governments. The City of Chicago must hire certainly as many people as does the state to do work and yet I'm not aware, and if I'm wrong I'd be delighted to be corrected, I'm not aware of any prequalification rules or regulations or ordinances which apply to the City of Chicago. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the way this Bill is drafted I think the intent is fine, it may serve a useful purpose, but it seems to me it has a very narrow base directed at one aspect of government and leaves out many, many



governmental units or bodies who ought to have the same rules that we have in this state for its Executive Branch. Time and time again over the years I have seen, as I know you have, the various pieces of legislation in the area of ethics, reform or what have your, and they always seem to be directed toward that part of government which is under the direction of the political party, the political individual with whom you are going to be in a contest with. I suspect the Bill is politically motivated and I really think that the Gentleman ought to at least make us a promise that before this Bill becomes law, if it does pass the House, he would have the Senate Sponsors amend it to include the City of Chicago and include every branch of government."

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

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

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

Geo-Karis: "Representative, you say that contracts...this Bill would require contracts of state agencies for professional services involving more than five thousand dollars be negotiated with prequalified individuals or firms, is that correct? Will you tell us how they can prequalify themselves?"

Houlihan: "I'm sorry, what is your question?"

Geo-Karis: "My question is, when you say that contracts to state agencies for professional services involving more than five thousand dollars must be negotiated with prequalified individuals or firms: Will you give me an example please of what you mean by prequalified? How do they get prequalified? How do they become prequalified?"

Houlihan: "Well the state agency would determine the criteria for prequalification in each instance."

Geo-Karis: "Well that's not what is...shown in your Bill. What is the criteria?"

Houlihan: "I suggest to you that it is shown in the Bill. If you'd like I'll give you the specific..."

Geo-Karis: "Would you quote it to me, please?"

Houlihan: "All right. Under Amendment #3, which is at page 11 and it runs from line 5 through 18."



Geo-Karis: "But your Bill says that... But there's nothing, I don't see anything in here that says how they're prequalified. Are you saying to me that the agency decides whether they're qualified or prequalified? Is that what you're saying, Representative?"

Houlihan: "Let me...let me, if I may because this may make it clearer and I'll refer specifically to the language of the Bill. In a relevant part it provides that each state agency shall adopt administrative procedures for the evaluation of professional services, including but not limited to the capabilities, adequacy of personnel, past record and experience and such other factors as may be determined by the agency to be applicable to its particular requirements."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "I think, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I think we're in the unusual posture of saying that because we have two medical men who have graduated with the same degrees, have the same number of years of practice, even if one is not as competent as the other as long as he bids less he gets the contract. You can not legislate talent. Professional services involve a great amount of talent. You have a great amount of talent in a doctor, a dentist, a lawyer, an architect, etc. I feel this Bill would be a bad Bill. And in our effort to save pennies we're going to be spending millions of dollars very unwisely. And therefore, I speak against the Bill on the basis that you can not legislate talent, like this Bill is trying to do."

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

Nardulli: "I move the previous question."

Nardulli: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Dan Houlihan, to conclude."

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

I think what the Bill will provide will be true to its purpose, is to



assure that quality work is obtained for the state at the lowest possible cost. The criticism of the Bill, the only real criticism as addressed by Mr. Telcser, to the effect that the Bill does not go far enough. I suggest that this is a start in the right direction. We see that it is achieving the purpose of the Bills, we'll be happy to introduce subsequent legislation. The need is there and I think the need of public disclosure and the fact to insure that the state and the Executive Branch will obtain quality work at the lowest possible cost is an ideal that we should be addressing in this legislative Session and I move for the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mann, 'aye'. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis. What purpose do you rise? The Lady requests a verification of the Roll. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'aye', 60 'nay', 12 voting 'present'. The Lady from Lake requests a verification. And the Gentleman from Cook requests a poll of the absentees. And the Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams. Jane Barnes. Bluthardt. Campbell. Collins..."

Speaker Bradley: "Campbell, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deavers. Friedrich. Hart. Kempiners. Laurino. Luft. Madison."

Speaker Bradley: "Madison 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Molloy."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "I think that to save time I will withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Continue with the poll of the absentees. The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Will you please change my vote from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Change the Lady's vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Oh, from 'aye' to 'nay'? 'aye' to 'nay'."



Clerk O'Brien: "Molloy. Schuneman. No further."

Speaker Bradley: "Starting with 91 'aye'. Call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley.
Brandt. Brady, then Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Members, be in your seats and raise your hand when
your name is called so they can see that you're here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Breslin. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers.
Caldwell. Capparelli. Chapman. Darrow. Corneal Davis.
Dawson. DiPrima."

Speaker Bradley: "Could Representative Davis be verified? You're verified
Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn.
Friedland. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan.
Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J. M. Houlihan. Huff.
Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz.
Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Lechowicz. Leverenz.
Levin. Lucco. Madigan. Madison. Mann. Marovitz. Peggy Smith
Martin. Matejek. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew.
McLendon. McPike. Mudd. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy.
Nardulli. O'Brien. Pechous. Pouncey. Richmond. Robinson.
Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Schumpert.
Skinner. Steczow. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Tipsword.
Van Duyn. Vitek. VonBoeckman. R.V. Walsh. Willer. Williams.
Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the affirmative?"

Schlickman: "Representative Eugene Barnes."

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

Schlickman: "Representative John Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Beatty is not in his seat, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Schlickman: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Brummer is in the chambers."

Schlickman: "Brummet. Representative Brummet? He's in the rear of the
chambers."



Schlickman: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Bradley: "Byers is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Dawson is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Schlickman: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Bradley: "Domico is in the chambers."

Schlickman: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Friedland."

Speaker Bradley: "Friedland. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Giglio, right here by the well."

Schlickman: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "Hanahan is not in his chair. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Schlickman: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Bradley: "Harris. Here's Tom Hanahan, put him back on.

Representative Harris is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Emil Jones. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Schlickman: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Bradley: "Leverenz is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "McClain is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"



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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off and Representative Beatty has returned to the chambers, put him back on the Roll Call."

Schlickman: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "McGrew is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Mudd."

Speaker Bradley: "Mudd is not in his seat."

Schlickman: "Yes he is...he's in the center aisle. Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Bradley: "O'Brien is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Richmond is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Terzich."

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

Schlickman: "Representative Ciglio."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the aisle."

Schlickman: "Yeah, I'm sorry, that's a repetition, I apologize."
What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "We have 84 'aye'..."

Schlickman: "I have not further questions, Mr. Speaker."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Kane as 'aye' and Mr. Emil Jones has returned to the chamber, put him back on. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Luft, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. And the Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "I vote from 'present' to 'aye', please."



Speaker Bradley: "He wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Christensen.

On this question there are 89 'aye' and 62 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3205."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3205. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3205 deals with part of the problem of the current crisis at Cook County Hospital. While it's a financial and a staffing crisis there is a problem of a great deal of lag time in terms of Public Aid reimbursing Cook County Hospital which has had some dire financial consequences on the hospital's ability to meet its budget requirements. What this legislation does is to deal with the main situation, the person who is not eligible for Public Aid but who is medically eligible and provides for a precertification procedure. The Tribune just last week editorialized in support of this legislation. Today, we have reached an agreement with the Department of Public Aid in a form of an Amendment which removes Public Aid's opposition to this legislation. Because of our rules prohibiting amending and passage of legislation on this same day, we can not put the Amendment on at this time. I am, however, making the commitment that I have made to Public Aid, directly, that this Amendment which has been agreed to will be put on in the Senate. I have talked to the Senate Sponsor of a comparable Bill who will be handling this Bill if it's passed out of this chamber. He's agreed to put that Amendment on. I urge the passage of this legislation at this point."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "I apologize, but I did not hear the explanation of the Amendment that you're committed to. Would you please describe it to me?"

Levin: "The Amendment provides a procedure whereby the doctors at Cook



County Hospital or the...clinic can certify that they believe that a particular patient will be in need of an operation and medical care in a hospital within 40 days. That certification then goes to Public Aid, who does a preliminary analysis. They obviously can not tell at that point whether the person will be financially eligible because that will be determined at the time of being in the hospital. But they will make all of the other determinations and if that person is indeed hospitalized within the 40 days then they will be in a position to make the medical...the financial determination and to immediately certify to Cook County Hospital that persons eligibility."

Schlickman: "Now under your Bill someone who anticipates that he or she will subsequently be in need of medical assistance must prequalify, is that correct?"

Levin: "Under the Bill in its current form, yes."

Schlickman: "Now, what happens when a person prequalifies but...and on the basis of that prequalification subsequently receives medical assistance, but subsequently it's been determined that at the time that individual received medical assistance that individual was not qualified?"

Levin: "Representative Schlickman, if I may just address myself to the Amendment, the agreed to Amendment...cause I think..."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, we've got to address the Bill as it's presently before us. We can't assume that there will be an Amendment because it will be out of the control of this House. And I think this Bill has got to go up or down based on its content as it's presently before us. And I'm asking you, under the Bill as it's presently before us, what happens when a person has received medical assistance on the basis of prequalification and subsequently the rendering of that service...the receipt of that service, it's been determined that at the time of receipt or rendering of that service the person was not qualified."

Levin: "Well under the Bill, in it's original form, makes no changes whatsoever in eligibility requirements. There are no exceptions, there are no special circumstances. That person is still asked to



meet every single requirement. All the Bill does is sets up a procedure where there can be a determination before the fact, as far as whether or not there's eligibility on every point except financial. Obviously, you can not determine if a person is going to be medically indigent until you see what the hospital bills are and what his problems are at the point when he's in the hospital. But, neither the Bill in its present form or the Amendment makes any changes whatsoever in anybody's eligibility requirement."

Schlickman: "That isn't my question, Representative. My question is this and I'll restate it, we assume at a point in time a person anticipating the subsequent need of service, medical service, will qualify. Subsequently, that person, based on this prequalification, receives medical service. I'm asking you, what happens if it is subsequently determined that at the time of receiving medical service the person was not qualified, lost its qualification?"

Levin: "Well the purpose of the precertification is to allow a period of time to do an adequate determination of whether or not that person is qualified. To go out to the persons house, if necessary, to verify records and so on. All...what the Bill does is it provides that this should take place as much as possible in advance rather than after the fact. I don't quite follow, Gene, what your question is."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have a Bill here which would allow people to prequalify for medical assistance with no assurance that at the time they receive the medical assistance that they are in a continued state of qualification. And as a consequence there would be, undoubtedly, individuals who under this Bill would receive medical service but not having qualified for it. An unnecessary and unwarranted expenditure of state funds. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this procedure would impose upon the Department of Public Aid, duplication. It would have to determine a individuals qualification prior to receiving



medical service and would have to determine a persons qualification subsequent to receiving medical service. I think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on two counts this Bill is deficient. Number one, it will open the door to fraud and number two, it will impose more administrative burden upon the Department of Public Aid. And on those basis, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to close."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Body, we have a real, very real crisis at Cook County Hospital. One, that the Chicago Tribune, which is not prone to be particularly spendthrift with state money, recognizes as a problem and also sees the need for passage of legislation of this kind, having specifically endorsed this Bill. After rather extensive dialogue with Public Aid, which initially was very concerned about the breadth of the proposal, the financial impact and of some of the questions that Gene had raise, we have worked out an agreement. I make the commitment that the Amendment that Public Aid today gave us with ... will be put on in the Senate. I think this is the way the legislative process works. I would have liked to be able to put the Amendment on. If Public Aid had been able to come to us yesterday or the day before we could have done it. Unfortunately, it was only this morning that Mr. Rakov and Dick Buckley came into my office and we were able to work out this, and it's on this basis that I ask for approval of this legislation at this point."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3205 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco... Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, to explain his vote. Shut your light off, Elmer? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Yes, Ma'am. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. What this Bill does is to say that people have to prequalify for medical



assistance so that if they don't have a green card they can go to County Hospital and get medical treatment and then County Hospital will be reimbursed. The problem now is that they can go there and get medical treatment but then there's really no way to compel them to come in and fill out all the forms that need to be filled out so that County Hospital can get the reimbursement to which it is legitimately entitled. This would set up a program which to many people who are not on Public Aid who are really the borderline non-welfare poor do support because they understand the need to keep our hospital going that help people in my kind of a legislative district. But they don't support it to the extent that they're willing to go there and fill out the papers once they're well and out of the hospital. But they do understand the need for doing this and it is a good program, we do need it so that we can find one more way to keep..."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is good legislation. Sheriff Elrod called me on this legislation. They've had a difficult time at the jail because of the people that have been receiving medical assistance and the Department of Public Aid has been in contact with the Sheriff of Cook County and they have a very serious problem. And the Department has been paying grants for which people have not been entitled to. The Department of Public Aid is in favor of this legislation, it will save money and I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've closed the board."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I didn't see your light until just now, I'm sorry, Sir."

Madison: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was in Committee when Doctor Horton from Cook County Hospital testified for this Bill. This Bill



seeks to alleviate, at least for Cook County Hospital, one of the basic problems that they are having in terms of their billing. As Doctor Horton explained, an individual comes into Cook County Hospital, he receives treatment and then they must determine whether or not he qualifies for Public Aid. If the individual fails to fill out the forms for whatever reason after he's received the treatment and left and gone home, that hospital is not reimbursed for the medical services rendered. That's not fair to County Hospital and yet it happens. A prequalification situation would at least let the Department of Public Aid know in advance if the individual is qualified. The billing procedure for Cook County Hospital would be speeded up and the cash flow problems that the hospital is having would at least in part be solved. I would hope we would support this legislation. I am proud to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino. Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, I'd like to have a poll of the absentees, so would Representative Levin."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Clerk will poll the absentees, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams. Jane Barnes. Bianco. Bluthardt."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Bianco 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Collins. Friedrich. Hart. Dave Jones. Leverenz. McAuliffe. McBroom. Miller. Mulcahey. Stearney. Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Stearney as 'no'. Mrs. Dyer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Dyer: "Please change that 'no' to 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'aye'. Kindly record Representative McAuliffe as 'no'. Mr. Sandquist."



Sandquist: "Aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Sandquist as 'aye'. Mr. Margalus.

Kindly change Mr. Margalus from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Van Dwyne as 'aye'. Mr. Pechous as 'aye'. Mrs. Geo-Karis, are you seeking recognition? 'aye'. Mrs. Geo-Karis. You did put down Mr. Pechous, I hope? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, are you seeking recognition?"

Pullen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like a verification, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "At the appropriate time."

Pullen: "Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jake Wolfe 'no', please. Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "Change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Christensen as 'aye'. What's our count, Jack? On this question there are 94 'aye', 67 'no'. You did record Representative Van Dwyne as 'aye', didn't you? Representative Winchester? 'Aye'. Kindly record Mr. Winchester as 'aye'. That's 95 then, right Jack? Does the Lady persist in her verification? Mrs. Pullen requests... Leverenz... Kindly record Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'. That's 96. And the Lady persists in her request for a verification. The Clerk will proceed to call the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Antonovych. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would everyone kindly be in your own respective seats? You know...everyone be in their own respective seats, kindly respond in the proper manner by raising your hand when your name is called. The Clerk will proceed to verify the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Catania."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schlickman"

Schlickman: "Would you ask the real Speaker to lead his troops from the center aisle so we can see, with all due respect."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The real Speaker has always been a model of efficiency. Please proceed."



Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman. Christensen. Darrow. Corneal Davis.
 Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Dyer. Ewell. Farley.
 Flinn. Gaines. Garnisa. Geo-Karis. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi.
 Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J.M. Houlihan.
 Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Kelly.
 Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz.
 Leverenz. Levin. Lucco. Madigan. Madison. Mann. Margalus.
 Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijeovich. McClain.
 McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Mudd. Mugalian. Murphy. Nardulli.
 O'Brien. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Richmond. Robinson.
 Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp.
 Shumpert. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich.
 VanDuyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. R.V. Walsh. Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr...Mr. Macon:...the
 Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Macon votes 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Macon and Dunn vote 'aye'. The Gentleman from
 Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Change my vote to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Winchester. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, are there any
 questions of the affirmative vote?"

Pullen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Bradley, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bradley? Representative Bradley, how is the Gentleman
 recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "And he's right here."

Pullen: "Representative Brummet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummet, in the back."

Pullen: "Representative Caldwell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Caldwell. How is the Gentleman
 recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Caldwell in the chamber? Kindly remove



Mr. Caldwell."

Pullen: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman is here."

Pullen: "Representative Ewell, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ray Ewell. Ray Ewell. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Representative Ewell in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Pullen: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is in his chair."

Pullen: "Representative Gaines."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Gaines is here."

Pullen: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa is in his chair."

Pullen: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Dan Houlihan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is right here, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane is in his...by his chair."

Pullen: "Representative Kornowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kornowicz is in his chair."

Pullen: "Representative Kozubowski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Pullen: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino's in the back of the corridor...back of the hall here."

Pullen: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leverenz. There he is."

Pullen: "Representative Mann."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mann is in his chair."

Pullen: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Ma'am."



Pullen: "Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Marovitz is in the chamber."

Pullen: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McClain is in his chair."

Pullen: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. O'Brien. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Steczo over there? Terry...Okay, I just couldn't see over there. How is the Gentleman, the Gentleman is recorded as 'aye'. Is Mr. O'Brien in the chamber? Kindly take him off the record."

Pullen: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Richmond. Is Representative Richmond in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see the Gentleman. Take him off the record."

Pullen: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Van Duyne. He's in his chair, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "VonBoeckman. Representative James VonBoeckman. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Representative VonBoeckman in the chamber? Spark? I don't see the Gentleman. Take him off the record."

Pullen: "No more questions, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. R. Walsh. Mr. R. Walsh, please. I'm sorry."

Walsh: "I'd like to change my vote to 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'no'. Mr. Mulcahey.

Kindly record Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Who? Mr. Molloy. Mr. Molloy, please. Kindly record Mr. Molloy as 'aye'. Was Representative Hanahan questioned? How many? What's the count, Mr. Clerk?

On this question there are 94 'aye', 67 'no'. This Bill, having received



the Constitutional Majority...and put Representative VonBoeckman on, he's back... This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3219."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3219. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to Clerks of Courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill does three things. The first is to increase the fee for filing confession of judgements in all counties. These fees were not increased in 1977 when other fees in the Act were revised. The fees consist...the people filing a case seeking a judgement of confession should consist of the fee for filing the complaint, plus the appearance fee, since this type of action contains both elements. To facilitate the processing cases in which the amount does not exceed 1,000 and those which exceed 1,000 are specified. This increase is ten dollars and fifteen dollars, respectively. The second change in this Bill makes...is to provide that in counties over one million that no fee under the Act shall be charged to any unit of state government. Units of local government are already exempt. This change makes the provision apply to counties over one million identical to the provisions applying to counties under one million. The third change makes this Bill...by this Bill is to remove any unnecessary Home Rule Amendment to a Section and the Act dealing with them...a Clerk begins his duties. The state courts have ruled that the language being removed is both unnecessary and confusing. There is no substantive impact of this change. The language being removed was originally put to protect against an inadvertent preemption of home rule power. This Bill was recommended by the Clerk of the Circuit Court and I would urge your support of House Bill 3219."

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

Leinenweber: "Some questions for the Sponsor."

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

Leinenweber: "As I understand it the Bill, the principal portion of the



Bill increases the cost of filing confession of judgement, is that right?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "It goes from 20 to 30 for under 1,000 dollars and 40 to 55 for over 1,000 dollars?"

Terzich: "That's correct." That's an increase of 10 dollars and 15 dollars and accordingly, from the Clerk of the Circuit Court, as I mentioned before that this represents the fees which are consistent with the filing charges."

Leinenweber: "You mean for suits that are not confession suits?"

Terzich: "Well, it states that to apply for fees to be paid for cases involving judgements by confessions. The charge is omitted through an error in the most recent statutes on fees properly reflect...the practice in the past. The fee for filing on a case seeking a judgement by confession should consist of the fee for the filing, the complaint, plus the appearance fee, since this type of action contains both elements."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly on this Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Leinenweber: "Last term we did raise the filing fees for civil actions in Circuit Courts throughout the state and I received, personally, a lot of complaints because of the substantial costs now for maintaining an action, particularly a small one of 1,000 dollars or less. When you have a confession case, true, you do not have at least right off the bat any sheriff's fees but 30 dollars for a suit which may be 500 dollars plus later to have to serve a summons in order to prove up a judgement so that a wage deduction can be taken will greatly increase the cost for collecting money. Now this is passed on by the collection agency or by the creditors because this will be taxed on as cost in addition to the judgement. But it...it hurts both the creditor and the debtor. The debtor, because his...by increasing the cost you increase the amount of his debt, the creditor because you greatly increase the amount of money it costs him to collect money that is justly due him. I think that we probably went overboard two years ago and



just because this one didn't get included I don't think we should necessarily continue to go overboard. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, to close."

Terzich: "Well yes, Mr. Speaker, all this Bill does is bring it in line with all the other prechanges that the fees that they're requesting to perform this function are both reasonable and necessary to provide the services in the county. And therefore, I would urge your support. And again, it's nothing more than it was similar to previous legislation that was passed. It is needed and necessary and I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3219 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 129 'aye', 11 'nay', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3227."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3227. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3227 amends the Medical Practice Act. And the Bill has the approval of the Illinois State Medical Society and the Department of Registration and Education. In 1975 we established a Medical Disciplinary Board and at the same time the...Medical Disciplinary Fund was created in order to pay the expenses of the operation of the Medical Disciplinary Board. The fund consists of fees that are used from the...collected from the license renewals of physicians. However, in creating the Act we neglected to provide that the relicensure of physicians, the expense of relicensing physicians would be covered in this fund. Since this year there are a number of physicians to be licensed it's necessary that we allow this language so the expense of their relicensure can be covered. I would ask approval of this Bill."



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

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Schlickman: "How much is expected to be in this fund by the end of this fiscal year, June 30?"

Stiehl: "A million sixty thousand dollars."

Schlickman: "How much...that's the balance that will be in the fund by the end of this year?"

Stiehl: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Okay, what's the cost for administering the disciplinary board? The annual cost?"

Stiehl: "In Fiscal '78 it was one hundred and seventy four thousand dollars."

Schlickman: "So there's sufficient money in that fund to take care of the board as well as the other administrative duties? Thank you very much."

Stiehl: "There will still be nine hundred and fifty thousand left."

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

Bowman: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Bowman: "What is the money currently being used for... I'm sorry, was that covered by Representative Schlickman's question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I don't believe she heard your question."

Bowman: "Okay. What is the money currently collected by these fees used for?"

Stiehl: "For the Medical Disciplinary Board and its operations. To hire qualified, experienced investigators to investigate any complaints against physicians as far as malpractice or malfeasance in office."

Bowman: "Well a further question, if you please, is there any assurance that that particular part of the departments operations will not be starved for lack of funds in the future? It seems to me that's a very important operation of the Department."

Stiehl: "No, Representative Bowman, absolutely not. Because at the time the Medical Disciplinary Board was established at the request of the physicians in Illinois, their license fees were doubled in order to pay for it. They feel very strongly about this Medical



Disciplinary Fund and the necessity of it. There's just a very small amount that will be used to cover the expense of their relicensure. The fees that are collected from them are to be used for these specific purposes. There will still be nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars left in the fund. Every other year large amounts of money from this relicensure is transferred into the fund. And as far as...it seeks the amount of money necessary."

Bowman: "By...by what amount? By what amount does the transfer of funding...of money into the fund exceed the amount which is necessary? Say...the last time there was relicensure, what..."

Stiehl: "Well, it will cost about one hundred and sixty thousand dollars in 1979."

Bowman: "To maintain the disciplinary investigators?"

Stiehl: "No, for the relicensure."

Bowman: "Oh, that's how much it will cost for relicensure? I see.

Then we're talking about taking in what, nearly a million dollars?"

Stiehl: "Yes."

Bowman: "And spending a hundred and sixty for the relicensure process itself?"

Stiehl: "Yes, that's in '79 and two hundred and fifty-nine thousand eight hundred dollars for the operation of the Medical Disciplinary Board."

Bowman: "Okay, lastly, if this Bill were to become law would there be any other item on which the monies could be spent?"

Stiehl: "No. The money is spent for this, for the operation of the board and for the continuing education of physicians. And that's all."

Bowman: "Wait a minute, continuing education of physicians is not in there right now, is it? I mean that money can't be spent for that purpose, can it?"

Stiehl: "No."

Bowman: "Okay, well how much is that going to cost? I thought the relicensure process cost one hundred and sixty thousand dollars. How much do you anticipate the department will need to spend on continuing education for physicians?"



Stiehl: "Oh, that's not in here. That will be in next years appropriation."

Bowman: "Well, then they'll...well, okay, if I can speak to the
Bill Mr...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Bowman: "Okay, I won't take the time of the House for further questions.

I do admit, however, I'm a little confused and perhaps the Lady in closing can clarify it. The...I, at the present time plan to vote against this, only because I would like to see the division that polices the medical profession receive as much in the way of revenues that they need to do their job properly. And I don't see why we need to divert monies away from that purpose. I could possible see covering the cost of relicensing itself, but when we're talking about continuing education I become a little puzzled and view that as a possibility of...of a open-ended type of program which could drain off monies which would be necessary for the policing of the profession. And unless I could be satisfied at that point I would vote 'no' on this."

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

Van Duyne: "Would the Lady yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Van Duyne: "Cissy, as I understand it, this money as originally...was designed for the State Medical Disciplinary Board, right? And somehow you accumulated a surplus of money in here and now you want to cut this out?"

Stiehl: "No. Representative Van Duyne, I was the Sponsor of the legislation that created the Medical Disciplinary Board and the physicians in Illinois felt very strongly that they needed this and they had to have this. So, in drafting the legislation we neglected to provide because we transferred this money and set up this special fund. The physicians increased their licenses...the cost of relicensing to cover this fund. But however, in doing this we neglected to put into the legislation that it would also cover the expense of relicensing physicians. Now the Illinois State Medical Society has asked for this. They feel that this is absolutely and important to them that it would in no way at all



weaken the fund."

Van Duyne: "Am I wrong in my understanding that you are deleting this charge?"

Stiehl: "Deleting what?"

Van Duyne: "You are cutting out the fee, right?"

Stiehl: "Oh no, in no way, no way at all. We're keeping the fee and the fee is to be used primarily for the operations of the Medical Disciplinary Board. But in addition it will be used for the cost of relicensing physicians, which is minimal."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Lady from St. Clair to close."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we have discussed this at length and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3227 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty. I didn't see your light, Mike. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 156 'aye', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3259."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3259. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I can imagine that most of the Members realize the magic numbers of House Bill 3259. I would like to just briefly go over the Bill to indicate to the Members the posture in which the Bill is in currently. Right now the Bill is in the same posture it was in as of two days ago, with the exception of some Amendments. We've discussed it at many lengths and on more than one occasion here. Amendment #14, which in fact changed the Bill to do various things that were discussed the other day... it sets up the revenue schedule, it sets out the corporations, it sets out the special tax on municipalities. It sets out the formula for the distribution. It sets out the regional corporations



and delineates the power of the regional corporations. It sets out the make-up and how the board will be selected. And in addition it makes other various changes relative to the corporations. We had in addition to that several Amendments which I will go through right now. These Amendments was added to the Bill and in terms of its caricature these are now included as the basic part of the Bill. Amendment 17 established a system of referendum throughout the counties. Amendment 19 changed the manner in which the funding would go relative to the common school fund. Amendment 21 required the corporation to undergo an annual independent audit. Amendment 22 prohibited any adverse advertisement. Amendment #25 provided any...prohibited any regional corporation activity relative to construction and investing in the construction of a sports complex. Amendment 29 requires that at the end of each month the corporation must pay a equal amount to .05 percent of the total handle at the off-track betting facilities to the municipalities in which...in which the tracks are located. Amendment 32... Amendment 32 changed the language relative to the municipalities to insure that all of the residents of the regions would have a voice in selection. Amendment #36 added that the employees for the corporations and the municipalities in which the corporations are located will be...will supply qualified persons for those facilities. Amendment #37, the final Amendment, added language that the Bureau of Race Track Security would provide the...investigative and legislative service for the off-track betting facilities.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is, as I have indicated from day one, the proposal that I have put forth with help and additions from many Members of this House to set out an alternative way of raising money for the much overtaxed and overburdened local municipalities. And the...with the concurrence of the Members of this House and with the directions of the Members of this House that has been somewhat changed in that much of those funds now will go toward the common school fund. As you know, I have always been supportive of that concept, I've always been supportive of the common school fund, but I also support O.T.B., in the sense that it



will give and afford hard pressed local communities to have an additional tool or an additional alternative to raising money for the operation for those local communities. This is...is not a mandatory type program. There are many safeguards that have been included and embodied in this legislation to insure that those communities...that these facilities would be located in will be selective. They will have that choice, they will have to agree and we have built in those protections. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that in all due respect to many of my colleagues that have raised some questions relative to the morality of this whole question of O.T.B. I think that those questions were better addressed and has been addressed on many occasions in this House, the various proposals that have come before us. I think that those questions are...was addressed when we decided long...many years ago to allow paramutual on-track... on-track betting in this state. I do not try to make a determination relative to what I think is a decision for each and every consenting adult...a decision that they would have to make. No minor, and I underline that, no minor would be able to partake in off-track betting facilities, same as no minor can partake in the home-track betting facilities. And I just don't think that it is, for me as a Member of this Body, to decide what a consenting adult should do relative to their decision on how they would like to spend their leisure time or how they should decide something of a moral question...that it's only something that they can decide themselves. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not going to prolong this. We know that many of you have had a great input to this program. I hope that that input was in such a way that you now support it. I realize that there are some that simply have opposition to this kind of a program on other issues, I respect that but I solicit to you...I want to close with this final note and some of the Members have inquired to me about it and I don't bring this in being facetious or anything of that type but you will find in today's newspaper the Governor of this state has indicated that he would like for this program to be continued, for



this to move out of this House, kept alive, moved into the Senate so we can further work on this proposal so that the benefits can adjure to the various local municipalities of this state. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit your 'aye' vote on House Bill 3259."

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

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for some questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Holewinski: "Thank you. Representative Barnes, do you now support this Bill in its entirety? All the provisions of the Bill as is amended?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes, please."

Barnes: "As I indicated in my opening statement, Representative, I support the Bill in toto. I believe that the concept is still there, the basic structure is still there, the major change, as I indicated, was in the change in the manner of the structure of...of how the money will be distributed. I do support the Bill. As I say, I yield to the wisdom of the House, the House has acted and in this instance I support the Bill in toto."

Holewinski: "Representative Barnes, then would you be willing to give the Members of this House a commitment that the Amendments that were adopted during the House proceedings will remain on in the Senate?"

Barnes: "The only commitment I can give to this House as a Member of this House to the best of my capability...I...I, Gene Barnes, will do nothing in the Senate to change this Bill."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, a couple of other questions about the financing, just so I'm clear. Representative Barnes, how again is the money to be distributed? How much goes in the common school fund and what other revenues go where?"

Barnes: "Approximately 40 million dollars, roughly, and this is estimated on a four hundred million dollar take in the year 1982. Approximately 40 million dollars would then go into the common school fund. All other funds is operational funds and is broken down in a similar manner



to the on-track betting breakdown now. Roughly 29.2 goes to industry...if you wait for just a second..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook... I'm sorry."

Barnes: "It breaks down roughly, with the exception of the 42...forty million that I...I alluded to, that approximately 700 thousand would go to the thoroughbred and standard breeders fund, approximately 17.25 million to the track, 12 million to the horsemen and that's about it."

Holewinski: "Well, Representative Barnes, one thing that I'm not clear about is, when we adopted Amendment #29 we provided that...for that 5 percent surcharge to go to the municipalities in which tracks are located. It says that the regional corporation must pay an amount equal to 5 percent. Where does that money come from?"

Barnes: "No, it's not 5 percent, I read it. It's .05 percent, approximately 200 thousand dollars, I am told, and I believe that that...that will go to the six cities that have facilities, on-track facilities, located in those facilities. That was Representative Jacob's Amendment, I believe, and that's part of the operation of the already existing facilities to take care of police, fire protection, so forth and so on."

Holewinski: "Representative Barnes, is that money that comes out of the dollars wagered because the way I read this it says a corporation must pay an amount equal to that one half of one percent, not that it shall pay one half of one percent of amounts wagered but rather an amount equal to. And what I'm asking you is if that is money that the regional corporation has to derive somewhere else? How do we get that money?"

Barnes: "No, it comes out of the wagers. And it, according to the information that Representative Jacobs indicated when he introduced the Amendment we concurred in, it would be approximately 200 thousand dollars a year."

Holewinski: "The provision, Representative Barnes, on phone calling and on setting up what is in effect an O.T.B. bank, can you tell us how you would envision that working? Is the O.T.B. Bank where people are going to deposit their funds and then call in their



wagers, going to pay interest on money?"

Barnes: "Representative, I'm not sure exactly how that will work.

Much of what is embodied here will be promulgated in conjunction with the racing board. I can give you benefits of my own personal research and to the only other operation of this type in the country and that's in New York State. That is, that provision was embodied and is embodied in the off-track betting procedures there and as late as last week my indication to New York is that that has very seldom, if ever, been used. And I don't anticipate a great deal of use of it here in Illinois."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Representative Barnes. Mr. Speaker, if I may address the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please, proceed."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, I have great reservations about this piece of legislation. To me, it looks like a Bill that is going to really, by which we are really passing the buck in our effort to look for increased revenues to support our government. What we are going to do by this piece of legislation is to, is exploit certain economic groups, certain groups of people, certain individuals in order that some masses who are non-betters will be spared a tax increase. Illinois, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you know, has had a tragic history with regard to the racing industry. It seems to me, strange, at this time, that we should look to building a gigantic bureaucracy without any experiment a gigantic bureaucracy that is bound to eventually be an embarrassment to us. This Bill has been creatively changed by Amendments, where in the past it probably would have resulted in the clobbering of suburban Republicans, the patronage provisions now will result in the clobbering of suburban Democrats. It is likely, Mr. Speaker, as has been the experience in New York, that this is going to result not in a decrease in book-making but in an increase in book-making and an increase in the intended crime. I'm surprised at the Governor's usual stand-up position on this legislation. What he's saying today, Mr. Speaker, is, 'I don't know yet.' What he's saying, Mr. Speaker, is, 'Let's leave this dangling so that we may use it as



a bargaining chip. I doubt that anyone would agree that that is a responsible position for the highest public official in this state to take. I think he ought to be ashamed of the equivocation on this issue. I think he ought to listen more to the business interests who have spoken ardently in opposition and I would ask my colleagues to seriously consider this vote and oppose this...the passage of this Bill."

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

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to coin a phrase of my good friend, Jane Barnes, the skids have been greased and I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative...."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'd appreciate...thank you very much. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and especially you, Representative Holewinski, I certainly share your concerns about what this Bill might do. I had to do an awful lot of soul searching before I start laundering this piece of legislation. Let me go back into the 50's. I voted against the legalize of Bingo, I voted against the Jai Alai Bill in 1959 and again the other day I voted against the Jai Alai. Because I think the State of Illinois is reaching a new low when we have to resort to gambling to educate our children. But let me tell you something, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, today in the City of Chicago you have Pechous Messenger Service, that 27 percent of the funds out of every dollar go to the people and 73 percent go into the pockets of some of these undesirables that we're concerned about. If the messenger Service is going to made... legalized by the Appellate Court, I am sick and tired of having the Appellate Court pass our legislation for us in this here House. Let's stand up and be counted, Let's legalize the off-track betting and make sure that the Illinois Department of Agency...the Law Enforcement Agency has control over this off-track betting. As long as the Appellate Court is going to decide that messenger service is legal I've heard all day long and all week long and for the last ten days how somebody is in the tank. Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen,



somebody is in the tank. We're only about 60 cents out of every dollar is being brought to the track. The State of Illinois is going in the tank for a lot of the paramutuals. The people who are betting in these messenger services are going into the tank, when they win the tickets are lost because of some of the people who are running messenger services in the State of Illinois today. Let's stand up and be counted. If you want legalized gambling in the State of Illinois, let's make sure that the state is regulating it. And I...to the best of my ability. I had a tough time trying to make up my mind on this piece of legislation but I was assured, Holewinski and I'm directing my remarks at you because you asked some pertinent questions. And these questions, I was assured that this bill will remain intact. And if it will not remain intact when it comes back from Conference Committee in the Senate... if the Illinois Supreme Court doesn't have the intestinal fortitude to rule gambling illegal in the State of Illinois, I will be the first to join you in voting against this piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel that no matter how many Amendments have been attached to this Bill the basic concept is still bad. I think it's a sad day for Illinois if we pass this O.T.B...off-track betting Bill. I say so because in so doing the state will put its seal of approval on yet another form of gambling. I feel that when this is fully implemented it will once again prey on the weaknesses of people. People who have a tendency to gamble. This is almost a disease with somebody...with some people and I feel the State of Illinois will be encouraging this bad habit, encouraging something that is destructive to some individuals and to some families. And it will do this in a very sophisticated way. It will do it statewide through its regional corporations. It will do it through sophisticated and corporate advertising. And I feel this to be wrong. I think the money arguments that it will bring to the State of Illinois, just as in the case of the lottery, is a phony argument. The amount will probably be something less than one percent of our total, as in the lottery. Less



than one percent of total revenues and income for the state. To hold up this idea as a boon to the schools I think is another fraud. I voted for this Amendment the other day and the more I thought about it, I was ashamed that I did, because what we're really doing is using what I think are bad means for the good end. And if I were to cast that vote again I would cast it 'no', because I think it's false and I think it's wrong to hold up to advance a bad idea for what is suppose to be desirable or good ends. Finally, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this will only add to crime. It will add another layer, I believe, of gambling in the State of Illinois, as those who would advance this type of gambling illegally would continue to do it. They will pay no heed to this legalized form but they will develop another layer and a fresh layer of gambling that will do the same thing but in an illegal form. I think all the way around, Ladies and Gentlemen and Mr. Speaker, this idea is a...is a bad one and I would urge you, my colleagues, to think seriously before you vote to implement this idea and put the state's seal of approval on it. Thank you."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...Mr. Speaker, may I have some order, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Mann: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've just been informed by Steven Schiller, the Executive Director of the Chicago Crime Commission, that a few moments ago the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois has granted leave to the Attorney General to appeal the ruling of the lower court on the messenger service case. So we had the syndicate before the messenger service case, we'll have it after the messenger service case. The only difference is that we'll spend two and a half million dollars of state money to advertise and to lure the poor, as they did in New York, with regard to this case. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen there's something that bothers me about this particular Bill. Because it's the last mile that we've walked in the last two years in which we have seen the emasculation of the third branch of government, the General Assembly. We heard the President of the



United States."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please, proceed, Sir."

Mann: "We heard the President of the United States say today, 'Consult your constituency.' He's in trouble because he came to Washington as an anti-Washingtonian who consulted his constituency and now he's left that premise. To every Member...incumbent Member of this House, outside of the City of Chicago, I tell you that you will be challenged. You will be challenged on this vote by every single opponent. And Boss Thompson, Boss Thompson, who was on the Republican side today lobbying for a Bill, the same man that called Agnew..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish that the Gentleman would stay on the topic of the Bill and quit making threats and...and derogatory remarks. If he'll stay with the Bill that will be helpful."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Mr. Mann. Kindly confine your remarks to the Bill."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the chief Sponsor referred to the position of the Governor and I think I have a right to make a statement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Mann: "And I just wish...I just wish that in the words of Sam Raburn that the Governor had run for sheriff some time in his life or he had run for State Representative some time in his life. He would not be so anxious together with the Mayor of the City of Chicago, to eliminate the function of the third branch of government. Namely us. Are we going to stand by and get emasculated? I don't think we're going to stand for it, I really don't. Will Rogers once said, he never met a man he didn't respect and I've never met a legislator that I didn't respect. But let's not be taken to the woods on this issue. Mr...Mr. Balandier is willing to sacrifice control of the Illinois House in order to pass this Bill. That Robert Stewart, a chief fund raiser for the Republican Party has labeled as extremely dangerous to employees because of its effect on morality, because of its effect on the business climate here in



the State of Illinois. So, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, no matter what your party let's stand up for our rights as a third branch of government. I'm tired of reading in the paper about all the votes that have been delivered. I'm tired of not being consulted. I'm tired of a Bill that will absolutely result in an imposition on the constituency of every Member of this House. And finally, I would just say this to you, don't buy the argument about the messenger service. The Supreme Court of the State of Illinois is not going to buy that argument. Your constituents are not going to buy that argument, and neither should you. Let's stand up for the two bosses in the State of Illinois who meet at the summit to deprive us of our legitimate roll as Members of the Illinois General Assembly, Boss Thompson and Boss Balandic. And let's say we are the third branch of government and we vote 'no', because we want to come back here and continue to be a third branch of government."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to add a few facts that should be considered, whether you are for or against this service. Number one, the realities of the situation are that we do have a messenger service that is functioning today. Secondly, the point that you ought to keep in your mind is the fact that they are operating on a 27 percent spread, which is greater than Las Vegas ever thought of. Now, the thing that you should think of is what is this going to do to us that are in downstate Illinois when you have rampant messenger service and they in turn will be in every neighborhood that there is in the State of Illinois. When the patrons do not go to the track you are not going to get the funds for the State of Illinois to operate the county fairs, to operate the funds for the fair and exhibitions, to operate those things that support 4-H and F.F.A. and the premiums in the county fairs. If messenger service is allowed to run rampant there will be none there. And what do you do then? The racing that you have approved here, the racing that you have approved here then diminishes. The quality of horses that run diminishes and you



no longer have racing in the State of Illinois and you do not have that source of revenue. Now, make up your mind. It may be a choice of two evils but I'll tell you this, off-track betting is a heck of a lot better than the messenger service."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, let me speak to the Bill. First, let me compliment the Sponsor of the Bill on his, the way he's handled both the discussion of the Bill, his presentation and the Amendments. I really appreciate the opportunity that many of us had to attempt to add points and elements to the Bill that we thought would make it a better Bill or would minimize the problems within the Bill. Also, let me...let me suggest to you that I have a great deal of respect for the Majority Leader who put together this package. I think he's handled it in a very gentlemanly way and I think he's respected every individual's right to say 'no'. And then has gone beyond that to the issues and convinced some of them of the merits of the Bill. But I'd suggest to you that as we discussed this Bill yesterday on Amendment stage a number of points came out which you could argue about. The Representative from Elmwood Park, in his efforts to improve the Bill, pointed out a very serious flaw. And that was that the core cities would control all of the patronage. We amended a Bill to improve it so that each of the communities would be able to control their own patronage. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's wrong to have something as sensitive as off-track betting corporations controlled by patronage employees. I think it's wrong, as we put on Amendments to hire people at 10 or 12 thousand dollars and expect them to be the principle bread winners and expect them then to be able to stand up to the possible temptations that will come before them. Mr. Speaker I suppose a lot of issues have been raised in terms of the general morality of racing. But many people have responded that we've already settled that problem and what we're dealing with now is the existence of messenger services. And since they already exist we have to have off-track betting. I would suggest to you that



that is very wrongful thinking. We can, we have within our power the ability to regulate the messenger services. We can, if we want to ban those services, we can regulate them to the point where they will have to be actual messenger services and not bookie joints. But, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there's a much deeper issue here. People have talked about the deal. They've talked about people being in the tank. They've talked about the possibility of judgeship. They've talked about the possibilities of jobs and patronage. What they haven't talked about is what happened last time when we had a deal on the cross town expressway. We got less money for education in the school aid formula than had been introduced by the Governor. Fewer dollars because when the politicians get together and they're begin to talk about their priorities they can sacrifice almost anything. But I would suggest to you that probably the most serious problem that this Bill presents to us is it represents a reversal in the last four years of racing in Illinois. Four years ago we decided to make a commitment to take politics out of racing. A Blue Ribbon Racing Board was appointed. That Racing Board took Illinois from the back rooms. Took politics out of racing, began to clean up the business of racing. Began to make some of the horsemen look with pride upon their business. In fact, I would say that board has taken more steps to improve the image of politics and government in Illinois than anything else in the last four years. What we're doing today is we're putting politics back into racing, We're saying that we shouldn't let this decision be made by the Illinois Racing Board, which in fact when they were before the Appropriations Committee indicated their serious reservations with off-track betting. They're saying we shouldn't let the professional decide this issue, we should let the political bosses decide this issue and they should put it up for sale. They should put off-track betting and the illusion of additional funds and the illusion that there will be more money for schools, put all of those up for sale to the highest bidder. And I'd suggest to you that as we bring politics back to racing through off-track betting,



we're going to see some very serious disasters in Illinois. I think it's wrong, I think it's probably at this time unavoidable, I think the deal has been cut. My only hope is that the people will speak out loud enough because in his characteristic straightforward way the Governor has not said, 'Vote for this Bill' he's only said, 'Don't let it die today. Give me more time to get more out of it.' And that's what I suggest to you is happening. This Bill is a political hostage. This Bill brings politics back to racing and this Bill, I think, will sully the entire State of Illinois in the future and I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would that I could expunge from the record my prior comment that the law and order Governor of the State of Illinois, the proud author of Class X would ever be the godfather of O.T.B. in an election year. If there were ever a cinch in a legislative proposal that came before this House to become the law, this Bill is the cinch and it will do so with the expressed approval of his excellency, the Governor. The something for nothing syndrome has struck again. Morally, there can be no question that the majority is wrong, as wrong as it can be. Maybe morality is just a myth after all. But politically there can be no question that you and the Majority are right. Because the polls show in Cook County that an overwhelming majority of the citizenry there wish to inflict a cruel repressive tax on the poor, the weak, the tempted. Those who society has traditionally felt a responsibility for government to protect. It is a sad commentary that the adoption of this Bill is official recognition by the State of Illinois that it can not control illegal gambling, that it's beyond the power of the state to stamp it out, which I think it sheer nonsense if the law were followed. And since they feel that they can't control it, they say we'll divide together the loot whether it be 24 million dollars or 40 million or maybe only 5 million. You all remember the astronomical figures that were quoted in prior years when you voted for bingo, when you voted for lottery and every other scheme



that's come down the pipe to enrich a section of mankind at the expense of those who are least able to pay the tax. And what about this other partner in this strange play? Well, the mayor will come out of this with thousands of jobs, millions of dollars... Ten minutes my foot, leave it on and blush. The mayor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Shut him off."

Lechowicz: "The Gentleman will kindly bring his remarks to a conclusion. It is ten minutes.... Yes I did... I am fair."

Cunningham: "You were never fair in your life...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please bring your remarks to a conclusion, Sir?"

Cunningham: "What is the time that I'm allowed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ten minutes."

Cunningham: "You want my watch?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I have a timer up here, Sir."

Cunningham: "Let me make this point if these interruptions will cease, in regard to his excellency the Mayor. The contribution you Republicans in Cook County have always told me about you're going to create a Republican Party, let you imagine for a little while what that invincible machine that's a cancer on the body politics will become when it gets this new infusion of taxpayers money, to mix metaphors: just for a moment, with this Bill, the Mayor has struck the jack pot. Now, it doesn't make a bit of difference to the Majority, not a bit of difference in the world that the overwhelming people in downstate Illinois want no part of this tainted money regardless of the size of it. In conclusion, before they ring the bell, let me point out to you that any of you that vote for this Bill, forever, forever forfeit the right to put on you campaign literature that you have not voted for an increased tax. This is an increased tax in the worse sense of the word. So, don't put that on your campaign literature. So you'll feel better tomorrow, so your conscience won't tickle you forever, vote 'no'."

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

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, We don't... we don't want and we don't need another Las Vegas or an Atlantic City



in the State of Illinois. Just last night the President of the United States addressed the Democratic Party of Cook County in the State of Illinois and indicated and complimented the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois on the excellent financial condition that we are in. Now, this legislation will be, as it was mentioned earlier, cruel to the poor. From off-track betting we will go to other areas, such as legalized gambling, slot machines, prostitution, drug parlors...Ladies and Gentlemen all this does is lead to an open door policy for the crime syndicate in the State of Illinois. Now, we don't need to maintain this type of illegal activity in Illinois. I think that we, for many years, have been going down...elected officials, in our moral standards in this state and the only way we're going to bring that image up is with action against legalized gambling or against off-track betting. To let the public know that we do have a great moral standard, Now, the Supreme Court, the Appellate Court and the Supreme Court have made a mistake by saying that the Legislature cannot control off-track betting. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to give that Body another opportunity to search their conscience because they know they're wrong and you know that they were wrong in making that decision that we cannot stop off-track betting in the State of Illinois and that's why I'm going to oppose this legislation when it's brought up for a vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson. Your light's on, Sir." The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, some of you know that I had...I guess you'd call it the honor to serve in the Nixon Administration and...and a friend of mine was a young chap by the name of John Dean, who wrote a book called Blind Ambition. I had the opportunity on Capitol Hill, as we've all had the opportunity here in Springfield to observe now and then some of our friends who become overcome with blind ambition, And I don't want to tempt my friends, either in my party, and I don't think you want to tempt your friends in your party who might be



inclined to succumb in an election year to the lure of some things that we believe in our hearts the voters are going to view as evil and wrong. There is a prayer that many of you know that goes like this, it has the language, 'Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil.' Here's a chance to apply that. I happen to believe that my Governor is a man of principle and a man of honor and a man who will appreciate the turning Illinois further into a gambling state is absolutely wrong and shouldn't be done. However, I see that we are in an election year and there are the temptations to deal, and there are the temptations to want to develop an overwhelming victory. This... anybody running for office knows that. I think we have a beautiful opportunity here on this side of the aisle to save our Governor from this temptation. There are many Members here who remember when we were assembled dealing with a subject called R.T.A. And whether you are a Republican or a Democrat you know what that meant and what that did and if you remember our former Speaker, what happened to his, some say, 'blind ambition' or his public service as a result of embracing R.T.A., just think what's going to happen to our Governor or other persons who might be tempted to embrace off-track betting prematurely before the Supreme Court has even had a chance to rule on it. I don't think that I want this to wind up on my Governor's desk in the middle of this campaign year and I exhort my Republican friends to help us protect Jim Thompson from this abominable temptation. And I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Two months ago I didn't have any particular feelings about O.T.B. I've never had any belief that it was immoral in itself. In the last few weeks I have seen the pressures built up in this chamber. I'm not privy to the back room conferences but I know what's been going on. And God forgive me, I even was thinking of being a part of it myself. I too received a call from Steven Schiller a half an hour ago or so telling about the Supreme Court Decision and I guess it was a



feeling of relief because the last justification that I was trying to rationalize was gone to support this concept. There's only one word I can use now to describe what I have seen in the last few weeks, what I have heard about and what it's leading to. The O.T.B. itself, what it will do to our people and what it's done to our political parties. The one word to describe it and that word is, 'sordid', s-o-r-d-i-d-, from beginning to end."

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

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

I rise in support of this measure and I do so, troubled by the fact that the opponents seem to think that gambling is...is wrongful in this state and can be very well prohibited. But I suggest to them that they read this Appellate Court Decision of *Finish Lines vs. the City of Chicago*. And I do so and I was furnished a copy of it just yesterday by Mr. Steven Schiller. And I say to the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle from Cook who said that this Bill will exploit certain groups and that it will generate revenue in this manner need be reminded that messenger services have now been legalized judicially and there is no revenue going to the state. Second of all is to the other Gentleman who mentioned that the Supreme Court is now going to give consideration to this issue. Let me just pose a fact to you and the propositions of law that were considered in the Appellate Court Decision and you be the judges and you decide and you think how the Supreme Court would rule on this matter. First of all, the court has said... the Appellate Court has said that the Legislature cannot enact laws by evoking the police power on the pretense of protecting of the public when the actual objection is the arbitrary interference with private business. That is a settled proposition of law and that is the reason they overruled, theyruled Mr. Holewinski's Bill unconstitutional. They say that the Legislature can regulate for the public good but we cannot use as a ground for the complete supression and the prohibition of any business. Now, then mentioned as a fact justifying, buttressing their argument that the Illinois Legislature has seen fit to legalize horseracing



and we have seen fit to create the Illinois Lottery Act. And they said in this opinion that this demonstrates that the state can not now contend that the public policy of Illinois is to completely prohibit gambling. And I think you Gentlemen, if you were on the Supreme Court, would consider it in that light. We have created different means of gambling, we have created the Horse Racing Act. We have created the Lottery Act. We cannot now say that public policy is against gambling in this sense. Now, mind you, another Supreme Court in the union has ruled that messenger services are legal and that was the State of Louisiana, where they held that the gambling did not take place until that messenger brought that bet to the track. So, this is ample precedent now for the Illinois Supreme Court to affirm the Appellate Court Decision. Now, I think what we're doing is acting in a reasonable fashion in trying to compete with the messenger services. And I suggest to the other Gentlemen from Cook that you cannot you cannot attempt to stringently regulate messenger services so as to put them out of business. They will once again be in court, they will rule that Bill unconstitutional... that type of law as well unconstitutional. What we have to do is create some competing form of enterprise. Off-track betting, to you, to the people who are opposed to gambling is nevertheless a necessary evil. You have to decide which of the two evils is the least and opt for that one. I say to you that off-track betting is a necessary...It's not only necessary, it's a needed measure for the state, we're losing vast amounts of revenue now to the track that we once again garner them into public accounts. I say we should vote 'yes' as a matter of necessity. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of Bills on the Calendar and this has been amply discussed and for those reasons I move the previous question."

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

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The previous question



has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you very...thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Representative Flinn has indicated I believe this has been amply discussed and I shall not try to attempt to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry, which I think is probably better brought up now before the Gentleman closes than after he closes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get to your point."

Walsh: "And that point is this... You recognized me for my point, Mr. Speaker and I shall give it. He may close after I give the point. The point relates to the Bill and to the number of votes required for passage. And I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Section 26.19(e), which says, 'The core city is a member of its regional corporation. In addition, any other municipality may join the regional corporation by passing an ordinance therefore. If the regional corporation decides that it will not place any off-track paramutual wagering facilities in the municipality, then the municipality is no longer a member of the regional corporation and may not rejoin the regional corporation for one year thereafter.' Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is a limitation by the state in this Bill on home rule powers and that therefore under Section...Under Section,"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Walsh, read the amended Bill. That thing was taken out by Elmer Conti's Amendment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker just to answer the question raised by Representative Walsh, that language was taken out by the Amendment by Representative Conti. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I will not prolong this but I do want to answer a couple of things that were said."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly address yourself to the point then, Sir? Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "My point is there's another Section and I wonder if it remains in



the Bill and I think we can...I can best ask Representative Kane whether the other point which we were talking about with respect to home rule powers remains in the Bill.'

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I'd refer you to Section 26.26 in the Bill, which says that 'each regional corporation shall be exempt from all state and units of local government taxes and registration and license fees.' And I would read to you the Constitution which specifies that the General Assembly can only by a vote of three-fifths limit the power to tax of any unit of local government. And I'd ask for a ruling from the Chair as to the effect of Section 26.26 on the Constitutional requirement for a three-fifths vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute...we got the Parliamentarian back would you kindly repeat your point, Mr. Kane?"

Kane: "The point I make, Mr. Speaker, is that Section 26.26 of the Bill says that each regional corporation shall be exempt from all state and unit of local government taxes and registration and license fees. And that the Constitution specifically says that the General Assembly by law approved by a vote of three-fifths of the Members elected may deny or limit the power to tax. And I would suggest that Section 26.26 is a specific limitation on the power of local governments to tax. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Parliamentarian be allowed to study that without being bothered."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll let him study that and we'll let Mr. Barnes close."

Walsh: "Could we have a response on that though, Sir, before you turn on the voting switches?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Definitely Mr. Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I started to say, and I don't want to prolong this thing but I think a couple points should be made here. One, one of the Gentleman that discussed in debate relative to this being a...a tax on a certain limited portion of our society, I would call to his attention that there are many taxes of that sort that was



initiated by this Body. Mr. Speaker, if I could have som...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly give the Gentleman some order, please."

Barnes: "I would suggest to them, just to name four of them, one, there is a cigarette tax that only tax the people that smoke cigarettes, and many of us do not. One...another, there is the liquor tax that only tax people that partake in liquor and many of us do not. There is the tax on gasoline that only people that drive automobiles and contrary to what people think there are many people who do not drive so they aren't a part of that. Then again there is the tax of on-bet...on track betting, which is the paramutual that already exists in the law. And many of us, and I say 'us' and underline that, have not and do not partake in that activity either. So those taxes already exist in law and there are many, many, many others. The point is, this is not setting any new precedence relative to taxing. a certain activity in this state. I would suggest also to another one of the Gentlemen that throughout a large... very large amount I guess to shock us into reality that a certain set amount would be spent on advertisement for this purpose, I challenge him to look into this Bill on any page, on any line, in any paragraph and show me or any other Member of this House where specifically it says any dollar amount will be spent for any advertisement for this purpose. It simply does not exist. It is not there. And Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are other questions and I know that these are on strict, strict, moral grounds to the individual members, those questions I cannot nor will I attempt to answer. I will merely indicate to you and to the Members of the House that this activity, this activity is for consenting adults. That is our law now. I would be the last Member of this House and as far as I'm concerned would be the last Member...resident of this state to begin to attempt to tell another adult what he can, she can or cannot do. I don't feel that that's within my prerogative. I think we all have to answer those questions ourselves, as adults. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there's only one purpose that I have put forth this type of legislation. As



I indicated early on so that we will have some way, some alternative at the local level to raise additional much needed revenue to meet those expenses that we are incurring that are increasing on a daily basis. I realize, I realize that there are some things that we cannot do. And I will suggest to you that I will never be one to suggest what we will do but I can say to you, I myself, I myself support this Bill as it now exists. As I indicated to the Representative that questioned me, that I will keep that posture throughout the other House. I have no voice there, I will be there when the Bill is presented and will indicate to the Senate my feelings. But that is as far as I can go and I will do that. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill has been thoroughly debated. It has been, I think, amended. I believe it's a good piece of legislation. It is a good start and I submit...from each and every one of you the support of the House on House Bill 3259."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm going to be responding to Representative Walsh's inquiry and Representative Kanes. I'm asking that the Parliamentarian write it out in detail so there is no question as far as the ruling, because I personally believe that this matter will probably be litigated. I want to make sure that the record is quite accurate in what the Parliamentarian is going to be responding to in my response to both individuals, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Kane and Members, the Parliamentarian has reviewed your question and his reply and I concur with his recommendation, there are two tax exemptions in Section 26-...26. The second is a property tax exemption. That type of exemption can be enacted under Article 9 of the Illinois Constitution and does not require a three-fifths vote. 89 votes are required. The first exemption is more general, however, it does not purport to restrict home rule taxing powers. Since home rule is not specifically mentioned in the Bill the Chair will not read such a preemption into the Bill. Second, this provision appears to be declaratory of the present...declaratory of the present law as stated by the Supreme Court in a case of City of Des Plaines vs. the Metropolitan Sanitary District. It...Therefore, this Bill



in order to pass and to come into law will require 89 votes.

The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Does the effect of your ruling then say that any home rule unit may levy a license on off-track betting?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's supposition, I think?"

Kane: "No, no that's not supposition, Sir. No, I'm asking..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewell, on a point of order."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, we're not here for declaratory judgement, nor do I think the Parliamentarian is suppose to act as a court. He's given a ruling, they have a clear alternative to it and I think the Chair's ruled and I think we've got to get about with the business of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Walsh. Mr. Kane... Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not...is that the only answer that you're going to give to my question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to repeat the question?"

Kane: "Does the effect of your ruling mean that home rule units may charge license fees on off-track betting?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The answer is 'no'."

Kane: "Is not that then a limit on home rule units, on their power to tax?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The answer is 'no'. The restriction does not come from the Bill, it comes from the Constitution."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I have never done this before, but given the ruling I would respectfully, and I do this reluctantly, appeal the ruling of the Chair and I would ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Parliamentarian, he asks that you take into consideration Article 7 from the Local Government... Constitution of the State of Illinois, Section 6(e), which says, 'A home rule unit shall have only the power that the General Assembly may provide by law: One, to punish by imprisonment for more than six months...to license for revenue or impose taxes upon or measured by income or earnings or upon occupation. The point is



that they cannot license for revenue they can only regulate."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully point out that Section 26.26 exempts regional corporations from all state and unit of local government taxes, registration and license fees. So, they cannot even charge anything for registration or license fees and all taxes..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me also point out to you, that's exactly what that case was, the City of Des Plaines vs. the Metropolitan Sanitary District. And I've made my ruling and I will abide by the ruling."

Kane: "I would respectfully appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the Chair be overruled? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this will be the first time that I can recall that I ever voted to overrule the Chair. And I might suggest to Justice David that, you might as well get your briefs, David, because you just pushed this damn Bill right into court and you know it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I just want to explain my vote because I don't think I've ever voted to overrule the Chair, but I'm voting that way because I really think Doug Kane was right on the issue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 59 'aye', 77 'nay' none recorded as 'present'. The motion fails. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to close. He's closed. All those in favor... The question is, shall House Bill 3259 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I say shame on you Jekyll and Hyde moralists. You have cut yourself into every piece of this pie with every Amendment you put on the Bill. Now, I suggest to you that when we put this money on the Ag. premium fund, you don't tell us, 'We won't repair the fences, take care of the



roads that have fallen, provide for the 4-H program, or even treat the horses with V.D.' I say that when we talk about racing it's all right to say that it's a sport of kings and that they can enjoy it but to put it down to the level of the common man somehow it has become tainted and I say that that's wrong. You don't talk about the poor, weak gamblers. You don't save them from their afflictions when they gamble in the stock market and that's what it is. You don't talk about gambling in the grain market with grain futures, that's all for men of good taste and a lot of money. I've heard these arguments about what this is going to do to the racing industry. The same arguments have been made when we talked about t.v., we'll kill professional football, but it did not. They had the most successful year that they've ever had. You made the argument that it would kill t.v., that it would kill the movies and they succeeded, all on the same plane. I'm saying that there's room in this free capitalist society for both types of ventures. And if you can have betting at the bet parlors and betting at the tracks then surely the state can license it for revenue. Where are you people when you talk about your morality and you want to let it be decided by the will of the people? If we put the will of the people on the line and they say that they're for it all of a sudden it is now time for the holy of holys to descend from the clouds and announce to them in pious appointment what they can and cannot do. Ladies and Gentlemen, that is wrong. This is the program that will help the schools. It will help provide some form of patronage or some form of employment. And I ask you, where are you same moralists who denied this when you spend every dollar out of the treasury for every type of proposition that you can think of. Where do you think the money is coming from? I say to you, at some time or another you have to take a little responsibility and you have to start paying the bills. If you don't want to pay the Bills then don't spend the money. But I'm going to be here to remind you on this floor, when every time you put up these Pork Barrel Bills and we're all going to send them



over there to the Governor. And we're wrong because somehow or another you have to have a little responsibility. If you want to spend the money then you'd better be prepared to raise it. And I don't see the moralists ever, when it comes down to the nitty gritty of raising the taxes because we don't have the revenue for the schools, for the health programs and for the other things that it states. I think that you have to vote in this situation and an 'aye' vote is the only reasonable and moral vote and I say, shame on you, double shame."

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams. The timer's on."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to explain my 'no' vote. And as we heard the President here this morning, he says, 'You listen to your constituency.' In addition as you well know the...a Member down here, I am the Mayor of Franklin Park and my people have talked to me and my people are at my board meetings and they have said, 'We do not want off-track betting.' Now I say that if these parlors are opened here and if our state and our courts can't do anything about it, I think it's high time we do something about that. I say if people want to go to the mountain, that's fine, let 'em go to the tracks; but we don't bring the mountain to the people. And on that basis, I have listened to my constituency and I vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can appreciate the comments of one of the prior speakers that we are hypocrites. Absolute, we are. We have the stock market, we have the race track. However, my area is very sensitive to the way the R.T.A. was drafted and passed and in this Bill, if the core cities were at least the main cities of each county, perhaps I could vote for it. But under the present situation, I'm afraid I'm forced to vote 'no'."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I notice that the timer is on for some and not for others."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's not true, Sir."

Griesheimer: "It is indeed true. The speaker over here was up there for a full five minutes and if you paid attention to your job, you'd understand that, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it's right up here. If you want to come up here and take a look at it, you can look at it. Now, the timer... I'll reset the timer, but don't tell me it isn't on."



Griesheimer: "Please stay out of debate, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do what?"

Griesheimer: "I would say stay out of debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm just keeping you straight."

Griesheimer: "That would be a very interesting ordeal for you, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any time you want to do it."

Griesheimer: "I just want to respond in my rather muffled voice to the hypocrite over here that stands up after a Gentleman has been in this House for 40 years striving to improve the rights of a certain element of our race because they have not had the educational opportunities they should have. And we know that's true and there's a group of Legislators from Chicago that have worked diligently for that because they know the educational opportunities haven't been there. Now, why do we have laws with regard to gambling? It's because these people without the education have been taken advantage of by crooks, by the syndicate and by people who deserve to be controlled by government. Now, these are your very people we're trying to protect, not the educated yet. The people that don't have the dollars. We passed the Lottery Bill, then what did we find out? The currency exchanges wanted to sell lotteries because they bring the welfare checks in there and they can get the money. Now, for God's sake, let's have a little degree of morality in this group and try to protect the people that need protection. Not you, not I, maybe but..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly bring your remarks to a close. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really wasn't going to say anything but I get tired of white folks telling black folks what they should be for. In the City of Chicago there are gambling, there are people who oppose the gambling. We have those in our district just like in every other district. I don't have...disadvantage...district, but it's 99 percent black. We have a lot of these horse parlors in my districts that the courts say we can't stop. So therefore, to say we cannot have gambling



...states the Sponsor...is going to stop gambling, it's not going to stop it. The only thing that we can do is to try to preempt it. I've talked to many lawyers in my district and they all say the same thing. Only if the state moves in and preempts it can we stop these..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Gaines: "Can we stop these entrepreneurs from doing the things that the last speaker talked about. So, therefore, I feel that we should have some form of state control over what we can't stop. Thank you."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, when this Bill first came before the Revenue Committee I had certain doubts about it. And I asked for some changes in it and I want to say that the Sponsors of this Bill were fully cooperative in improving and amending the Bill. It took out the power of eminent domain, the power of condemnation that I objected to. It took out some of the bonding power, the power to sell bonds that I objected to. No municipality need have a off-track betting parlor unless it first requests that it be placed there by the regional unit. In other words, municipalities can exclude off-track betting parlors if that is their desire. And if that's the desire of the people in our suburban towns then their board should not request the regional authority to place it there. I think this Bill has been amended with the referendum and the other provisions to the point where we can support it, where we can vote for it, and that is because the Sponsors of the Bill were willing..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Pierce: "And that is because the Sponsors of the Bill were willing to take suggestions and to accept comprehensive Amendments and I am now in a position to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. W. Walsh, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

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



there is anyone among you who feels that this addresses itself to the Appellate Court decision on Messenger Services, please disabuse yourself. Do not excuse an 'aye' vote on the basis of that decision. This Bill doesn't address itself one iota to messenger services. Messenger services can operate next door to an off-track booking establishment. They don't...aren't affected one iota by this and don't think for a moment that they are. They're separate and distinct. And I challenge anyone here to point out to me where in this Bill messenger services are addressed: It's a phony, false issue. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote. The timer is on. Greiman, please. Greiman, please."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure yet how I'm going to vote frankly, but one thing I am certain of is that I heard some remarkable things from the other side of the aisle about protecting the poor. A lot of the red lights that come from the other side of the aisle are red lights every time we have a consumer protection Bill for the poor people, everytime there's a form for landlord and tenant law for the poor, everytime there's something dealing with public aid, everytime there's something dealing with anybody that deals with the poor, I don't see those lights so anxious to work for the poor. So today we're going to do it for the poor, we're not going to let them gamble. I think it's hypocrisy. I don't know how I'm going to vote but I wanted to explain your vote for a moment, not mine."

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

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of my 'aye' vote, first and foremost is the provision for a referendum and let the people themselves decide. Number two, with the removal of the powers of eminent domain, number three, with the removal of the provisions enabling the issuance of bonds by the regional corporation. Those three items alone made it possible for me to vote for this Bill. And if any one of those provisions come back from the Senate and are not contained in this Bill I will



not vote for it when it comes back. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't been in the arguments on bingo, I haven't been in the arguments on the lottery, I'd like to compliment the House on...for the less hysterical attitude towards this new...new entertainment for the citizens of Illinois. But I was amused by the Gentleman from Lawrence who singlehandedly tried to bring..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, please proceed."

Giorgi: "Who singlehandedly tried to bring slot machines back to the state and didn't have much luck. I thought that was...and then then the other fella from Lake County who was talking about the deficiency of some races and I think it sounds...reminded me of a brain of an ass, but on that I voted 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think all that could be said has been said and I will reserve myself to say a few things once this vote is taken, irregardless of the manner in which it goes. I would suggest again to all of the Members of the House that this is a much needed program in the state. We are looking for additional ways of raising revenue. The demand for services are ever, ever, ever increasing and we do need this kind of program or some program to insure that we be able to have the funds to meet the...meet the ever increasing demands of local citizens relative to service in this state. I would solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, asks for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Bluthardt, Don Brummet..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Brummet as 'no'."

Clerk Hall: "Collins, Darrow, Epton, Friedrich, Hart, Leverenz, Madison, O'Brien, Peters..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, record him as 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Schisler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski, are you seeking recognition?"

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, only if it gets over 89 votes, then I'd respectfully ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 82 'aye', 75 'nay'. This Bill, having failed to receive... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman. How is Mr. Greiman recorded? Kindly record Mr. Greiman as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz. Kindly record him as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Darrow as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen as 'aye'. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Breslin 'no'. On this question there are...88...what is it? 86 'aye' and how many 'nay'? 75 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr...Leverenz."

Leverenz: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're recorded as 'aye', Sir? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "What is the count now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's 86 'aye', is that correct? 86 'aye', Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Madison: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Madison as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Epton as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson."

Abramson: "Change me to 'aye'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Abramson as 'aye'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Schneider as 'no'. Mr. Clerk... The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Bartulis. Kindly record him as 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. Is there anyone else seeking recognition? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 'aye', 73 'no', the Gentleman from, Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think we ought to sit idly by here and let some green lights go on there that aren't here, I'd like a poll of the Affirmative Roll Call, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You have that right. A verification?"

Dunn: "Sorry, it's been asked for, I'm sorry. I thought you were going to announce. I didn't know it had been asked for. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Holewinski already requested that. And... let me announce the results first. On this question there are 90 'aye', 73 'nay', how many 'present'? 6 'present'. The Gentleman has requested a verification. Ladies and Gentlemen, would you kindly be in your own seats and will all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? And in all fairness, kindly respond to the individual in the proper manner. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would it be possible for us to go through a Verified Roll Call? I think it would be faster on this matter."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will proceed to verify the Affirmative Vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I have leave to be verified on this Roll Call?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has requested leave. Hearing no objections, the Gentleman is verified. Proceed to poll the Affirmative Vote."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson. E.M. Barnes. Bartulis. Beatty. Bianco. Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it looks like about one third of the Membership is out of their seats and I would respectfully suggest on this very important matter that everybody occupy their chairs and raise their hands when their names are called."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schlickman, I made that announcement before we proceeded. I'll be more than happy to do so again. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an important Roll Call. Kindly be in your own respective seats. Kindly respond to the individual who is polling in the proper manner. Will all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? The Clerk will please proceed with the Affirmative Vote."

Clerk Hall: "Brandt. Caldwell. Campbell. Capparelli. Christensen. Coati. Darrow. Corneal Davis. Dawson. Deavers. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Dan Houlihan. Huff. Huskey. Jacobs. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Keats. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Lucco. Luft. Madison. Margalus. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mudd. Mulcahey. Murphy. Nardulli. Pechous. Peters. Pierce. Pouncey. Robinson. Ryan. Schumpert. Stanley. Stearney. Steczo. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. VanDuyne. Vinson. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Waddell. Winchester. Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski, any questions of the Affirmative Vote?"

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Some people maybe I couldn't see from here. Representative Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bianco is in his chair, Sir."

Holewinski: "Representative Bartulis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bartulis. He's in his chair, Sir."

Holewinski: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Christensen. Pardon me. Representative Christensen. There he is."



Holewinski: "Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Martin. Mrs. Martin. There she is, she's over here on the other side."

Holewinski: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here."

Holewinski: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is in his chair."

Holewinski: "Representative Taylor there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Taylor? He's in his chair, Sir. On this question there are 90 'aye', 75 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House on a point of personal privilege... Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side I would move to reconsider the vote by which 3259 was adopted...passed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't believe the Bill's in the chamber anymore."

Barnes: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on a point of personal privilege and if I could have a little quiet, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please, proceed."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the 8 years I've served in this Body this is only the second time that I have ever rose on a point of personal privilege. The other time was due to the untimely death of the mother of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I would like to say this to my colleagues here in the House on both sides of the I can understand the moral and the religious questions that some of them had to wrestle with and answer on this type of question. But let me say this to some of my colleagues. If I were..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for one second. The Gentleman is on a point of personal privilege, kindly give him your attention. Please proceed."

Barnes: "Let me say this to some of my colleagues if I can and I will be brief. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, in my 46 years on this earth have never tried to injure anyone or anybody"



in any manner and never will. I have never in my life, I can truthfully say, ever bet on a race in this state or anyplace else in these 50 states in the United States. Let me make one thing clear here, clear above all, someone alluded to the fact that a member of my ethnic background that they were trying to protect from the ravages of gambling, racing and all of the ...all of the other allied and sundry things that some people, some people associate with that. Let me say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there is no way, no way on God's good earth that I would ever do anything, anything whatsoever to bring any kind, any kind of disorder, any kind of hardships on any of the people in this state. Let me also add to that, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there is no way, there is no way that I would try to attach my moral convictions on anyone sitting in this House or anyone in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise unusually to talk about myself as an individual. I neither smoke, nor do I drink but I would never tell anyone that they should not do that. I think one thing that my father left to me, who's been passed on now for 12 years is, to live your life and live your convictions. And if you do that, you and only you will be the one that has to answer for the way you live and the manner in which you die. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I appreciate and I thank every Member of this House who on this issue addressed it as an issue. But, to those Members of the House that consider themselves moralists, purists and better than thou, I say to them as they say in the Bible, 'Ye without sin cast the first stone.' Thank you."

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

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. I don't think that anyone in this chamber would impute anything but the finest motives to the Sponsor and no one is imputing any lack of integrity to anyone that voted 'aye'. I'd like to make a couple of observations, however. One is that I do think that we should hold accountable all of the speakers that got up and said that if this Bill is emasculated in the Senate and if the Amendments are taken off that



they will honor their word and vote 'no' when the Bill comes back from the Senate. Because, Mr. Speaker, as sure as God made them green, this Bill will be amended in the Senate. The School Bill Amendment will come off. Any possibility of any successful constitutional challenge will be handled, if possible. But the second thing I want to say to my colleagues regards our role as the third branch of government. I'll recall to you what happened when we had an executive war in Vietnam and the Congress has not yet regained the confidence of the people of the State of Illinois. What I fear today is that the Eightieth General Assembly will be known as that Session, notwithstanding the outstanding Membership we have, will be remembered as that Session in which the Illinois General Assembly cast aside its roll as an independent branch of government as prescribed by the State and the Federal Constitution. It will be remembered as the Session in which we permitted ourselves to be used by pimps, as pimps by Governor Thompson and Mayor Balandic. And finally, it will be remembered as the Session when the two party system in the State of Illinois failed to operate and came to a grinding halt. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the record I want to point out that Representative Kane and I and anyone who would care to join us will file a dissent from the ruling of the Chair with respect to the number of votes that were required for passage. And apart from that, I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "My point is that that is shown by his vote on the appeal of the ruling of the chair and that's not necessary as a dissent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken."

Walsh: "May I continue. Now, Mr. Speaker... We shall nevertheless file a dissent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to enter my personal objections to the conduct of the Chair during that Roll Call. They were disgraceful. You, Sir, conducted that in a manner that



did not befit anyone who presides over this House. You should, Sir, never again sit in that Chair and preside after the display you put on this afternoon. It was terrible and I would urge you never again to take that rostrum."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You got a Bill, Bill? House Bill 3272? Mr. Porter. Porter, do you want to take that out of the record?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "...House Bill 3279, Mr. Pierce."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3279, a Bill for an Act to provide for release for real property taxpayers, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think all of us in this House are aware enough of our constituents to know what the number one issue in the state is to them. As important as the last Bill may have been, that's not their number one priority...number one issue. The most important issue and highest priority of all our constituents - downstate and Chicago and in the suburbs - is real estate taxes on homeowners and renters; residential real estate taxes. Now that the Senate today defeated the real estate tax relief Bill that the Comptroller introduced, the only meaningful piece of real estate tax relief left is House Bill 3279, which is before you. This Bill wasn't the brainchild of Dan Pierce. This Bill came here from a group of citizens throughout the state who formed together.... the Illinois Public Action Council. They came to the conclusion that the best way to attack the real estate tax problem that is driving people out of their homes is to extend the circuit breaker, which has worked fairly well for senior citizens, to all citizens of our state, regardless of age, regardless of whether they are homeowners or renters. I did object to the richest people receiving relief and to the upper middle income people receiving relief so we put a top on here of 30 thousand dollars family income. It will only give relief to those whose income is 30 thousand or less. With those at the bottom of the scale receiving the maximum of 650 dollars and those at the highest part of the scale receiving 50 dollars benefit. The way the Bill works is to the extent that if your real estate taxes are more than three and a half percent of your income, then the circuit breaker kicks in with a 30 percent of your taxes the first year, minus two percent of your income, 45 percent the second year of the phase-in and 60 percent the third year. By Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee, we reduced the amount of cost to the state during the three year phase-in period. The Chicago Sun Times, in two editorials found this to be responsible legislation and endorsed, specifically,



House Bill 3279, specifically, and found it not to be a budget-buster but to be a solid piece of legislation. Now, yesterday, it was the second Bill on the priority of call, if we'd have stayed on that priority of call. The Speaker today chose to swing back to the Regular Calendar, which made this Bill come up this late in the day, right after everyone's angry about the circuit....about the previous Bill, the off-track betting Bill. But don't blame that on me, I wanted this Bill to be called yesterday or the day before...I know some of you are anxious to get home. We do not agree...we do not agree with the figures in the fiscal note that was prepared by the Department of Revenue, they assumed 100 percent participation. They assumed that the average income around the state is the same as it is in the Chicago Metropolitan area, by the figures they used. Their figures show 270 million dollar fiscal impact the first year for fiscal 79. We disagree with that and our figures, from the Illinois Public Action Council, from an economist with them and not from me, provide for 80 million dollars the first year; on the assumption there'll be 60 percent participation, which has been the experience around the country. This Bill will provide additional real estate tax relief to both senior citizens and the young people who are sending children through school - to people of all ages - to renters. It will be assumed that 30 percent of rent ...30 percent of rent represent real estate taxes which is presently in the law in the circuit breaker provision. I know many of you have studied this Bill which was approved as an emergency matter by the Rules Committee and approved in the House Revenue Committee and that you have been lobbied and spoken to by citizens and taxpayers from your home areas who have banded together under the umbrella, Illinois Public Action Council, but what that is is groupings of local taxpayer groups in Chicago and Peoria throughout the State of Illinois. I know it's late in the day. I know we all understand what a circuit breaker provision, I know we all understand that the number one priority of our voters back home is real estate tax relief. I come before you with a comprehensive plan of real estate tax relief and I urge your support of House Bill 3279."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria,



Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to make a few points concerning the affect of House Bill 3279 on the homeowners in older deteriorating neighborhoods. Older neighborhoods are hurt the most by spiraling taxes. The most stable citizens are forced to sell and move away. Those who stay cannot afford to pay their taxes and maintain their homes. Result of that is the homes are not kept up and the neighborhood declines further. House Bill 3279, Representative Pierce's Bill, will put back money into the pockets of people who really need it. Both so that they can stay in their homes and so that they can have the money to do the repairs. House Bill 3279 will help to keep stable and solid citizens in their communities where they want to remain. It will prevent them from having to sell their homes at a low price and being forced to find something elsewhere. It will help them to do the repairs and keep their neighborhoods attractive. I think that this Bill is a good Bill to stabilize the neighborhoods in the State of Illinois and I support it wholeheartedly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentlemen from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Pierce? Would you yield to a question? He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Representative Pierce, I'm a proponent of circuit breaker philosophically, but do I understand you correctly that - Right over here, Dan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Do I understand your Bill correctly, that say a person is...income is 29,750is eligible to get a rebate on his taxes as a result?"

Pierce: "You're correct. He's at the maximum, but he would get the minimum rebate of about 50 dollars because what we do is ...you take ...the 60 percent minus 2 percent of his income. When you take off 2 percent of his income - at that rate - off of 650 maximum, that would be 600 dollars, because he'd be close to the 30 thousand. His rebate would be 50 dollars. You gave an example of the high end of the scale. Some have said we should have made the high end of the scale 25 thousand or 20 thousand. I felt that middle income people,



where the husband and wife are both working, and they have an income in the 20 thousand range, up to 30 thousand; and were also being forced from their homes by high real estate taxes and they are at the high end of the scale and they would be entitled to the minimum rebate of 50 dollars because we subtract 2 percent of their income from the 650 dollars."

Tuerk: "What is the maximum amount now, that the circuit breaker's pegged at is it 12 thousand?"

Pierce: "It's 10 thousand. I understand there is a Bill floating around somewhere in the Legislature to make that 12 thousand and of course that applies only to people 65 and over."

Tuerk: "What's ...the impact of your Bill on state revenue? What do you project this is going to cost?"

Pierce: "I said in my opening address, that I have a....we have a serious disagreement with the Department of Revenue because they assume 100 percent participation. What they say - which is in your Digest - is that for fiscal 79, it would be 270 million; fiscal 80, 373 and fiscal 81, 477 million. We disagree because they assume 100 percent of participation and they take the income level for the Chicago Metropolitan area and extend it throughout the state where it is lower. Our figures that come not from me but from economists from the Illinois Public Action Council, are for 80 million costs the first year of the phase-in, 112 million the second year and 144 million the third year; based on about 60 percent participation."

Tuerk: "What you're saying then is it would cost approximately 150 million in the third year?"

Pierce: "Yes, that'syes, we do say that."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of this measure brought forth by the Chairman of the Revenue Committee. This measure offers relief to middle income people which is unusual and, I think, after all, these many tax relief measures we've had for senior citizens and for other persons I think it's about time we offered some relief to the other homeowner. We've seen problems that the



homeowners and renters have had, we've seen, on the northside of Chicago just recently, a semi-tax revolt and I think that we're going to have reassessments in other parts of the city and the state in the next year or so and we're going to probably have further problems. The real estate tax people deserve some relief. In California, at the present time, there's a crisis brought about by the increasing real estate taxes. We're seeing that now in an area in Chicago and in the suburbs. Property values are rising. Real estate taxes are jumping at an alarming rate. So this be....this measure does offer relief, relief to people who have not previously had any. I ask for your favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Davis, J.: "Representative Pierce, how do you define, in your Bill, earned income...er...how do you define 'income'?"

Pierce: "It's defined in the same way that the present circuit breaker does. We include Social Security...payments and so on. I believe Rep.... the acting Speaker has a very fine Bill floating around somewhere and I think it's passed the House already...that removes Social Security income from it."

Davis, J.: "I understand that, but I...go a little further with me, Representative Pierce. How do you define income in terms of, let's say, a taxpayer who is earning 17 thousand dollars a year, but all of a sudden had an inheritance - I'm talking about earned income now - and had an inheritance come by him, a windfall inheritance, and invested that money and was receiving interest or dividend income from that money that put him over the 30 thousand dollar bracket. Would he be excluded?"

Pierce: "Yes. Unearned income would count toward the 30 thousand. The inheritance itself wouldn't because, of course, that is not income. But the income on the inheritance ...over the years would be income."

Davis, J.: "Well, what I'm driving at, Representative Pierce, is what sort of figures would you have to bring to your filing application for the circuit breaker exemption to prove that you're eligible for it?"



Pierce: "The same thing the senior citizens do now, they have to show all of their income when they apply."

Davis, J.: "They have to show all of the dividend and interest income and ...and all forms of income. Is that correct?"

Pierce: "That's right. The unearned income is just as much income as is the earned income."

Davis, J.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill.

It truly relates itself to ability to pay. It deals, in a sense, with a scaled program of rebates to people who need them - with regard to extending the circuit breaker. In fact, we've talked about tax relief throughout this Session and last Session. We've dealt with the Farm Tax Relief Bill, we talked there about giving farmers relief. To a great measure it is the best Bill, I think, that's come before us for tax relief because it looks at the little guy at the bottom. Including in that I might bring up - for those downstaters who have many farmers who were supposed to have been helped by the tax relief program for farmers - it will help those farmers who may not indeed be helped by that tax assessment Bill, because that tax assessment Bill that we passed provided for a consideration of the best grade of farmland in counties. In many cases, where the person is a farmer who operates near or at a loss, he may not be benefited by that tax relief program because it allows local assessors to determine the value of other grades of land which may be poor and may in effect bring up the value, the taxable value, of that land at the detriment of the poor farmer. For that reason and the other reason cited by people here, it helps renters, it helps property taxpayers, it helps farmers. I rise in support of the measure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am sure there's merit in the concept put forth by this Bill. I was indeed shocked when it came out of Revenue Committee - but of course the Sponsor is the Chairman of that Committee. - but the Sponsors of this Bill, the coalition, indicated to me in their conversations that they didn't



feel this Bill had a ghost of a chance this year and I couldn't believe that it's on Third Reading in this House. I am sure that the concept will be back. I do not see how in the world we can afford this type of program this year or next year and I would urge a 'no' vote on this matter."

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

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 3279. I think what this Bill represents is a very realistic approach to tax relief for all of our constituents, or at least a great number of them. Those of us who are in favor of progressiveness and taxing should be in favor of this concept because that indeed is what this Bill represents. What this Bill does is tie...tie your level of relief to your income level. I think we should take a look at the income levels that would receive relief under this Act, and question whether relief...whether the relief is indeed necessary and appropriate. I think if you look at the family income levels under this Act and the amount of relief which would be provided, you would find that it is a modest and appropriate method of dealing with the extreme problems many people are having with dealing with the very heavy tax burden. Under this Bill some 60 percent of the relief provided would go to families...whose family income is approximately 12 thousand dollars or less. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have many people, I think, in my community who may have family incomes of 18 thousand dollars or so, but that represents both family members working. That represents both family...family members working so families can survive, so they might send their children to school, so that they might provide the necessities of life for sizable families. Those people are in as much need of relief as others. What we're proposing here is a modest level of relief, something that the state can afford, something that will address the questions of progressiveness in taxing and I would urge you to give serious consideration to your support and support House Bill 3279."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

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



the Sponsor yield?"

Pierce: "Yeah."

Wikoff: "Representative Pierce, could you give me approximate....idea of what this would mean to a full-time Legislator whose only source of income is the legislative salary, or have we been exempted?"

Pierce: "No, Legislators are entitled to the same circuit breaker, home-
stead and other real estate tax relief as are others. A full-time
Legislator, I take it, is someone whose only income is from the
Legislature. Unlike myself and other lawyers, that would be 20
thousand a year income, and we subtract the 2 percent from the
maximum 650....your maximum....your maximum grant would be 250 dollars.
That would be assuming ...assuming that your real estate taxes are
over two and a half percent of your income and that you get up to the
maximum 650, minus two percent of your income. I don't know in
Champaign County if your taxes are that high."

Wikoff: "Thank you."

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

Farley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All
those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed....The
previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce
to close."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate the fact that this
is a comprehensive real estate tax reform measure; that it affects
all homeowners regardless of age, renters regardless of age and
farmers. I'm glad that the Gentleman, Mr. Stuffle, emphasized what
this does for farmers. The normal growth of the state's revenue
should take care of the cost of this program as it phases in under
Amendment #1, over three years. I wouldn't have sponsored it if I
didn't believe it to be responsible. The Chicago Sun Times has found
it to be responsible and not a budget-buster in two different
editorials. They don't feel that it's too big a step. Now,
perhaps the Senate, in its wisdom, will water this down somewhat.
We watered it down in Committee with Amendment #1, which was adopted
in Committee and approved on the floor. Your voters back home aren't



concerned with ...with potholes nearly as much as they are concerned with their real estate taxes. The real estate taxes that threaten their ability to remain in their home, to live in their home. If we want to maintain the American homeowner and not cause the type of revolt that they have in California, that threatens the very existence of schools and local and state government, we must do something comprehensive now. That's what House Bill 3279 does. It's late in the day. I solicit your support for this very...very serious attempt at real estate tax reform."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3279 pass? All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'aye' on this Bill. It's fine for all of us to stand around here and talk about things like O.T.B., but now we're talking about something that's called necessity. This is a necessity. I think we've all heard about real estate tax reform as we've campaigned in the spring, and we'll hear more about as we campaign in the fall. If we're going to tell our constituents that we are really down here trying to do something substantial and constructive, to bring about real estate tax reform this is the first step, it may not be the perfect step, but it's the first step. It's for all homeowners and all renters, not just senior citizens. Seniors over 10 thousand dollars, they'll get some relief, but not as much relief as low income seniors. When 60 percent of the money ...60 percent of the people with family incomes of 12 thousand dollars or less are going to get this money, you take a look at how people who make 12 thousand dollars or less are going to be able to live and exist; they are the people who are going to get the bulk of the money, they're the people who need..."(mike off)

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ...a few minutes ago I spoke about poor people and some of the concerns that I have for them and sometimes where we...some people turn their



backs on them. There is another class, that's the middle class, that we should also not forget, that we should give some sensitivity to. They are an embattled group in America today and I suspect they will become an embittered group as they become more embattled. I am voting for 3279 for that middle class constituency that I represent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What bothers me is that the people are mad about the high cost of taxes, but this isn't what they want. They want us to stop spending. The day we stop spending is when the taxes will go down. That's what they want. They don't want this sham, 30 thousand dollars is not a low income. Who's fooling who? We are just trying to make it look like we're for the taxpayer. The only way you do for the taxpayer is to quit spending."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Skinner: "Yes, I'm going to vote 'present' on this because as a full-time Legislator, with no outside income, I obviously have a conflict of interest. This is tax relief for Legislators and I will happily accept it if you pass it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'ayes', 40 'nays', 8 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3283."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3283."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3283. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's handling that Bill? Representative from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3283 provides that insurance companies that write life insurance and health and accident insurance cannot discriminate against persons with, cannot discriminate against persons with disabilities or handicaps in their rates. If those disabilities and handicaps do not effect the life expectancy of the individual and I would urge passage of House Bill 3283."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves... The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Would the Sponsor yield, please, for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Luft: "Does handicapped also include mental illness?"

Kane: "There is not a definition of handicapped in this language at the present time. It does not specifically include mental illness, no."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that conclude your questioning, Mr. Luft? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

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

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

Schuneman: "Representative, I believe you said that this Bill applies to life insurance. Does Amendment #2...Is Amendment #2 still attached to the Bill?"

Kane: "Amendment #2 is language that cleans up some of the language and applies specifically to life insurance."

Schuneman: "My copy..."

Kane: "I think you're looking at Amendment #3."

Schuneman: "Oh, okay. Amendment #3. Is that still attached to the Bill?"

Kane: "Yes, Amendment #3, which applies to health and accident insurance is still a part of the Bill."



Schuneman: "Well this is the problem, this is the part, Representative, that you indicated to me a few days ago you were going to remove by Amendment and that has not been removed. What are your intentions regarding that?"

Kane: "Since we didn't get to this Bill before and the Amendment has been filed, what I'm asking is that we pass this Bill in the present form. And it would be my intention to delete that language since we have not been able to work out some of the problems with it and delineate it only to specific handicaps and disabilities and so we will do that over in the Senate."

Schuneman: "So your intention then is that the Bill will only apply to life insurance?"

Kane: "Yes,"

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill does have some problems as it has been extended to apply to disability insurance and health and accident insurance. But I believe that the very good Sponsor of this Bill will keep his word on this matter and will have it amended in the Senate. And consequently, I am in support of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane... Excuse me, the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is an excellent Bill. There is, as Representative Schuneman has just pointed out, a matter in it that will be cleared up when it gets to the Senate. But it addresses a problem that for far too long we have not addressed in the Illinois Legislature. I urge you with all the possible persuasive power that I could muster that you pass this Bill. Because it certainly, certainly goes a long way toward cleaning up a problem that we have ignored much too long in our insurance in Illinois. I urge that we pass House Bill 3283."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on behalf of those persons who are handicapped and who are discriminated in insurance rates when their disability does not effect their life



expectancy. I would urge the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3283 pass?"

All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Yes, Sir. McPike 'aye'. On this question there's 147 'aye', 1 'nay'. Waddell 'aye'. 3 recorded as 'present'... This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3287. Mr. Kempiners."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3287. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance and the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, correct the board. 3287, Jack. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was debated length...in a lengthy debate yesterday when two Amendments were added. Basically, it creates the local initiative fund for the purpose of local public and non-public agencies to contribute to this fund and to receive 75 percent matching of Title 20 Funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to provide social services for people within their particular jurisdiction. The Amendment #1 was an agreed upon Amendment and Amendment #2, which was offered by Representative Madigan, was adopted onto this Bill and I'm sure you remember the debate and so I'll end there and just ask for your support of this House Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 3287 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hesitate to rise on this but I would suggest to all the Members of the House, there are accompanying Appropriation Bills. I realized they've tried to work this matter out. I'm voting 'present' for a number of reasons and one that I expressed the other day when this was up on Second Reading. We will have another chance to discuss this matter because there is an Appropriation Bill that now is resting in Approp. II. But I suggest to you again and I was informed



by a press statement just recently that some...again, this is an area where some action has already been taken relative to this program long before we...long before we act here in the General Assembly. So, it seems to be a feeling that...instead of us ratifying and instead of us establishing programs that the Constitution so provides, some people in the Executive Branch are going ahead with programs and then sending down legislation for us to ratify what they do, whether it is right or wrong that's what we're doing here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I'm only explaining my vote because there's so few of us and you wonder why we might vote 'no'. The reason I'm voting 'no' is that too often we tried to, with tricky phrases, have a program that sounds good. From where I sit the local initiative programs has meant that we've lost many, many federal dollars. And just calling something a local initiative fund and a local initiative program, I don't think that makes it good. I think we're going to continue to lose federal funds and therefore I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote I would just like Representative Matijevich to know that we realized he was voting red because at one point Peggy Pullen was too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye', 3 'nay', 15 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3296."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3296. A Bill for an Act in relation to Peer Review Committees for long term health care facilities and the professional staffs of such facilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion. Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this creates



the...House Bill 3296 creates the Long Term Care...Peer Review Protection Act. It provides immunity and confidentiality for the Peer Review Committee. It is, there is similar legislation now in about 38 states and this is recommended by the health care... the American Health Care Association and I think it's much needed legislation to improve the health care in Illinois and I'd certainly appreciate... It's patterned after similar legislation in Indiana and I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to remind some people here of exactly what's in that Bill. I'm not sure that we're really following the precedence of other states. I think we're giving entirely too much latitude to the industry. What the Bill provides is that they may set up these Committees by contract amongst themselves and that there is...we have no guidelines in there for even very simple things, like how big the Peer Committee is, who shall be the members of the Peer Review Committee or any procedures that the Peer Review Committee should follow. So, I think that really we're giving such wide discretionary powers to the industry here that the Bill ought to be defeated. I could support a Bill that had some restrictions in there or at least some guidelines in there as to what the...the Committees...how they should be structured and how they should function. But this one doesn't specify any of that and I think until we can get something like that we should defeat it. There's no emergency thing and I'm surprised it got through the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "Representative Campbell, we have all heard time and again that the nursing home industry is subject to repeated inspections and reporting, why should they now have another reporting who consists of a group of their own members?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Campbell, I believe your microphone is on."

Campbell: "Hello. This is simply giving them an opportunity to clean up their own house as we do in the Medical Practice Act and several other Peer Review Committees that we have and there's nothing really new or unusual about this and I think you will agree that there...there is some cleaning up that needs to be done. Obviously it isn't being done by the inspections that they're having now, so let the people work to do that within their own group."

Brummer: "May I address the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Brummer: "I realize that the nursing home industry is in support of this Bill. This is a Bill that they are supporting. However, I feel that we have sufficient regulations with the Department of Public Health, with the Federal Medicare Programs. And I feel it is an error to have those who are involved in the industry, who themselves present now a whitewash of the industry and say, 'Well, we have inspected ourselves and we are clean.' I think this will be misleading to the public. I do not think it adds anything to cleaning up those abuses in the nursing home industry and I think this Bill ought to be defeated."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I personally think that Chuck Campbell has a good Bill here. I was in on Human Resources for two terms. I...perceived as long...Representative Lou Capuzi was the Chairman one term for me and the other term was Representative Eugenia Chapman and I personally think that we should have done this years ago with almost all the professions and all the institutions throughout the state. I think we ought to all always give them an opportunity to peer review themselves. Then indeed if they breach that we have the wherewithall then to pass the law to be strict and more restrictive and then even to go in there and receive C.P.A. reports and the like. I personally think this is a logical, common sense approach to handling people in a good faith method and I



applaud Chuck Campbell and I'd urge you to 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, to close."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's no provision in here that gives the authority of any Peer Review Committee to overrule any of the inspections made by any department of the state, obviously, and it does give them an opportunity to control some of their own problems. And there is no cost to the state whatsoever and I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3296 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye', 15 'nay', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is the intent of the Speaker to continue on the Calendar for the remainder of the day and to provide an opportunity to every Sponsor to have his Bill called and given a hearing, including Postponed Consideration. In light of that and in light of the limited number of hours available I would now move that we move to a short debate circumstance and situation so that on each of the Bills to be called for the remainder of the day there would be one proponent, one opponent and then the Sponsor would be allowed to close the debate and we would proceed to a Roll Call. There will still be explanation of vote and I would further move that the explanation of vote be limited to two minutes. One minute? Make it one minute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support the Gentleman's motion. It's clear that this is the only equitable way in which to give every Member a chance to have their Bill heard before midnight tonight, if in fact we are here that late."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is...the Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support the Gentleman's motion but I would like to make one correction from the...Mr. Telcser has made an observation that if we do this everybody will have an opportunity to have their Bill called. I would submit to you, Representative, that everybody would have had their Bill called if we didn't do this. All we have to do is go...turn to the next page and we're finished with House Bills, Third Reading, which means everybody in this House, which the Republican Party kept accusing us would never have their Bills called, every Bill on Third Reading has been called when we finish the next page."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman is correct, if you turn the page there aren't many Third Reading Bills left but there are a number of Bills on Postponed Consideration whose Sponsors would like to have heard and you may be sure, Representative, that this is not any kind of a partisan request and I'm sorry that you indicate that it is."

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

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker it's the intent...address that to the leader, floor leader. Is the intent to go back to touch the House Bills Third Reading that have not been heard this week and are the Calendar but were not heard?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "It's the intent of the Speaker to continue in numerical order to the end and...and go back and. Well, it was the intent to go back and go through all the numbers again."

Polk: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that we should suspend the appropriate rule to have limited debate. We'll have one proponent, one opponent. You'll have the opportunity to explain your vote for the appropriate amount of time. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Clerk will take...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's



143 'aye', 9 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present' and the Gentleman suspends the appropriate rule. Now, the Gentleman moves that the House go into limited debate. One proponent, one opponent, with the explanation of votes for the proper time. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'. On that question, Don...Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if the Majority Leader might just take a look at this. There's only six Bills left on this page if you take out the Appropriation Bills and then let's go to short debate so everybody's got a shot..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', all opposed. The 'ayes' have it and we're not in the process of short debate with explanation." House Bill 3312."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3312. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3312 helps to clarify the minimum standards that must exist for establishing a community college district. The Act now states that there must be a population of 60 thousand persons and equalized assessed valuation of at least 150 million dollars. This Bill sets forth in a clear manner that the equalized assessed valuation and population is a threshold a community must meet before they shall be considered qualified to establish a new community college district. The Illinois Community College Board should find that they meet this standard of population and equalized assessed valuation but still, because of enrollment or other pertinent factors would not be a desirable community college district. A public hearing must be held to advise the rejection of the application and thus give the proponents of this proposed district an opportunity to advance any additional information that might persuade the Illinois Community College Board to approve the petition for formation into a new community college district. This Bill, as amended, is supported by the Illinois Community College Board and it passed Higher...it was unanimously approved in Higher Ed. Committee. I seek your favorable support."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion?"

Are there any opponents? The question is, shall House Bill 3312 pass?

All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye', 3 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3327. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3327. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Holewinski."

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

House Bill 3327 addresses a problem that we've experienced in the last couple years in my district. And from what my information tells me this has been an experience also in a variety of areas of the state. What the Bill simply provides and it's a very short Bill, it provides that an insurance company that cancels its agent's contract, that is the agent who writes the insurance, cannot automatically terminate all the policies that agent has written. What...what this does is give the consumer the option so that if his agent's contract with the insurance company is canceled he can either seek new insurance through that agent or anyone else or continue with the company. It came out of the Insurance Committee with, I think, 14 affirmative votes. There's very...to my knowledge there's no substantial disagreement as to the intents or purpose of the Bill. It was also in the...one of the recommendations of the Valukas report prepared for the Department of Insurance. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any opponents? Any opponents?"

The question is, shall House Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "I just wanted to ask a question. If they refuse to write the Workmen's Comp. Bill can they turn you down on something like this?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Holewinski, please."

Conti: "I've had an agent... In other words, I've had an agent for four or five years. They refuse to renew the Workman's Comp. because



there was too much of a problem. Does that mean that a municipality or an individual cannot get insurance?"

Holewinski: "No. I think the Sections...the only Sections this refers to is really homeowners liability."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3327 pass?"

All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'aye' and...this seems to be my day, I guess. But let me say one thing to the Sponsor of this Bill and to the Members of the House. I am one Member of this House that can attest to what happens when this kind of occurrence is allowed to take place. I left Springfield two weeks ago and when I got home I received a notice that my agent, my agent, had been...had some contractual problems so he had been discontinued so that my policy would not be extended beyond August 1. Now, that happened to me two weeks ago. This Bill is just two weeks late but I'm still supporting it with my 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3339. Who's handling that for state government reorganization?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3339. A Bill for an Act to abolish certain committees, councils and commissions. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is not new but it's probably an idea whose time has come. House Bill 3339 is a Committee Bill out of State Government Committee, which abolishes certain commissions and councils of the General Assembly. The creation and proliferation of legislative commissions had its origin and its limitations placed on the General Assembly by the 1870 Constitution. As a result of



judicial interpretation legislative commissions were created to do the work of legislative committees during the interim between Sessions. However, today there are no longer any constitutional or judicial limitations on the ability of committees to meet continuously throughout out Sessions. Legislative commissions came into being to serve a very important need. That need is now removed. Some committees have continued to exist over the years even though their original mandate has long been fulfilled. Some have gone ungainly looking for continuing justification for their existence. At the present time the Commissions that are proposed to be abolished in House Bill 3339 spend a little over 3 million dollars a year."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Don. Could we give the Gentleman some order? Please, proceed."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the Members to listen carefully while I read the commissions that are not abolished by this Bill. These are the ones that are not abolished by this piece of legislation. First of all, the Auditor General, Cities and Villages Municipal Problems Commission, the Dangerous Drugs Advisory Council, the Economic and Fiscal Commission, the Illinois Legislative Council, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Commission, the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid, the Legislative Audit Commission, the Legislative Information Systems Commission, the Legislative Investigating Commission, the Legislative Reference Bureau, the Legislative Space Needs Commission, School Problems Commission, Senate Operations Commission, State Employee's Group Insurance Commission, Transportation Study Commission and the County Problems Commission. Those 18 commissions are not abolished. There are some 50 commissions of the General Assembly which are abolished. Those that are created each year by new legislation are not effected by this legislation. I'd ask for your favorable support for House Bill 3339. I don't think there's anyone in opposition."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who wishes to speak in opposition? The Gentleman from



Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to delay the business of the House but I think the Gentleman should have spent more time in explaining the commissions and the committees that are being dissolved and perhaps...I think if the people of the House would know they'd be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to close."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wonder how many of you have received the various Commission and Committee Reports over the year and have put them on your desk and have never taken a look at them. I wonder how many of you have taken a look at Commission Reports and then sat at the Committee and not looked at the reports for which the legislation was created from those Commission Reports. The volume of reports coming from Commissions today, which is not read by the Members of the General Assembly is awesome. I had a stack in my office over three feet high of Commission Reports this year and I'm sure I, like you, have not read many of them. Probably today it is much more efficient to do the work of many of the Commissions by doing them in our existing Committees. We have Interim Study we have various subcommittees created of the substantive committees of this General Assembly. We can save over \$3 million dollars by supporting House Bill 3339 and I ask you to support me in this attempt to do something about making our system of the General Assembly much more efficient and responsive."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3339 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears that some of the commissions that were left untouched, the decisions on those commissions were rather arbitrary. As I read the Bill, however, I see some commissions that are being abolished that are actually grant making commissions. For instance, the Commission on Juvenile Delinquency Prevention is abolished. That commission, in addition to its activities makes... to community organizations that are vital to the work of



preventing delinquency, juvenile delinquency. And as I further read the Bill, although I'm not as sure and I didn't get a chance to ask a question, it appears on the face of it that the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission is abolished and I just don't think we'd want to do that so I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to belabor you in regard to any argument but we did receive a list from the Sponsor of the commissions that were being retained. Let me give you the commissions that are going to be abolished and you determine what constituency you're serving. The Commission on Children, the Commission on the Status of Women, the Spanish Speaking People's Study Commission, the Council on Aging, the Commission to Visit and Examine State Institutions, the Election Laws Commission, the Judicial Advisory Commission, the Southwest Illinois Metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission, the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, the Illinois Energy Resources Commission, the Illinois Recreation Council, the Illinois Education Council, the Illinois Commission on Atomic Energy, the Data Information Systems Commission, the Illinois Insurance Laws Study Commission, the Law Revision Commission, the Model School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Commission, the Commission on the Reorganization of the General Assembly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Kane: "Very briefly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what the purpose of this Bill is and we've worked with this Bill for a number of years and that is to put the resources of the House where the decision making process is. All of these legislative commissions come in with proposals. All of those proposals have to go to committees. The Committees redo everything that the commissions have already done and you have to educate the committees as well as the commissions. What we want to do is to put



the resources into the committees where the decisions are made and not into commissions and we have all of that duplication and it doesn't work very well and hasn't worked very well and anybody who's been here for a while knows that they don't work very well and I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 76 'aye', 65 'nay', 11 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Can I poll the absentees please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees.

He's entitled to that. The Clerk will kindly poll the absentees. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Should he find enough people to get to 89 I would request a verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes. Bluthardt. Brandt. Caldwell. Collins.

Deuster. Ebbesen. Ewell. Friedrich. Hart. Hoffman. Hudson.

Huff. Klosak. Laurino. McCourt. Murphy. Nardulli. O'Brien.

Schlickman. Stearney. Terzich. Williams. Winchester and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 76 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Would you change me from 'present' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Madigan as 'no'. 76 'aye', 66 'nay'. This Bill, having not received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost." House Bill 3340. Are you handling that Bill as well, Mr. Totten?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3340. A Bill for an Act to reorganize and consolidate certain legislative service agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Provisions of House Bill 3340 have been long debated by the Members of the General Assembly in other Bills. The provisions of House Bill 3340, from not only extensive research done by the State Committee



but by many Members of this General Assembly and from the House Executive Committee hearings chaired by Representative Matijevich in the last Session of the General Assembly. Too often Members of the General Assembly are faced with the fact that the Executive Branch of State Government is continually reorganizing and attempting to become more efficient. We in the General Assembly have not done a major reorganization of our Legislative Service Unit in as many years as I can remember. House Bill 3340 deals with that subject matter. It deals with streamlining and overhauling the operations of the General Assembly. The present structure between the Executive and the General Assembly puts us at a distinct disadvantage because many of our service units are staggered through various different independent units. House Bill 3340 will attempt to correct and bring the General Assembly into a more efficient, modern and competitive branch of government. The reorganization provisions are an extension of many Members desire to streamline the process. Adoption of this proposal would usher in a new era in legislative reorganization in Illinois. An era where form would have a greater relationship to function and effectiveness. There are several major advantages of House Bill 3340. Number one, it would fix the responsibility and accountability for all administrative and technical services with the leadership. It would provide for a professional administrator for all administrative services to the General Assembly in order to give us the technical capability to meet these responsibilities. It would free up leadership staff currently involved in basic administrative tasks to provide more important assistance with legislation. It would align costly duplication and basic operation. It would establish a sorely needed mechanism for revising the Illinois Statutes. It would consolidate all legislative libraries into one office where reference materials can be obtained without duplication. It would combine computer and printing services into one office where these services can be efficiently coordinated saving time and money. In addition, in conclusion, it would provide for more and a better administrative and technical services for the



dollars we are currently spending by integrating these services and avoiding duplications of the basic administrative tasks.

I'd be happy to answer any questions on House Bill 3340. It's a comprehensive and intensive study done to accomplish the product of this Bill and I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any opponents? Who wants to speak in opposition, if anyone? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I understand it this would all but annihilate the Legislative Council, the Reference Bureau and Information Systems run under the legislative end. It would remove the libraries in those groups, putting them in one library. We'd have people running back and forth. We'd create a new umbrella to run the entire thing. I submit to you that the Space Needs Commission, the Senate Operations Commission, the House Operations, the Council the Reference Bureau, the Information Systems are running very well. To create a new umbrella for all of these for the thought of fiscal management, I think, is not the best thing that you could do. So, I would ask for a red vote on this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will. I'm sorry, Ma'am, we're in short debate. Give the Lady the mike please."

Geo-Karis: "Okay. Just a point of information. You just had one Bill abolishing commissions and now you're adding three more. I don't see the consistency."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to close on House Bill 3340."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In closing I would just like to point out that probably no branch of government needs this help more than we do. We are inundated by over 6,000 Bills in a Session, we are inundated by an Executive Branch of Government with the capability and availability of sources over and beyond our ability to keep up with them. We are scattered amongst several reference and assist committees



throughout the General Assembly that have no coordination and much duplication. I can't stand before you and say that this would save any money but I can stand before you and say that this would greatly assist all of us in being able to compete and operate effectively as Members of this General Assembly and as Representatives of the constituency that we were elected from. I think it is much needed, I think it is well thought out and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 3340 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'." The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Skinner: "This is a pretty good example of the disadvantages of short debate. We've got a system that's working now and that is something that really astounds anyone who realizes how many people are in the General Assembly. I think we ought to leave it the way it is because I don't think an outstandingly persuasive argument has been made to change it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 49 'aye', 76 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 3350."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3350. A Bill for an Act to regulate transportation by rail of hazardous material in the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which would authorize the State of Illinois to adopt the existing Federal regulations that regulate the transportation of hazardous materials over the rail. This Bill becomes law the Illinois Commerce Commission will be authorized to adopt those regulations and to enforce them with officers and agents of the Illinois Commerce Commission. I would respectfully request a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opponent that want to speak on this measure? The question is, shall House Bill 3350 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Williams: "Yes, I'd just like to say that Illinois certainly has a greater track density and a larger number of accidents in the nation and my district has probably the largest number of railroads running through it as well as Representative Dunn, we certainly need this. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye', 6 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3386."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3386. A Bill for an Act amending Sections of an Act relating to the Department of Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's handling that Bill on state government? Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3386 is really clean-up language for the legislation that we passed last year in the reorganization of the Department of Law Enforcement. It actually replaces the Bureau of Narcotics with the Division of Narcotics. It's just the terminology in the language...in several parts of the Bill the State Police Merit Board is referred to and it should be the Department of Law Enforcement Merit Board. And it allows 14 members in the Division of Narcotics Control to be transferred into the Special Agent Pension Plan and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any opponents that want to speak to the measure? The question is, shall House Bill 3386 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Pardon me. No. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. It's been



brought to the Chair's attention that there is one Senate Bill which is an emergency category. That's Senate Bill 1569. It's located on page 8 of your calendar and on that question there's Senate Bill 1569. Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1569. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Regents for the development of a parking facility in Northern Illinois University. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I believe the leadership on both sides has been apprised on this Bill. This Bill appropriates 684 thousand dollars to the development of a parking facility at Northern Illinois University and they are paying in that exact amount from their local fund. We're just doing this for a proper procedure of a government accounting funds from Northern Illinois and I urge your support of this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any opponents? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1569 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record, please. On this question there's 133 'aye', 7 'nay', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives and Representative Hanahan, may I have your attention. Thank you. We do have one major piece of legislation that has been the focus of a great deal of public attention over the last several months. This Bill is on the Order of Third Reading at this time, page 3, House Bill 1333. I've discussed this with the Republican Leadership and Representative Daniels and at this time I move that we consider House Bill 1333 immediately."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate rule for the immediate consideration of House Bill 1333. Is there leave for the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing no objection the Attendance Roll Call will be used. House Bill 1333. The Clerk will read the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1333. A Bill for an Act relating to product liability actions and product liability insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1333 is the product liability Bill that you heard at some length yesterday. It was...had Amendment #6 adopted to it. It applies to statute of repose of a ten year period from the time it's sold to the initial user. A twelve year period from the time of its initial manufacturer. It also has a two year period of limitation from the time of injury with an outside limit of eight years. We have attempted through our negotiations to resolve most of the questions involved and I would ask for your favorable support of the same."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1333 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan, to explain his vote, the timer is on."

Houlihan: "I'll withdraw my explanation of my vote. I do support the Bill and it is an agreed compromise piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to explain his vote, the timer is on."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know some Members have had some questions about the position of the AFL-CIO on this particular piece of legislation and noted that in the last newsletter there was an article in opposition to the passage of this piece of legislation. That was written before there was an agreement arrived at. It was written prior to some of the Amendments that were adopted or the Amendment that was adopted to this Bill as introduced. That doesn't mean that we're not concerned, we are concerned with certain areas in asbestosis and certain chemicals affecting workers in Illinois and their right to sue if they're injured from the usage of these products. It also...we do recommend sincerely, even though I'm going to vote 'aye', that we do have some concentrated efforts in the future to look at the problems that



might arise by the passage of this legislation, because I don't think anyone should really just willy-nilly give up the rights in Illinois, the right of recovery for accidents or injuries caused by the manufacturers that did not take care to prevent one common...to the Sponsors that we will be constantly vigilant in the future for some changes so that the working people of Illinois are protected. And I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, do you want to explain your vote?"

Matijevich: "No, I was just going to tell the last speaker, I never wanted to question the AFL-CIO about this Bill. What I did want to question him about was endorsements?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the... Representative Gaines, 'aye', please. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'aye', 3 'no', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask leave of the House that anybody that would like to be added as a Cosponsor can leave to go up to the well and add their name as a Cosponsor to this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave, are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. On... On page...we're on page 3 of the Calendar. Are there any Sponsors that want to have their Bills called on page 3? Okay. House Bill 400. Representative Skinner. 400, Jack. He will."

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

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

Skinner: "I take inspiration from the appearance of our President in this chambers today. On January 4, President Carter called for the Congress to legislate on the key issue of post-employment



controls designed to deal with the revolving door problem for governmental officials. We've got it in spades in Illinois and in response to that and inspired by that pronouncement, House Bill 400 was developed. What it does is say that if you work for state government and earn 20,000 dollars or more that for four years immediately following the termination of your governmental service no official of an Executive Agency shall be employed by any persons affected by the actions of that agency unless the employer is a political subdivision of the state. Nor for compensation of financial gain shall by ex-employee appear before or initiate contact with any officer or employee of the agency of which he or she was formerly an official. The penalty would be a Class B Misdemeanor and in addition anything that is earned for this illegal job. Now, why is that needed in the State of Illinois? It's needed because under the prior administration you can almost kick off the names of the Directors of the Departments who would have been in violation of this law. For example, here's a headline from the late belated, lamented Daily News, March 14, 1977. 'Ex-State Public Aid Chief hired by lobbyists for nursing homes.' Well, obviously the Director of the Department of Public Aid helps set the rates for nursing homes and that isn't right. Of course we know that Ron 'Stockler', the Director of the Department of R and E, took all of his files with him, that is all of our files with him because he took every letter that any Legislator had ever written with him. We know that two of Governor Walker's Insurance Directors now work for the insurance industry. Robert Wilcox works for the Property and Casualty Insurance Council and Michael Duncan works for All State Insurance. Additional employees of the Department of Insurance who have retired or left office... left their post in the last two years include David D. Taylor, who went to work for United Equitable Insurance Company and Dennis W. Toivonen, who now works for the Compensation Rating Bureau in New York. And Campbell D. McCue, who now works for the Abraham Lincoln Insurance Company in Springfield. This is a serious problem, Ladies and Gentlemen, and we must do something about it or we will have, well we will have more revolving doors



in Springfield. This may mean that we have to raise the salaries of those people who are regulating industries in the State of Illinois, in which case I shall be happy to vote 'yes', if they give their implied consent once this Bill is enacted that they will not go to work for the industry they have been regulating for two years after they leave office. I now yield to my noble opponent."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is in opposition? Representative Matijevich? "

Matijevich: "Well the problem, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that too often we pass legislation that may have good intent but we never find out how broad that can be. I don't think we serve the public's interest or anybody's interest when we, as a Legislature say that by our actions we are going to tell private enterprise who they can or cannot employ. I think that's beyond the function of us as a Legislature and I think that if we pass such legislation that we can do some harm both to any individual or private enterprise or even government. I think that by this type of legislation you can hamper an individual's right to employment, right to earn a living and I think that can be very dangerous. So, I realize that Representative Skinner has good intent. I know that because I've heard him talk about the subject matter in the Appropriations Committee, but I think this legislation is too broad and I've heard on that side of the aisle so often...it's said that we are regulating too much. We're telling people every day what they can or cannot do, we're telling private enterprise what they can or cannot do. So, in spite of the meritorious intent of the Legislature I would say that we are better off and the Legislature is better off by not getting our dirty hands into the subject matter and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Well, the prior speaker may admit to having dirty hands but I don't. If he thinks that this Bill gets into private enterprise he ought to take a look at the Bill that he just voted for, House Bill 3190. The Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act. This Bill is truly an Ethic's Bill for the State of Illinois."



We are going to know everything there is to know about consultants. But what about our own employees? For whom are they working after they have been approached by someone within the industry which they are licensing or regulating? Are they working for the best interest of the State of Illinois or are they working for their future potential employer? I would suggest that there's at least one Walker Director for which there should be absolutely no question, or perhaps I should put it in the reverse, perhaps there should be very many questions to the Director of Financial Institutions was working for? Because after he left state employment where he was regulating currency exchanges, he bought one. Now isn't that interesting? Now, Illinois is one of the most corrupt states in the United States. One can figure that out...that is what one of the National Press Corps. sitting up here this morning said. He said, 'Here we are...' I won't give a direct quote because some of you would take direct offense, but my wife turned around and said, 'Do you really think that Illinois is worse than Maryland?' And the guy answered, 'Well probably only on absolute numbers, certainly not percentage.' But absolute numbers on any rank order you want to put, this state has problems with conflict of interest and we have done virtually nothing about it. We're going to do something about it with House Bill 3190 but that's from the ones who are coming into government to get a piece of the action. I think we ought to approach the other side, those who are going from government to get a piece of the private sector's action. This Bill is not unique in this country. In the State of Michigan there's a one year prohibition and in the State of Hawaii it's five years, but then again we don't have scandals in the State of Hawaii or in the State of Michigan like we have in the State of Illinois. So if this goes down to defeat I'll know that too many of my colleagues friends plan to do exactly what this Bill would prohibit."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Parliamentarian please come to the podium. Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison,



to explain his vote."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I generally confine my reliance on the the Sponsor of this Bill to his expertise in the area of real estate taxes, etc., but I think he's come upon a novel idea and I'm going to support this Bill. It seems to me that perhaps the Bill doesn't go far enough and maybe it ought to apply to Legislators."

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

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I too am supporting this Bill. I think the Gentleman came up with a good idea. I just wish that I had thought to amend it while he had it on Second Reading to provide that before they enter service they must have been registered voters in Illinois for two years."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I think this is a fine Bill, I just cannot help but stand up and wonder why the fine Sponsor did not support the Amendment which I had with regard to the Department of Insurance, which would have...which has been a department which has been subject to a great deal of attack in that area. And the Amendment that I'm referring to would have created a seven member independent board with regard to that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'aye', 35 'no'. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I certainly want to at least give those 52 absentees a chance to say that they're not here. They're already voted, you say? Not by me, Sir."

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

Skinner: "Will you please poll the absentees, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 82 'aye' and 35 'no'.

The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Conti, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bluthardt.



Brady. Brandt. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Collins.
 Daniels. Corneal Davis. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Ebbesen.
 Epton. Ewing. Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Harris.
 Hart. Hoffman. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe, 'aye'. Representative Jaffe 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Katz. Kelly. Klosak. Laurino. Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Lechowicz 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Matejek. McBroom. McGrew. McMaster. Miller. Mudd.
 Nardulli. Richmond. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schuneman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlien 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney. Totten. VonBoeckman. Wikoff. Williams.
 Winchester. Wolf. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "85 'aye', 36 'no'. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Well, you've already announced, I wanted to change to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "I haven't declared the result yet. Representative
 Macdonald from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Antonovych."

Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker, I had my light on for some time and I would
 like to explain my vote. And in answer to... I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the count? 86 'aye', 35 'no'. and the Bill,
 having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
 declared lost. Are there any other Sponsors who have Bills
 on page 3 that desire to have them called? Representative Bowman,
 what's the number of the Bill?"

Bowman: "1270."

Speaker Redmond: "1270. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the rule that we
 just adopted for short debate. And that rule, and I just consulted
 with the Parliamentarian, reads that the Sponsor of the Bill shall
 receive two minutes as a proponent of the Bill and there shall
 be one opponent to the Bill who shall be allowed two minutes
 and then we will immediately proceed to a Roll Call. There will
 be no opportunity to close debate given to the Sponsor of the Bill.
 And there will be one minute for explanation of votes. Thank you,
 Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman, the timer is on..."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1270. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bill(sic), this is a Bill on...Cosponsor is Representative Porter. It affects the township assistance programs. It will provide in those cases where the township is levied...at the one mil. rate to qualify assistance, that it may if it chooses, raise its rate above one mil. in order to provide additional support for recipients. It... The Bill has been amended three times to tighten up the language to make absolutely sure that the township will in all other respects conform to the rules and regulations of the Illinois Department of Public Aid and that it will not be able to shift any portion of the financing of its program off onto the state. This is purely a supplementation Bill and I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is... Representative DiPrima, are you in opposition? The only purpose for rising is in opposition."

DiPrima: "I just want to make one announcement. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Redmond: "That is not the order right now, Representative DiPrima. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, what this Bill does, unless it was changed by the Amendment is to provide that local governing units and I suppose that means municipalities, primary response for the administration and supervision of...under general assistance. Hasn't that always been the responsibility of the township supervisor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Amendment 3..."

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 101 'aye' and 11 'no' and the Bill, having



received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
 Representative Younge, you have some Bills on page 3, do you
 desire to have any of them called?"

Younge: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, would you call 1088 please?"

Speaker Redmond: "1088."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1088. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections
 of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This
 Bill would...would empower the Illinois Industrial Development
 Authority to make loans to the Regional Business Economic
 Development Council for the development of Progress Plaza
 Industrial Park. The Regional Council has a 2 million 300 dollar...
 2 million 300 thousand dollar federal grant to build this
 industrial park. This Bill passed the House and the Senate and
 was vetoed by the Governor and then died in the Senate last year.
 The emergency now is the possibility of losing the federal
 grant and I ask for your continued support of this matter because
 it will bring to the most depressed areas of Illinois between
 2 and 3 thousand jobs."

Speaker Redmond: "Is anyone in opposition? The question is, shall
 this Bill pass? Those in favor...wait a minute, Representative
 Leineneweber."

Leineneweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just going to point out, as
 the Lady indicated the Governor saw fit to veto this Bill. It's
 no different than it was when it was vetoed. I guess...somebody's
 saying give him another chance to veto it again but I hardly
 think that a Bill of this nature is an emergency. It provides
 for loans at 3 percent interest. It costs the state 1.9 million
 dollars, it's not in the budget. It's an exercise in futility
 and I urge a 'no' 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.
 Representative Davis."



Davis: "Well I just wanted to say....to explain my vote. If you want to do something to help a depressed area here's your opportunity. You've been talking about poor people being ripped off, here's your opportunity to do something for them so they won't be ripped off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski 'aye'. Representative Ewell 'aye'. For what purpose do you arise? Seventh inning stretch. Representative Ewell, no explanation of votes. Representative Madigan... Representative Gaines 'aye', Peters 'aye'. Anyone else? What's the score now, Mr. Clerk? Geo-Karis 'aye', Mudd 'aye'. Stuffle 'aye'. Representative Robert Walsh, 'aye'. What's the count now? 86 'aye'. Representative Campbell 'aye'. 87. Anyone else? On this question there's... Representative Van Duynes, you're recorded. 87 'aye'. Have all... Anyone desire to be added to the Roll Call? Representative Walsh 'aye'. Representative Pechous 'aye'. 88 'aye'. Representative Christensen 'aye'. On this question there's 89 'aye' and 50 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1533. Representative Younge. Representative Younge."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1533. A Bill for an Act to create the Depressed Area Land Use and Community Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, this Bill would establish the Illinois Depressed Area's Land Use and Community Development Authority. This authority is needed because we have areas in Illinois that are permanently and totally depressed and what the General Assembly needs is a plan as to how to make the taxates of these areas economically sound and help bring up the incomes of the people who live in these areas. The Bill would establish a fund that would...hire staff to bring about a long range economic growth plan and I ask for your support of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Dyer, 'aye'. 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? Take the record. Representative Younger, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Peters 'aye'. Keats 'aye'... Oh, pardon me, Representative Keats persists in 'no'."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, this is a joke. There are 20 empty chairs on that board. If we keep this up I'm going to verify and I want to get out of here just like everybody else. I can't believe we're going to play this turkey effort but if they keep voting it we're going to verify it and be here forever."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino 'aye'. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman who just spoke hasn't voted for anything such he's been here, he could leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? On this question there's 89 'aye', 46 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Well, we've got to go in order now. How about 1764. Kane? Out of the record. 1773. Did I skip 1710? 1710."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1710. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younger."

Younger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Very briefly, this Bill would give an authority to the Capital Development Board, a permissive authority for it to become the guarantor of bonds issued by any district when the district has had a successful referendum for school bonds but is unable to find a purchaser of those bonds. The schools in East St. Louis are condemned and have been condemned by the only district that this Bill relates to...or affects is School District 189, or the East St. Louis School District. And all of the schools are condemned in the East St. Louis School District and they have been condemned by the Office of Education, the Illinois Office of Education. Three of the schools have been



discontinued in their use and I'd like to just read to you very briefly what Martha O'Malley said, who is the Regional Superintendent. 'All of the schools in the East St. Louis area need improvements of leaking roofs.' What we're talking about is that the children in our area, in my area, leave homes with leaking roofs and go to schools with leaking roofs. They leave homes of...that have no plumbing and go to schools that have corroded floors and hazard water conditions and electrical conditions and they spend their whole day in those kinds of schools. And because these schools have amounted to and fall down to dungeons I ask for your support. What it will mean is that the board will help the school district find purchasers and that is what is needed and I ask for your help in this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone standing in opposition? 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? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Young, for what purpose do you rise?"

Young: "Could we poll the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Young."

Young: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that request."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has withdrawn her request for a poll of the absentees. On this...take the record. On this question there's 79 'aye' and 45 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 2075, did you say?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2075. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2075 is the companion Bill to House Bill 1088. It would authorize the Capital Development Board to provide loans for industrial park development in Illinois..."



to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. It is merely a Bill that gives a grant of power to the board. I have talked with the Representatives of the Executor of the Capital Development Board and they're in agreement with this Bill as is the Illinois Industrial Development Authority and I ask for your support of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? 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? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we passed 1088, this is the companion Appropriations Bill and I think we ought to send this to the...at least the companion Bill along with the substantive Bill."

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

Bradley: "Change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley, change him from 'no' to 'aye'. What's the count now, 86? Have all voted who wish? 86 'aye'...50 'no'. The Bill, having failed to received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 20...2214. Representative Youngue."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2214. A Bill for an Act in relation to family resource centers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Youngue."

Youngue: "I... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2214. would establish a pilot project of a program for family resource development. The upward mobility of families in our state is dependent upon knowledge, knowledge as to how to improve the quality of life. And this Bill would focus on the development of the potentials of less developed people and family groups, to help them to help themselves. Most of the legislation that we have addressed ourselves to here has to do with external help for people, food stamps, welfare, etc. This Bill would help people to develop their coping skills, therefore give them an opportunity to be self-delivery systems out of poverty."



And therefore this Bill will reverse the deteriorating conditions in the intricacies in the rural areas of this state where people are having trouble. The specific type of programs that would be discussed in this Bill, in this center..."

Speaker Redmond: "Two minute time on argument.

Younge: "Would be... there would be courses in child care and parent education and the development of the ...skills and language skills of children, their nutritional needs and to help them in the mental development of the children. This is a...I think new and very valuable concept and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? 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 Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I know that the family services of Champaign County is in very strong support of this concept. I believe, as this Bill is written it would provide for a pilot project but it might very well become a model that could be used throughout the rest of the state. This is your opportunity to do something to support the family. Thank you for your vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye' and 37 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2295. Representative Younge."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2295. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just have one other Bill I ask your support on. It's a Bill to amend the Capital Development Bond Act to authorize the issuance of 2 million dollars in bonds for loans to develop industrial parks. One of our largest problems in this state is the unemployment, the rising unemployment rates. Our business climate is adversely affected because there are not industrial park sites to attract and



to retain the business we have here. I read an article in the St. Louis newspaper which said that...a firm which would hire two... 20...2 thousand people did not locate in the City of St. Louis because there wasn't a 45 acre site. That tells us that if we would develop a site in the Metro. East area and in the Downstate area we would be able to attract industry. I have done a cost benefit ratio on this matter and the cost benefits of this would be 10 to 1 for the investment that we would make. There would be an increase of state revenues by taking people off of welfare, by their paying income tax, by their paying sales tax, by their buying homes and paying property tax. And the kinds of benefits that the state would receive would just far...10 to 1...outweigh the expenditures and I ask your support of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? 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? This vote...the Parliamentarian advises me this requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 107 votes required on this one. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 87 'aye' and 46 'no'. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 1764. Representative Kane, did you seek to have that one called? 1773. Representative Vinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1773, A Bill for an Act to repeal the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the description on the Bill is deceptive. It has been amended, everything in the original Bill after the enacting clause is struck. The Amendment which seeks to provide a responsive bureaucracy by creating a term appointment process after the next election is in its place. I urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition to this Bill as I rose in opposition to the Amendment some time ago which



was attempted to be tacked on to Representative Jacob's Bill. I think this Bill goes the wrong direction in terms of patronage. It's unfair to the career employees of this state. It should never have gotten out of Committee. It was called on an evening when no one knew what was going on and the chief opponents of the Bill were off the floor. This Bill was called in the Subcommittee on Pensions and Personnel and I was asked to handle it despite the fact I was opposed to it. And because of the fact that every Member of the Subcommittee was opposed to it. The Bill received a 5 to 0 vote in that Subcommittee. 5 to 0 against and then we brought it out here on the floor and emasculated it with this effort to destroy career appointments in the civil service system in the State of Illinois. It ought to be defeated."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this piece of legislation. I was the chief Sponsor of 1773 along with Tom Hanahan. I think that's the way to go but I guess everybody has to compromise a little bit so Sam Vinson offered this Amendment. I don't know where the Gentleman...Mr. Stuffle comes off. He handled this Bill in Subcommittee for us."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 19 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1884. Do you want this one called, Representative Catania?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1884. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. With the Amendments that we have adopted this Bill now requires that after January 1, 1979, padded seat backs will be placed on school buses in the State of Illinois only if federal funds are available. This is the product of the work of a Subcommittee chaired by Representative Kosinski. The Members were Representative Totten and



Representative Leverenz, they held a hearing on this. And this is fully supported by the Subcommittee and I'm sure they'll be happy to answer questions if you have off-hand, specifically. The Illinois Office of Education has surveyed the 1,017 school districts in the State of Illinois to find out how many school buses we are still talking about. The Federal Government requires that after April 1 of this year school buses purchased will have seat back padding. But since the average life of a school bus is about ten years there are still buses out there on the road that children will be riding for their entire grade school careers. We find that we have approximately 5,100 buses in the State of Illinois. Padding the seat backs will cost about 500 dollars but this will be done only if federal funds are available. The Governor and Dr. Manderville are committed to helping to find the federal funds. I have responses here, I want to point out some...the districts, the school districts in Illinois..."

Speaker Redmond: "Time is coming to a close."

Catania: "And if you want to look at responses from your own districts they're here in alphabetical order by towns and cities because if the Bill succeeds in getting all the way through the process I'm sure you'll want to know...let your own districts know that money is available and that they can have their school buses. I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is...The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'... Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, a very personal..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you in opposition? This is short debate, Representative Jones."

Jones: "I'm explaining my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Not yet, I haven't put the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Now, Representative Jones,"



Jones: "In explaining my vote, a very personal observation, just about this time last year 28 pupils in a...the grade school in Libertyville, Illinois, was proceeding from an outing back to their homes and when a squall hit...the rainstorm hit the area and an automobile with 2 ladies in it turned broadside and slid in front of the school bus and the 28...both the ladies in the car were killed but the students who were injured were taken to the hospital and among them was my 10 year old grandson, David Lawrence 'Fixemer'...and who was injured by hitting the bar...his face hitting the bar on the back of the seat, to which this is to be remedied. And he's carrying a scar the rest of his life from that injury and many of his other buddies have likewise or more serious injuries that will be handicap to them in their lifetime. So I urge this...I see you have enough votes so thanks...."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? On this question...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1970. Representative Giglio."

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

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1970, as amended, the Amendment is the Bill. The Bill now authorizes and directs the Motor Vehicle Law Commission to conduct a study in the whole recycling universe. The study will include the feasibility of the state subsidy, a subsidy to governmental agencies and to assist in the disposition of the abandoned junk vehicles. It also makes some technical and practical changes in the Section 19-102. The commission feels strongly that the potential problem in the abandoned junk vehicle needs to be reviewed now. And as a result of a survey conducted by the commission with its staff and a private survey conducted by the Illinois Municipal League of approximately 62 percent who responded responded that the communities indicate that they do have a problem and will anticipate a greater problem in the future. With that, Mr. Speaker, I



would ask that it receive a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 8 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2538. Representative Dunn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2538...."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that an Appropriation Bill? Take it out of the record." That was taken out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Page 4, 2578."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2578. A Bill for an Act in relation to the commercial relocation or removal of trespassing vehicles from private property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an example of a serious problem being solved by legislative action. It's a result of a study by a bipartisan Subcommittee of the House of Representatives and bipartisan Amendments and I'd like to thank Representative McMaster for his cooperation in helping to make this a better Bill and working with us. This gives authority to the Illinois Commerce Commission to set rules and regulations for towing companies. It gives them the right to set up rates and to license towing operators and towing companies. It sets up rather strict insurance requirements and gives the Illinois Commerce Commission the power to revoke and suspend licenses of both operators and towing companies. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill, that solves very serious problems, particularly in Cook County but in other areas of the state."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I'm not sure I'm in opposition but I wonder if the Gentleman would yield to a question?"



Marovitz: "Surely."

Walsh: "I perceive this pretty much as a Cook County problem and more specifically, a Chicago problem. Why doesn't Chicago, under its home rule powers, license towing operators and correct the problem there?"

Marovitz: "It doesn't now. It can. It still has the power to but we have set up a state authority, the Illinois Commerce Commission has set rules and regulations throughout the state and enforced those rules and regulations. And if any home rule authority, if the City of Chicago should seek to set up its own rules and regulations, its own standards a towing company would still have to comply with the state rules and regulations in order to be licensed by the Illinois Commerce Commission. This would not preclude the City of Chicago or any other municipality throughout the state from doing so."

Walsh: "Does this have a home rule exemption?"

Marovitz: "This would...not technically, it does not have a home rule exemption. It would allow the City of Chicago, if that's what you're getting at, it would allow the City of Chicago to set up its own rules and regulations but in order for anybody to get a license they would still have to comply with every rule and regulation set up by the Illinois Commerce Commission. So in fact they're not going to be able to set up any standards that are less than the state standards set up by the Illinois Commerce Commission."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may just very briefly address myself to this? It seems to me that we are with a state law attempting to solve a problem that exists in Chicago. And I say Chicago because it is almost exclusively a Chicago problem where tow trucks are moving cars from the near North side and charging exhorbitant fees for doing that. We don't have that problem in the balance of Cook County, that I know of. We certainly don't have it in any part of my district. And I don't want to have to license tow truck operators there and make their expenses higher so that



when we need their services we have to pay more money. And so I oppose this Bill on the basis that it can be solved in a...in a much better manner."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Levin, one minute to explain your vote."

Levin: "Yeah, in explaining my 'aye' vote...say that any difficulties with this legislation have been worked out. As far as the point raised by Representative Walsh, there is a question whether the City of Chicago has the authority to set rates."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 105 'aye' and 24 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2591. Flinn."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, because it appears that the Transportation Bond Act is clear enough that we can appropriate money out of that to acquire land and build airports, this Bill becomes unnecessary and I move to table the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves to table the Bill. Any objections? 2652. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 2652 is very close to the Bill we passed this afternoon by Representative Jacobs. It was brought to our attention by our State's Attorney and our Community due to raffles. And it limits the raffles that can be put on by churches and veteran's organizations. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm not really in opposition but I would like to know if this privilege is extended to nonprofit political organizations?"



Polk: "No."

Skinner: "No. Oh, what a shame."

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 128 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2662. Representative Bradley."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record...Oh, I don't know, I didn't get the signal. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2736. Representative Ryan. Out of the record. 2753. Representative Jacobs."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2753, you may remember, is the provisions for a hearing by the Civil Service Commission for those cases where a hearing is provided before an impartial arbitrator with binding authority pursuant to collective bargaining. This has been approved by the Department of Personnel, Director Boys and also has support of the Governor's Office. And it is a labor Bill. However, if you remember there was Amendments put on there by Mr. Vinson which makes it in the same status as what Mr. Vinsons and I'd ask for a favorable vote also."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? 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? Can't wait, Adeline, can't wait. Better get aboard, Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 31 'no'."



This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2770. Representative Leinenweber."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, this Bill is a merely Bill, although some people apparently don't think it is. This attempts to...last year we passed House Bill 199, the Governor signed it. Through some error somebody forgot to put an immediate effective date, we put a cut off date of October 1 for units of local government to, in overlapping tax districts, to opt out of having their taxes apportioned by the Department of Local Government Affairs. The Bill wasn't effective until October 1, which is the deadline. So, all House Bill 2770 does is permit the units of local government, by Resolution, to object to apportionment of their taxes prior to the time the last county in the overlapping tax district gets its multiplier from the state, which is the time when the tax bills will become finalized. That's all it does and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan,"

Madigan: "Question of the Sponsor. How long will this delay the tax bills in Cook County?"

Leinenweber: "It won't delay them at all, it can't because of the Amendment to the Bill that was proposed by the Department of Local Government Affairs but the tax bills can't go out until the multiplier is issued. And once the multiplier is issued..."

Speaker Redmond: "That's right, it's short debate, Representative Madigan, you called that to my attention."

Madigan: "Thank you and thank you Representative Satterthwaite and as the opponent to the Bill...the passage of this Bill in the last Session delayed the issuance of the tax bills in Cook County by close to three months. And the passage of this Bill will do it again and I rise in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all...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 Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, anything that will delay my tax bill three months, I'm for. I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? For what purpose do you rise, Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "Just to point out that this Bill couldn't have possibly delayed any tax Bills in the last year because it didn't become effective until October 1 and there wasn't time for anybody to apply under it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Skinner: "The Majority Leader is wrong again."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye' and 41 'no'. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen votes 'aye'. Representative Jaffe 'aye'. On this question there's 90 'aye', 41 'no', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2794. Representative Yourell. Representative Terzich, you're standing in front of Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2794. A Bill for an Act to abolish comprehensive...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, is that what you want?"

Yourell: "Leave for Interim Study, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to put it in Interim Study? Hearing no objection, Interim Study. 2834. Representative Madigan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2834. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to legalize and validate Appropriation Bills and tax levy ordinances. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I request leave to consider House Bill 2834 and 2835 together."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection,



leave is granted. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2835. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to legalize and validate appropriation and tax levy ordinances. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, these two Bills simply validate the tax levy ordinances of the County of Cook and the Cook County Forest Reserve District for tax year 1976. I move for their adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "We've got something we can do for the taxpayer. What the Gentleman's saying..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you in opposition, this is short debate?"

Skinner: "Yes, I am against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, proceed."

Skinner: "Both of these Bills. Cook County taxpayers have one last shot here. If they pay their tax bills under protest and this Bill doesn't pass they're going to get a refund. Now, we wouldn't want to deprive Mr. Tobin and all those other angry taxpayers in Cook County the ability to get some money back from those patronage rich forest preserve districts, would we? Well if we wouldn't then we ought to vote 'no' on this so they can pay their taxes under protest and get a refund. That's something positive you can take home to your suburban and city constituencies and we Downstate will help you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you rise."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote to correct the misunderstanding of Mr. Skinner, these Bills only apply to tax year 1976 and therefore the only people who would still qualify for a refund would be those who had paid their taxes under protest in tax year 1976."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye', 33 'no' and the Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. 2854." Representative Brady."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2854. A Bill for an Act in relation to state revenue sharing with local governmental entities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. What this Bill does is correct a situation where a municipality when it increases in population a county is not automatically deducted. There are situations now where a county is automatically deducted of population count even if it's not the case that they moved from the county population to the municipality. There's a court decision that says that this will not be acted this way, the county will not decrease but that court decision is only good till the next census and this will correct the statute and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Why not. I'm going to get a good taxpayers record this time. Those of you who have cities downstate that are growing cities, or even in Cook County, that are growing cities, if this passes you're going to get a smaller cut of the pie from the local distributive fund in the Department of Local Government Affairs budget. I don't know whether you want that, if you do want that you're going to vote for this Bill. But if you'd like to get a bigger piece of pie, the maximum piece of pie what you want to do is when an area goes from an unincorporated area in Cook County to a city, you want to take that population away from Cook County. Cook County has less the pie the rest of us have more of the pie. I'm in favor of getting more of the pie, vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Brady, for what purpose do you rise?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker to explain my vote, I think there's some explanation needed on that. It's not when the unincorporated areas go to the city but it's when the cities add a person of population. It's an automatic deduction of counties. It doesn't affect the annexation or the incorporation of the unincorporated area. You'll not lose



count from your municipality but you're guaranteed losing count from your county that surrounds the municipality if you don't vote in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'aye' and 49 'no'. Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "Oh, we're going to verify this baby."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Poll the absentees at Representative Brady's request. Representative Skinner, be in order, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams. Jane Barnes. Bluthardt. Breslin. Collins. Conti."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jack Davis. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Friedrich. Gaines. Hart. Jaffe. Katz. Keats. Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners decides to be changed from 'absent' to 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Leinenweber. Mahar. McAuliffe. Meyer. Molloy. Murphy. Sandquist. Schlickman. Stearney. Telcser. W.D. Walsh. Williams. Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Brady, what's your pleasure? Do you want to dump this Roll Call and try a new one? Verification?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I think that what Representative Skinner is trying to do is delay the Body here. Although I think the majority favors this piece of legislation for the sake of the time of the Body I'll withdraw it."

Speaker Redmond: "2859 is withdrawn. 2865. John Dunn."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that was originally a product of the Mental Health Fund Committee, headed by our late colleague, Representative Juckett."



At the present time Title 18, federal reimbursement for those who reside in state mental hospitals goes all to the Mental Health Fund. Title 19 federal monies however, go to the General Revenue Fund. This Bill would reallocate the monies coming into the General Revenue Fund and provide for half of those funds to be put in the Mental Health Fund and the other half in the Common School Fund. The reason for this Bill is that these reimbursements going into the General Revenue Fund have jumped tremendously in the last few years, jumping from almost 13 million in 1977 to approximately 32 million in 19...Fiscal 78 and approximately 39 million in Fiscal 1979. This will be a great help to the Common School Fund and I would urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise, reluctantly, because I think the intentions of the Sponsor are very worthwhile. There's no doubt both Mental Health and Education are two very worthwhile places to spend our money. I have two problems. First of all, this would restrict what the Legislature could do with this money. We're saying this money would automatically go into the... these two funds, which I think we should not take away any of our authority, as some other people have tried on some other Bills and we've been successful in defeating that legislation. Plus you set the precedent. We do it for Title 19, next we might do it for Title 20, which you're talking about 100's of millions of dollars. Secondly, you do remove the potential that this money could all go to Mental Health. You would now split it between Education and Mental Health, where...this money is originally refunded for Mental Health projects. I think, in conclusion, I would ask for a 'no' vote in order that we don't tie the hands of the Legislature in determining how the money would best be appropriated. And secondly, I think it could result in a potential loss to Mental Health, which I think is the original intention of the Sponsor...is to help Mental Health."

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



vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I was a strong supporter of the concept of this Bill as it was originally introduced because I think we need to segregate some funds to guarantee a funding level for community mental health. But the Amendment that goes on this Bill reduces the Mental Health Department's appropriation and it is for that reason that I must regretfully vote 'no', with deep regret, even though the administration opposes this Bill. Thank you."

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

Dunn: "Well, I would like to explain my vote since I didn't close on this, if I may. Just...just briefly, to point out that this is... this is a reallocation of funds. This does not draw down General Revenue at all. These monies would be coming into General Revenue without this Bill and they will still be coming in, it's what we do with them after they get here. That's what we're after here."

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

Edgar: "I'd like to request a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, please change me from 'no' to an 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative VanDyne, 'aye'. Is that right? Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I only rise to suggest that we can avoid all of this if people will not vote other people's switches. Because all you have to do is look up there and see that these people aren't there. And we're just asking for this and if you can't get the votes honestly you're going to be in trouble getting them dishonestly because this is going to happen and some people aren't going to have their Bills heard. And that's wrong."

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



Johnson: "Change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it is the sentiment of this Body to pass this Bill. And most of those votes up there, as a matter of fact probably all, are up there for real. But I'm still going to withdraw...if the Gentleman persists in his request for a verification I will ask leave to place this Bill in Interim Study. If he's going to persist in that request."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar, do you persist? He persists. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave to put it on Interim Study. No objection, leave is granted. Interim Study. 2883. Wait a minute. Representative Matijevecich."

Matijevecich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it gives me a great privilege and this has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, to ask leave and use the Attendance Roll Call to place the following Bills on the Interim Study Calendar. On Second Reading; House Bill 2316, Sponsor - Kane. 2548, Sponsor - John Dunn. 2837, Sponsor - Matijevecich. 3040, Dan Houlihan. 3186, Brady. 3187, Brady. 3193, Laurinc. On the Order of Third Reading; 2591, Flinn. House Bill 2662, Bradley. 2736, Ryan. 2883, Holewinski. 3039, Dan Houlihan. 3041, Daniel Houlihan. 3119, O'Brien. 3129, John Dunn. 3163, Redmond. 3164, Redmond. 3165, Redmond. 3854, Brady. On the Order of Postponed Consideration; House Bill 1642, Yourell. House Bill 1788, McAuliffe. House Bill 2121, Bowman. House Bill 2162, Younge. House Bill 2833, Ewell. 2926, Capparelli. And House Bill 3200, Domico. I ask leave that those Bills be placed in Interim Study...one more, what? House Bill 1238, Gene Barnes. Leave that those Bills be placed in the Interim Study Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last 20 Bills I've been voting 'no' or 'present' and I was going to suggest the same thing that Matijevecich just did now only go a little



step further. If we're going to continue ghost voting that we just might as well put everything on Consent Calendar and I vote 'no' on Consent Calendars anyhow. So we'd save the time of the House by putting everything on a Consent Calendar so I can vote 'present' and go home."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Might I inquire to Representative Matijevidch? John, the Bills that you read, are they...I didn't quite hear you, are they on Second or Third?"

Matijevidch: "They're on Second, Third and Postponed."

Geo-Karis: "And these are all the ones on this Calendar?"

Matijevidch: "They're all the ones that I read and they're on the Calendar, yes."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, okay. I have no objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I tabled 2591 because I found that it was not necessary, we have another Bill that will take care of the matter that's coming out of Appropriations..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll strike that one from the list. 2591. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I object to 1238 being added to that list at the last moment."

Speaker Redmond: "Take that one out. Representative Skinner... Representative Ryan, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, on Third Reading I'm not sure whether the Gentleman said 2854 or 3854."

Speaker Redmond: "28..."

Ryan: "2854?"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. 2854. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been around here for a little while but I've never heard anyone nor have I...maybe the Gentleman can point out the rule that another Member can object to a Member putting his Bill into Interim Study. Now, I may want to separate it from his motion. I have no problem with that because I



don't want to goof up these Bills." I'd be happy to separate it from his motion but I'm going to make the same request."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think it's a proper objection on behalf of the Member a separate motion would take care of it."

Barnes: "...Separate it from this motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "An inquiry of the Chair. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Senate extended their deadline until next Friday and went home. It seems to me that if we're going to be in two days next week, Thursday and Friday, there's going to be nothing on the Calendar anyway. Maybe the solution is simply to extend our deadline to Friday, finish off these Bills during those two days and go home tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this move right now is a good move. Even if we did extend the deadline, to kill this many Bills in one motion is always a good move as far as I'm concerned. And there are three more Bills but they haven't been cleared by the Minority Leader but Yvetta Younge just gave me 1710, House Bill 1710, 2075 and 2295, if that's all right. I haven't been able to walk over there and those..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe those Bills were defeated. I don't know how we can put them on the Interim Calendar."

Matijevich: "I wasn't aware that they were defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "If they lost then I think his objection is correct."

Matijevich: "He's right then."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I object to any Bill on Second Reading going to Interim Study. It's obvious that the Sponsors are not serious about them if they're not on Third Reading by now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know that they're going to move to kill the Bills. Let's do it real quietly and bury them. I don't see why anybody should object to that. And this has been



cleared on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, do you still..."

Geo-Karis: "I'll tell you what I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you're finished because I have a nice young man who's going to take me home, all the way home and I'm going to lose my ride if you don't let me..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's not my fault. It's been suggested that we divide these up into three separate motions. The first would be with respect to the Bills that are now on Third Reading and Postponed Consideration. That would be Representative Matijevich's motion that these Bills that have been read before on Third and Postponed Consideration be recommitted to the respective Committees in the Interim Study Commission. On that question... you didn't listen, Mr. Skinner, which is rather typical. I said Third Reading and Postponed Consideration. You and I have a common failing. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to recommit. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye' and 6 'no'. And the motion carries and the Bills which were read off on Third Reading and Postponed Consideration are recommitted to the respective Interim Study Committees. Now, the next one is those on Second Reading that were read off. The question is on the Gentleman's motion that those Bills which are 2316, 2548, 2837, 3040, 30...3186, 3187 and 3193 be recommitted to the respective Interim Study Committees. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye' and 17 'no' and the motion prevails. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House Bill 1238 would be submitted to Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Bennet, are you seeking recognition on the motion?"



Is there any objection to recommitting? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to recommit House Bill 1238 to Interim Study. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "No, to ask for a verification. We killed off-track betting once, that's enough...We passed it once, that's enough."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Skinner's request is dilatory and I'd ask the Chair to so rule. There's no purpose in that."

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

All you Gentlemen that are begging Adeline for the opportunity of driving here home, please toss a coin. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'aye' and 48 'no' and the motion falls. Representative Bennett, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bennett: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave for House Bill 2708 to be placed in Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman...is there any objection? Hearing no objection we will use the Attendance Roll...Representative Ryan. Do you still persist in your objection, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I didn't object at all, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear what you had to say."

Speaker Redmond: "You didn't know whose Bill it was, is that right?"

Ryan: "No, that wouldn't have made any difference."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay now, are there any objections? Hearing no objections we'll use the Attendance Roll Call in support of the Gentleman's motion. What was the Bill number again? 2708. It's on Postponed Consideration." Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, if we're on the Order of motions I've got a motion on the Calendar for House Bill 3394 and I would ask leave that we use the Attendance Roll Call to discharge House Bill 3394 from the Appropriations I Committee. Representative Matijeich is agreeable to this due to a posting problem that the Committee did hear the Bill and there's no problem there, it's just that we had



a posting problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, what happened last week, we had to post the Bills early to meet the deadline and this was one of the Bills that we allowed the Committee leave of the House to have it heard last week but it was postponed a week and because we had to post early it couldn't be posted again and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski, are you seeking recognition?"

Matijevich: "...And so this has been approved."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners, will you repeat the motion again?"

Kempiners: "I would ask leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to discharge House Bill 3394 from the Appropriations I Committee and place it on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Motions, appearing on Page 14, the motion by Representative Kempiners to discharge Appropriations I and advance House Bill 3394 to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, may we use the Attendance Roll Call? Attendance Roll Call will be used in support of the motion and the Bill...the Committee is discharged and advanced to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Consideration Postponed. House Bill 388. Well I guess I made one mistake here. Go ahead, Representative go ahead. Representative Davis, for what point are you rising?"

Davis: "A point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Did not we send all Bills on Postponed Consideration..."

Speaker Redmond: "No, we did not.. Representative Dyer on House Bill 388."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask that House Bill 388 and 389 be considered together. House Bill 388 is simply a technical Bill. 389 is the heart of the pair of Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave to hear 388 and 389 together?"

Dyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, proceed."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 389 is a very carefully drawn Bill now. It



has been completely rewritten by Judge Duban in Springfield, to respond to all objections that had been expressed. It applies only to young people, age 16 and 17, who have lived either wholly or partially independent of their parents. There are some young people who have been sort of kicked around in society, have lived in foster homes, are sort of lost youngsters. And their parental situation is such that there has been estrangement. So with the consent of their parents the court may order a very very limited..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll be back to Representative Davis, proceed with Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "A very, very limited emancipation, purely for the purpose of being able to rent an apartment, sign a lease, pay for a car on the installment plan. Ironically, if these young people were married they'd be automatically emancipated. But this permits a young person to remain single, to get a job, to get an education. It's a good Bill. It's supported by the Department of Children and Family Services, the Commission on Children, the Judge White of Cook County. I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall these Bills 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 109 'aye' and 9 'no'. These Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. I inadvertently overlooked two Bills on House Bills Third Reading. 2949. 2949. Representative Hoffman wants to be recorded as 'aye' on the last Roll Call."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2949. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to permit leasees to receive a rank credit for paying certain lessors obligations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are Bills that I've been dealing with for the last month..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are these companion Bills, Representative Davis?"

Davis: "Just about, yes, Sir."



Speaker Redmond: "Are they just about close enough that they could be considered together? All right, Representative Walsh objects. Proceed on the..."

Davis: "All right. This Bill, as amended, as amended, we struck everything after the enacting clause and the version differs from the original in that it allows tenants to petition the court for a receiver. The receiver will receive the money. He will make the disbursement to the utilities, to the landlord. This is something for poor people. I ask your support, please. There's an agreement on them and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the only Member of the Public Utilities...or one of the Members of the Public Utilities Committee that voted against this Bill in Committee, I want you to know that it has been amended and the objections that were raised have been cleared up and I commend the Representative from Chicago for his diligence and fine work on this 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 130 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2950. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill... has been amended and my distinguished friend, Representative Neff, amended it so that it will only be effective until...for a year, year and a half, I think it is. And it is...it involves a Bill from the Gaslight Company. I read an article this morning where some people had...in the Sun Times where some people there collected some people's money this morning and they were people who were well able to pay and they didn't want to pay and the State's Attorney took out after them and finally they made an agreement. The man had run away... Finally, they made an agreement



that they would not collect the money from these people. These people were rich people. This is a case of a poor person and it would only last for a year. All right."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass...read the Bill."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2950. A Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Consideration Postponed. You got...you got two. You got another one? Pardon me."

Davis: "May I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege... That these are the last two Bills, perhaps, I will Sponsor in this House, because I intend to retire and come back from time to time and wish you all God speed. And may you be as well as I know you deserve to be. Thank you for your wonderful support."

Speaker Redmond: "Consideration Postponed. House Bill 1357. Representative Rigney."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1357. A Bill for an Act relating to farming by business organization, family farm corporations and authorized farm corporations."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill does nothing that the Clerk just mentioned because..."

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

Bradley: "Well, we've been pretty fair all day. There's a few Bills before that one on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll get to them."

Bradley: "Well, I ob..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll get to them."

Bradley: "All right, we'll verify this Roll Call then, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this started out as a corporate farm Bill. We have since that time taken out all reference to corporations, partnerships and trusts. About the only one that would be prohibited from land ownership now would be anyone who is a non-resident alien. They are limited as long as they are acting as a single proprietor. They would be allowed to become an owner by way of a corporation so long as they did not own more than ten percent of that corporation's stock."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Gene Hoffman. Opposition, the timer is on."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I grew up on a farm. I grew up on a farm and I think anyone...I think I hear some repugnant remarks being made here. But Mr. Speaker, as...as a youth...as a youth growing up on a farm I was told that anyone who wanted to become successful should have the right to own a farm. And they didn't say you had to live in Illinois or you had to live in the United States or that you couldn't be incorporated or that you couldn't come from overseas. My family settled the land in Witt County around in Wapella around the Williamsville area. They got involved in politics. My great grandfather became the Republican County Chairman of DeWitt County and he was a farm boy...and he was a farm boy and he came...and he came from the old country. And he had... you're going to keep somebody like that from buying property? I don't think so. I don't think so... And for that reason, I'm in opposition to this Bill."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of vote. Originally, when I supported this measure I prefaced it by saying there were a number of holes in the Bill that



should be taken care of in the Senate. These Bills...these holes were called to my attention later forcibly. It is now my understanding, by Amendment, these holes have been filled. In consequence, my original thinking...and I read from the daily newspaper foreign speculators have pockets bulging with devalued dollars are shopping for choice American acreage. By all accounts they've already acquired a large piece of America. An estimated 20 percent... 21 percent of all U.S. farms...last year involve foreign purchases. Many of them dealing through dummy corporations. Alien...people who have become Americans, fine. Aliens, no."

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent Bill. Us Indians just think it came 371 years late."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Catania to explain her vote. One minute."

Catania: "I just wanted to point out to Representative Hoffman that the old country wasn't Saudi Arabia."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 28 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 883. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "883 is a pretty good Bill, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why we had to jump over it to get to another Bill. I'll simply ask that we get an 'aye' vote on 883. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? 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. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Reluctantly, Mr. Speaker, I must ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Take the record. 104 'aye' and 36 'no'. Representative Bradley, do you want a poll of the absentees?"

Bradley: "No, I don't, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to take the time of the House, but I think the same thing would have happened on the



Bill just before this if I would have verified and I think it's kind of ridiculous for us to be sitting here passing these Bills without Members in their seats. I'm not going to take anymore time of the House but I'm surprised at the way it's working out here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry, I neglected to get on this.. May I be added as voting 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite votes 'aye'.

What's the count? 105? 36 'no'. Representative Ryan has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed with the verification. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is against help for foster parents, well let's go ahead and get them on record as being opposed to it and let them verify the Roll."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman 'aye'. Representative Davis are you seeking recognition? That's dangerous. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. E.M. Barnes. Beauty. Birchler. Eowman. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Breslin. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Conti. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Friedland. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J.M. Houlihan. Huff. Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan. The request for a verification has been withdrawn. 104 'aye' and 36 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1913. Representative Bowman. Out of the record. 1973. Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this isn't quite the E.R.A. We had House Bill 1973 last week and had 88 verified votes but there was some objection so I have responded to objections raised on both sides



of the aisle and have removed numerous Sections from the Bill where there was a question raised. So, at the present time House Bill 1973 clarifies and strengthens sex discrimination portions of the School Code and its principle...substantive improvement is that it now applies not only to certificated workers but also to noncertificated workers who also are covered by the Constitution. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think the Lady did anything with her Amendment that made this Bill any better. It's as bad now as it was when it was first presented. It applies now to noncertified positions and says that there can be no classification by sex in...in those positions. Which would suggest to me that a locker room attendant in a high school would have to be determined not on the basis of sex, regardless of whether it was the boys or girls locker room. But you guys are too late, you know, it doesn't apply to you, you can't get back in unless...unless Mrs. Chapman comes up with something else that will let you back in and if we wait a little while I'm sure that will happen. But this is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that there should be that classification on the basis of sex that equal pay for equal work provides that women will be paid same amounts as men but we ought to be a little bit reasonable in this thing and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to rise on a point of order before. Mr. Speaker, since it's really nothing to do with the issue before us but I would object, Mr. Speaker. Some of the Members have left for home hours ago and frankly I object to somebody sitting there pulling their switches for them so they can show their constituents that they are here and voting. And I would suggest that it stop, Mr. Speaker. If they want to vote they ought to be here."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "I would like to explain my vote. I don't think Mr. Walsh has had an opportunity to read the Bill. Because the Bill doesn't use the word 'classification' at all. The Bill covers non-certificated employees where formerly the law only covered certificated employees of the School Board. In making this extension we are applying the Constitution of the State of Illinois to non-certificated school employees in the same way that we now apply it to certificated employees. And I think Mr. Walsh will agree that in our schools today you still find washrooms for men faculty and washrooms for women faculty. So I hope he doesn't get shook up on that particular matter. This is a good Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Stop maligning Representative Walsh."

Chapman: "I don't know anybody who deserves to be maligned more than Representative Walsh. In asking you to vote 'aye', I'd like to point out that very often those few people in this House who vote against the Equal Rights Amendment say that they will vote for equal rights for women, that they support equal rights for women. And that if they have Bills brought to them on a piece-meal basis that they will vote 'yes'. So, Gentlemen and Ladies, here's your chance."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bowman: "Well, to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. I'm very surprised that Representative Walsh is opposing this Bill because after all he has a brother serving in the Senate and we all know that the Senators get off pretty easy and don't have nearly as many Bills to consider as we do. I think we ought to send this one over there and let them work on it and...so I would recommend that we pass this out for the benefit of Bill Walsh's brother."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85 'aye' and 30 'no'. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby



declared passed...lost. 2106. Just wanted to see if you were awake." 2106. Representative Von Boeckman. I've already declared it lost. You didn't rise. Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker, I know you couldn't pass a controversial Bill at this time, I'd like to place 2106 on the Interim Study..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to put it on the Interim Study?"

Hearing no objections...Well, he'll put the motion and get the votes anyway. Okay, Representative Von Boeckman, Representative Hanahan objects. So the question is, to recommit...Representative Von Boeckman moves to recommit House Bill 2106 to the Interim Study Commission of Motor Vehicle Laws. 89. Yeah. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "This is just a bad Bill and it deserves a good death. This Bill is on DWI, it's on implied consent, you know, it's just a make-do Bill that's going to double penalties and...and reduce the ability for people to drive in Illinois. It's one of those Bills that says a lot of nice things but if you read it and you live with it you'll find that it's an anti-person Bill. And you know and I know that half the people couldn't live with that kind of Bill and it deserves an early death."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye' and 5 'no'. The motion carries and the Bill will be recommitted. 2256. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2256 is a Bill that's identical to one we've already passed out, 2941, which affected the...that Bill affected the Clerks of the Court. And it has to do with the maximum and minimum salaries of the various county officers. This affects the compensation of the Sheriff, the Coroner, the County Treasurer, the County Clerks, Recorder and Auditors. It's identical to the Bill that we've already passed and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Johnson, please sit down. Representative Johnson and Bowman, sit down."



Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill.

I think it's ill advised and ill timed at this time. Leaders of both our parties, Bakalis and Thompson, have recommended that we exercise restraint in bringing about raises for public officials, holding down inflation. And I might say to you that in my county this Bill would amount to a raise from 25 thousand to over 35 thousand for these public officials. And a passage here in the Legislature is tantamount to the same passage in our county. And there's shortage of qualified candidates in our county. In the recent primary over six candidates filed for Sheriff, qualified, able and willing to serve at the present salary range. I think this is ill advised, ill timed and I think it should be opposed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, in closing..."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on short debate, there is no close."

Flinn: "Explain my vote then."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll get to that. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Flinn, to explain his vote."

Flinn: "All right, Mr. Speaker, to correct the Gentleman who spoke in opposition to this, that does not effect his county at all unless the County Board acts. What this does is raise the minimum. And it does affect some of the smaller counties, those that are like 60,000 and under. A few of them, not all of them. Even the smallest county in the state pays more than the minimum. And I would like to point out to him that this is a permissive Bill. It...takes action by the County Board to have any action at all in his county level."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'aye' and...Representative Christensen 'aye'. 102 'aye' and 22 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2507. Human Resources. Out of the record. 2636. Representative Birchler. Representative Birchler."



Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some of you folks who are here tonight recall the first of the week when the Speaker was trying to move Bills when there was very few people on the House Floor, this Bill was called. This was the Bill that authorizes the establishment of centers...career educational centers. It's been asked for by the State Board of Education, by the Office of Education. I've checked with the Representative who objected to the Bill the last time and he said he has no objections now. I've checked with the Governor's people and they have no objections to the Bill. All I ask is an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson. Timothy Johnson."

Johnson: "Just an explanation. I asked to verify this the last time. The objections we've had have been cleared up so I would encourage everybody to vote green on it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? A pair of glasses were found at Representative Jaffe's desk. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'aye' and 16 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2792. Representative Tipword. Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, that's an Appropriation Bill. I think we can take that out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this one out of the record. 2853. Brady. Representative Brady. 2853, did you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk? Pardon me. It's been read..."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. This Bill amends an Act governing the Cook County Forest Preserve Districts, regarding property owned by the districts. It takes them away from being subject to eminent domain proceedings and special assessments. There was objection to the area of special assessments. I had Amendments prepared at the beginning of the week and we have not



gone back to this Order of Business so it was possible to amend it but I would commence to get the Amendment on if we could get this Bill to the Senate to it would take the special assessment part out." I would urge your support of this Bill with that committment."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I object again on this Bill the same as I did last week for the simple reason that there are forest reserve lands contiguous to municipality that the perimeter of the community ends at the parkway and there are school children who are forced to walk on highways. We can't force any special assessment on any of these forest preserve districts. Besides that, I had an opportunity to read the Bill, this is going to restrict any municipality from ever going in... eminent domain. We had to buy property in the Village of River Grove because we had no property in Elmwood Park to build a high school when we had close to 3 thousand acres or 2 thousand acres right next to the Village of Elmwood Park where we could have gone in and built our high school. So Elmwood Park High School is in a different high school because we couldn't take any land away from the forest preserve. And this will restrict municipalities from annexing. This will restrict municipalities from putting special assessments and our school children would have to walk on the highways and they couldn't have any sidewalks to walk on."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that the Amendment is on the desks. Are you familiar with the Amendment?"

Conti: "I'm not... it's never been passed."

Speaker Redmond: "I know it... With the Amendment what would your position be?"

Conti: "My position would still be the same because you can't go in on eminent domain."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady, what is your pleasure?"

Brady: "I seek a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

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? Parliamentarian? Parliamentarian here? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 83 'aye' and 40 'no'. And the Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 2898. Representative Yourell."

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

House Bill 2898 amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund Article in the State Employee's Retirement System Article of the Illinois Pension Code. This Bill...the only reason it didn't pass the last time we had it on Third Reading was because it was an objectional Amendment. And I cleared that Amendment up and withdrew it at the request of Representative Ebbesen and others and the Bill now is in the shape that I think everybody can vote for it. What it does simply is to provide that the...the language of the Bill now is jointly recommended by the Administrators of the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund and the State Employees Retirement System. And what it does it say that CETA Employees, which you know are part-time employees, or at least short term employees and that they should not be allowed to participate in the Pension Fund and have the city or local unit of government provide the other fund. Now this Bill is necessary to keep local governments in the state from having to pay...incidentally, from general funds the employer cost of retirement...presently, such contributions are provided in conjunction with the CETA grants. The Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund estimates that this Bill will save municipalities approximately 3 and a half million dollars..This is a... The language is put together by the IMRF and the SERS and I move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2898."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is... Representative Simms."

Simms: "What Amendment was withdrawn by...the one that we..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis, are you rising in opposition?"



Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... I'm in opposition to this Bill. What he failed to tell you, there is a .6 million dollars that it's going to cost the General Assembly in the Judges Retirement System and also the Municipal..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "No, that is not correct, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Wrong Bill."

Bartulis: "Why yes it is. There's one Amendment on for the Judges and one Amendment on for the General Assembly and there's three on the Municipal Retirement Fund."

Yourell: "May I suggest to you, Sir, that all of the Amendments, with the exception of Amendment #6 that was withdrawn, was recommended by the Pension Laws Commission. Now the figure that you're looking at is the result of the figure with Amendment #6. When you take Amendment #6 out we're talking about a million dollars. And if we don't pass the Bill we will have a net loss to units local government from the General Revenue Fund of those governments to 3 and a half million dollars."

Bartulis: "Well, Sir, the Pension Laws Commission has not even acted on this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Well Amendment #7 and that's the Amendment that apparently is causing some difficulty now, was actually House Bill, I believe 741, that went out of this House with 120 votes."

Bartulis: "Roll Call. I'm just opposed to this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 25 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2903. Representative Stuffle, Kane, Brady, Dunn...Out of the record. 3201. Representative Ewell. Out of the record. 3274. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Clerk going to read the Bill or..."



Speaker Redmond: "It's been read. It's on Postponed Consideration, proceed with your explanation."

Leverenz: "Thank you. This would allow, by a vote of the college board, community college board, would elect to abolish its working cash fund. We eliminated, I think, the major problems with the Amendment offered by Representative Bluthardt and I. They could only establish a working cash fund if they had a referendum. We did restore the 'shall' part and took the 'may' part out, that they shall transfer to the educational building and maintenance purposes the money in the working cash fund, which eliminated another problem. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 30 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3201. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a simple Bill requested by the Sanitary District. I...I think the problem's been worked out. I hope the problems have been worked out and I urge the Body to pass the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? 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 95 'aye' and 17 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1913. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill attempts to put some due process into the property seizure statutes. The Bill, in its original form did discriminate between residential and commercial properties. Representative Johnson offered an Amendment, which I accepted and he now supports the Bill. And I would hope that you recognize him when the time comes to explain votes and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Daniels."



Daniels: "I was just wondering if he could explain the Amendment and then we could determine."

Bowman: "The Amendment allows...has this Bill apply equally to residential and the commercial properties and provides due process mechanisms for both...a property seizure against both."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in opposition to House Bill 1913 I can't imagine that by the Amendment this Bill is in any better form than it was at the time that it was placed on Postponed Consideration. There was heavy opposition to this Bill throughout the Judiciary hearings and there was opposition throughout the time that the Bill was fully debated and I can't see where that opposition should be removed."

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

Johnson: "When this first came to our Committee there was objections raised because the total abolition of the remedy... Representative Bowman has agreed to my Amendment, which basically just provides protection for tenants in the same measures we provided commercial property. We're saying that they ought to have protection in terms of a due process....into this Bill...It's a good...fair to both landlords and tenants and I would think it's the kind of thing that everyone ought to support."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 56 'aye' and 70 'no' and the Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Lechowicz, 612. Do you want to go with that one?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call to put House Bill 612, 1450 and 2643 to Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "What are the Bills?"



Lechowicz: "612. 1460. 2643."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. On page...House Bill 2951. Representative Kornowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2951. A Bill for an Act relating to conducting of pool tabs and jar games of certain non-for-profit organizations. This Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I would like to ask for leave of the House to waive the appropriate rule so that House Bill 2951 can be considered on Third Reading for final action. This is a very important Bill and I need your help."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk inform us as...have the Amendments been put on? Was the last Amendment put on the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "2951?"

Madigan: "On House Bill 2951 there were Amendments filed."

Clerk O'Brien: "No, no Amendments have been adopted yet."

Madigan: "Are there Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Amendments are on the desk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I heard Representative Kornowicz say that at the appropriate time... I want to ask him, when is the appropriate time?"

Kornowicz: "Oh, it's right now. All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table all five Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendments 1 thru 5. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Slow down here just a little bit, Mr. Speaker. First of all, if you table the Amendments I can't be for the Bill."

Madigan: "If we table the Amendments all the money goes to the state."

Ryan: "Wonderful, I've still got to be against the Bill."

Madigan: "That's one for the Governor today."

Ryan: "Which state?"

Madigan: "You say you're still against the Bill? Well, are the Amendments



that you want on?"

Ryan: "Don't ask a lot of questions, Mike."

Madigan: "What are the Amendments that you want on? I'll withdraw my motion..."

Ryan: "Is there any... Could we possible put this in Interim Study or something..."

Madigan: "You're not going to disappoint Ed, are you?"

Ryan: "I withdraw."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a very fine Gentleman over there that all he wants to do is move his Bill. Maybe the Speaker could help him get it in a form where he can move this so this Body can determine whether or not this is good legislation. Representative Kornowicz's daughter is in my district so we want to do all we can to help him."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on Representative Madigan's motion to table Amendments 1 thru 5. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The motion carries."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Read the Bill a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2951. A Bill for an Act relating to conducting of pool tabs and jar games by certain nonprofit organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask for a very 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 97 'aye' and 26 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Porter, do you seek recognition?"

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to put House Bill 3272 on the Interim Study Calendar."



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave?"

Porter: "I'd further...would like to ask leave of the House to have the sponsorship of House Bill 1270 changed from my name to Representative Bowman alone and put myself on as a Cosponsor, since he handled that Bill all the way through Committee and on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there...has the sheet been filled out here, Mr. Clerk? The Bill has already passed."

Porter: "He's entitled to be... I know that, but he's entitled to be the Sponsor of it since he actually handled it."

Speaker Redmond: "It requires Leave of the House. Does he have leave to change the Sponsor? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative... Agreed Resolutions. Representative... Representative Huff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to remind you that there's one other Bill on..."

Speaker Redmond: "1274. I'll be back, you weren't in your seat when I went past it. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 92. Vitek. House Resolution 890. Kornowicz. 891, Younge. 893, Younge. 894, Younge. 895, Younge. 896, Simms. 897, Getty-Miller-Metejek. 898, Getty - Mahar. 899, Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 92 by Vitek asks that the Richard J. Daley Memorial Commission extend their reporting date for a week. House 890 by Kornowicz notes the 25th Wedding Anniversary. Younge's 891 talks about the Girl's State High School Track Team. 893, by Younge, talks about the season Muni Opera. 894, by Younge, talks about the Opera again. 895, by Younge, says the same thing. 896, by Simms, talks about the AMVETS. 897, by Getty, Sr. Anne Leonard. 898, by Getty, about the Mini Civic Center and 899, by Leverenz, talks about Si and Isabell Bray and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'."



Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Agreed Resolutions... Representative. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 900. E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. Representative Davis, are you waiting to introduce someone?"

Davis: "No, Sir. Mr. Speaker, on Second Reading there appears Senate Bill 1475. Inadvertently Representative Matijevich was left off as the hyphenated Cosponsor and I'd like leave of the House to put him on that as well as Representative Ryan, the Minority Leader, in the event that I'm not on the floor either one can handle the Bill for me."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing no objections..."

Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a Bill here I would like to file and waive the appropriate rules and move it to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Mr. Clerk, will you follow the motion? On Postponed Consideration, 1274. Representative Huff. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, before the chamber is entirely empty and I had meant to do this earlier today, I would like to commend you and your staff on the way that you handled the presidential visit this morning. I thought it was an outstanding job and I know you worked hard at it and you deserve the praise for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you. The staff thanks you. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the only appropriate motion for me to make at this time is to ask leave of the House to place House Bill 1274 in Interim Study?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Adjournment Resolution, Mr. Clerk? Representative Porter, do you still want to extend the deadline to Wednesday? Who's taking Adeline home? Who won? Walsh win?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives



the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution. The adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #91. Resolved by the Senate of the Eightieth General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein; that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, May 26, 1978 the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 31, 1978 at 1 O'clock P.M. and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Thursday, June 1, 1978 at 1 O'Clock P.M."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move for adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Representative Madigan, we need five minutes."

Madigan: "Allowing five minutes for the Clerk, I move that we adjourn until next Thursday until 1:00 p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that we, after five minutes of the Clerk's perfunctory, we stand adjourned until next Thursday at 1 O'Clock. All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. We now stand adjourned until next Thursday at 1 O'clock."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 252. Pullen. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 311. Mautino - Matejek. A Bill for an Act increasing homestead exemptions." First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1510. Younge. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1841. John Dunn. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bills, First Reading. House Bill 3400. Bluthardt. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Commission to Survey and Study the Problems of Cities and Villages and Incorporated Towns. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3401. Polk. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to acquisition and possession



and transfer of firearms and firearm ammunition. First Reading of the Bill. Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, passage of this I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills 1585, 250, 253, 1419, 1590, 1599, 3375, 736, 1519, 1687, 1688, 1769, 1780, 1786, 1819, 1822, 1835, 1847, 1690, 1691, 1725, 1772, 1792, 1802, 1816, 1817, 1456, 1529, 1833, 1850, 1861, 1876, 1476, 1572, 1579, 1888, 1863, 1864, 1515, 1561, 1565, 1563, 1605, 1617 and 1680. Passed by the Senate, May 26, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills. First Reading. Senate Bill 1585. Campbell. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Public Aid. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1419. Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1590. Stearney. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration and Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1599. Jack Davis. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 736. Capparelli. A Bill for an Act to exempt from certain occupations the use of tax, machinery, equipment and repair replacement parts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1519. Giorgi. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to promote public health and comfort to persons employed by providing one day of rest in seven. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1769. Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to provide for state funds for job training programs for new or expanding industries in Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1780. Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1847. Daniels. A Bill for an Act relating to product liability actions. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1772. Pierce. A Bill for an Act to establish policy of state



agencies to perform energy consumption analysis on major construction or renovation of buildings. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1792. Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1456. McClain. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1478. Yourell. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the various commissions, boards and agencies of state government. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1531. Bradley. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Secretary of State. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1617. Dave Jones. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizen's and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1680. Bradley. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. No further business the House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	8:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Rev. Krueger	prayer
		Speaker Redmond	ease till 8:20
	8:26	Speaker Redmond	House to order - Roll Call
		Doorkeeper	
2		Speaker Redmond	welcomes Senate
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		President Hynes	
		Speaker Redmond	Joint Session convenes Committee or Escort named
3		Speaker Redmond	
		Doorkeeper	Chief Justice at door
		Speaker Redmond	
		Doorkeeper	Senator Stevenson at door
		Speaker Redmond	admit Senator Stevenson
		Doorkeeper	Governor, Secretary of State
		Speaker Redmond	admit State officials - Ease
		Doorkeeper	President Jimmy Carter arrives
	9:15	Speaker Redmond	admit President Carter
		Senator Hynes	Welcomes President Carter
4 thru 8		President Jimmy Carter	speaks to Assembly
		Speaker Redmond	
		McPike	Questions President Carter
9		President Carter	responds
		Speaker Redmond	
		Macdonald	Question



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
10		President Carter	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Sen. Berman	Welcomes President Carter
		President Carter	
11		Berman	Question
12		President Carter	
		Speaker Redmond	
13		Senator Glass	Question
		President Carter	
		Speaker Redmond	
14		Ewell	Question
15, 16		President Carter	Answers and closing remarks
17		Speaker Redmond	
18	9:56	Sen. Hynes	Joint Session adjourns
	10:06	Speaker Redmond	Joint Session adjourns - ease
19		Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Houlihan	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
20		Daniels	Question
		Speaker Redmond	Recess
	11:25	Speaker Redmond	House to order - S.B. 1st
21, 22		Clerk O'Brien	Reads S.B.'s 1st Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schneider	leave to loosen his tie?
		Speaker Redmond	leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	Journal



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	dispense with reading of Journal
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	repeats request
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	motion carries
23		VanDuyne	OTB Bill information?
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matejek	point of personal privilege
	11:30	Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	today's program
24		Speaker Redmond	Special Order of Business
25, 26		Houlihan, J. Frank	Exec. Order #1 Energy organization report
		Speaker Redmond	
27	11:38	C. Stiehl	HB 3316 supports report
		Speaker Redmond	
28		Lucco	supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Williams	supports
		Speaker Redmond	
29	11:45	Brummer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	supports
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
30		Brummer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	to close on Exec. Order I
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Houlihan	suspend rule for HR 889
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	
31		Speaker Redmond	
	11:50	J. Houlihan	suspend rules
		Speaker Redmond	leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.R. 889
		Speaker Redmond	
32		McClain	yield?
		J. Houlihan	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
33	11:55	Matijevich	opposes H.R. 889
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	objects to order of business
		Speaker Redmond	
		Cunningham	
34		Speaker Redmond	H.R. 889 adopted
35		P. Martin	explains HR 86
	12:02	Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	Parliamentary Inquiry
36		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Peggy Martin	to close
		Speaker Redmond	
37		W. Walsh	point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
		P. Martin	explains vote
	12:10	Speaker Redmond	
38		Catania	
		Speaker Redmond	discussion
		W. Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
39		Winchester	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	possible verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
40		Madison	in favor
		Speaker Redmond	
42		Beatty	in favor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
43		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Call
		Speaker Redmond	
44, 45		Leinenweber	Questions Roll Call
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
		P. Martin	PPC
		Speaker Redmond	
46		Daniels	HB 1333 motion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:30	Mudd	opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
47		Lechowicz	opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	withdraws motion
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading. H.B. 3013
		J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3013
48		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		McGrew	take out of the record
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3027 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Getty	
49		Redmond	
		Deuster	yield
		Getty	discussion
		Redmond	
50		Waddell	yield
		Getty	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
51		D. Houlihan	supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	
52		Getty	to close
	12:45	Speaker Redmond	passed
		Clerk Hall	H.B. 3038
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jacobs	Sponsor
53		Speaker Redmond	passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3039
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3057



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Sponsor
54		Speaker Redmond	passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3083
		Speaker Redmond	
		Winchester	Sponsor
55		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	Cosponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Meyer	question
		Winchester	discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
56		Winchester	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brandt	
		Speaker Bradley	
57		McMaster	
		Speaker Bradley	passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3088
		Speaker Bradley	
		McMaster	Sponsor
		Speaker Bradley	
58		Jaffe	yield
		McMaster	discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
59		Yourell	yield
60		McMaster	discussion



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
61		Speaker Matijevich	
		Mahar	opposition
		Speaker Matijevich	
		VanDuyne	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Wolf	MPQ
62		Speaker Matijevich	
63		McMaster	to close
		Speaker Matijevich	
		VonBoeckman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Waddell	
		Speaker Matiejvich	
64		Conti	
	1:15	Speaker Bradley	H.B. 3088 continued
65		J. Davis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Bradley	
66		Yourell	
		Lechowicz	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McMaster	leave to return Interim Study
67		Speaker Bradley	objections raised
		McMaster	PPC
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
68		McMaster	leave for Interim Study
		Speaker Bradley	Bill returned
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3097 Third Reading
69	1:25	Winchester	
		Speaker Bradley	passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3134 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Giglio	leave to hear 1970
		Speaker Bradley	objections raised
70		Giglio	H.B. 1970 motion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Totten	
		Speaker Bradley	
71		J. Houlihan	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Bradley	
		VonBoeckeman	hold H.B. 3134
		Speaker Bradley	Giglio's motion fails
		VonBoeckman	tables H.B. 3134
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3158 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
72		Chapman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Vinson	
		Speaker Bradley	
73	1:37	J. Houlihan	supports



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Gaines	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Keats	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
74		Byers	explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		E.M. Barnes	explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mugalian	explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
75		Kosinski	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Vinson	verification
		Speaker Bradley	
76		Chapman	
		Speaker Bradley	
	1:45	Kelly	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
77		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Chapman	poll absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	Bill lost
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3163, Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Telcser	yield?
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Speaker Bradley	
78		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3177 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
79		Mautino	
		Speaker Bradley	
80		Tuerk	yield?
		Mautino	discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
81		Tuerk	speaks to Bill
	1:57	Farley	support
		Speaker Bradley	
82		Schuneman	yield
83		Mautino	
		Speaker Bradley	
84		Mudd	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Simms	yield



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Mautino	
		Speaker Bradley	
85		McMaster	
		Mautino	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
86		Mautino	close
87		Speaker Bradley	passed
		Katz	
88		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3190 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
89		D. Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
		Telcser	yield?
		Speaker Bradley	
		Telcser	question
90		Houlihan	discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Telcser	speaks to Bill
91		Speaker Bradley	
92		Geo-Karis	questions Sponsor
		Houlihan	discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Nardulli	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
93		Houlihan	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Dyer	'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
94		Clerk O'Brien	continues
	2:30	Clerk O'Brien	reads Affirmative Roll Call
		Speaker Bradley	
95		Schlickman	questions Affirmative Roll
96		Speaker Bradley	
		Pierce	change to 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kane	'aye'
97		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 3190 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3205 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	yield
98		Levin	discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
99		Speaker Lechowicz	
100		Levin	to close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
101		Catania	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Yourell	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
102		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	polls absentees
	2:52	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Dyer	change to 'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
103		Sandquist	'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pullen	verification
		Speaker Lechowicz	'proper time'
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
104		Clerk O'Brien	
		J. Dunn	'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tipsword	'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	continues
		Speaker Lechowicz	
105, 106		Pullen	questions Affirmative Roll Call



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		R. Walsh	change to 'no'
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3205 passed
107		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3219 Third Reading
	3:08	Terzich	Sponsor
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leinenweber	questions
108, 109		Terzich	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	to close
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3219 passed
		Clerk Hall	H.B. 3227 Third Reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		C.M. Stiehl	
110		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	yield
		C.M. Stiehl	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bowman	yield
111, 112		Stiehl	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
113		VanDuyne	yield
		Stiehl	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		C.M. Stiehl	to close
		Speaker Lechowicz	passed H.B. 3227



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk Hall	H.B. 3259 Third Reading
114	3:29	E.M. Barnes)	
)	
115, 116		Speaker Lechowicz)	
		Holewinski	yield
117		E.M. Barnes	
118		Holewinski	
119		Speaker Lechowicz	
120		Conti	
		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
120		Conti	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
121		Hudson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
122		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ryan	objection
		Speaker Lechowicz	confine remarks to Bill
123		Mann	continues
		Speaker Lechowicz	
124		Waddall	
125		Speaker Lechowicz	
	3:52	J. Houlihan	against
		Speaker Lechowicz	
126, 127		Cunningham	against
	4:00	Speaker Lechowicz	
128		Kelly	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
129		Deuster	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
130		Willer	against
		Speaker Lechowicz	
131		Stearney	support
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Flinn	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
132		E.M. Barnes	to close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Wm. Walsh	point or parl. inquiry
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		E.M. Barnes	to close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
133		Wm. Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kane	refers to 26.26
	4:15	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Wm. Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
134, 135		Barnes	to close
136		Speaker Lechowicz	responds to Walsh and Kane
		Kane	question
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ewell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kane	repeats question
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kane	appeals ruling of the Chair
137		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matijevich	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	Chair is not overridden
139		Ewell	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
140		Williams	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
141		Greisheimer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
142	4:40	Gaines	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pierce	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
143		Wm. Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
144		Campbell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		E.M. Barnes	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
145		Clerk Hall	polls absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Holewinski	possible verification
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Darrow	
		Speaker Lechowicz	86 'aye' 75 'nay'
		Epton	question
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	4:52	Madison	'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Epton	'aye'
146		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schneider	'no'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		R. Durn	
		Speaker Lechowicz	90 'aye', 73 'no'
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Laurino	leave to be verified
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	Affirmative Roll Call



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
147		Schlickman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	continues
		Speaker Lechowicz	
148		Holewinski	questions affirmative
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3259 passed
		Barnes	point or personal privilege
149		" "	move to reconsider vote
150		Speaker Lechowicz	
151		Mann	point of personal privilege
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	5:10	Walsh	file a dissent
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matijevich	point of order
		Speaker Lechowicz	
152		Walsh	objections to conduct of Chair
		Speaker Lechowicz	
153		Clerk Hall	Reads H.B. 3279 Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Pierce	explains H.B. 3279
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	5:20	Mudd	supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
155		Tuerk	yield?
156		Pierce	discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	supports
157		Speaker Lechowicz	
		J. Davis	yield
158		Pierce	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	5:25	Stuffle	supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ewing	opposes
159		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Holewinski	supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
160		Wikoff	yield?
		Pierce	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Farley	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pierce	to close on H.B. 3279
161		Speaker Lechowicz	
	5:35	Marovitz	'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
162		Kent	'nay'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	'present'
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3279 passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 3283
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kane	explains H.B. 3285
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Luft	yield?
		Kane	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
164		Schuneman	yield?
		Kane	
	5:40	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tipsword	supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
165		Kane	to close on H.B. 3283
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3283 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 3287 Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kempiners	explains H.B. 3287
		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		E. Barnes	'present'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	5:45	Matijevich	'nay'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		McGrew	
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3287 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 3296 Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
167		Campbell	Explains H.B. 3296



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
168		Brummer	yield?
		Campbell	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
169	5:50	McClain	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Campbell	to close on H.B. 3296
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3296 is passed
		Madigan	motion to go to short debate
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Telcser	supports motion
170		Speaker Lechowicz	
	5:55	Bradley	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Polk	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	
171		Speaker Lechowicz	motion carries rules are suspended
		Totten	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Short Debate
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3312 Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		McCourt	explains H.B. 3312
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3312 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 3327
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	6:00	Holewinski	explains H.B. 3327
		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		Conti	question
		Holewinski	answers
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3327 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 3339
		Speaker Lechowicz	
174		Totten	explains H.B. 3339
		Speaker Lechowicz	
175	6:05	Giglio	opposes
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	to close on H.B. 3339
		Speaker Lechowicz	
176		Madison	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
177	6:10	Kane	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	poll absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Peters	verification
		Clerk O'Brien	polls absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	'present' to 'no'
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3339 is lost
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 3340
		Speaker Lechowicz	
178		Totten	explains H.B. 3340
179		Speaker Lechowicz	
	6:15	Leverenz	opposes
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	yield? point of info.
		Speaker Lechowicz	
180		Totten	to close on H.B. 3340
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3340 is lost
	6:20	Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 3350
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Dunn	explains H.B. 3350
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Williams	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3350 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 3386
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stiehl	explains H.B. 3386
182		Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 3386 is passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	S.B. 1569, Third, Emergency
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads S.B. 1569
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brady	explains S.B. 1569
	6:25	Speaker Lechowicz	S.B. 1569 is passed
		Madigan	motion to consider H.B. 1333
		Speaker Lechowicz	motion carries
183		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1333
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	explains H.B. 1333
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		D. Houlihan	supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Hanahan	supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matijeovich	
	6:30	Speaker Lechowicz	H.B. 1333 passed
		Daniels	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 400
		Speaker Lechowicz	
185, 186		Skinner	explains H.B. 400
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
187		Skinner	to close on H.B. 400



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
188		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	explains vote:
		Speaker Redmond	
	6:40	Brummer	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
189		Clerk O'Brien	polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Macdonald	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Antonovych	'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 400 lost
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
190		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1270
		Speaker Redmond	
	6:45	Bowman	explains H.B. 1270
		Speaker Redmond	
		DiPrima	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Bowman	
191		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1270 is passed
		Younge	1088
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1088
		Speaker Redmond	
		Younge	explains H.B. 1088
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
192		Davis	
		Speaker Redmond	passed H.B. 1088
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1533
		Speaker Redmond	
		Younge	explains H.B. 1533
193		Speaker Redmond	
	6:55	Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	passed H.B. 1533
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 1710
		Speaker Redmond	
194		Younge	explains H.B. 1710
		Speaker Redmond	
		Younge	polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Younge	withdraws
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1710 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2075
		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
195	7:00	Young	explains H.B. 2075
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	'no' to 'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2075 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2214
		Speaker Redmond	
196		Young	explains H.B. 2214
	7:05	Speaker Redmond	
		Satterthwaite	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2214 passed
		Celrk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2295 third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Young	explains H.B. 2295
197		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2295 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	reads HB.1773
		Speaker Redmond	
		Vinson	explains H.B. 1773
		Speaker Redmond	
198		Stuffle	opposes
	7:10	Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1773 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1884 Thrid
		Speaker Redmond	
199		Catania	explains H.B. 1884



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
200		Jones	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1884 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 1970 Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Redmond	
201		Giglio	explains H.B. 1970
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1970 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2538
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2578, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:20	Marovitz	explains H.B. 2578
		Speaker Redmond	
202		Walsh	yield?
203		Marovitz	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Levin	'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2578 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2591
		Speaker Redmond	
		Flinn	table H.B. 2591
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	explains H.B. 2652
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2652
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	yield



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
204		Polk	discussion
	7:25	Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2652 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2662, Third
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2753 Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jacobs	explains H.B. 2753
205		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2753 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2770 Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	explains H.B. 2770
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	yield? opposes
		Leinenweber	discussion
206		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	supports
	7:30	Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	poll absentees
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2770 is passed
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2794
		Yourell	Interim Study
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2834 Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	2834 and 2835



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
207		Speaker Redmond	leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2835
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	explains bills
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:33	Skinner	opposition
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2835 is passed
208		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2854
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	explains H.B. 2854
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	opposition
		Speaker Redmond	
209		Brady	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	verification
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:37	Clerk O'Brien	polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	H.B. 2854 withdrawn
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2865
		Speaker Redmond	
210		Dunn	explains H.B. 2865
		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
211	7:40	Edgar	opposition
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	explains 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dunn	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Edgar	verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Redmond	
212		Johnson	'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dunn	Interim Study H.B. 2865
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:45	Matijevich	Interim Study Calendar H.B. 2316, 2548, 2837, 3040, 3186, 3187, 3192. 2591, 2652, 2736, 2883, 3039, 3041, 3119, 3129, 3163, 3154, 3165, 3854, P.P. 1642, 1788, 2121, 2162, 2833, 2936, 3200, 1238.
		Speaker Redmond	
213		Conti	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Flinn	H.B. 2591



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	objects to H.B. 1238 on list
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
214	7:50	Barnes	inquiry, separate motions
		Speaker Redmond	
		Porter	inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	add on H.B. 1710, 2075, 2295
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
215		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
	7:53	Speaker Redmond	three separate motions Third Reading and Postponed Motions
			Motion carries
		Speaker Redmond	2nd Reading Bills and motion Motion carries
		Barnes	H.B. 1238 Interim Study
216		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	verification



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	request: dilatory
	7:55	Speaker Redmond	motion fails
		Bennett	H.B. 2708 Interim Study
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	leave granted
		Kempiners	H.B. 3394, discharge from Comm.
217		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	repeats motion
	8:00	Speaker Redmond	leave granted
		J. Davis	inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dyer	H.B. 388 and 399 together
		Speaker Redmond	leave granted
218		Dyer	explains H.B. 388 and 389
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 388 and 399 are passed
		Clerk Hall	reads H.B. 2949, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		C. Davis	explains H.B. 2949
219		Speaker Redmond	
		G. Hoffman	supports
	8:05	Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2949 is passed
		C. Davis	explains H.B. 2950
		Clerk Hall	reads H.B. 2950



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
220		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2950 is passed
		C. Davis	point of personal privilege
		Speaker Redmond	Postponed Consideration
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 1357
		Speaker Redmond	
		Rigney	read it wrong
		Speaker Redmond	
221		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Rigney	explains H.B. 1357
		Speaker Redmond	
222	8:10	Hoffman	opposition
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1357 is passed
		Bradley	explains H.B. 883
		Speaker Redmond	
223		Ryan	verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Satterthwaite	'aye'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	8:15	Speaker Redmond Bradley Speaker Redmond Greiman Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Ryan Speaker Redmond	'aye' affirmative Roll withdrew
224		Chapman Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1973 Third
	8:20	Walsh Speaker Redmond Wolf	opposes
225		Speaker Redmond Chapman Walsh Speaker Redmond	explains vote discussion
	8:25	Bowman	explains vote
226		Speaker Redmond VonBoeckman Speaker Redmond Hanahan Speaker Redmond Flinn Speaker Redmond Hanahan	H.B. 1973 is lost H.B. 2106 to Interim Study objects motion carries H.B. 2256 Interim Study opposition



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Flinn	explains vote
227		Steele	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2556 passed
228		Birchler	H.B. 2636
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2636 passed
		Tipsword	H.B. 2792 TOORW
	8:32	Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
229		Brady	explains H.B. 2853
		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	take Roll Call
230		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2853 lost; H.B. 2898 Third
		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Simms	question
		Speaker Redmond	
231		Bartulis	opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Yourell	explains further
	8:40	Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2898 passed
232		Leverenz	explains H.B. 3274
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 3274 passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ewell	explains H.B. 3201
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 3201 passed
		Bowman	explains H.B. 1913
		Speaker Redmond	
233		Daniels	opposition
		Bowman	
	8:45	Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1913 lost
		Lechowicz	Attendance Roll Call
234		Lechowicz	H.B. 612, 1460, 2643 Interim St.
		Speaker Redmond	leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2951 Second
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kornowicz	H.B. 2951
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	table Amt. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
		Speaker Redmond	
235		Ryan	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
	8:50	Daniels	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	motion carries, Third
		Clerk O'Brien	reads H.B. 2951, Third.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kornowicz	H.B. 2951
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2951 is passed
236		Porter	H.B. 3272 Interim Study
		Porter	H.B. 1270 Porter to Bowman
		Speaker Redmond	
	8:53	Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giorgi	reads Agreed Resolutions
237		Speaker Redmond	Agreed Resolutions are adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	H.R. 900
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Davis	S.B. 1475 add Cosponsors
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brummer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	commends Democrats
	8:55	Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	H.B. 1274 Interim Study
		Speaker Redmond	leave granted
238		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate Adjournment Resolution
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Madigan	moves adoption
		Speaker Redmond	Adjournment Resolution adopted
		Madigan	moves adjournment
		Speaker Redmond	
	9:00	Clerk O'Brien	S.B.'s First
239			Messages from the Senate
240		Clerk O'Brien	Adjourn till 1:00 June 1



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES