

1.

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Phillip Brook said: 'No man has come to true greatness who has not felt in some degree that his life belongs to his race, and that what God gives him, He gives him for mankind'. Let us pray. Almighty God, giver of all good things, we express our gratitude this day for the knowledge and position that Thou has provided these, Thy servants, the Members of this House of Representatives of the State of Illinois. As they deliberate the issues of the day, O Lord, give them clear minds free from self-seeking and prejudice and hearts that are attuned to Thee. As stewards of Thy gifts, may they be always accountable to Thee for that which they do for the good of this State, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading appears... 35. Out of the Record. 36. Representative Winchester. Out of the Record. 96 through 159. Terzich. Out of the Record. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. Last night I announced that the 'Cubs' were winning, six to nothing. It seems to me that the record should show today that the 'Cubs' won, eight to two. Mr. Speaker, furthermore I was subject... I was subject to a bit of criticism last evening for not relating to my seatmate the Gentleman from LaGrange, how the 'White Sox' had done. Well quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, my record down here is one of parochialism, and I can only be concerned about the north side. But for the record the Chicago 'White Sox' won three to two. Now I know,



Mr. Speaker, in giving these results the question will arise, how did other teams do? The 'Yankees' lost to Detroit five to two, St. Louis beat Los Angeles four to three, Pittsburg lost... or excuse me, Pittsburg beat San Diego, nine to two. Importantly, Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia 'Phillies' lost to Cincinnati ten to five. And the National League Champions, the World Champions now have the lead by six and a half games. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Who won the NCAA Basketball Championship?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker. The university to which my daughter will be attending this fall, 'Marquette'."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you. 205. Stanley. 280. Out of the Record. 286. McPike. Out of the Record. 305. McClain. Out of the Record. 310. Deavers. Out of the Record. 322. Abramson. Out of the Record. 331. Telcser. Out of the Record. 345. Ebbesen. Out of the Record. 433. Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen is here."

Ebbesen: "Well a... yes Mr. Speaker you know a... we've been calling that Bill a... at a time when there is hardly anyone on the floor... and I have got an Amendment... and I think of course... I think there should be more people on the floor to discuss the Amendment. I'd like to take it out of the record with the understanding we'll go back to that sometime this morning... I would appreciate your cooperation on this. But I... you can't call an Amendment that has come... "

Speaker Redmond: "I understand your situation and we will be back to you."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "433. Brady. Out of the Record. Representative Ryan. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do we have a quorum here this morning?"



Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Ryan: "Do we have a quorum here this morning?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think so."

Ryan: "Do ya... I don't think we do Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Then we will stand in recess for a half an hour until we round up the Republican absentees."

Ryan: "Fine. Don't forget the... Democrats."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplementary Consent Calendar, Second Reading ... Third Reading, Second Day, Group I, page 10 on the Calendar. Senate Bill 21. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Director of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to convey land in Alton. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 30. A Bill for an Act to create the Law Enforcement Commission. Amends the Act creating the Law Enforcement Commission. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 114. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Occupational Diseases Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 124. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 132. A Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 133. A Bill for an Act to amend the Blighted Areas Redevelopment Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 134. A Bill for an Act to amend the Urban Community Conservation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 135. A Bill for an Act to amend the Urban Renewal Consolidation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 136. A Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 137. A Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 144. A Bill for an Act to amend the Evidence and Disposition Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 146. A Bill for an Act to amend an



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 166. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 170. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 172. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to certain sanitary districts names. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 189. A Bill for an Act to amend the County Home Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 207. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning mechanics' liens. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 229. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to State monies. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 303. A Bill for an Act to create the Model School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 355. A Bill... A Bill for an Act in relation to the Legislative Information System. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 371. A Bill for an Act to amend the law in relation to mechanics' liens. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 497. A Bill for an Act to amend the Uniformed Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 573. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Property Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 607. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 629. A Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to reduced fares for public transportation. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 643. A Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 645. A Bill for an Act in relation to regulation of rivers, lakes and streams in Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 686. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 694. A Bill for an Act to amend the

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 845. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 868. A Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 915. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 922. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Aeronautics Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1028. A Bill for an Act to amend Articles of the State Universities Retirement System of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1115. A Bill for an Act to amend the Common Trust Fund Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1145. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1189. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1290. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1303. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1314. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1367. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 693. Representative Darrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 693."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to take Senate Bill 693 back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. It's on... 693 is on Short Debate Calendar. It's on page 8."



Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Now on the Order of Second Reading."

Darrow: "On this we have worked out an Amendment with Senator 'Schwartz' and members of the cities and villages... What we are doing is making some technical changes in place of local government. We are talking about municipalities. Now, we have made a number of other changes in the Bill... they're purely technical, and that I ask for adoption of this Amendment. If there is any questions, I will be glad to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Darrow: "Yes... yes I will, Gene."

Schlickman: "This is a new Act, is that correct?"

Darrow: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "And it deals with... the issuance of revenue bonds?"

Darrow: "Yes it does... it deals with issuing bonds for non-home rule municipalities only."

Schlickman: "And to what... for what purpose?"

Darrow: "It's a very limited purpose...it's a... for sewer projects... gas lights, things such as that you cannot... you cannot issue them for golf courses or anything of that nature. What you are doing, we're issuing bonds for services that all the residents of a municipality require... such as utilities...and water."

Schlickman: "Well don't these bonds become in the nature of 'G.O.' bonds when you allow the units of local government to pledge its full faith and credit?"

Darrow: "Yes, they do."

Schlickman: "And these would be bonds that would be issued without referendum?"

Darrow: "That's correct. But there would... they presently are, but there would also be a provision that these bonds would be paid off by the service fees from the utilities. There would not be any property tax connected with the



bond."

Schlickman: "Would you mind just reviewing exactly what... the Amendment is, because this is a very important Bill?"

Darrow: "All right, the Amendment changes in all the areas where we have local government... it changes that to municipalities."

Schlickman: "That would be restrictive?"

Darrow: "Since it applies only to municipalities."

Schlickman: "And by going from local government to municipalities, you're excluding other units of local government such as park districts, library districts etc."

Darrow: "Yes, that's correct."

Schlickman: "Now, is the word municipality a word of art?"

Darrow: "Yes."

Schlickman: "OK. Now what else does the Bill do then?"

Darrow: "The Bill or the Amendment?"

Schlickman: "Excuse me... the Amendment, I'm sorry."

Darrow: "The Amendment? Other than that provision, the only other provision is we have plugged into this Bill... a phrase, a term that is applied to other legislation concerning the leveling of taxes pursuant to this Section of the Code."

Schlickman: "What is the effect of that?"

Darrow: "It... the purpose for that is tied in with the desire to use your full faith and credit for the issuance of these bonds. I'll tell you, if you would like to discuss the Bill after we adopt the Amendment... I'll be glad..."

Schlickman: "I'll be over. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Friedrich. Questions on the Gentleman's motion, for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no', the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On... 797. Where is that



Representative Smith... Martin?"

Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. 797 is on the..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Short Debate Calendar, Senate Bills, Third Reading."

Martin: "And I'd like please to have it moved back for the purposes of an Amendment. It has been... the Amendment was cleared with Senator Newhouse, and of course it's okay with me and Mr. Skinner... Representative Skinner does have an Amendment... to put on 797."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to return 797 to the order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Skinner. Amends Senate Bill 797, on page 1, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Amendment #2 might be called the 'Ron Stackler' Amendment. This is an Amendment which would forbid state employees earning over \$20,000 a year, who are in a official capa... regulatory capacity, from getting a job in the industry they regulated... for two years after they leave state government. With all the talk we had about the Insurance Department officials, the Directors for example... specifically any that are going to work for the industry which they had previously regulated, I certainly think something like this is long overdue. We shouldn't allow the Thompson Administration to perpetuate the... the sins of the Walker Administration. So for that reason, I offer Amendment #2."

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

Lechowicz: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question?"

Skinner: "Certainly."

Lechowicz: "Amendment #2, as I read it, your saying for two years immediately following termination of governmental



service no official of a elected agency shall be employed by a person... affected by the actions of such agency.

Does that also include elected officials?"

Skinner: "No it does not. I do not have that much guts. This is appointed officials only. People like Ron Stackler."

Lechowicz: "Yeah but... that's fine with Ron Stackler ... let me just ask you another question."

Skinner: "People like Director Wilcox."

Lechowicz: "I would strongly recommend that this House take a very close look at Amendment #2, and I don't happen to agree with the Sponsor's... explanation of the Amendment. I believe that the 'person' means any private individual, firm, partnership, community association, corporation or any other organization or group of persons, and 'official' means any individual appointed to or employed by an Executive Agency whose annual salary is \$20,000 or greater. And I believe that's rather broad in its intent, maybe unintentionally, but it's too broad and I would strongly recommend that Amendment #2 be defeated."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Schuneman: "Cal, I'm sorry I don't have a copy of this Amendment."

Skinner: "It was distributed yesterday."

Schuneman: "As I understand the sense of what I've heard, you're attempting by means of this Amendment to make sure that appointed Directors of Departments of state government, for a period of two years after serving in their governmental position, cannot have employment in the industry which they served to oversee."

Skinner: "That is correct. It definitely... is only... Executive Branch officials."



Schuneman: "OK. I understand what you're... what prompts this but I'm concerned about what the effect might be. It seems to me that the reaction is a 'knee-jerk' reaction to correct a situation, and that the correction may very well be worse... the cure may be worse than the disease. I'm thinking, for example, of the Director of Agriculture. Where do you think he should come from? What background do you think he should have...in banking?"

Skinner: "Well... I don't know."

Schuneman: "In education... do you think that would be a good place...?"

Skinner: "...President Nixon found an Agricultural Director ... Department Director at the University of Indiana."

Schuneman: "I see..."

Skinner: "For example, and I believe that Mr. Williams came from a farm which he owns, and I believe that Mr. Block came from a farm which he owns."

Schuneman: "Would your Amendment preclude those people from returning to their own occupations after serving as Director of Agriculture?"

Skinner: "No. It says they shall not be employed by someone whom they have regulated."

Schuneman: "So anyone... the Director of Agriculture then could not be employed by anyone in the 'Agri' business area after leaving office as the Director of Agriculture?"

Skinner: "Well I certainly wouldn't want the Director of Agriculture on the state level to go work for some multinational grain company. That's for darn sure."

Schuneman: "No, but what about... what about a family farm corporation? ...Mr. Speaker, may I speak for the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand what the Sponsor is trying to do here, but I really believe in joining with Representative Lechowicz in opposition of this Amendment, would be the correct position. This matter perhaps should have some additional



study; maybe there should be some legislation. But the type of Amendment that the Sponsor is offering here today is certainly not the one, and I urge that this Amendment be rejected."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion?"

Skinner: "Well I am astounded to find anyone on the Republican side of the aisle attacking this concept since it was in Governor Thompson's position paper on ethics. That of course a... means that this is the only part of his ethics package that has any chance whatsoever of being enacted this Session, and so I certainly hope that those of us who showed such uniform support of the Governor's budget proposals yesterday will all vote for this today. ...To try to dispel any apprehensions that the... Majority Leader... or Assistant Majority Leader may have made when he asked and suggested that an elected official might be... might come under this Act, I would point specifically to line 11 of the Amendment #2, which defines official as anyone employed by an Executive Agency. Now that does not go to a Legislative Agency, and it says that that person must have an annual salary of \$20,000 or less... or...or greater. What we are attempting to do is to keep public officials from profiting in the private sector from decisions that they may make in anticipation of going on the payroll of some private firm. It seems to me that in the State of Illinois with the former Director of the Department of Public Aid, Director Trainor going home... going to work for the nursing home lobby, after having set rates for that nursing home industry, it's just totally reprehensible and indefensible. However, that is legal now. That should not be legal. How are we to know that Director Trainor did not set the rates of the nursing homes higher in anticipation of going to work for the nursing home lobby? How are we to know that Director Stackler of the



Department of Registration and Education under the Walker Administration did not make specific appointees... appointments to the various registration boards who would be friendly to him when he represented clients before them, after he left office as Director of Registration and Education. Indeed I think there is every reason to believe that that is the case, since he took microfilm files of every Legislator's 'letter' in this General Assembly with him. How are we to know that he is not... he was not planning to use his official connections in the state government under Governor Walker to hurt us after he got out before Registration Boards. Who knows what he will do with the microfilm which he may now have duplicated. And what about Director Wilcox. He's the one that approved the Workmen's Compensation rates, and who did he go to work for after he left the Department of Insurance? He went to work for the Rate Setting Bureau of the Insurance Industry, the National Insurance Industry. Now is anyone going to stand up here and defend that type of employment after having... after the Gentleman gained access by way of appointment to a job that paid more than \$20,000 in the State of Illinois. Now these are only the people that we know about who are at the top of the various Departments, and for that reason the Amendment goes down a little lower in the structure. It goes down to those that are earning over \$20,000 a year and that figure was picked because it seems to me that anybody earning over \$20,000 a year in state government has some special access, some special knowledge, some special records. This is the type of legislation that state government is going to have to adopt. if we are not to become... if we are not to continue to be the laughing stock of the State of Illinois. My colleagues in the 33rd District, Republican colleagues Representative Waddell and Senator Schaffer have just sent out 35,000 newsletter - combination newsletter and



questionnaires, and we are getting back comments that you wouldn't believe. Like 'leave us alone', or 'why don't you crooks come home?' It's legislation like this, that will help turn the public opinion around in the State of Illinois and make it more favorable to those of us who are in public...public positions. I would repeat, again, this will not affect anybody in the Legislative Branch; it will affect only those in the Executive Branch. Let those who are braver than I take on the Legislative Branch."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 797... Mr. James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker. Just to correct the record I think Representative Skinner is mistaken. I think the rate increase he is referring to was approved by acting Director Toivonen, Dennis Toivonen, who was the acting Director in between the time... Director Wilcox and Director Duncan served. I believe that is the person that approved that rate increase which you're referring to."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Perhaps I stand corrected, I'm referring to the 1975 increase, and I thought that Director Wilcox was in office. If he was not I certainly apologize, and would ask where that interim Director is now working."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an interpretation from the Chair whether Amendment #2 is germane. Based on the question of the official being designated on Amendment on #2, in Section B, lines 10 through 12 and whether the Amendment is germane to the Bill or not, and the definitions as far as an official and people making \$20,000 or more."



Speaker Madigan: "Well I understand that a... that the a... Clerk would like to take the Attendance Roll Call. So let's take this matter out of the record. This matter shall be taken out of the record, and the Clerk will take... the Roll Call for attendance... Mr. Lechowicz, are there any excused absences on the Democratic side?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the record show that Representative Kornowicz is excused because of illness?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan. Are there any excused absences on the Republican side?"

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative McAvoy due to illness."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lucco, push your attendance switch will you please. Back on the order of Senate Bill 797. Amendment #2. Mr. Lechowicz has questioned the germaneness of Amendment #2. The ruling of the Chair is that Amendment #2 is germane. Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I have a young lady here with about four dollars and some cents in change, and a cold glass of a... a cold carton of milk, but she is not quite sure where it's supposed to go. Anyone order... give somebody a five dollar bill, apparently, and ask for some milk and a donut?"

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion on Amendment #2. to Senate Bill 797? Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to Amendment #2, I would point out to the..."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Skinner arise?"

Skinner: "Well the Gentleman is entitled to explain his vote, but I have closed and you were ready to call the question, and I have no objections as long as you turn the timer on: He is usually very concise."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman's point is well taken. Question is, shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 797 be adopted? All



those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Daniel Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In rising to speak against this Amendment, I would point out to the Membership that what we are dealing with here in this Amendment and in the Bill is the Criminal Code of this state. I will point out that in the Amendment the language that is used ^{is} that it shall be a Class A misdemeanor to initiate contact with any officer or employee of the agency, which previously employed the person as an official. What is the words 'initiate contact' mean? To meet someone? To say hello to someone? To place a telephone call? To write a letter? Now this is the kind of loose draftmanship in the Criminal Code that causes nothing but severe problems. Now this Bill... this Amendment is not well drafted; it is extremely poorly drafted. It deserves a negative vote, and that is what I urge for the membership."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kane to explain his vote. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I see the vote is going where it is. Briefly, I would just say that if we are going to get expertise in a very complicated Department like the Department of Insurance, and the only place where we're going to get that expertise if we don't bring in new people and train them every two years, then the insurance companies can sure snow anybody that comes in fresh. That means that we are going to have to get people who know insurance... the only place where we're going to get them is from the insurance industry, and the only time that we're going to be able to do that is we're not going to be able to get them, if say that not only are you going to have to take a break and take a loss when you come into public service, but not only that you're going to have to change your complete career when you get out. And I think this is a very bad Amendment, and I would urge a



'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "I am absolutely astounded that someone of the National Party of President Carter would speak against this proposal, which President Carter first made. In fact, from whom I got the idea. He's talked about the 'revolving door' phenomena in Washington, where people from the industry go to government to regulate government, and then go back to the industry. You know it's sort of like in the Defense Department, where the... where the Colonels and the Generals go out and work for the defense contractors, after they've worked in the Department of Defense's Procurement Office. Now I know that reform is not ready... is not available at the Federal Government. That's rather obvious with the way Congress is kicking the President around. But, I had hoped that in the State of Illinois, which has more convictions in the Federal Court for official corruption and bribery and similar offenses, that we could be a leader in reform. I was obviously hoping too much."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Mr. Epton to explain his vote."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a conflict of interest in this matter. I'm not exactly sure what it is, but I know it's there. As usual I'll vote my conscience."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 61 'ayes', 67 'nos', and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 797 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Bowman. Amends Senate Bill 797 as amended on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman. Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to offer Amendment #3 to Senate Bill



797. Amendment #3... is an Amendment that is very... is similar in some respects to a Bill which we have already considered, House Bill 1547. This is not identical to House Bill 1547 so I believe it is appropriate to reconsider the issue at this time. The issue, to put it bluntly, is whether police authorities may use secret agents or spies to infiltrate lawful organizations to report on their lawful activities to their superiors. Now I believe that the concensus not only of this House but of the citizens of Illinois is that that should not be tolerated. This Amendment amends the official misconduct Section of the Criminal Statute; provides that police authorities shall not use secret agents to gather intelligence on lawful activities of lawful organizations if that information is not to be used for criminal investigation. Now at this point the Amendment differs from House Bill 1547. House Bill 1547, you may recall, would have required judicial authorization; essentially a warrant, if you will, before the police could use secret agents to infiltrate lawful organizations for the purpose of conducting a criminal investigation. Well Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment deletes that particular provision. That was one of the most contentious provisions of the Bill, and I believe that this is a good Amendment. Anyone who voted for House Bill 1547 should be able to vote for this particular Amendment and those... many of you who did not vote for this Amendment as well. I think it is high time that the... we send the Bill to the Senate for their consideration, and I urge the adoption of the Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kosinski."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Kosinski: "I still have a problem with this. Under our lawful police surveillance, we indicate that it would be unlawful to covertly gather, by any means, for the use of his agency



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

or any other governmental agency, information concerning the lawful activities of any person or group. I understand the intent, but the wordage... the wordage indicates ...you know actually we don't know their lawful activities until there might be such an investigation covertly."

Bowman: "No... if I may respond to that, Mr. Speaker. The questioner very deftly broke off in the middle of the sentence. If he had concluded reading the same sentence, he would note that such activity is illegal except, except mind you where such information is directly relevant to a valid investigation of criminal conduct. No wait a minute,... this doesn't say that they have to have proof of the criminal conduct in advance. All they have to do, is be able to establish that there is an investigation of criminal conduct, that to which this information is relevant. That's all they have to do, Sir. I believe, a... your question has been more than answered."

Kosinski: "I didn't intentionally break off at that point, it was an etc. But I still have a problem because how do they know it's directly relevant to a valid investigation of criminal conduct until they covertly make such an investigation?"

Bowman: "It's their investigation, Sir."

Kosinski: "Yes, I understand that, but if they say they were intending to investigate Communist activities within a legal organization because they presume some subversive elements had entered that organization...this is a presumption and not relevant to a valid investigation of criminal conduct."

Bowman: "Sir, if the police cannot be expected to spend their time in the conduct of valid criminal investigation, what are they doing out there?"

Kosinski: "Well until such time as becomes a fact of what they're out doing out there, neither you or I know. I'm certain that many investigations that are going on presently where they cannot indicate what the facts of



that investigation are for fear of blowing cover. It was on that basis that I took exception to the need for a court order. Because once you start an investigation on the basis of a court order and enter such an order in the court you've blown your cover. You may as well give up."

Bowman: "If I could respond to that issue. There's no problem about blowing their cover here. There is no requirement in this case for prior authorization. In other words, the only way their cover would be blown is if they blew it themselves and someone found them out, they were unmasked, they were discovered, then the issue would arise. Was it a valid and criminal investigation that they were conducting? If this is a post fact... this is a post facto Bill."

Kosinski: "You know by the introduction of this actually, what you're indicating is that the cause that you've pleaded so valiantly on the floor in your original Bill was remiss, because you have made a modification. Now, I still have^a question as to whether this one is complete."

Bowman: "When we get back to discussing the original Bill, I'll be happy to answer that."

Kosinski: "You know...you know... If I may continue Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker. You know I think we ... we part in a similar direction, we don't want injustices committed against us, the Legislators, or anybody else. At the same time, I know the society needs protection. I have great concern about these... first Amendment efforts to... to protect our civil rights at the expense of collective civil rights. I worry about this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In rising to oppose Amendment #3 to this Bill, I will point out to the Membership that this Amendment differs very significantly from the prior Bill introduced by the Sponsor of the Amendment. The most



significant difference is that this Amendment provides no provision whatever for judicial supervision of alleged unlawful police surveillance. Now it is the judicial supervision aspect of the prior Bill that I thought was the saving grace of the Bill, to balance the interests of the individual or the interests of the group which might be investigated with the interest of society as a whole. But this Amendment has no provision whatever for prior judicial supervision of police intelligence gathering. Now the Sponsor admits, and admitted in Committee that there are instances, and a great number of instances, of lawful legitimate police intelligence gathering, but here we have in this Amendment no judicial supervision provision, and in consequence I believe that the Amendment here would be fatally defective. I think it deserves a 'no' vote, and would so urge the Membership."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Getty: "What...I'm concerned about... the provision that on page 2, line 20, 'covertly gathers by any means for the use of his agency or any other governmental agency, information concerning the lawful activities' etc. I'm concerned about there is...I just think that it's... it's far too overbroad, that information could be gathered here where it isn't the type of police find that your attempting to get at, and yet it would be covered. It doesn't address itself just to groups, it goes into a... a much...any person...you say any person or group. I think you're just too overbroad there. Could you explain that?"

Bowman: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to Representative Getty. First of all this language is really very little different, this particular part of the Bill is very little different from House Bill 1547. Furthermore,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

to the extent that others foresee this as an issue, let me suggest to them that this provision should not inhibit the... the kind of police conduct which we all find acceptable. I would simply answer him with a question. If it is acceptable, why...why should they be doing it covertly in the first place, and lastly I would point out that in the penalty Section a violation of this particular Section is not treated as harshly as violations of other Sections, but it is grounds for injunctive relief if the court so decides that... that it is inappropriate in a particular instance, it is grounds for injunctive relief. And I think that's appropriate."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill? I'm afraid that this is just too overbroad. I supported Representative Bowman's Bill when it passed out for the reasons indicated by Representative Houlihan. It did have judicial discretion involved in it, that was a saving property. But moreover, I think here we're getting into a very, very serious area where you're going to find police officers and others because it doesn't seem to be limited just to police officers, are going to be inhibited in the investigation of any cases. This language taken in a very broad manner could mean you, as a Legislator, if you sought to gather information, information that you might want to use in your official capacity as a Legislator, might be subject to this. I think it just goes far too broadly, and I think that we should reject this, and if there is some further Amendment, something more in keeping with the Bill which this House previously passed out, bring that up and we'll pass it. But not this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think this subject has been very adequately discussed, and I would move the previous question."



Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the "Chair" the motion fails. There's a request for a Roll Call on the question, as to the previous question. All those in favor of the motion for the previous question, in other words to close the debate, signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 34 'nos', and the motion for the previous question carries. I'm advised that you take the 'no' vote, double it, and if there's more 'ayes' than 'nos' times two you win. Mr. Matijevich, is that correct? Mr. Matijevich tells me I'm correct. The "Chair" recognizes Mr. Bowman to close the debate."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. About the only objections that have been raised to this have been that it is overbroad. At least one of the persons who raised that objection has said that they preferred the judicial supervision voted against the Bill that had judicial supervision in it. So I suggest to you that it is really a smoke screen. Neither of the Speaker's who are... who address that particular issue were able to point out to this House in what way this particular Amendment is broader than the similar language in House Bill 1547. The only issue that this Bill... this Amendment addresses at this point is the issue of whether police authorities ought to be able to use spies to spy on lawful activities of lawful organizations without the motive for conducting a criminal investigation. That's the only thing, and I submit to you that it is perfectly clear, it is perfectly clear that police authorities do not have that right. It is wrong, and it should be made illegal, and we ought to be able to agree on that particular point, and that's what this Amendment does, and I urge an Affirmative Roll Call.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thank you for your attention."

Speaker Madigan: "Question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted?"

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mrs. Willer to explain her vote."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of the series of articles that have come out this past week telling us far more about the activities of the Chicago 'Red Squad', I find that the intransigence of the opponents of any type of protection simply unbelievable. Now to say that we, as Legislators, might be affected is nonsense. We had a Legislator who tried to go in for covert investigation and got in a lot of trouble if you'll remember. I as a Legislator don't have to do anything that's covert to get information I need to be a good Legislator. I don't think that applies to us at all. When you have people being spied upon, finding out in their files if they said they were a member of the Communist Party in 1934 when they were nine years of age, and that's one of them, and it goes on and on and on ad nauseam; and yet, as the Representative pointed out, those who voted against the last Bill now are wringing their hands over there's no judicial review. We need this Bill. I can't imagine anyone voting against it. What in heaven's name are you thinking of?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Macdonald to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's regrettable that House Bill 1547 ran into the problems that it did in the Senate. I strongly support this Amendment. I think it's... it is certainly long overdue, and I think for the protection of the people of this state that we certainly ought to vote for this Amendment. I urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I look at that board, and I can't believe my eyes. The issue



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

here is do you want a Gestapo police organization? Do you want a police state? Do you want policemen at every lawn party you attend? I have a file that's fifteen years old. I encourage all of you to look at my file and see what was spied upon. Attending a lawn party at the home of 'Julian Levy' of the University of Chicago. Attending a cocktail party with regard to mobilizing legislation, having to do with the Undeclared War Bill. Now let's face what we're doing. People have gotten up and have used broadness, and excuses, and a lot of other things to excuse the most undemocratic thing that could happen to our society. Look at every police state all over the world and you'll find that the police run the society. It's our taxes that pay for the police. They don't run our society. We run them. They're working for us. Ladies and Gentlemen, for God's sake, don't give a mandate to the policemen in the City of Chicago to continue to spy and intimidate the citizens of that city. Please turn your vote around."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hudson to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I voted for Representative Bowman's Bill previously in these chambers, but I think it's entirely possible that we can enter into an area of overkill on this desire to protect society at large. We seem to be interested in what we might roughly call the 'rule of law', yes we're all interested in the 'rule of law' and protection of those who need protection. But we can enter into an area of overkill. Who's 'rule of law' are we interested in? Certainly the framers of the Constitution in no way intended that the defenders of public order should be pilloried and prosecuted for having performed that essential duty. Is there not a 'rule of law' to protect the safety and security of the majority of our people? Freedom does not imply a person's right to falsely shout 'fire' in a crowded theatre ,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

you've all heard that. And I do feel that our police need some help, some protection, some protection to do the job that they have to do to protect our society. There's a very delicate question here as to our constitutional rights and who is protected and who isn't. We have a great land of freedom. We all want to keep that land a freedom, and I am casting no aspersions on anybody here, but we all know that there are people in our society who would actually destroy our constitutional rights or form of government and the very freedoms we have. Those people should be, I think, surveyed and... the public should be kept informed as to their activities. Again I repeat, I'm not referring to any member of this Legislative Body. You are all fine people. But I think we're riding a very delicate line here as to what we must do or must not do, in order to preserve the very society that we all admire and respect and want to keep. And if those who would bring down our form of government, who would destroy our society, certainly if they're successful, they're going to bring down with it those very freedoms we all enjoy and seek to keep. So... I think there are arguments to be made here, lest we do in fact enter into an area of complete overkill on our ability to keep tabs on and survey those who would destroy the very freedoms that we want to preserve and to keep."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan to explain his vote. James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There have been arguments raised in opposition to this Amendment, and I must respectfully suggest that those arguments are at best excuses. It seems to me that what we're talking about here is a set of priorities. Whether we want our police force, our law enforcement officials, to be joined organizations spying in effect on law-abiding citizens, people who are trying to help put



together an American consensus of our public policy. Whether we want our police force distracting themselves from...to this legitimate function, and instead spying on members; whether we want police force members to be using their resources to join organizations that are law abiding citizens, or whether we want those policemen to be out combating crime, to be out on the streets protecting the people. We're talking in this day and age of law and order. We're talking about individuals who will protect society. Those police force resources should be used to stop crime; not to spy, not for political purposes, not for an agenda for a particular Department which has a difference with an organization on a substantive or social matter. This Amendment ought to be adopted, and the Bill ought to be passed over to the Senate."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stearney to explain his vote."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the first occasion in this Session that I have rose to join with Representative Bob Mann, and I think it's imperative that especially the Conservatives on this side of the aisle support this particular Amendment. We must be very careful of the police activities because as Mr. Mann has said it's not only the Fascist but that KGB mentality. And if you were to look at this, this Amendment here provides that they can only investigate covertly where they believe they have a valid investigation, which means that the individuals being surveyed have committed, or they are committing, or they are about to commit a crime. Now remember, you cannot arrest, nor can youan individual unless you believe that he was in violation of those instances. I think the Amendment is carefully and properly drawn, and especially I think it's incumbent upon the Conservatives to protect freedom, and remember we seen it in the Chicago Police Department and we've seen it in the FBI, that whenever you give a police agency too much power,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that power corrupts. An absolute power corrupts absolutely. And there must be limitations on the power that you give to any police agency, and I think now that the Amendment...the Amendment is the proper way to handle and to attack this problem. I think we should support it, and it should be supported especially by the Conservatives, who are more concerned with liberty than the other side of the aisle, I would think, and I would ask that the people on this side of the aisle support this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Robinson to explain his vote."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what bothers me about this is not just the civil liberties issues, what bothers me about this is that the stories in the Chicago Tribune have pointed out that the Chicago Police Department has been used as an arm of the Chicago Cook County Democratic Organization. Everyone should think about that. There was one story that talked about how the late Mayor used the Chicago Police to spy on a member of the Chicago Board of Education, so he could try to find some reason to fire him and to put somebody else in who had more favor. There were stories in the Chicago Tribune about how the Chicago Police went to meetings of Committee on the Illinois Government to find out which one of the Independent Democrats were going to run against the 'machine' Democrats. The Chicago Police Department should not be used as an arm for one wing of the Democratic Party in Chicago. Those of you on all sides of the aisle, who believe in free elections, ought to be voting to pass this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mugalian to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I can understand about five 'red' votes on this Bill. or possibly ten. As a matter of sincere, very conservative caution, misdirected I would say, but I can't understand how 85 of us would really, in effect, be voting to promote a



police state mentality. What this reminds me of is George Orwell and 1984; and everything that double-think implies. And it reminds me also, and I wish... I only ask one thing of my colleagues, think of this vote in a historical perspective. Don't vote on the basis of present political considerations. Think about what you would...how you would like reporters of this scene a year from now to view this vote. It's a very important vote, and it reminds me, those that are voting 'red', and the reasons some of them have given is the statement that some of our subtle officials made several years back, that in order to save a city we had to destroy a city. That's what we're saying, in order to save it, we have to destroy it. How can anyone be voting 'red'?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I can assure you I'm not for a police state. But we have all these problems with law and order, and yet here is an attempt to tie the hands of a Police Department. I can tell you that no Metropolitan Police Department can operate without files, and knowing who's who in the community, and who is liable to cause a problem. So I urge you to stay on the 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Martin to explain her vote."

Martin: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sure that you know that I am one of the persons who was spied upon. I resent that very much. I resent even more that the police took their time to follow me into thirty-eight different churches. Any time that we have crime, or a crime ridden city as much as Chicago, I can see no reason in the world why the police should waste their time following me into 38 churches. Not only did they have files on me, but they also had files on the churches of which I attended worship services at. Not only that, but the schools of which I spoke at at commencement time. I



cannot understand you here not voting 'green' on this Bill. It's like sometimes that you are accusing us, or that deep down in your minds, that you think that we as Members of this House are part of some 'Red' activity. I am not. I am not a Communist, and I never have been a Communist. Those people whom I know, I don't know what they are, and it's really none of my business, but I would hope that you in the Legislature would show your confidence in us, to say to the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois that you do not believe that the Members in this House, who are certainly your colleagues, that we are not in any way connected to any Communist Party. I urge you please to vote 'green' on this Bill, to send off that message loud and clear. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, I would like to announce my intention to ask for a verification, an oral verification if you will, and with that you may proceed."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Ewell to explain his vote. Ewell, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, you don't get patriotism out of police files, you get it from the heart. What we have to concern ourself here is the fundamental issue as to whether or not we are going to approve the type of tactics and the policies that we have seen become nothing but a political spying operation. I think if we put the Constitution's Bill of Rights up to vote today it would be voted down. But we're getting one chance now to take a look at a fundamental issue, a very fair issue. Now we, as State Legislators, are not legislating for the FBI. We're not telling them what they can conduct and what they can't do, but what we're simply putting down are the regulations from our own local jurisdictions. You don't have this problem in



smaller communities, because everyone knows everyone else, and that's good. And if the Police Department took a little more time to come into the communities, except for traffic enforcement and spying, they would know everything that goes on. I point out to you that we have a thousand murders in the City of Chicago, and the time might well be spent investigating these murders. But if you allow Keystone Cops to conduct political surveillances, you're gonna get a Mickey Mouse Operation and nothing for your dollar. I say that what we ought to do is approve...approve of the fact that unless there's probable cause, unless there's some indication to believe that there would be violence, that there would be some breach of the law, that surely the Police Department particularly in the City of Chicago could better spend its time in occupying real crime, murders, rapes, robberies, burglaries. That's where we need the law enforcement, and not in traffic, and not in political surveillance. I suggest in the years to come you will have to ask your own conscience, 'How did I stand on a fundamental issue of freedom?' A fundamental issue that goes to the heart and core of the American system. You can hide behind a 'red' vote and say that it's politically expedient, or that perhaps I owe my political loyalty one place or another, but that is not the question. Answer your own conscience, look at the Bill on its merits and surely you will vote 'green'. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Griesheimer to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I initially thought I would vote 'yes' on this Amendment, and I have now had an opportunity to read it and as debates should, I listened to debate, and I'm somewhat overwhelmed and forced to make this explanation of vote. We have had our police referred to as Gestapo; we've said we live in a police state. What happened to these bleeding hearts when they talked about the bombings



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that were going on? The incitement that was going on? Insidious incitement of the type that you can't get unless the police go out and try to infiltrate these places? How many drug raids would be accomplished, if the police didn't infiltrate these groups that are selling drugs to our youngsters? I think it's perfectly ridiculous to stand up and say that we must oppose this Bill because of a police state. What we need now is some good police protection. So far as I can tell from the way this Legislature has been passing Bills, and thanks to Mr. Kosinski for his efforts in this area, we finally started getting tough on crime and we shouldn't back off now. And to those bleeding hearts that say they don't want to be investigated, an honest person in our society has nothing to hide. So just inquire of yourself, what do you have to hide?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we're all missing a point in this Amendment. As I read the Amendment it says that 'anyone who covertly gathers by any means, least for the use of his agency or any governmental agency, and permission concerning the lawful activities of any person or group except... except when such information is directly relevant to a valid investigation of criminal conduct'. Which means to me that any officer can still be using covert means as long as it is in relation to a valid investigation of criminal conduct. It certainly is a good Bill because... I'll tell you why. The honorable policemen do not want to be ordered to do something that's dishonorable. Something that isn't right. I am for the honorable policemen, I do not attack the policemen, I think they're fine men, as a whole, and fine women. But I think it's high time to realize that we don't have to have unnecessary spying unless it's in relation to a valid investigation of criminal conduct. And that's what this Amendment is all about."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Katz to explain his vote."

Katz: "In the recent past, we have seen the situation that was never anticipated that could ever happen, we have seen it happen. And we have seen a President of the United States and the head of the Department of Justice of the United States engaged in activities completely contrary to the protection of the rights of the people. Congress was able in a nonpartisan-bipartisan manner to deal with the problem. They did not stick their head in the sand. They faced reality. The reality in Illinois is that the police department in Chicago has been engaged in activities totally reprehensible in a free society, police investigation of Members of this General Assembly, police investigation of organizations engaged in causes like the American Civil Liberties Union and many religious organizations. Will we have the courage that Congress had to deal with the problem? What has happened to the spirit of this House that passed a Bill like this a few days ago? Why do we back down in the face of liberty? Why do we, when the Senate rejects a Bill, not say to the Senate, 'we were serious the other day'? This was a legitimate threat to the rights of free people. We will not stick our heads in the sand. I think of Harry Truman who faced a General who was intent upon showing that a General could defy a President. We are involved in a situation where the police have tried to show that the police can defy the rights of the General Assembly and the rights of the people to engage in free political activity. Let us do as Harry Truman did. Let us do as Congress did. Let us go forward. Not stick our heads in the sand, but recognize that this issue is an issue that should not divide this House and this General Assembly. It is the right of the people in a free society to be free to engage in political activities without the intervention of police."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Waddell to explain his vote."

Waddell: "Just briefly, Mr. Speaker. It always is amusing to me that when you get into a surveillance situation such as we have here, you don't have any threat to life, yet we hear the names of people bandied around, the words of liberty, freedom, protection of rights, so on and so forth. And yet, if you look at that board, the people



that have created the greatest legalized 'genocide' that we've ever had in abortion are now screaming about somebody's surveillance rights. I think it's ludicrous."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf to explain his vote."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, those of you who know me would hardly regard me as a 'flaming liberal'. I could be generally considered what is a law and order guy. I support our police, and I think they have been 'bum rapped' for a lot of things along the way. But let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, and it was said before and I'll repeat it, a basic conservative philosophy, I say conservative is belief in the dignity of the individual, and that doesn't mean that we have to give the Police Department license to engage in things like we had 'no knock', like when somebody comes and knocks your door down in the middle of the night and breaks into your house without a search warrant. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I believe in law and order, and I believe also that if there is reason to suspect anybody of criminal activities or wrongdoing that they should get a court order to carry on their investigations. I don't think that this General Assembly or any Legislative Body should give any law enforcement authority complete license to do any damn thing that they please. I would urge that some of those who believe in the dignity of the individual, those who express a basic conservative philosophy, to change their votes and vote 'red'...'green'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Younge to explain her vote."

Younge: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to add that I'm voting for this Amendment, because I believe that surveillance should only be in relationship to a valid investigation of criminal conduct, and I think that the issue doesn't term upon whether or not there are good policemen or bad policemen, or whether one believes that



surveillance ought to be...in reference to those people who are likely to cause problems, or to have a 'who's who' list in a particular city. I think it ought to be closely tied in only to a valid investigation of criminal conduct, and that is defined as a standard under the law, and I think this is a good Amendment because it would mean that there would only be surveillance when there is a valid investigation, which means only when there is probable cause; the probable cause that Representative Ewell spoke about. Probable cause. We have set a standard for valid investigation, and if there is investigation and surveillance only when there is probable cause, then we won't have people going around spying on Legislators, people spying on organizations just because they think there is a likelihood of problems. When you don't have valid investigation based on probable cause, then you have investigation because you don't like the color of a person's hair, or the color of their skin, or their political beliefs, and I think that because it is the responsibility of this General Assembly to exercise the sovereign will of the people, it is very necessary that we hold closely to this legal standard, that valid investigation is only investigation when there is probable cause that there has been criminal activity, and not the kind of surveillance and spying that has been going on in this state."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schoeberlein to explain his vote."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of this Amendment has already explained his vote. This is not for Chicago alone, it is also for my city, where, thank God, we have policemen that could infiltrate certain organizations, and we have stopped many things that has been explained on the floor of this House and by Commissions studying Aurora and what's going on. So I don't know what we're afraid of. The more the talking is going on here, the more the



'red' votes there are, and I wonder when we can shut this off and get down to the business of the House."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Gaines to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The last couple of days I've read in the newspapers where the number one Republican Member of the National Establishment 'Bert Jenner', along with the other leaders of our legal societies, have condemned this spying practice which is now interfering with the client relationship with the attorneys. That's how far it has gone. To many of you it's just that they are spying on a few kooks. Well I may be a kook, but I don't think you'll consider 'Bert Jenner' a kook. Therefore, I'm asking the good Conservative Republicans on this side of the aisle to heed Representative Wolf's call, because he more than I expressed a point of view that you should listen to. Because he knows that as Jesus said 'when you do unto the least of these, you do unto Me'. So as they do unto the least of us, they also do unto you. So therefore I'm calling for more 'green' lights. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe to explain his vote."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. There are certain groups in Chicago, and I'm sure all over the state, who are dedicated to nothing but causing trouble and disrupting things. Two weeks ago in Chicago we had a mini-riot that was preceeded by a bombing in the County Building. Now if the police don't have the right to go in and infiltrate some of these groups, and watch out in advance for trouble that they are going to make, there is going to be no safety for people in Chicago. They are going to start bombing department stores, subways and everything else. People have no conscience, they're terrorists. We see what happens in other parts of the world when terrorism takes over. There is a need for the policemen to infiltrate some of these groups for the



safety of the citizens 'cause we're going to end up like...over in Holland there, where people are going to be held hostage, and any kind of thing could happen. Terrorist groups don't care what they do to people. Their aim is just to cause trouble, and if we don't have the police to get into these groups in advance, and learn their plans and warn us, we're going to have no protection, and we're not doing our duty to the public. I am absolutely opposed to this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Catania to explain her vote."

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

Please forgive me for feeling that I have to speak on this question, but I do. We've heard from the other side that they don't want this with judges, and they don't want it without judges, and I think that makes it pretty clear. They tell us they want protection, but I don't know who they think they're fooling. I think it's very ironic that we heard from one of the people on the other side that he feels that we have to continue to do this to have protection. He sits three feet away from a Lady who was spied on, who has an half inch thick file. Does he think that he needs to have the taxpayers in his district pay their money to the Chicago Police so they can spy on her to protect him from her. I think this a great giant cover-up. The Chicago Democratic Machine has iron control, and they want to continue to use the Chicago Police Department to spy on anybody who's any kind of a threat to that control. I agree with Representative McAuliffe that we ought to have the police looking into terrorist groups, and criminal groups. I think that that's absolutely just and fair, and nothing in this Amendment says that they can't do that. But I think it's a colossal waste of money for them to spend the taxpayer's money trailing the three women Legislators from Chicago, and very carefully writing down notes that they could



have got from reading the Blue Book . They don't need to follow us around instead of being out solving crimes, copying down information very carefully on their rather high salaries that they could have got from reading our résumés or reading the Blue Book . How do you suppose our families feel reading in the newspaper that we've been tracked by the police? How do you suppose other women feel about getting into politics in Chicago when they find out that all of the women Legislators from Chicago have been labeled 'subversive' by the Chicago Police? How do you suppose my parents, who have lived on the south side of Chicago paying taxes with their hard earned money all their lives, feel about seeing that that money was used to trail their daughter by the Chicago Police? And it was used then to label me as a subversive. That's what we're talking about here. We're talking about breaking one small fragment off the iron control of the Chicago Democratic Machine that it is using in a grossly un-American way to trail innocent people. We hear a lot here on the House floor about veterans; and about what the veterans have all done for us in fighting for out rights in other countries. Well let me remind all of you who fought in World War II that you fought the Nazis to prevent this kind of abuse of the ordinary people on the street. I don't know how much longer the people of Chicago are going to put up with this kind of thing. The Chicago Tribune has done an excellent job exposing just what kind of abuses the Chicago Police are perpetrating at the behest of the Chicago Administration. I suppose the people of Chicago will put up for it a little longer, not much longer, and I think everybody should vote 'green' to protect the Chicago Administration from itself."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sevcik to explain his vote."

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to ask a...previously I wanted to ask the



Sponsor of this Amendment a question, and I don't know if it's too late to ask him, but I was wondering how this would affect the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission. Well we have had undercover men go into the Ku Klux Klan, and we have had undercover men go into the fencing operations, into the illegal drug operations: and by the various operations that they have gone into we have received many indictments and convictions of the people that were involved in this organization. Now how would this effect somebody if they joined the YMCA to see how the YMCA worked, And that was the question I wanted to ask the Sponsor. I think that this is a bad Amendment, and it should be defeated."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Mr./Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, I believe I announced some time ago, and I wish the debate perhaps had not gone quite so long, but I announced some time ago that I was interested in an orally verified Roll Call, and I renew my request."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall proceed to an oral verification of the Roll Call. All Members will please be in their chairs. All unauthorized individuals will be removed from the floor. We will now proceed to an oral verification of the Roll Call. All unauthorized individuals will please be removed from the floor. Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Abramson, 'pass'. Adams, 'no'.

Anderson, 'no'. Antonovych, 'yes'. E.M. Barnes.

E.M. Barnes, 'pass'. Jane Barnes."

Speaker Madigan: "'No'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'No'. Bartulis. Bartulis, 'pass'. Beatty, 'pass'. Bennett, 'aye'. Birchler, 'no', Bluthardt, 'pass'. Boucek, 'no'. Bowman, 'aye'. Bradley, 'no'. Brady, 'aye'. Brandt, 'pass'. Breslin."

Speaker Madigan: "Brandt, 'no'."



Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt, 'no'. Breslin, 'pass'. Rich Brummer, 'aye'. Don Brummet, 'no'. Byers, 'aye'. Caldwell, 'aye'. Campbell, 'no'. Capparelli, 'no'. Catania, 'aye'. Chapman, 'aye'. Christensen, 'no'. Collins, 'aye'. Conti, 'no'. Cunningham, 'aye'. Daniels. How did he vote? 'Aye'. Darrow. I can't hear."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Membership please give their attention to the Clerk. And the question is on the Amendment to the Bill, so those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'aye', and those opposed to the Amendment will vote 'no'. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Gaines, 'aye', in the back of the chamber."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye'. Garmisa, 'no'. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. Getty, 'no'. Giglio, 'no'. Giorgi, 'no'. Greiman, 'aye'. Griesheimer, 'no'. Hanahan, 'aye'. Harris, 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Harris, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Harris, 'no'. Hart, 'pass'. Hoffman, 'aye'. Holewinski, 'pass'. Dan Houlihan..."

Speaker Madigan: "Holewinski."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Huskey, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Huskey, 'no'. Jacobs, 'no'. Jaffe, 'aye'. Johnson, 'pass'. Dave Jones, 'aye'. Emil Jones, 'aye'. Kane, 'aye'. Katz, 'aye'. Keats, 'no'. Kelly, 'no'. Kempiners, 'aye'. Kent, 'no'. Klosak, 'no'. Kornowicz,



'pass'. Kosinski, 'no'. Kozubowski, 'no'. Kucharski, 'no'. Lauer, 'aye'. Laurino, 'no'. Lechowicz, 'no'. Leinenweber, 'aye'. Leverenz, 'no'. Levin, 'aye'. Lucco, 'no'. Luft, 'aye'. Macdonald, 'aye'. Madigan, 'no'. Madison, 'pass'. Mahar, 'no'. Mann, 'aye'. Marovitz, 'aye'. Lynn Martin, 'aye'. Peggy Smith Martin, 'aye'. Matejek, 'no'. Matijevich, 'no'. Mautino, 'no'. McAuliffe, 'no'. McAvoy, 'pass'. McBroom, 'no'. McClain, 'no'. McCourt, 'yes'. McGrew, 'aye'. McLendon, 'pass'. McMaster, 'no'. McPike, 'aye'. Meyer, 'aye'. Miller, 'no'. Molloy, 'aye'. Mudd, 'no'. Mugalian, 'aye'. Mulcahey, 'no'. Murphy, 'no'. Nardulli, 'no'. Neff, 'no'. O'Brien, 'aye'. O'Daniel, 'no'. Pechous, 'no'. Peters, 'aye'. Pierce, 'aye'. Polk, 'pass'. Porter, 'aye'. Pouncey, 'no'. Pullen, 'pass'. Reed, 'aye'. Reilly, 'aye'. Richmond, 'no'. Rigney, 'no'. Robinson, 'aye'. Ryan, 'no'. Sandquist, 'aye'. Satterthwaite. She vote 'aye'? 'Aye'. Schisler, 'no'. Schlickman, 'aye'. Schneider, 'aye'. Schoeberlein, 'no'. Schuneman, 'pass'. Sevcik, 'no'. Sharp, 'aye'. Shumpert, 'no'. Simms, 'no'. Skinner, 'aye'. Stanley, 'aye'. Stearney, 'aye'. Steczo, 'aye'. E.G. Steele, 'pass'. C.M. Stiehl, 'aye'. Stuffle, 'aye'. Sumner, 'no'. Taylor, 'no'. Telcser, 'aye'. Terzich, 'no'. Tipsword, 'aye'. Totten, 'pass'. Tuerk, 'aye'. Van Duyne, 'no'. Vitek, 'no'. Von Boeckman, 'no'. Waddell, 'no'. Wall, 'no'. Walsh, 'aye'. Wikoff, 'no'. Willer, 'aye'. Williams, 'no'. Winchester, 'no'. Wolf, 'aye'. Younge, 'aye'. Yourell, 'no'. Mr. Speaker, 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, 'aye'. E.M. Barnes. E.M. Barnes, 'pass'. Bartulis, 'no'. Beatty, 'no'. Bluthardt, 'aye'. Breslin, 'pass'. John Dunn, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, 'pass'. Ewing, 'pass'. Farley, 'no'. Johnson, 'pass'. Kornowicz, 'pass'. Hart, 'pass'. Madison, 'pass'."



McAvoy, 'pass'. McLendon, 'pass'. Polk, 'pass'.
 Pullen, 'pass'. Schuneman. Pullen votes 'aye'.
 Schuneman, 'no'. E.G. Steele, 'aye'. Totten, 'no'.
 No further."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further changes? On this question there are 77 'ayes', 89 'nos', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Since there were no Amendments adopted to this Bill, it can be placed back on the Order of Short Debate, Third Reading. On the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 600. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 600. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, there are two other Bills pertaining to the same subject matter, and I would respectively request that when we go from 600 that we move to the Order of..... say on the Order of Second Reading and go to 720 and Senate Bill 1019, which is the same subject matter."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Jones, arise?"

Jones, E.: "Mr. Speaker, you changed the order of business. How did you arrive at...starting with Senate Bill 600?"

Speaker Madigan: "We proceeded pursuant to the priority of call on this order of business, Mr. Jones. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I believe there are Amendments filed to Senate Bill 600. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the Chair then to move from 600 to 720 then to 1019 as I request?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, it is, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Sir."



Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "No Committee Amendments. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1. J. Dunn and Mautino. Amends Senate Bill 600, on page 8, by adding immediately below line 34 the following and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Who is the Sponsor of the Amendment? Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Because there will be Amendments offered and consideration given to the following two Bills in this package, at this time I would table the Amendments which I have offered to Senate Bill 600. Those Amendments are Amendment #1, Amendment #2, Amendment #5, Amendment #6, Amendment #7 and Amendment #8. I would ask leave to table Amendments 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to Senate Bill 600 at this time."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn, would you repeat the numbers of the Amendments again?"

Dunn, J.: "I hope I have them correct. Amendments #1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to withdraw Amendments 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Is there leave? Leave being granted, those Amendments are withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3. Jacobs. Amends Senate Bill 600 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to have leave to table Amendment #3 and Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 600. I'd like to withdraw those Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jacobs, what is your request?"

Jacobs: "To withdraw..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jacobs requests leave to withdraw



Amendment 3 and Amendment 4. Is there leave? Leave being granted, those Amendments shall be withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 4 is withdrawn. Amendment 5 has been withdrawn, 6 withdrawn, 7 withdrawn and 8 withdrawn. Floor Amendment #9. Rich Brummer. Amends Senate Bill 600, on page 9, by deleting line 3 through 6 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer. Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to withdraw Amendment #9."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman requests leave to withdraw Amendment #9. Is there leave? Leave being granted, Amendment #9 shall be withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10. J. Dunn..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn. Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I request leave to withdraw Amendment #10."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Amendment #10 shall be withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11. Bradley..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I would move to withdraw Amendment #11."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman requests leave to withdraw Amendment #11. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Amendment shall be withdrawn. Further Amendments? Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments. Amendment #12. Skinner. Amends Senate Bill 600 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "This Amendment has not been printed. Mr. Dunn. Mr. Dunn. John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is not on the desks, and to the best of my knowledge, it is not printed and I don't think it would be in order at this time. So I ask that this Bill be advanced to Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "Well I am perfectly willing to have the Bill advanced to Third Reading if there are no Amendments adopted. Are there any other Amendments lying on the table?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker. All the Amendments, the first eleven Amendments have been taken out of consideration, and I was not aware that there was twelve. I'm not aware that there will be any further Amendments. So if there aren't any further Amendments, and the Gentleman is willing to withdraw twelve, we'll advance the Bill to Third Reading."

Skinner: "That is correct."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner requests leave to withdraw Amendment #12. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Amendment shall be withdrawn. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bill 720. Mr. Mautino."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 720. A Bill for An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 720 was amended in the House Labor and Commerce Committee in the form that you see it now. There have been some Amendments filed with the Clerk. I'd like to explain what the Bill does in its present form. It passed the House Labor Committee eighteen to nothing. There was no opposing votes to Senate Bill 720. There was no objection by either Labor or Management on that Bill as amended. What it does in its present form, as amended, provides for a panel of physicians to be agreed upon by the employer and the employee with the employee's option. Limits the death benefits to 250,000 or 20 years, whichever is greater. It puts in the state's average weekly



wage in lieu of the state's average weekly wage in manufacturing. Eliminates the 133 percent increase on permanent, partial disabilities, and it cuts out the rate adjustment fund for those claims before 19...between 1965 and 1975, and it directs the Commission to publish rules and procedures in determining the extent of an injury. That is what it does in the present form with one additional Amendment, that would be Amendment #11, to implement the date of the state's average weekly wage, and there have been some other Amendments filed, other than Amendment #11. I will be opposing all other Amendments, other than #11."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino, what is your request at this time?"

Mautino: "My request is to...if it's leave of the House, to ask for Amendment #11 to be called at this time. If not, I will take them in order. I'd like to have Amendment #11 called to 720."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk. Are there any Committee Amendments to this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously, and Committee Amendments #1, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee, and Amendment #5 was adopted on the floor."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any motions filed to table Amendments 1, 3 and 4?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there a...an Amendment #2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Evidently it's been tabled in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there an Amendment #6?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6. Schuneman. Amends Senate Bill 720..."

Speaker Madigan: "Who is the Sponsor of Amendment #6?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Schuneman."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6..."



Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, arise?"

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask, before we proceed here, a clarifying question of the Sponsor of Senate Bill 720 relative to the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Which Amendment, Mr. Tuerk?"

Tuerk: "Well, I need the clarification. I think I have it pretty well in mind, Dick, but as I recall you adopted 1, 2, 3 and 4 in Committee, and then tabled #2 on the floor, adopted #5 in place of #2, is that correct?"

Mautino: "Yes Sir."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #6. Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 would make some very significant differences in Senate Bill 720. Senate Bill 720, as I understand it presently requires that the benefits for Workmen's Compensation be based upon the statewide average weekly wage as determined by the Department of Labor, from Unemployment Compensation Reports. Amendment #6 would use that same basis. The principal difference, however, is that in Senate Bill 720 the requirement is that those benefit levels be computed semi-annually; whereas, in my Amendment, those benefits would be computed annually. Amendment #6 would also make some reductions in some very significant areas of Workmen's Compensation. It would limit the permanent partial benefit, the permanent total benefit, and the death benefit, to 66 and 2/3 of the statewide weekly wage. The temporary total benefit, which is the amount... which is the benefit that the employee receives when he's actually off work and unable to return to work, would be set at 100 percent of the statewide average weekly wage. I'd like to point out to the Members that it is especially significant that this Amendment limits the permanent partial, permanent total and the death benefits to two-



thirds of the weekly wage benefit. The importance of that is that many people, especially those on permanent total benefits who are receiving benefits under Workmen's Compensation, also receive disability benefits under the Social Security System, and the employer in fact is paying disability insurance twice. He's paying it once under Social Security, and once under Workmen's Compensation. I submit that the benefits for permanent total benefits should be something less than 100 percent of the statewide average weekly wage, and that if you want to adopt significant changes in Workmen's Comp that will have effects on the cost of Workmen's Compensation, then you should address yourselves to the permanent total benefits, and the death benefits, because those particular benefits cost a lot of money. The other benefits... the other change in Amendment #6 would put a limit on the death benefit of \$250,000 or 20 years, and that I think, is the same as the present benefit in Senate Bill 720. Another difference between these two Bills, in Amendment #6, we would adopt standards for hearing loss, and to the best of my knowledge there are no standards for hearing loss presently in Senate Bill 720. I think many, many of you who have had complaints from employers, complaining of the fact that there is no adequate way now to determine hearing loss for employees who are making claims under Workmen's Compensation, and this is an area that needs some standards established. Amendment #6 would also require the Industrial Commission to adopt standards for the purpose of determining disability. For those people who routinely go before the Industrial Commission, it's common knowledge that an employee who is injured, and whose doctors say that he has a 10 percent disability, it's common knowledge that the Industrial Commission will invariably award higher awards than the doctors say actually should be applicable. This is a system which started under the old Workmen's Compensation Law,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

and perhaps had some justification when the benefits were very low. But that's not the case anymore, the benefits are high. They're the highest of any of our surrounding states, and I'd like to read some figures to you to give you some idea of where we will be if we adopt Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 720. The permanent partial benefit in the State of Illinois, the maximum would be \$154.00. Now I hope you will pay attention just for a few minutes and write down some of these numbers. This compares with some of our surrounding States, where the benefits in Indiana are \$60.00. \$60.00 in Indiana. 154 in Illinois under Senate Bill... under this Amendment to Senate Bill 720. The benefits in Wisconsin for permanent partial are \$57.00. The benefits in Missouri are \$80.00. The benefits in Kentucky are \$104.00. Now let's look at some of the industrial states. New York, for example, where the benefits are \$95.00. In California where they're \$70.00, and in Ohio where they're \$98.00. Now if we pass Senate Bill 720 without this Amendment, the benefit level for permanent partial in Illinois will I believe be \$229.00. Now I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that there is no mystery as to why industry and jobs are leaving Illinois. These are significant differences, and no one, no one is asking you to adopt Workmen's Compensation benefit levels that are below a reasonable figure. But if you adopt the benefit levels that I'm asking, in Amendment #6, the permanent partial award benefit level in Illinois will be \$154.00, compared to Ohio's \$98.00, California's \$70.00, Indiana's \$60.00, Wisconsin's \$57.00, Missouri \$80.00, Kentucky \$104.00. We will still be way and above any of those other surrounding States. So I submit to you that this is not gutting the Workmen's Compensation benefit program that we have here in Illinois. This is only restoring a little reality to the program. Amendment #6 would



also address another area which is very important, and that is that it would require that the Industrial Commission give some consideration to previous Workmen's Compensation payments under Workmen's Compensation. It would effect only those areas where there was an amputation, for example, if an employee has had a previous loss of a member, two fingers for example, and was paid for that loss. If he later had a more severe loss, the Industrial Commission would be required to deduct the loss which had already been paid. This is known as granting credit for prior existing injuries. Amendment #6 would also require that in the case of occupational disease an employee would have to show that his employment actually aggravated the disease, and that the aggravation did in fact arise from his employment. This seems like a realistic request, and is something that would solve a lot of problems and settle a lot of litigation that has been filed in connection with occupational disease. The other requirement, the last requirement in Amendment #7, is simply that doctors and hospitals would require...would be required to be certified by the Industrial Commission, and that they would be required to render periodic reports so that both the employee and the employer would have timely reports as to the condition of the employee. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that Amendment #6 is a realistic approach to making some significant changes in Workmen's Compensation, and I respectfully...respectfully urge the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, significantly, the Gentleman who is offering this Amendment has failed to say what the real issue is. The real issue is the rates charged by insurance companies for Workmen's Compensation. All the rest of this is just 'balogna'



and 'stale bread'. The facts remain, the Gentleman didn't even say to this House that if we adopted Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 720 that he would guarantee a 1 percent, a 2 percent, a 5 percent, a 20 percent, a 40 percent decrease in rates. Now you and I know that the only issue in the business community today is the cost of buying the insurance, not what benefit level injured workers get, not what benefits a widow receives, not standards, not anything he spoke of. The only issue in Illinois today on Workmen's Compensation is the great rip off the insurance companies created by charging almost unbelievable high rates for their Workmen's Compensation Insurance. Now let's face facts, did the Gentleman say if we adopt this Amendment that he's gonna do anything about the cancellation of Workmen's Compensation Insurance? Did the Gentleman say that he's going to help create jobs in Illinois? You and I know better. Workmen's Compensation benefit levels is not the issue. The issue is to investigate and to cause the insurance industry to direct their greed and quit ripping off the business community and blaming this Legislature, and it's a fact of life. This Amendment will do nothing but harm the injured worker and his family, and I challenge the Gentleman to try and get that adopted in the 'Republican Platform' in the next election. I challenge the Republicans of this House to stand up to the people of Illinois and say I'm for decreased benefits for injured workers, and that's what the Republican Party stands for. You and I know better. That isn't what you stand for, but that's what this Amendment does, and you ought to consider very seriously the direction of where you're going. The direction is downhill, as long as you are blind to the fact that injured workers should have a decent kind of benefit level, and not the smoke screen into buying an Amendment that won't do one damn thing about the high cost of insurance."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to respond very briefly to what Representative Hanahan has just said, about... Representative Schuneman did not say there'd be a 1 percent or a 2 percent or a 5 percent or a 10 percent or a 20 percent decrease in insurance premiums. But I'll tell you without Amendment #6, I can tell you it's House Bill 720... you can certainly...you're certainly going to see a 1 percent, or a 2 percent, or a 10 percent, or a 20 percent decrease in the jobs around this state, and take that into consideration when you vote on this particular Amendment. If you want to attack, as far as the insurance rates, and I'm all for that, but we've been assured by Representative Epton in the Insurance Commission with the money they have appropriated to continue in this area as far as those rates are concerned and to look it over. This is not the Amendment or the time to be discussing insurance rates, but employment for the people of this state, and I think this Amendment on Senate Bill 26 is mandatory."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I'd really like to address my remarks to the Sponsors of the Bills and those who respond to the Amendments, I am seriously concerned about the Workmen's Comp laws in the State of Illinois. I am confused. I'm trying to get the facts, and I think it would be helpful for those of us who are not...who have not made up their minds yet, that we don't start saying the Republicans, 'I dare you to put this in your platform', or the Democrats are trying to do this to you. Let's work on the Workmen's Comp that we can sell the people of the State of Illinois, and let's not make this a



partisan issue, so that when I push my button I'm not voting for my leader, but I'm voting for the people of Elmwood Park or the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "In answer to the Gentleman's question, I agree that wholeheartedly that we in this General Assembly are voting for all the people of the State of Illinois and not a partisan issue. In answer to your question, Representative Conti, we tabled all of the Amendments to the previous Bill 600 because every Amendment but Amendment #11 is Senate Bill 600. That's why we tabled all of the Amendments. That's why I am opposing these. We've said, 'Okay, put that on Third Reading.' All your Amendments do the same thing. Representative Schuneman made one statement, that on the state's average weekly wage, it's computed twice a year by the Federal Government. That covers all employers in the State of Illinois except the person who does not hire any more than one person, in other words a 'mama, papa shop'. So with all industries, with the exception of that one area are covered, that's where we get the statistics. It's given twice a year. July...I think it's July 15th and December 15th, or January 15th, and we're conforming to that figure given to us by the Federal Government in industries covered by the Unemployment Insurance Act. So that's why we took the Amendments off number 600 to leave it in the same posture as all of these Amendments do, and if you want to vote for 600 you'll have the opportunity. But the point is don't clutter up this Bill, because we're walking a very thin tight line. If, in fact, these Bills get all cluttered up, there's a possibility we would have no changes whatsoever in Workmen's Comp. What we want to accomplish is meaningful significant changes, and that's what we're trying to do in answer to your question."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the gifted pride of Crystal Lake regales us with these horror stories about the insurance companies, but he really offers no solution. His accusation, his position is seriously undercut by the indisputable fact that Insurance Companies are fleeing Illinois in the Workmen's Compensation field almost as fast as industry. You just cannot reconcile their departure with his implied accusation that they are getting rich on the premiums. If it were so, others would be coming here to write the premiums. I urge you to believe that there needs to be a two-pronged attack on this problem. The first thing we need to do is to lower the benefits that are being paid under the present Workmen's Compensation Statute, that we might have a basis to say to the Insurance Companies, 'straighten up and charge less of a rate that do not drive our industry away.' If we adopt this Amendment while there are no guarantees that it will lower rates, it will certainly lay the foundation or call the insurance companies to account. I ask you each to examine in your own districts the problem that industry and business is confronted with. In my home town, the number two industry in that town is awaiting the decision of this General Assembly whether to move a business that's vitally needed across the line into the State of Indiana. Many of us fear that the transport trucks are already there to haul it away. I beg you to recognize the problem that we have, and that you have in your district. We have no right we have a duty, on the opposite, not to fiddle while Illinois is being turned into agrarian wasteland. We have a duty to those we seek to serve to protect their interests and ours by luring industry back and keeping what we have. I urge you to vote 'aye' for this Amendment. Then together we'll



bring these insurance companies before the 'Bar of Justice' and reduce the rates so that we can all live and prosper in happiness together."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker. At the proper time, I'd like to be recognized for a motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In rising to support Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 720, let me point out just a couple of facts. The Sponsor of this Bill just a few moments ago admitted to the fact that he wants to see some meaningful and some realistic changes. Now I would not come before this body and say to you that the Amendments that he adopted in Committee and on the floor are not meaningful up to a point. Now the reason I qualify that statement is because what he has done with those Amendments. He has made some movement in the proper direction of coming up with a meaningful and realistic approach to this entire problem. However, what he has done is given a few little crumbs that he felt and his colleagues on that side of the aisle felt, and some of the people that he is working with in concert on remedial legislation, that it would be a few crumbs that would attract this side of the aisle to saying and the entire business community to saying, 'well, this is a real fine, fine compromise,' and it is no compromise, it is what he and his people, whoever they may be, are willing to go on Senate Bill 720, to make it a more realistic Bill. Now it does not address itself to many of these serious problems that Representative Schuneman and others have addressed themselves here this afternoon, and that's why I rise in support of adopting Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 720 because then we have a realistic approach. And as far as



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

saying and answering to cluttering up 720 with this Amendment, what this Amendment will do is make it more realistic, more livable and certainly unclutter what 720 purports to do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have Senate Bill 600 on Third Reading. Amendment #6 is basically Senate Bill 600. Last night when we were speaking about the Education Bill and the proper level of funding with regard to education, it was pointed repeatedly that a 'sandwich' was better than an entire 'loaf'. I would respectfully suggest that we ought to leave 720 in the shape that it is in because it does make some meaningful changes. It may not make all the changes all of us desire, but it does make changes, and we ought to have the alternative available to make some changes and take the 'sandwich' instead of the entire 'loaf' if we cannot obtain the entire 'loaf'. Therefore we ought to defeat this Amendment and the other Amendments and vote with regard to 600 when we make the decision of whether or not we want the entire 'loaf', but leave the 'sandwich' available here, if that's what it's called."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. I was going to talk on the issue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed. No...we'll hold that in advance."

Giorgi: "What I would like to point out to the House is that I think the first 'prophet of doom' is in the insurance business, I think Sponsored the Amendment, and he is talking of eulogizing some of the other states, but he



didn't suggest to maybe insurance companies would move to those other states and try to foist their premium on the people. I think that there is also an attorney here that spoke on this issue talking about insurance companies. Do you know there are over 400 insurance companies selling Workmen's Compensation Insurance in the State of Illinois?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment please. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker. He's not addressing himself to the Amendment. He's talking about the insurance industry. He's out of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I can't divorce the personality from the person making the Amendment, Mr. Ebbesen. I want to repeat for the record, there are over 400 insurance companies selling Workmen's Compensation in the State of Illinois, if that's such a bad business. I don't see any people running for the border states. They can't get the premiums in the border states, and someone else was talking about Illinois. We had a net gain in jobs in Illinois last year, a net gain in jobs. We might have lost some in manufacturing. We were second in growth and bank assets. Second. We were third in total bank capital. We were third in bank savings accounts. That doesn't indicate that a state's going backwards, and the guy sitting in this room doesn't know what it's like to have an industrial accident. Don't know what it's like to be on their backs. And you know, because of the employers like some of these Sponsors of these Amendments, these people had to go into the court to get their money. That's why we are in the situation that we are in today. I think this is a terrible Amendment, and it ought to be defeated."

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



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again we are considering probably what is the most important issue of this particular session. The Labor Committee of this House, the Labor Committee of the Senate, both the House and the Senate, have given a great deal of consideration to this particular issue already. We have fought great fights on the floor of this House of Representatives concerning the question of Workmen's Compensation and Unemployment Compensation. At this particular time, the Members of the Labor and Commerce Committee of this House have proposed to us that we placed two different proposals on the Order of Third Reading. One proposal, as represented by Senate Bill 600, represents one point of view on this particular issue. That Bill in its pure form is already on the Order of Third Reading. The other point of view in this controversy is proposed to be represented by this Bill without the Amendment 6 through 10, and I suggest to you that if we are to proceed to an orderly, intelligent consideration of the two conflicting points of view on this issue that we ought to vote against these Amendments. Allow Mr. Mautino to put his Bill in the form that he wishes. Move it to Third Reading, and then all of us can consider whether we wish to support him or whether we wish to support the other point of view. But we ought to pay him the common courtesy that is normally accorded to a Sponsor in this House and vote against these Amendments, then move the Bill to Third Reading as is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a comment about this Amendment for anyone who hasn't really happened to catch this provision. This Amendment addresses itself to the doctor's panel and provides that only those doctors may treat who have been certified and approved by the Indus-



trial Commission. And if you think about this a minute, I think you will quickly realize that the doctors and physicians who will be treating, if this Amendment is adopted, will only be those who are willing to take the time to apply to the Industrial Commission for certification. So if you think that your family doctor will be treating you or your employees or a member of your family who might have a summer job in a factory trying to earn enough money to go to college, and Lord knows all of us in here have that problem with the salaries we earn, if you think a member of your family will be treated by your family doctor, you're kidding yourself, unless you think your family doctor will apply to the Industrial Commission for certification to be approved to treat Workmen's Compensation cases. And that certification will contain as a proviso an agreement by the doctor to issue periodic status reports at reasonable intervals. What doctor at the present time likes to write reports? How many doctors who are going to take the time to apply to the Industrial Commission to have the opportunity to write more reports? I think the answer is that your family physician and mine will not be treating Workmen's Compensation cases. So if you break your back, or I break my back on a job somewhere, or my child breaks his back on a job somewhere, the treating doctor is going to be one who does nothing but Workmen's Compensation cases, either as a union doctor or as a company doctor. You might think about that in your deliberations on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman to close."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will try to be very brief in my closing comments on Amendment #6. But at the same time, I would like to address some of the comments that have been made by opponents to this Amendment. We are constantly



being besieged with smoke screens, trying to blame the insurance industry for what this General Assembly has done by way of providing benefits under Workmen's Compensation. Now if there is some inclination on the part of this General Assembly to make an unbiased study of the insurance industry, I'll join in that effort. But I would like to point out to you some facts, which have nothing to do with the insurance business, but do have something to do with Workmen's Compensation costs. I think every Member of the House received this past week the Workmen's Compensation costs for Caterpillar Tractor Company, one of the largest employers in Illinois, who in 1973 had Workmen's Compensation costs of \$1,700,000. In 1974 it went up to \$2,300,000. In 1975 it jumped to \$3,300,000, but in 1976, after the benefits became apparent, the cost increased to \$6,198,000. Now can you say that none of that was due to the increase in benefits? Of course you can't say that. Another employer in Illinois, not insured, paying these costs out of their own pocket, self-insured, Northwestern Steel and Wire. In my own district, in 1973, had Workmen's Compensation costs of \$590,000. 1974, \$640,000. 1975, \$692,000. 1976, \$1,287,000. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, we can blow all the smoke we want about the insurance industry, but you can't refute costs of companies that are paid on a direct basis. They're paying these losses with...and not buying insurance to cover them. This has nothing to do with the insurance industry. This is a labor management problem. As to the partisan politics charge, well, I really don't think this is something that should be involved in partisan politics, and I don't think it is. Amendment #6 represents in essence a compromise. Many of these principles were compromised in the Senate, and I'd like to point out to the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle that a significant, a significant number of Democrat



Members of the Senate joined in passing similar legislation out of the Senate. Both Republicans and Democrats now recognize that in 1975 we went too far. And in 1977, it's time to roll back some of those benefits. We all know that the charges about the Labor and Commerce Committee giving proper consideration to these Bills is not true. Both this in the House, Senate Bill 600 had to be discharged from that Labor and Commerce Committee. In the Senate the same thing had to happen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Jacobs, on a point of personal privilege."

Jacobs: "Personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Jacobs: "I don't mind the Representative from the other side of the aisle explaining his Amendment, but I do object to him saying that it was not properly heard in the House when it went out of the House Committee eighteen to nothing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Gentleman kindly confine his remarks to Amendment #6?"

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to respond to some of the comments that were made by the opponents to this Amendment. Let me summarize, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the business community in Illinois is looking to the Legislature this year for some meaningful changes. Meaningful changes. They're not expecting us to injure their employees, to take away benefits that are needed by their employees. What they're asking is for us to restore some reason to the Workmen's Compensation Benefits. Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 720 is a compromise provision. It is a compromise package of benefits. It's realistic. It will do something. It is significant, and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #6 be adopted? 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. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 99 'nays', none are recorded as 'present', this Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #7. Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 720 in sub-paragraph 2. of paragraph D in Section 8 by inserting immediately after the first period the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker. Could I have leave of the House to hear Amendments 7, 8 and 9 together?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection to hearing Amendments 7, 8 and 9 together? Clerk will read the Amendments."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #8. Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 720 by inserting immediately below the last line of sub-paragraph 16 of paragraph B, Section 8 the following. Amendment #9. Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 720 in the second paragraph of subsection A of Section 8 by inserting immediately after 'expense' the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in deference to time of the House, I ask for this privilege of hearing these three Amendments together, because quite candidly what these three Amendments do is address themselves to three of the real important issues of Workmen's Compensation Legislation. Representative Schuneman so aptly described all the elements of Amendment #6 and 7, 8 and 9 are certain elements of that particular Amendment. Amendment #7 addresses itself to the pre-existing credit, and he explained what that meant. Amendment #8 is merely the adoption of 'OSHA' standards for hearing loss, which is basically the same type of provision that our neighboring states Wisconsin and Missouri have. I think this is a very important area in the Workmen's Compensation Field, and what this merely does is adopt



the 'OSHA' standards for that hearing loss calculation. Now Amendment #9 zeros in on the panel physicians; and to speak to that point just a little, particularly in view of the fact that one of the colleagues from the other side of the aisle took issue to that panel of physician's provision in Amendment #6. Frankly that is a compromise, it's a certification of doctor's provision in the Amendment. I am not particularly sold entirely on that concept, but here again it is a compromise to a very important element within the law. I ask for a favorable Roll Call to Amendments 7, 8 and 9 because this would make some significant changes to the law. I think 720, as I stated in my remarks in debate of Amendment #6, that Senate Bill 720 makes a few small moves in the right direction. Amendments 7, 8 and 9 would add to that, and as far as the Majority Leader saying that 720 ought to be put on Third Reading, in the posture, it is now in. I think it's ludicrous to think in terms of giving us a form for three, four, six, eight, ten Bills, when we can put it into one Bill. Vote out a good Bill. Do something meaningful. Do something for the entire State of Illinois, and I would ask for the adoption, your support of the adoption of Amendments 7, 8 and 9."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Once again I rise in opposition to Amendments 7, 8 and 9, and I'd like to comment and then direct a question to Representative Tuerk if I may. Let's be honest about it, when you're talking about the certified panel of physicians in most cases, you're talking about taking away the opportunity of the employee to basically go to a chiropractor or to an osteopath or to someone who is not certified and that probably is the bottom line to that panel of physicians. In most



cases where us downstaters; our physicians...and... there aren't that many in those cities downstate where they do not have an abundance of them, will not take the time or the energy to be certified. So we want protection for the employee, so he may have the same opportunity to use his family physician who delivers his wife's baby, to take care of his broken leg, or his busted arm. That's basically what we are talking about in that Section. Concerning the hearing loss provision. I do not portray myself to be an expert in any way, shape or form concerning hearing loss. I'd like to have someone explain that to me. What is the, if I may Representative Tuerk, what is the average loss in the decibel figures for the normal person going to a football game or to a basketball game as opposed to a person working in an industry, and since we've used the Missouri-Michigan standards, how have they operated over the past couple of years?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, he asked me a question. In answer to that question, I'm glad to hear that the Sponsor of the Bill says he's not an expert in this field, nor am I, nor have I found anybody that came before Committees or the House, or the Senate who purport to be an expert in hearing loss calculation. However, what this purports to do is adopt some 'OSHA' standards, which are pretty tough, and then able to live with those 'OSHA' standards, and I think that is a good calculation, and as far as the football game's concerned, I wouldn't have the slightest idea what the decibel level is, and really some of the arguments that you would extend in that area are some of the arguments that I've extended over the past several years in this House when we have been debating the loss of hearing as it relates to Workmen's Comp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question, Representative Mautino? Okay. Gentleman from Champaign,



Representative Johnson."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed... Previous question has been moved. Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk, to close on Amendments 7, 8 and 9."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think it's all been said, there's no point in belaboring the Amendments to the point where we just wear each other out. I think in discussing Amendment #6, where it was all encompassing, these address themselves to three important areas, as I said before. What this does is give some meaningful change. It's a compromise, and I underscore that word compromise, because when Senate Bill 600 came to this chamber it was a compromise. 600 began as a pretty tough Bill, the same as 1795 and 6. But when it was reported out of the Senate and reached this chamber.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman will kindly confine his remarks to Amendments 7, 8 and 9 on 720 please."

Tuerk: "I'm doing that because 7, 8 and 9 certainly address themselves to certain segments of that Bill. I want to reiterate that it is a compromise, it's a move in the right direction, and I would ask for your favorable support to these three Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendments 7, 8 and 9 be adopted? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker. The 'Good Book' said 'what shall it profit a man if he gained the whole world and loose his own soul'. If I can paraphrase that, what good would it do you to make a million dollars if you broke your leg, if you didn't have a job in the first place? I think we're driving jobs out of Illinois, and Workmen's Comp won't do you much good if you haven't got a job



to go to. I think this is an effort to preserve the economy in Illinois, and I think you better take do notice and support these Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 'ayes', 92 'nays', none recorded as 'present' Amendments 7, 8 and 9 are not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #10. Daniels. Amends Senate Bill 720 by deleting the title, and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #10."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #10. Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment #10 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #11. Mautino. Amends Senate Bill 720 as amended in subparagraph 6 in paragraph B of Section 8 by deleting; 'on the 15th day of July 1976, and on the 15th day of each July annually', and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #11 conforms with the Unemployment Insurance Act as they give out information concerning the state's average weekly wage. It goes into...the reports come out on July 15th of each year, and January 15th of the next year, and that's basically what that Amendment does. When the state's average weekly wage comes out, it's reported, and it's twice a year, just as it is given to by the Federal Government. That's with the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall



Amendment #11 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading."



1.

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 1019, Representative Mautino. Clerk. 1019, John."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1019 I would like to put in the exact same...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Representative excuse me, Mautino, the Clerk has to read the Bill."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 10....Senate Bill 1019. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are Amendments filed on...on Senate Bill 1019. It is my hope that we could put Senate Bill 1019 into the exact same posture as 720. I think it's important that this chamber have two Bills in the same posture just in case something gets upset in the Senate. I say this because in the Senate Committee the vote was 5 to 3 on the same identical question of 720, and I would hope that nothing happens in the Senate but in order to protect the Members of this chamber and all the people of the State of Illinois, I'd like to have 1019 in the same posture as 720. There are Amendments filed to....to 1019...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments? Any motions?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2. Schuneman. Amends Senate Bill 1019 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman on Amendment #2. Mr. Schuneman, Amendment #2 on 1019."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is just a technical Amendment. It changes one word line 20, page 1, from 'and' to 'or'. Move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative....the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I have the Amendment before me, it appears to be about thirty-four pages long. I'm looking at page 1, line 20 and don't see any change."



2.

Speaker Lechowicz: "This is Amendment #2, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was on the wrong Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's all right."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is in effect the same as Amendment #6 on Senate Bill 720, and I won't take up the time of the House to debate the merits of the Amendment. I simply ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "This...this Amendment, this Bill...in the same posture as Senate Bill 600, I'm sorry, no, no....this is his Amendment, 600. I am opposing this Amendment, I would hope that we would adopt just Amendment #7 no other."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 51 'ayes', 96 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #3, Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 1019 on Subparagraph 2 of Paragraph D of Section 8 by inserting immediately after the first period the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Amendments 3, 4 and 5 to this Bill are the same as 7, 8 and 9 of 720. I would ask leave to withdraw the Amendments, 3, 4 and 5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to withdraw 3, 4 and 5. Hearing no objections the Amendments are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #6, Daniels. Amends House...amends Senate Bill 1019 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #6. Hearing no objections the Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #7, Mautino. Amends Senate Bill 1019 as amended in the title by changing Sections 7 and 8...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

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



Amendment #7 strikes everything after the enacting clause and puts it in the exact same posture of 720 that we just voted on, and I ask for your affirmative Roll Call on Amendment #7."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #7. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Dick. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 118 'ayes', 25 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1023. Representative Capparelli. 1023. Ralph."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1023. A Bill for An Act to create and continue the Electronic Funds Transfer System Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1 was tabled in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2 was tabled in Committee. Amendment #3. McAuliffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "I'll handle Amendment #3 for Roger. It's an agreed Amendment. Just adds an extra Member from the minority side, and one from the majority side in the House and the Senate, and it was agreed with... Mr. Wright. I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Third Reading. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. Oh, you've got another Amendment. I'm sorry."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #4. Ryan. Amends Senate Bill 1023



on page 2 by deleting lines 1 through 6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I understand there's a technical error in Amendment #3 which we've just adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It refers to the Bill being in the Senate, and the Bill is actually here in the House. It should be corrected on its face, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right fine. The Clerk will correct the Amendment #3 on its face. Get back to 3. And... would you kindly state, Mr. Beatty, what the correction should be so that the Clerk can make the change on its face. In the House is what you wanted to write, is that correct? Fine. The Amendment amended on its face. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #4. Ryan. Amends Senate Bill 1023 on page 2 by deleting lines 1 through 6."

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

Ryan: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #4, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #4. Hearing no objection, it is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham; for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, where...how did we get to where we are on this? We started out with 600 on Second Reading, and I recognized you took the next two or three as part of the series of Workmen's Comp, but I was hoping that eventually the Chair would get to 639."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we'll get there eventually."

Cunningham: "Respectfully requested."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. House Bills, Third Reading. Located on page 2 of the Calendar. House Bill 689. Do you want to take it out of the record? Brady. Okay. House Bill 1044. Mrs. Kent."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1044. A Bill for An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration and Education, and I ask you for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1044 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. 'Marco'. 'Marco'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted/who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 156 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1349. Representative Shumpert."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1349. A Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record please. House Bill 2361. Representative Hanahan. Or Gene Barnes. It's an appropriation for the State Board of Education. The one we discussed last night. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes. Lou Caldwell's seat."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2361. A Bill for An Act to make an appropriation to the administration of the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's Hanahan. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2361 is the ordinary expenses of the operation of the Office of Education, plus all the grant-in-aids as amended last night. I urge your support of this very most meaningful Bill. The Amendments were well debated. I don't want to take any further time of the House here today in



discussing a Bill that is not written in granite and will certainly be addressed to by the Senate, and by the time we get it back, it will probably be something we won't recognize. But at this time, I ask for a favorable vote to get the Bill out of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I know money means very little to my colleague from McHenry, but I wonder if he could tell us how much is in this, and whether it's up or down from last year."

Hanahan: "I was just wondering Representative Skinner. Were you in attendance last night?"

Skinner: "Yes, I was here until the 'junkyard' or... whatever we call this guy that runs this place, let us out."

Hanahan: "House Bill 2361 presently has an excess of seven hundred and some million dollars."

Skinner: "I'm sorry Representative...was laughing too loud. Could you repeat that?"

Hanahan: "Seven hundred and some million dollars in distributed funds, both in Federal allocations and in general revenue. This represents an increase from last year's appropriation of a few million dollars. But once again, I might reiterate that this vote here today in no way in my judgment will reflect the final vote on this measure."

Skinner: How much is this over the Governor's Budget?"

Hanahan: "I have not been apprised really, of the Governor's Budget, but I would estimate about ten million of what he estimated the grants should come to. But we're about 70 million short of what the requests were."

Skinner: "How much of this money is going to be used to enforce busing upon communities that are not under federal court order?"

Hanahan: "None. That was removed from the...Amendment #3 removed that provision."

Skinner: "You mean there's no money for...Superintendent 'Gronin's' forays into Chicago and Rockford, and Elgin



and Joliet?"

Hanahan: "Zero."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk:"

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand in total support of Mr. Hanahan's House Bill 2361, although I take exception, I think we did an excellent job last evening, and would like to point out, it isn't a paltry sum, Mr. Representative. It is almost ten million dollars over the Governor's Budget. The Governor originally asked us to hold it around somewhere around 72. We ended up considerably higher than that. I was pleased, I am saying pleased that we were able to hammer it out. Get it to the point where it's acceptable. It's much higher than the district...the school...the administrators thought it was going to be, and I would certainly appreciate an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, we've heard extensive debate on this last night. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed ... The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from McHenry to close. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2361 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief. I would just like to take the opportunity to compliment the Appropriations Committee which heard this Bill and the hard work that



the Members did, as well as the hard work that the staff did, and I appreciate the time and attendance and interest of this House Membership during last night's debate. I think all Members of the House are to be complimented for their serious consideration of this issue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hate to take up the time of the House, but I would just like to point out that this Bill provides about seven hundred million dollars in grants to public schools. Two million dollars in grants to nonpublic schools. Added on to that is 1.3 billion in public school grants in House Bill...pardon me, Senate Bill 689. So that it comes out to be roughly two thousand million to public schools, and two million to nonpublic schools. That's a thousand to one ratio, Mr. Speaker, and that is neither equitable nor fair to the tax-paying parents of the State of Illinois, whose children constitute about one-third of the student enrollment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 160 'ayes', 5 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1.

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2402, Representative Walsh."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2402. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense to the State Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2402 provides for an appropriation of \$2,642,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Elections. This is about 200,000 less than approved by the Bureau of the Budget and is about 25% less than the appropriation for the agency...this agency for fiscal 1977. And I solicit your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was wondering if the Gentleman might yield for a question? Mr. Walsh, right now the way I read the State Board's position, if we don't do something by a week from tomorrow we will not...we will not have a State Board of Elections. Is this correct or are they going to continue toyou understand they're going to continue to operate the way they presently are or just what position will they be in other than limbo?"

Walsh: "Well as I understand it, technically, this appropriation is to an agency that we have created. I would expect that either we will address ourselves to the problem of the makeup of the board or the... the courts will extend the period and that we will have to go into a Special Session to resolve that question. But the appropriation is, as I understand it, to the agency and not technically to the board."

Bradley: "Well then to the...to the motion or to the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "To the Bill?"

Bradley: "Bill then, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to...this is a House Bill and I'm going to support the House Bill. Hopefully, by the time it gets to the Senate and we adopt...the Senate adopts, that the House will take some action on recreating the Election Board so that we will have one as the Constitution said we shall. And I think that the Members of the House in voting for this Bill...I just draw to their attention, that by doing this we should move on the State Board question sometime between now and Thursday. Thank you."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Sponsor of the Bill pointed out, this Bill is lower than asked the...the amount is lower than asked for by the Bureau of the Budget, and I guess it's lower than it was as introduced which is certainly in the right direction concerning this agency. But actually the only amount that would be proper for the funding of this agency would be a big fat Bill. If there is any agency in state government that has failed to function properly or to perform any useful function, it is the State Board of Elections. And the only proper action for this Body to take would be to beat this appropriation, give them absolutely nothing and then pass the Constitutional Amendment that I have offered that would repeal that section of the Constitution of mandating a State Board of Elections. They have done nothing over their history since the implementation of the new Constitution but waste money. It's just one more mistake that was made in the Constitutional Convention. And when you look at the real functions of this Board that were properly carried on by the Secretary of State under Democrat and Republican Administrations for a fraction of the cost of this State Board, we realize the extent of the mistake we made. We could get rid of this monster. We could turn those functions back to the Secretary of State. We could take the mandated functions in there such as disclosure and give that to the Secretary of State and I'm sure he'd handle that much....a lot better in a much more economical manner. All this place has become is a dumping ground for political patronage, for hiring of lawyers on contract. As a matter of fact, one lawyer in Chicago referred to it in my presence as legal aid society, or the lawyer's aid society. And that's all it is. It's a dumping ground, it's a boondoggle. We should vote 'no' and get rid of this thing and then amend the Constitution and get rid of it permanently."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Byers: "Representative Walsh, how many employees does the State Election Board have?"

Walsh: "As of now they have 96 employees."



3.

Byers: "How many of them under Civil Service Code?"

Walsh: "None of them."

Byers: "How many have they contemplated for next year?"

Walsh: "They have contemplated no increase in the number of employees."

Byers: "How about raises for them? What kind of raise is in this salary for State Election Board employees?"

Walsh: "I'm not aware of any raises in this appropriation for State Board of Election employees."

Byers: "They're...they're all going to be working making the same amount of money they made this last year then? That would be....raise..."

Walsh: "No. I cannot respond yes to that, I don't know. I suppose that within the agency there will be promotions, I cannot say absolutely that there will be no raises to any employee in the agency."

Byers: "Then this total budget is how much over what it was last year, Sir?"

Walsh: "It is less by about 25%, it's close to \$900,000 less than the appropriation for fiscal 1977."

Byers: "And why was that, that it was less this year?"

Walsh: "I beg your pardon, I didn't..."

Byers: "Why...why is it less money this...for this coming year than it was last year?"

Walsh: "Well, I'm given to understand that the agency is now functioning in a more efficient manner and are better able to use the employees and resources that they have. They had, there's been a period of experimentation, as there would be with any new agency, and I...I would chalk it up to efficiency, Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Walsh apparently didn't understand the question, it's the reduction in the amount of expenditure. Their actual expenditure, as it's revealed in Appropriations I Hearing, there's...this current year were \$2,672,000. The amount that they seek here is just pennies below that. If you folks were not listening when Representative Collins was speaking you should have been listening because he spoke



4.

78.

the truth, and it's something we need to ponder in the days that lie ahead. It'll be no tragedy if this House fails to agree with the people across the corridor in a new Board of Elections. Its only excuse for existence is the fact that it was inadvertently put in the Constitution. You must recognize that and not be panicked into feeling that the Halls of Justice will crumble by failure to continue a monstrosity. Collins should have pointed out to you the actual ratio here in the cost. A man named Don Ed, I think he's still around government somewhere, he and a girl performed precisely the same...functions that are done by this group ten years ago for \$20,000 a year. Now applying Byer's arithmetic a moment ago, you'll find that this has risen a hundred and thirty times in ten years. In the name of God and economy the taxpayers can't stand this kind of growth, and we must think of that when it comes time to say whether or not it should be perpetuated...the next ten days."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Robinson: "Would you be willing to hold this Bill on Third Reading until a Constitutional Board of Elections is passed by the House?"

Walsh: "Well, I'm told that we do not have sufficient time to do this.

I believe that this is the last House...well, it's not quite the last, it's the second to last House Appropriations Bill on the Calendar. The Senate is anxious for us to get Bills over there so that the Senate Appropriations Bill...Committee can consider it. So I'm afraid that I'm unable to but I...I repeat the answer that I gave to Representative Bradley, and that is, that the Appropriation is to the agency and not to the board."

Robinson: "Well, if I may speak to the...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Robinson: "Bill. I think that we're in a position here in the House of appropriating money for an unconstitutional board, an unconstitutional agency, really, that I think we ought to wait on this. There's no deadline Saturday on Appropriations Bills. This can still move very quickly. I think we ought to wait on this until we have a Constitutional board approved by this House. Perhaps this will be the thing



to spur us to action, we seem to be procrastinating on coming up with a board Bill... And I hope that Representative Bradley who has an approach to a Constitutional board and that all the Members of the House who have sponsored and supported whatever proposal will vote 'present' or vote 'no' on this until we actually come up and...and compromise and have some kind of Bill passed for a real Board of Elections. We shouldn't appropriate money for something that's unconstitutional."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

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

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

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed... The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, to close."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, disregard Representative Collin's remarks. He thought this was the appropriation to the Arts Council. The other thing for those ...for those people who thought that the State Board of Election does nothing, let me suggest to you that in the Election Code we mandate about three pages of things that the State Board of Elections must do, and we were mandated by the Constitution of 1970 to have a State Board of Elections. Now I submit to you that for what they are required to do, and I will not bore you by reading these three pages, this is little enough in terms of an appropriation. The suggestion that the amount of attorney's fees was uncommonly high, I really don't know, but I was given a letter from the State Board that indicated that there were many cases that the State Board had to be involved in. And also, that this appropriation is down \$50,000 from what it was in fiscal 1977. The...I certainly share the hope of Representatives Bradley and Robinson that we are able to come up with, as they say, a Constitutional Board. But, nevertheless, we are required to appropriate money to this agency. I have no doubt that we will do what we are constitutionally liable to do and that is come up with this board. And I solicit your support for this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 2402 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan, to explain his vote. Timer's on."



Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me point out that Representative Walsh is about to slip another one by us. He very facilely said that this is an appropriation to the agency, this does not argue for a four member board. But what he forgot to tell the Members of this House is the fact that the salary for those four members is in this appropriation. And in fact I suggest you might even hear from Representative Walsh in a couple of days arguing that we have to have a four member board because we only have appropriations sufficient for a four member board. I would suggest that Representative Walsh has been again very tricky, very tricky."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 115 'ayes', 31 'nays', 11 recorded 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Lauer wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Is there leave? Hearing no objections kindly record Representative Lauer as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Gentleman also asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 2402. Any objections? Hearing none, Gentleman is so recorded."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 2403 at the request of the Sponsor is taken out of the record. House Bill 2410. Representative Totten."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2410. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent distributive expenses of the Illinois Community College Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Totten. Amends House Bill 2410 on page 1, line 23, and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, on Amendment #2."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 reduces the appropriation by 385,700 for utility increase funds. This decrease was also done in Representative Brady's Bill, 2417. The difference is that it's done in a different line item, and I'd be happy to explain that. If not, I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On the Amendment, I brought it to the attention of the Minority Spokesman of the Appropriations Committee that this Bill did not coincide with the agreement made between the Governor and the Board of the Community Colleges, which we worked out for House Bill 2417. I asked them to proceed with House Bill 2417, and I would be glad to name Representative Totten as a Cosponsor on it. For some reason they're deciding to try and go ahead with this, and try and put it into conformance. I suggest to you, this Amendment does not put it in conformance with what the Community College Board and the Governor's Office agreed to, as related to me by



both parties. And I don't understand why we are proceeding with this Bill and this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten. You want to respond to that?"

Totten: "Sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the Representative is wrong. The dollar amount is...will be exactly the same with this reduction, which is in agreement with the Governor's Office and the Board. At least that's my understanding. The reason that we're taking out of a different line item, if you'll remember, in Senate Bill 830 that they're...the special credit hour grant line item which is now nine million, I believe four hundred thousand says that that will be a dollar seventy-nine. You've taken that utility increase out of that line item, which would mean we wouldn't be able to provide that dollar seventy-nine, we'd be providing less. We've taken it out of the line item on the basic credit hour grant, which is I believe, where it should be. It leaves that eight thirty intact then. And I'd like to move with the Amendment, and then when we get on Third Reading, we can debate the differences on them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, in Representative Bradley's seat."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much. Well Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, what Representative Brady stated earlier is absolutely correct. Our staff is taking a look at this Bill right now, and we seem to find differences involved in the Amendment, which was not pointed out to us the other day. I would suggest to Representative Totten, the Gentleman from Cook, if he could hold onto this Bill so that we can iron out the problems here. It was the intent of the Appropriations II Committee and myself as Chairman, that move these motions, that these would be identically, identically, I emphasize, the same. Apparently they are not. And I would just suggest to the Gentleman in deference if



he would take this out of the record at this time, then perhaps we can come back to it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "That's okay. If we can hold 2417 so we can get them both in the same. because they're still...they're not right now, and they won't be with the Amendment...We can hold both of them, and make them both the same, that'd be fine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Representative Totten. I can't understand why you persist in your position to maintain the Sponsorship. We have two Bills. We passed them out of Committee. They're identical Bills. Why don't both of you Gentlemen become Co-chief Sponsors and move this one Bill along to appropriate for the Junior Colleges? What's wrong? We've got two identical Bills moving out of Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That question has been raised already. Representative Brady. Do you want to... What do you want to do on 2417?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to move 2417. The agreed upon amount between the Governor's Office, Community College Board and everybody else, and I welcome Representative Totten to join me in the Cosponsorship of that Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is whether we're going to adopt Amendment #2 on 2410 at the present time if the gentleman..."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, if I can have an opportunity. I ask the question then if we're talking about the adoption of the Amendment, I would move to oppose the adoption of the Amendment, or oppose this Bill in any other form. There is no Republican in the Senate who voted in favor of community college funding, and I don't think we should allow the Republican Party to put the community college funding back in their hands over on that side. They may all oppose it again. We'll have no funding for community colleges in Illinois. I urge your opposition."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes. Bradley's seat. Bradley's seat."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again to echo Representative Brady. There were three basic proposals that...Brady...there were three basic proposals that was put forth in the Senate. Each one of those proposals were defeated in that body. Now if we want to send back to that body one of those similar proposals without some kind of consensus from the House, the only thing we will be doing in fact is sending a proposal back to be killed again in that body. I don't think that's what we want to do. I think we're trying to work out a reasonable solution to a problem that could very well tie up this General Assembly in the last few days of this Session. That we do not want to do. I again would erect a...would again would request to Representative Totten as I requested of him in the Appropriations Committee to agree on a joint Sponsorship. Send one Bill over there, one Bill alone, so we can get on about the business of funding this agency."

Speaker Lechowicz: The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, to close on Amendment #2. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me point out to the Members of the House that in Senate Bill 830 which establishes the rate, it says that these \$9,400,000 special grant that now appears in both Bills that money is to be used at a rate of \$1.79 for these special credit hour grants. Representative Brady's Bill 2417 takes this utility increase out, which we both agreed on, should be out of that line item, which means you can only supply a \$1.77 which would be less than what the Bill calls for. For that reason we're taking the utility grant out of the proper line item. The amount agrees with the Illinois Community College Board and with the Governor's Office and that is the correct way to do it. House Bill 2410, which is...I am the



Sponsor, which is the first one filed; and if Representative Brady would be pleased I'd be welcome...more than a lot to be a Cosponsor on that Bill. I'd move the adoption on Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 90 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2417. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2417. A Bill for An Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Community College Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Now we'll go to page 10 of the Calendar. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Supplemental Consent Calendar, Second Day. The Clerk will read the Bills. This is Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "One of the Bills that is on that item of business is Senate Bill 497 of which I am the Sponsor. And I would ask to have that removed from the Consent Calendar. We're going to have to bring it back and place an Amendment on the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Gentleman asks leave to remove Senate Bill 497 from the Consent Calendar. Hearing no objections, it is so removed. All right. Clerk. Want to read the Bills?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I'll read the lists of the Bills on the



Calendar and announce which one..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for one second. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Deavers. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remove 1367 of which I'm the principal Sponsor. It has to go back to Second for an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "1367?"

Clerk O'Brien: "It's already removed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ok ay."

Clerk O'Brien: "I'll read and announce which ones have been removed. Senate Bill 21 has been taken off the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 30 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Left on the Consent Calendar are Senate Bills 114, 124, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 144, 146 and 166. Senate Bill 170 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 172 and 189 remain on the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 207 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 229, 303 and 355 remain on the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 371 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 497 and 573 remain on the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. At the request of the Sponsor, he wanted 497 removed, and he had leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "497?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Correct. 497. It was removed from the Consent Calendar. Is 573 still on?"

Clerk O'Brien: "573 remains on the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 607 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 629 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 643, 645 and 686 remain on the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 845 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 868 remains on the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 915 is removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "915."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 915 was removed from the Consent Calendar."

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

Conti: "I think that's been clarified. 915 has been put back on the Consent Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "There was two removals. One removal was withdrawn, the other removal has not been withdrawn."

Conti: "The other removal has not been withdrawn?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No."

Conti: "Who withdrew it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Miller has a copy of the challenge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed. 915 is withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 922 remains on the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1028 is removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1115 is removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1145, 1189, 1290, 1303 and 1314 remain on the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1367 is removed from the Consent Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now Ladies and Gentlemen, if I may just repeat that the following Bills, as I indicate, have been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 21, 30, 170, 207, 371, 497, 607, 629, 845, 915, 1028, 1115 and 1367. These Senate Bills have been removed from the Consent Calendar. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 189, the Clerk has indicated remains on the Consent Calendar. We were under the impression here, that the House Sponsor of that Bill, Representative Adams, wanted to take that Bill from the Consent Calendar and to place an Amendment on the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Adams. Does the question being posed on Senate Bill 189, which is on the Consent Calendar, did you agree to remove that from the Consent Calendar



for the purpose of an Amendment?"

Adams: "Yes, I removed it...the Amendment was not agreed to... or was objected to...the Amendment was objected to so we put it back on Third Reading, and I agreed to let it go back on Consent Calendar if they want it to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. So it will remain on the Consent Calendar."

Adams: "Does that clarify the situation?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, it does, thank you. Any other discussion on the Consent Calendar? The question is, shall those Senate Bills pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'ayes', 1 'nay', 16 recorded as 'present'. These Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. It's getting better everyday. Ladies... Pardon me. All right, Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II. Each of the following Bills were referred, action taken June 22, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'do - pass as amended'. House Bill 2411, Senate Bill 332, 362, 501 and 502."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Now I'd like to go to the Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, which is located on page 7 of your Calendar, the House Calendar. And may I also point out to the Membership, as far as Short Debate, there is one proponent, and one opponent, if there is an opponent, and then in turn then we have the opportunity of explaining our votes as well. First Bill on page 7, Senate Bills, Short Debate, is Senate Bill 23. The House Sponsor, Representative Emil Jones."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 23. A Bill for an Act to amend the Currency Exchange Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones. Pardon me. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schlickman: "Well with respect to the Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate, aren't we going to use the priority of call list?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well your point is well taken, and... when we get through with this Bill, we'll go into the priority of call."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones, on Senate Bill 23."

Jones, E.: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 23 is... is the last of a series of Currency Exchange Reform Bills. Senate Bill 23 allows the Director of... the Director of Financial Institutions to set maximum fees for cashing checks. It also gives the Director the power to finance and suspend license up to a maximum of \$100 per day. It provides that the Director shall hold public meetings, prior to issuing any changes or rules or regulations. And I move for the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."



Collins: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 23."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 23."

Collins: "Senate Bill 23. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I would like to remind the Members of this House that in their wisdom they passed a package of Bills that had been presented to this House by a variety of Sponsors on both sides of the aisle and endorsed by the Governor, and commonly referred to by all of us as the Governor's 'package'. Senate Bill 23, as introduced, would be similar to Bills in the Governor's 'package'. However, as amended it is anything but, and as a matter of fact, it would run contrary to the thrust of the Governor's 'package'. The Bill as introduced as Representative Jones' correctly stated would authorize the Director of Financial Institutions to set a uniform schedule for cashing checks and writing money orders. However, by Amendment everything after the enacting clause was deleted and the Bill became a new one. It's now superfluous because this House has already passed the 'package' of Senate Reform Bills, the Governor's 'package'. In addition, there are now some very bad provisions in the Bill. Number 1: It takes away the authority of the Director to issue an ambulatory license after making his investigation, if an objection is filed. Now just think, he would have to hold for a full scale hearing any application for a license, regardless of who filed the objection or where it came from. An extreme example of the currency exchange operator in one town, say Decatur, to file an objection to the issuance of a license for an ambulatory to service a plant in Skokie, and if he did so, this application and issuance of license would be held up until the full scale hearing would be held. This would be a perfect way for anyone to eliminate competition, or at least certainly to retard it. In addition to that, the Bill



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

as amended would require the Director to set up two fee schedules. One for community exchanges, and a different one for ambulatory exchanges. Just another opportunity to prevent competition which could improve service to the public. And as the Sponsor of the Bill pointed out, there is a provision in the Bill that would allow the Director to levy fines, which is a good provision and is already the case. As a matter of fact previous Directors have levied fines under the existing Act without any problem in the past. I submit to you this is not a good Bill. It runs contrary to the thrust of the Governor's 'package', which we the Members of this House have endorsed. And I would suggest that we reject Senate Bill 23."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones, to close."

Jones, E.: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It surprises me that this individual, who opposes this piece of Legislation, feels that the Governor is the only person in the State of Illinois that can propose reform for the Currency Exchange Industry. The ambulatory currency exchange, which he refers to, is a Bill that was defeated by this House Committee not once, but twice. The provision that this Bill is similar to the same House Bill that I passed out of here two months ago, House Bill 783. He voted for that Bill now, but now he feels he wants the Governor to receive credit for any reforms that is done for the Currency Exchange Industry. And I ask for an affirmative vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall Senate Bill 23 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Dick. Dick. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones, to explain his vote."



Jones, E.: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I notice the 'green' votes are going very slowly. But I'd like to remind this body, I'd like to remind this body that we passed out..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of Order. One moment please. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Under the rules, Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor of the Bill can only speak twice. He has spoken twice."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah. Well it was my error, he should have never closed. Please proceed."

Jones, E.: "That this body passed out this same Bill, House Bill 783, which I was the Chief Sponsor two months ago. That Bill is over in the Senate now, and it will pass. The only problem here is that Representative Collins wants the Governor to receive credit for any reform that is made in the Currency Exchange Industry. This is wrong, and I feel that this Bill should receive more 'green' votes than it is receiving. But as I said before, Representative Collins opposed this Bill because the Governor did not endorse it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. What? The Gentleman asks a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett, Brandt, Cunningham, Corneal Davis, Deavers, Hoffman, Kornowicz, Lauer, Madigan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record Representative Madigan as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madison, McAvoy, McGrew, Pierce, Van Duyne, Wikoff, Wolf and Yourell."

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

Bowman: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bowman: "Vote me 'aye' please."

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



The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker. Record me as 'aye'."

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

The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you change my 'aye' vote to 'no'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record...change the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker. Will you please change my 'aye' vote to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change the man's 'aye' to 'no'.

The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Change my 'aye' to 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment please. It's getting a little too fast for the Clerk. Change Representative O'Brien from 'aye' to 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, C.: "'Aye' Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly record the 'Deacon' as 'aye'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman. Kindly record the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'. The Gentleman from Johnson...Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker. Change my vote from 'present' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Mr. Speaker. Please change my 'aye' vote to 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change the man's 'aye' to 'no'.

The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: Well I would ask for the same change, but apparently there is a lot of misunderstanding. I would suggest the Sponsor take it out of the record so we can find



out what the Amendment did. Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Representative Mann from 'aye' to 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones."

Jones, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was surprised that my colleagues on this side of the aisle asked me to take this Bill out of the record because there has been no House Amendments placed on this Bill. But in view of the fact that many of them decided to change their vote from 'aye' to 'no', then I ask for a Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks for a Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 23 is on Postponed Consideration."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 420. Representative G. L. Hoffman. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? I don't see him. Representative Hoffman: Not there. Senate Bill 27. Representative Lynn Martin. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 27. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Martin."

Lynn Martin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when the working cash funds were set up for downstate school districts, there was a slight error in the Bill. One school district was not given the opportunity to have such a working cash fund, therefore, to bring the School Code in line so that it will apply to the State equally, and secondly because it's my school district. This Bill would change the population requirements. And that is all it would do, so Rockford could also have the option for a working cash fund. I ask your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's been a request for photos to be taken. The lights have been turned up. Is there any objection? Hearing none, it will be granted for a period of time. Is there any discussion in reference to Senate Bill 27? The question is, shall Senate Bill 27 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to comment and say that I'm supporting this Bill because I think it's fair and equitable that Rockford has the same advantages that we do in the rest of the state. I think that it's unfortunate though that the Senator from Rockford who introduced this piece of legislation is holding up working cash authorization for the Chicago area in the other side of the chamber. I would not wish to oppose Rockford or any of their Members in this House, but I think it should be duly noted that fair and equal treatment for children in Illinois should be exhibited by all the Members in the General Assembly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take



the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 152. Representative Greiman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 152. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 152 has three parts at this point. Firstly, the Bill as originally filed addresses a problem that this Legislature was very interested in. We thought we passed essentially the same Bill as an Amendment to the appropriation for the Department of Labor last year. The Supreme Court of Illinois came in and held that we couldn't do that. And this General Assembly filed...a brief in the Supreme Court to protect our rights to do that. So this is the codification of that right. The..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Greiman, have you concluded or what? Greiman."

Greiman: "My plug has been pulled for the moment. And I wonder in consultation...the Majority Leader has some questions. If we could take it out of the record just for a moment. Just for a while."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to take this Bill out of the record?"

Greiman: "Yeah. Take it out of the record, just for a while."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Senate Bill 492. Representative DiPrima."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 492. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vietnam Veterans Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all Senate Bill 492 will do is that instead of



every two years making out a new Bill for this program, keep it on for a few years so that I don't have to keep introducing a Bill every two years, and that's about it. I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 492 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 819. 'Mr. ...' take it out of the record. Senate Bill 230. Representative Simms."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 230. A Bill for An Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Rockford, Representative Simms. Winnebago."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 230 amends the Probate Act of 1975 by authorizing a non-for-profit agency, public or private which the court finds capable of providing an active and suitable program of social services for the aged individuals may be appointed conservator to the person or the State for aged individuals that judge to be incompetent. However, the court shall not appoint a conservator or agency which is directly providing residential services to the aged. This is basically the same provision that is similar for individuals and criteria for non-for-profit agencies that can conduct a program for mentally retarded individuals that passed the Senate 48 to nothing. It passed the Judiciary Committee 17 to 0, and there was no opposition. I would urge a favorable vote on this Bill."

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

Schlickman: "Well, I can't ask a question, can I?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No. The question is, shall Senate Bill 230



pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'ayes', no 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 466. Representative Daniels. Priority of call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 466. A Bill for An Act..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 710. Representative Von Boeckman. Gentleman in the chamber? Von Boeckman. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 743. Representative DiPrima."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 743. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Brokers and Salemen's License Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 743 permits the Department of Registration and Education to censure or reprimand for violations. This legislation gives the Department another option, instead of either revoking the license or doing nothing at all for all minor violations. And this has the approval of the Real Estate Board. 'Bob Cook' asked me to handle this Bill. And I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker. I'll point out that on line 4, on page 5, there is an apparent conflict with the current prices of the industry which is in conflict with the practices of the Department which puts it into discussion, which I think is not legitimate to be considered at this time. And I would ask the Gentleman to take it out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe the Gentleman has indicated what he thought of your comments. I'm more than sure. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."



DiPrima: "Yeah, Jimmy. I think you're all confused. I'm gonna go with that Bill, in spite of your objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 743 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 149 'ayes', 3 'nays', 8 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 826. Representative Stuffle. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 870. Representative Sandquist."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 870. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Interest Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The purpose of Senate Bill 870 is to amend the present add on interest statute to permit commercial lenders, primarily banks, to offer consumers a potentially less costly form of installment loan. What legislation would facilitate the using of the simple interest method of computing finance charges on consumers loans? The simple interest concept is beneficial to consumers particularly when they prepay installment loans, which apparently about 3/4 of the borrowers do. This Bill is for consumers because it would allow them to prepay loans and they'd only pay for the time that the money that they had. It's passed the Senate unanimously....passed the Judiciary Committee of the House on a 21 to nothing vote. I'd ask your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 870 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 158 'ayes', no 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1359. Representative Matejek."



Clerk O'Brian: "Senate Bill 1359. A Bill for an Act to establish the Illinois Board of Hearing Aid Dealers and Fitters. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Matejek."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Senate Bill 1359 creates a new Act called the Illinois Hearing Aid Act, requiring the certification of hearing aid dealers by the Department of Registration and Education. This piece of legislation is designed to protect the public in this state from the serious consequences of fly-by-night operators selling hearing aid equipment which are over priced and do not fit the hearing needs of the customer. It requires certification for persons to engage in the sale, practice, fitting of, dispensing, or servicing of hearing aids with the Department of Registration and Education. It provides for the certification of persons certified in other states with the equivalent or higher standards than those required by the State of Illinois. Corporations and other business organizations do not need certification if they employ only properly certified individuals. The hearing aid citizen dispensers must also issue an instructional brochure providing medical advice and information to the user. It also requires that a receipt be given to the customer of the hearing aid which must contain the seller's signature, the business address, certification number, full term of the sale and must be clearly marked if the hearing aid is used. Provides for complaints and hearing procedures and criteria for suspension or revocation. It also creates a five member board of hearing aid dealers and fitters appointed by the Governor of the State of Illinois. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Anybody in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, This is another licensing Bill. It certainly does not



belong on the Short Debate Calendar. Any licensing measure deserves our full consideration. This would seek to license hearing aid dealers, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason that hearing aid dealers want to be licensed is so that they can protect themselves. They say that there are licensed hearing aid dealers in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Indiana and that they are having problems with people coming hear. Well, they are having the problems, Mr. Speaker, not the consumer. To the extent that we license this, Mr. Speaker, we increase the cost to the consumer, we increase the cost to the state. There is considerable expense involved in setting up this licensing procedure. I know of no reasonable person who's for it. And I urge your opposition."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1359 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Could we have a little decorum in the House please? Please continue, Sir."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House; I heard all the conversation and all the reasons in Committee why we should license these people. Representative Walsh has hit the nail right on the head. This is just another group that wants to 'grandfather' themselves in and shut everybody else out. There was no valid reason for passing this Bill. In fact, I have opposed most licensing Bills in general. We've got too much regulation and too much big government now, and this is just another layer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I stand, I hope, as a reasonable person in support of this Bill. This is an area of the...of, of our society that has great danger if it goes unregulated. The people who

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

bear the brunt most of the fly-by-night operations that are prevalent in this area are senior citizens who can least afford to bear the brunt of that particular kind of fly-by-night operations. I'm opposed in general to over regulation or over licensing, but this is reasonable. It's an area that should be controlled. It's an area that's not now. And I strongly urge a 'green' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker. As always the ones we hear from are the groups that want to come in and be licensed. They want the good housekeeping seal of approval of the State of Illinois behind their business. and that's really what it amounts to. The fact of the matter is that even after this is passed all it will do is put the authority of the State of Illinois behind the group. He said that there would be a group on which the public would be represented, but the group that will govern this will have a majority of people who are in the industry governing it. The fact is that hearing is a very difficult field. It is one where physicians may be needed. It is one where the individual may need professional attention. This is not a profession, but a business. And there is no reason why the State of Illinois should guarantee a product, when in fact we have no control over the product..."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think this is a very necessary Bill. The hearing aid dealers, the reputable ones, want to police themselves. It's about time. I think that in the long run we'd be much better off with it. This Bill is patterned after the National Hearing Aid Associations Model Registration, which is scrutinized by the Pricing Commission. And this Bill has evolved out of some of those hearings. This is a necessary Bill. And I urge a favorable vote."



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

Skinner: "Well, I sure hope Representative Totten's Conservative Union for the State of Illinois uses this as one of their Roll Calls of who's a conservative and who's a liberal. This is not the worst licensing Bill this Session. Probably the worst one is coming up. It's the one that licenses landscape architects. But this certainly is a Bill which will allow the industry to regulate itself. And we above all others should know that no group can regulate itself efficiently. That's why we go back to the voters every two years. The hearing aid dealers will never have to go back to anyone but themselves if this Bill passes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, to explain his vote."

Bowman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'no' only because I haven't heard anyone say how someone has been hurt by not having the industry regulated. Until I hear some justification in terms of the consumer interest, I'm going to have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know there are a lot of votes up there, but I wonder if you've thought of one thing. In setting up this Examining Board, if I'm reading all the Amendments correctly, no audiologist has been provided for on the Examining Board. These are the people that can detect different kinds of hearing deficiency. In tones in which people may be deaf, this kind of person is very definitely needed on this Examining Board. There are children right now here in Illinois who have been classified as retarded..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'ayes', 45 'nays', 10 recorded as 'present'."



This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 39. Representative Mautino. There's a hold on it by Representative Ryan. Senate Bill 348. Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 348. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. The Gentleman is not here. Senate Bill 350. Representative Pierce."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 350. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Physician's Assistants Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 350 upgrades the examination requirements for physician's assistants. Two years ago, this General Assembly created a certified license physician's assistants on a Bill that I handled in the House for Senator Berning. We found in that two year period, that we were not specific enough in setting up testing standards and that there were national standards for physician's assistants. What Senate Bill 350 primarily does is establish the standards of the National Commission on certification of physician's assistants. Upgrades the profession. It is supported by the Illinois Department of Registration and Education. The Department of Public Health and in addition the Illinois Hospital Association and the State Medical Society are in support of the Bill as well as the physician's assistants. We have put an Amendment on in the House, requested by Representative Peggy Smith Martin in Committee, that makes it clear that physician's assistants cannot exercise independent judgment for purposes of diagnosis and treatment of patients. We restored that sentence to the Bill that had been taken out by the original Senate Bill and put that back in the Act. The Bill makes it clear that the physician's assistants must work under the direct



supervision of a physician and maintains the one on one relationship. The main thrust of the Bill is to upgrade the examination of the physician's assistants to national standards, because in Illinois we did not do that when we passed the original act two years ago. The Bill was approved after a thorough discussion in the Human Resources Committee of the House. And I ask for passage of Senate Bill 350."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any opposition? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker. When the original idea of physician's assistants was passed by the Legislature, there was to be a generic concept of trying to get better health care. This doesn't do that. This begins to set up a new profession in Illinois, a new profession that will be in the state mental institutions. A profession of people who cannot do what nurses can do. Nurses, clinical nurses, in these mental institutions can make independent judgment. They have special psychiatric courses and training that these physician's assistants don't have. Yet physician's assistants in Illinois and throughout the country because they have an exciting title in their name get higher pay than nurses. Physician's assistants are overwhelmingly white male upper middle class. Nurses can do the same if not more than these physician's assistants and yet we pay them less. I think the passage of this Bill creating an absolute profession out of the physician's assistant will not only be unfair, but it will lead to tremendous labor disputes within our hospitals and within our mental institutions as the nurses and physician's assistants fight over scarce resources. You'll see this become a contention of collective bargaining throughout the hospitals and mental institutions that will create tremendous problems for morale in those institutions. I think that this Bill ought to be defeated."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 350 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Dick. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know we already have the Physician's Assistants Practice Act that was created in the last Session of the General Assembly, and this Bill merely is improving upon what is already an existing Act in the State of Illinois. In its efforts to improve the quality in this area, has introduced this particular legislation. The Sponsor has been working with the Department of Registration and Education and I'm sure to raise the standards so that the National Association, the National Association, has requested legislation of this type. And the previous Speaker here indicated that we're creating a whole new arena. Well, I'd like to advise you that perhaps we do need a whole new arena as far as when it comes to the health care field. The Bill addresses itself to the shortcomings of the original Act that was adopted in the Seventy-ninth General Assembly..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman from DeKalb said we already have physician's assistants in our law. In fact we in the House earlier this year passed a Bill that Mr. Ryan, the Minority Leader, said was an emergency Bill to all physician's assistants to practice in the state mental hospitals. And I'm surprised that he's not in support of this Bill, which upgrades the qualifications to national standards. All we're doing is taking a occupation that two years ago we decided to license in Illinois and taking it up to the national standards. Which we should have because the other states do. Why should Illinois have the lowest standards of any state in



the Union for physician's assistants. That's why we support this Bill. That's why we advocate the Bill. It's a good Bill. The Department of Registration and Education supports it, as does the Department of Public Health, Illinois Hospital Association and the State Medical Society. And I ask for its passage. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'ayes', 42 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 693 will be taken out of the record. As the House knows, the Bill was amended, and is taken off the Short Debate Calendar. Senate Bill 1097. Representative Leverenz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1097..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "For what purpose..."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell seek recognition?"

Waddell: "I just wanted to know if we have an electrical short because I have my button on here? I wonder if it shows up there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "When did you have your button on, Sir?"

Waddell: "Prior to this. That doesn't make any difference. Does it show?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's on now."

Waddell: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to try it again and see if it flashes? Yeah, it's working. The Gentleman requests to have the Bill taken out of the record. All right. Senate Bill 1295. Representative Campbell. 1295. Take it out of the record? Senate Bill 1301. Representative Brummer."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1301. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is a Bill to authorize the legalization of mopeds in the State of Illinois. Mopeds are bicycles with small motors on them. They are defined within the Bill as a bicycle type vehicle with fully operative pedals for propulsion by human power, an automatic transmission and a helper motor with a cylinder capacity not exceeding 50cc displacements which produces more than two break horsepower, and is capable of propelling the vehicle at a maximum speed of no more than 30 miles per hour on level ground. It is described as a vehicle very similar to a bicycle in that it's mounted, started, pedaled, controlled and stopped like a bicycle. It has an automatic transmission with no gears. Has hand brakes. It weighs typically 60 to 75 pounds. It is described as a vehicle which can be ridden by anyone who is capable and used to riding a bicycle. The Bill provides for the legalization of that vehicle under the Motor Vehicle Act. It provides that for licensing of a moped. It provides that it shall not be driven except by anyone who has an authorized valid Illinois drivers license, and it is...it complies with the federal standards that have been developed with regard to moped operations. It further provides that it cannot be operated on streets or highways in which the maximum speed limit exceeds 45 miles an hour. I respectfully request your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone standing in opposition? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker. Could I ask a question on this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, what was your question?"

Griesheimer: "Are these Short Debate, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes Sir, it's Short Debate."

Griesheimer: "All right, I'll explain my vote."



Speaker Lechowicz: "You can speak against it if you like at this time. The question is, shall Senate Bill 13... Oh there is some... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, in opposition."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, if nobody else is going to speak in opposition to this Bill, I will. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill was amended in Committee to provide that anybody holding a valid drivers license may operate one of these moped bikes in the State of Illinois. I believe that the proper...the proper stance in this issue, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is that they should have a motorcycle operator's permit, and I believe that that would probably coincide with the thinking of the Secretary of State. I haven't spoken with the Secretary personally on this matter, but I am quite certain that he was not aware of this Amendment that was put on in Committee. And if he were, then he probably would oppose it. I would ask for a 'no' vote on this, unless this Bill is brought back to Second Reading, and amended to remove the provision that anybody holding a driver's license can operate one of these small motorcycles. I would like to point out that my 76 year old mother can operate a car, but she sure as heck couldn't handle one of these mopeds."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1301 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote. I see it."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My question was going to concern the subject which none of the Sponsors have dealt with on these mopeds, which is the very reason that the rather ancient motorbike was outlawed in the State of Illinois back in the late 40's. Although there's guarantees that this vehicle cannot go faster than 30 miles per hour with human power in a motor assist, there's no indication that



they can safely be stopped. And this is the whole problem with the old motorbike. They could control top speed, but there was no way of putting on an adequate braking system to stop the vehicle. As a consequence in the late 40's numerous young people were killed on these vehicles, not because they were going so fast, but because they could not be stopped properly. I think therefore they'd be an incumbrance to all the traffic in the State of Illinois. And with the problems we are already having with motor scooters and with various forms of motor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Leverenz: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a controversial thing, I think at the last minute, and I rise to explain the fact that we did put an Amendment on in Committee, whereas you would have to have a driver's license to drive one of these on the street. But it seems this morning, the Secretary of State's Office, or early this afternoon, the Secretary of State's Office is vigorously working the floor in the front aisle to make sure that we get 'red' votes on this because they would have to have then a motorcycle classification on the license. I ask that you would provide 70 votes so that we can put it on Postponed, bring it back, and amend that end of the Bill which I understand will take care of the Secretary of State's opposition."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lee Schwartz. Vote me 'aye'. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: Mr. Speaker. This is an effort on the part of the industry to provide a low fuel consumption method of transportation. It's one of the few states that doesn't have it. I think you ought to vote for it."

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



Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not against this; in fact, I saw this article in the paper yesterday. It seems like it's a good energy conservation program. However, I remember in the late 60's there was an Amendment put on the Bill that anything under 5 cylinders did not require a driver's license. And it became a scandalous affair until the Chicago Press editorialized that this Amendment, every father was buying his 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 year old kid a motorbike and was riding down the streets with them, and they were having more accidents and more youngsters were killed because it did not require a driver's license. The only concern I have, if the Secretary of State is going to require license for this Bill or not. I have no arguments with the Bill. All I want to make sure is that we don't repeat the scandal that we had in 1962."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "There seems to be..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sorry, it's my mistake. Please proceed."

Brummer: "Seems to be some confusion regarding this. I'd understood that initially the Secretary of State's Office had wanted to require a drivers...a motorcycle classification. I had understood that that objection had been removed. The part of the rationale was that some 30 states licensed mopeds. There is not a single state in the United States which requires a separate motorcycle classification with regard to mopeds. In fact 6 or 7 of the states require no drivers license with regard to mopeds similar to that which we do with regard to bicycles in Illinois. A ten year old kid can ride a bicycle on any highway in the State of Illinois without regard to any driver's license whatsoever. This requires a valid operator's license. I would further point out that this complies with the federal standards that have been adopted, and the safety record in Europe where these



vehicles have been used extensively indicates they are 6 1/2 times safer than motorcycles, and the accident history has been 1 1/2 times less that of automobiles themselves."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman want to take this... put this on Postponed? Representative Brummer.

Brummer: "Yes. Postponed Consideration please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Senate Bill 1301 on Postponed. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry. Those Bills that were taken off the Consent Calendar and would be placed back on Short Debate Calendar, isn't that right?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Mudd: "Would they be eligible then to be considered today on Short Debate?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "There will be a Supplemental Calendar following sometime today."

Mudd: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson. He wanted recognition. He's over there by Representative Brady's desk. Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 350, could you change my vote to 'present'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's on Postponed Consideration. You want to handle your Bill, Senate Bill 73, Representative Johnson? Your Bill 73. Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 73. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker. I think we've probably had all the discussion on this before. This simply makes it a specific offense to hook up illegally to a 'C.A.' TV outlet."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Is there any opposition? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker. House Bill 73 was taken, I believe, last Friday when there weren't many people on the floor. Senate Bill... It was taken out of the record. Very briefly what the Bill does, it makes it a theft to make or consent to an unauthorized connection of a cable TV outlet for the purpose of an unauthorized use. Now as was pointed out drastically by questioning by, I believe, Representative Wolf if you bought a house that had a cable TV outlet in it, if the cable TV company did not for some reason disconnect, and you hooked your TV up to it, you've committed a felony. Now it would seem to me that the cable TV industry is regulated on the municipal level, very easy for them in their ordinance granting the franchise on the local levels to decide what ought to be done to a person who connects to a cable TV outlet which may or may not already exist in his home. It has been said many times this is taking a howitzer to kill an ant. And I don't think we need to go that far. So I would stand in opposition to Senate Bill 73."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 73 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Dick. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are... The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lechowicz: "State your point."

Byers: "Yes. I would like to ask that the downstaters not commit themselves too soon on House Bill 2414, which is the crosstown, until they have time to consider what's in that particular Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 36 'ayes', 76 'nos', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby



declared lost. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I'd like leave of the House to be recorded as voting 'no' on that Bill. I missed my switch here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Ebbesen as voting 'no' on Senate Bill 73. Same request for Representative Simms. Representative McBroom. Vote him 'no. Representative Harris. Bill Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, its just been said to downstater, there's no downstate, there is no upstate, it's the State. It's not hyphenated, it's spelled Illinois. There is no upstate, and there's no downstate, it's the State."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point is well taken. Senate Bill 206. Representative Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 206. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this legislation is to require motor contract carriers of property to file proof of complaints with the financial responsibility provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Law. The Illinois Commerce Commission presently issues the permit certificates and registration forms. Hence the filing of proof must be filed with the ICC. This Bill is to insure that contract carriers can meet financial responsibilities should the need arise. Also this Bill affects only the contract carriers which number about 1,000. It does not affect private or common carriers. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 206."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."



Hart: "Thank you. I discussed this matter with the House Sponsor the other day. I called the Illinois Commerce Commission about this Bill. The staff analysis indicates that the Illinois Commerce Commission has no position on the Bill. But they tell me that it's completely unworkable, and it also would eliminate any possibility of self-insured carriers. There is no way that this Bill can work. You can't comply with it if you're self-insured. There's no procedure for establishing evidence of financial security or whatever the words are in the Bill. And I believe the Bill is going to run into a veto outright if the Sponsor doesn't agree to amend it in some way, so it's workable. So I believe we should oppose the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 206 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We...I don't see how anybody can vote 'no' on this particular Bill. At the present time there are provisions that self-insurers do license with the ICC to show financial responsibility for the operation of their vehicle on the state highways. All this does is that if they have an employee that drives that rig that they have proper insurance to protect that employee if he gets injured on the job. Now this does not apply to any individual or private farm machinery or anything of this nature. But if they are a contract carrier this simply says that you have to show that you have the proper insurance. And there are provisions at the present time to do this. Now all I know is that the Commerce Commission simply says that this would be an additional paper work. All of it is for the protection of the poor guy that's operating... If they don't have the insurance, they shouldn't be on the highway. And if this is all it requires, an additional piece of paper work, it's well worth the passage of this Bill. And



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I would urge my colleagues to support Senate Bill 206."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kozubowski, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty, to explain his vote. Beatty. You want to try Representative Bradley's mike? Bradley's mike."

Beatty: "Yes, my mike just busted. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's no point in this House passing changes in the Workmen's Compensation Law if we don't protect the employees where we can; where they are hiring vehicles and where it normally requires to show that they're insured. What's the use of passing all these laws that help business employees if their employer doesn't have insurance? And this law is being promoted because some of these carriers have not had insurance in the past. And their drivers have been hurt, and they're left stranded with their medical bills, and they're not being paid enough being protected. These motor vehicle drivers have serious accidents. They should be covered in other areas of the law. These carriers are required to show their insurance coverage. There's no reason why they shouldn't show it here. And I think if the Commerce Commission doesn't want to comply or doesn't want to take on some more work, then we should look into the Commerce Commission. But the employees should be protected. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

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

Skinner: "Well, the more I hear about this Bill, the more reasonable it sounds. That's why I switched my vote from 'present' to 'yes'. Originally having the Illinois Commerce Commission being against it, it sounded like a good reason not to vote for it. But when you see one part of Illinois state government requiring Workmen's



Compensation Insurance and Workmen's Occupational Insurance and then another part of state government saying, 'Well we don't care if this other part of state government is requiring this insurance', you can just, you know, sort of thumb your nose. Having one part of state government thumbing their nose at another part of state government. It seems to me that perhaps it's time to tell the Illinois Commerce Commission that they're part of state government and can help enforce the laws of the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Department of Labor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 87 'ayes', 67 'nos', 8 recorded as 'present'. Gentleman asks leave to poll the absentees? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Have you announced Roll Call on this yet?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, I did. And we're also going to be polling the absentees."

Mudd: "Okay. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, Collins, Deavers, Klosak, Kornowicz, Lauer,..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Record Representative Richmond... Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Yes. From 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change him from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative McAuliffe wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Please proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madison, Lynn Martin, McAvoy, McGrew, Meyer, O'Brien, Stearney, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell. Would you kindly record him as 'aye'? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison."



Madison: "Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as 'aye'.

And I would like for Representative Terzich to know that this 'aye' vote is for him, and it is certainly not for the Senate Sponsor."

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

The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins. He wants to be recorded as 'no'. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 66 'nays'. This Bill having received... The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change me from 'no' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Record me as voting 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Anyone else? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate to put this in the record. I have already notified the electrician. There is something wrong with my switch. I was on green, it showed 87 when you took the record, and it was disconnected. I want to be recorded as 'aye.'"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Getty. The electrician will please take note. Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "They're being recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Bowman as 'aye'. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 66 'nos', 7 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 360. Mrs. Willer."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 360. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 360 provides the means for the Delinquency Prevention Commission to maintain a statistical overview of juveniles who have had contact with law enforcement agencies and change the present file on juveniles with police contacts to a file of adjudicated delinquents. This is in keeping with a recent Appellate and Supreme Court case of St. Louis vs. 'Drolay', which states that a system of control and continuity of official action taken by the juvenile court and the disposition that occurs is essential. The confidentiality required by the Juvenile Court Act is not consistent with the current record-keeping devices in use to preserve and disseminate all police contacts with juveniles. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill simply for the reason that it is a companion to Senate Bill 359 which is at the Order of Consideration Postponed. And it would seem to me that before acting upon 360 and giving to the Delinquency Prevention Commission new authority, authority which would be for the implementation of 359, let's wait for the passage of that Bill, if it does pass, and then follow up with 360. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think acting upon Senate Bill 360 at this time is premature, it's untimely, it should be taken from the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Willer. You want to proceed ma'am?"



Willer: "Okay. I will."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 360 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli, to explain his vote."

Capparelli: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, this just goes along with House Bill 199 that this whole House agreed on last year. It just furthers the agreement that we made with them. We're going to...we removed all objections to 359 and that will be going too. I would ask for your favorable Roll Call."

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

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I see it's too late. But I think it's important, if you'll look particularly on the Republican analysis, and I don't know if the same is contained on the Democratic analysis to note, that there's a requirement that records identifying individuals as delinquents would have to be destroyed when that individual reached age 19. I think there's very valid reasons for an employer or people in the future wanting to know that an individual committed juvenile crime before they reached a certain age. I think this is tied into Senate Bill 359. But I think it's the kind of thing that is going too far in one direction and there's really probably kind of an anti-law and order type of provision."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'ayes', 33 'nays', 8 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 419. Representative G.L. Hoffman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 419. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Hoffman, G.L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We adopted a couple of Amendments to House Bill 419 on Second Reading. Let me just quickly say, #1, this is a product of a Subcommittee of the School Problems Commission. It was sponsored by Senator Berman in the Senate. As Chairman of that Commission and as Vice-chairman, I am sponsoring it here in the House. It defines truant. It defines what a chronic and habitual truant is. It defines what is called a valid cause for absence. And it encourages the use of available, supportive services and other school resources before any other methods are used such as expulsion or the court. And I would... It passed the Senate 53 to nothing. And I would ask for your support. Yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection?"

Hoffman, G.L.: "Mr. Speaker, would there be any objection to taking 420, which is a companion Bill, with it. It's on...the second Bill listed on the Priority of Call Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 420?"

Hoffman, G.L.: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hearing no objection, the Clerk will please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 420. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hoffman, G.L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill...pardon me. Senate Bill 420 actually defines or authorizes the State Board to enter into contracts for providing educational services for a chronic truant. This is a program that we've had on a pilot basis for the last couple of years. We passed in the appropriation Bill last night a line item for \$525,000 for the continuation of this program. And I would encourage your support of 420, which is a companion Bill to 419."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bills 419 and 420 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay' Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'ayes', 12 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. These Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 708. Representative Luft."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 708. A Bill for an Act to amend the Gas Revenue Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 708 amends the Revenue Act, the Gas Revenue Tax Act, provides that the Department of Revenue shall not penalize municipalities own gas utilities which do not include engross receipts, the amount of utility taxes due the Department. Basically, what we're trying to do is when the locally owned gas tax company sends out their bill and the bill would be a \$100, they would include in that bill the 5% tax, and the bill would be \$105. The \$5 is not distinguished as tax. Now the Department of Revenue has tried to come back on these utilities and collect the...in excess of the \$5. This came through the Senate with a vote of 51 to nothing. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, shall Senate Bill 708 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140...150 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 779. Representative Johnson. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Yeah. Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 779. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to prohibit solicitation or inducement



or sale of purchases of real estate on the basis ~~of~~ race, color, religion or national origin or ancestry. ~~The~~ Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. ~~The~~ Bill came out of the Judiciary Committee with the ~~unanimous~~ approval of that Committee. We've adopted the ~~Amendment~~ on Second Reading that I believe solved all the ~~present~~ objections to it. I believe it has the support of ~~Representative~~ Houlihan, who had some questions about it ~~before~~. It simply defines what written notice is with ~~respect~~ to the Anti-solicitation Bill. There was no ~~opposition~~. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? The question is, ~~shall~~ Senate Bill 779 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all ~~opposed~~ vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish. Have all ~~voted~~ who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this ~~question~~ there 157 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. ~~This~~ Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is ~~hereby~~ declared passed. Senate Bill 1012. Representative Mautino."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1012. A Bill for an Act to ~~amend~~ the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Workmen's ~~Compensation~~ Diseases Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate Bill 1012, sponsored by ~~Senator~~ Knuppel, is...sets up the provisions for paying ~~court~~ reporters what the Industrial Commission the same as ~~the~~... the same basis as the court reporters in the Circuit Court. With the provision and if they pass the 'A' proficiency examination, they would be paid \$10,000. Now ~~their~~ salary is set by statute, the low being \$6,000, and the ~~high~~ being 12. Basically, that's what this Legislation does. ~~This~~"



puts them in the same posture as the court reporter under the court system as well as the Industrial Commission."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1012 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill requires that court reporters working for the Industrial Commission be paid the same amount as court reporters working for the Circuit Courts. Now I submit to you that I have no idea whether the work is the same or more difficult one place or the other. But the thing that is most objectional about this Bill is that it ties one salary to another. If for some reason later on in some subsequent Legislature we increase the pay for court reporters working in the Circuit Court, unknown to all of us will be an increase in the pay for court reporters working for the Industrial Commission. This is not right, Mr. Speaker. We should handle these things individually and on their merits. And I submit that this is not a good Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'ayes', 54 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1025. Representative Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1025. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to the inspection of hospital records. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Brady. Take it out of the record. Take 10...Take 1027 out of the record. The Gentleman is not here. Senate Bill 1379. Representative Bluthardt."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1379. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1379 would simply eliminate a 2 1/2% limitation on the levy of a tax for police or fire protection on non-home rule communities. The present law permits a tax of up to 7 1/2% for police and fire protection on non-home rule municipalities, but it provides first that the first year shall be limited to 5%, thereafter, may go up to 7 1/2%. This Bill would eliminate the 5% limitation. Allow any non-home rule municipality to go right to the 7 1/2%. I would ask for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1379 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I look at this Bill, I stand to be corrected, this is in essence a tax increase without a referendum. And I just wanted to point that out to the Members of the General Assembly."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, the present law permits municipalities to levy up to 7 1/2% without referendum. This is no new law. It's been passed several years back. The only trouble with it is, is that it provides that the first year shall be only 5%, thereafter, you may go up to 7 1/2% without referendum. That is the present law. And we're not attempting to enact a new law. Anything over 7 1/2% would require a referendum. That's the present law. This would affect very, very few municipalities because most municipalities have put it in and are already at the 7 1/2%. I might point out also the unfairness of the home rule provisions of our Constitution that provides and allows home rule municipalities to levy taxes without any limitation."



But still limits..."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like the attention of the House. Under the home rules provision, we in Cook County, and especially through the ramifications of the O'Hare Airport, the world's greatest airport, some of these small municipalities around there have to have a police and fire protection equivalent to any Ward in the City of Chicago. However, because they are not a home rule provision, they can't get the increase, and they can't pay for the police and the fire protection that it needs. Now Schiller Park, I think, has a population of 12,000. They service close to 350,000 people that come into that community day in and day out. They have to have a fire department and a police department equivalent to that of any large municipality. They are in dire need of these funds, and I wish you'd reconsider and don't..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have ...What was that, Elmer? Kindly let the Gentleman conclude."

Conti: "I just wanted to say that 2 1/2% without referendum, they can do that now thereafter. And I said you're a nice fellow, Teddy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Yeah. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 50 'nays', 18 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Will you poll the absentees please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly poll the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty, Brummet, Brady, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Capparelli as 'aye'. Cunningham as 'aye'. Deavers as 'aye'. Why don't we dump this Roll Call and try another one. Is that all right with you, Eddie? The question is, shall Senate Bill



1379 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Dick. You want to give me his 'aye' please? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'ayes', 36 'nays', 11 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keats. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Keats: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask leave of the House to change my positive vote, my 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 1007, to a 'no' vote. When the Bill passed 148 to 5, I was one of the 148 votes. But it was brought to my attention later that there was an Amendment on that Bill that we as a House had defeated twice when it came up as a Bill. For that reason I would ask my 'yes' vote to be moved to a 'no' even though I actually support the Bill. It's the Amendment I'm opposed to. I ask leave."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What was the Bill number?"

Keats: "Senate Bill 1007."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be changed from 'aye' to 'no' on Senate Bill 1007. Hearing no objections, the Gentleman from... is so recorded. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I believe you were in the Chair yesterday when this came to the attention of a lot of Members, and you were going to recognize a motion to reconsider a motion to reconsider on that at that time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I was. And in turn I believe Representative Keats tried to file a motion, and he was informed by the Clerk's Office that the Bill was already in the Senate. So you have no alternative but to change your vote at this time."

Totten: "Okay, then I'd like to change my vote from 'aye' to 'nay'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Ebbesen asks for the same request. Representative Meyer, the same request. Is there anyone else? Okay. Those Gentlemen will be recorded



as voting 'no' on 1079.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 122. A bill for an Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in various aspects of education. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one of the sex Bills again. Senate Bill 122, now listen to this, men, Senate Bill 122 pro...is the same as House Bill 558 which we passed out of here. It amends an Act to provide for annual inspection of several Departments of Universities, Colleges, Academies and other educational institutions organized under the law in the State of Illinois. The discrimination based on sex is prohibited. Female professors of State Universities may be drafted into the National Guard. Girls can refuse county military school scholarships and discrimination against the applicants by vocation and business schools on the basis of sex is prohibited. And I would urge your support of Senate Bill 122."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Any objection? The question is, shall Senate Bill 122 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really would like to commend my liberal colleague for this Bill. Get off the floor, Bob. Especially the part that says that female professors of State Universities may be drafted into the National Guard. And I think that's very important. I'm glad to see that Larry DiPrima is supporting this very important Bill for the National Guard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Kindly record Mrs. Geo-Karis as 'aye'. On this question there's 122 'ayes', 12 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Daniels: "Yes. May I have leave of the House to be changed from 'aye' to 'no' on Senate Bill 1007?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave of the House to be changed from 'aye' to 'no' on Senate Bill 1027. Representative Jack Davis asks the same request. 1007. Mrs. Sumner, do you have the same request?"

Sumner: "No, I don't. I would like to have leave to vote 'no'..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Those two Gentlemen... Hearing no objections they will be so recorded. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Sumner: "Mine is on Senate Bill 350. I would like to be recorded as 'no' in place of 'yes'. It won't change the outcome."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks leave to be recorded as 'no' on Senate Bill 350. Hearing no objections, you will be so recorded. The Lady from...One moment. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers. What's your point of order?"

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this takes a lot of time to change the votes and to disrupt the proceedings of the House. And if people can't hit the right switch, I'm going to start objecting to everyone. I'll give them about another five minutes to get straightened out, and then I'm going to object."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin."

Martin, Lynn: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be recorded from 'no' to 'aye' on 743? Senate Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks leave to be recorded 'no' on Senate Bill 743. 'Aye'? The Lady wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Hearing no objections, it is so recorded. Any other requests? Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl, C.M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I be recorded as 'no' on Senate Bill 1007?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady have leave to be recorded as 'no'? Hearing no objections, she is so recorded. Representative



Adams, same request. 1007? Okay. Representative Ebbesen, same request. All right. Let's go to Senate Bill 129. Let's go."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 129. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color or sex. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, on Senate Bill 129."

Terzich: "Well, I hope everyone doesn't get too excited with all this sex going on now. But Senate Bill 129 provides the same as House Bill 665, which passed the House, which amends an Act prohibiting discrimination in employment under contract for public works. And I would urge your support of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? The question is, shall Senate Bill 129 pass? Let's clear up the board. 129. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Dick. I thank you. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'ayes', 3 'nays'... Getty. His switch isn't working again. Vote him 'aye'. On this question there's 146 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 139..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 139. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is another sex Bill. And again it eliminates discrimination on the basis of sex. And I would urge your support of House Bill 139. And I believe Representative Lienenweber would like to speak on 139."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is... Any opposition? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Lienenweber."



Lie nenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Sponsor pointed out, I do oppose Senate Bill 139. And Senate Bill 139 does not have a corresponding House Bill that passed the House because of the fact that we put a very substantial Amendment on the House Bill eliminating all the provisions which are currently in Senate Bill 139. Senate Bill 139 is much more than a technical updating of the Criminal Law of the State of Illinois; it makes a graphic change towards unisex in what can be described as places of a public accommodation. Now that sounds very good, that we should not be able to discriminate in places of a public accommodation; but I'd like to point to you, and I have researched this question, this is the third year in a row this Bill has been before us. A place of public accommodation is much broader than what it sounds like by court interpretation. A place of public accommodation is broad enough to include everything from a YMCA down to a women's hotel. This would absolutely prohibit under the pain of the criminal law such things as a male only YMCA or a YWCA. There is no provision in this Bill for any reasonable exceptions. I'd like to point that if you pass Senate Bill 139 you are going to eliminate every single sanctuary for males or every single sanctuary for females. This is a bad idea. It's way ahead of its time if that time should ever come. And I'd like to point that I have consistently supported the Equal Rights Amendment, because I believe in freedom of opportunity and that laws that we pass should treat men and women equally. But this is an attempt by law to treat men and women as if they were exactly the same. This is far different than discriminating against them. And I would certainly urge on behalf of your constituents, who may desire to attend an institution or reside in a hotel or go into an eating club that is male only or female only, I think they should have this right. So I would certainly urge that we vote 'no'. because the Sponsor of this Bill,



the House Sponsor of this Bill, accepted an Amendment to his House Bill to remove this odious provision. So I urge a 'no' vote. Let's kill this right now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I think that's terrible. I move to table Senate Bill 139."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You move to table? Gentleman moves to table Senate Bill 139. Are there any objections? The Bill is tabled. How about 145. Senate Bill 145. Representative Terzich. Anything you want to do."

Terzich: "Senate Bill 145 does the same as House Bill 665, which we did pass. It amends the Municipal Code. The Bill inserts sex neutral language, which removes the power to discriminate on the basis of sex from municipal civil service positions. And I would urge your support on Senate Bill 145."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Getty 'aye'. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye', and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 287. Representative Bartulis."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 287. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 287 amends the Personnel Code which allows the state employees to appeal layoffs to the Civil Service Commission. On such cases the Commission has to determine the provisions of the Personnel Code or Department rules have been violated relating to the layoff. And provides for automatic reinstatement if the Commission has not made a decision within 60 days. An appeal of a



layoff must be filed by the employee within 15 calendar days following effective date of the layoff."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I read the... I'm saying in opposition. I hope the Gentleman can answer the question. The Amendment, Senate Amendment #1, states that the personnel matter has to be public. Is that accurate?"

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 19 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 347. Representative O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 347. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien. O'Brien. Out of the record. Is that what you want? 505. Representative Mahar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 505. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Senate Bill 505 permits the sale of alcohol on land owned by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of greater Chicago. The land must be leased for a 20 year period, and the Board of Trustees must approve of the sale. I know of no opposition. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 13 'no'. And the Bill



having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 509. Representative O'Daniel."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 509. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Pharmacy Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "O'Daniel."

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill merely removes the requirement for having weights and measures in both a hospital and a nursing home where they are joining. These weights and measures are very expensive and very seldom used. Nearly all medication that they dispense is already prepacked. This Bill came out of the Senate 58 to nothing. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor/vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Getty. 'Aye'. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 533. Representative Telcser."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 533. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Chicago Public School Teachers Pension and Retirement Fund. Article of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 533 affects the Chicago teachers who were laid off in 1976 from June 6th to June 21st. It allows those teachers to have the option to pay in the amount of money which would have been their contribution, plus the amount of money which the employing unit of government would have contributed, plus a 5% penalty after January 1st for their pension benefits. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 50 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 537."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 537. A Bill for an Act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 537 amends the Solid Waste Disposal District Act, provides authority and procedures for not more than 5 adjoining townships to organize and operate solid waste disposal districts. The Bill is a product of 16 suburban municipalities and 4 townships. It passed the Senate 50 to nothing. And there was no dissent in the Committee in the House. And I would ask for your favorable approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? 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 144 'aye', 5 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 591."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 591. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Industrial Pollution Control Financing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Pollution Control Revenue Bond Financing, which in essence is a Federal subsidy because it is the Internal Revenue Code which permits public instrumentality such as this authority to issue tax exempt bonds for the special limited purpose of financing pollution abatement to various industries and businesses."



I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is...

Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if this Act provides financing similar to the Industrial Revenue Bond Act?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "This is based on Revenue Bonds. It's not on general obligation bonds. They are both the same."

Dunn, J.: "That's not my question. We have the Industrial Revenue Bond Act in the State of Illinois and local municipalities take advantage of this. Who's going to issue these bonds? The State or the local municipality?"

Geo-Karis: "It's the Industrial Pollution Control Financing Authority, I understand."

Dunn, J.: "I can't hear the Lady, Mr. Speaker."

Geo-Karis: "It's the Industrial Pollution Control Financing Authority that does. And what this... In fact this is already in operation. The only thing that this Amendment does is increase the bond level. These are revenue bonds with no expense to the state. And these bonds are for the purpose of providing assistance to industry for constructing pollution control facilities to abate the pollution problems. I don't know if I've answered your question."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114... 119 'aye' and 11 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 663. Dan Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 663. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Court Reporters Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Houlihan, Dan.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 663 amends the Court Reporters Act by setting the maximum limitation on salary for full-time court reporters at \$20,000 per year. And for part-time court reporters on a per diem basis at not less than \$12 or more than \$26 per half day. This Bill was suggested by the Illinois Supreme Court and has been endorsed by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. The funds involved are in the Governor's budget. The Bill passed Committee without a dissenting vote. And I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? 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 12 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



1.

Speaker Redmond: "668."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 668. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich. Representative Madigan, do you seek recognition? Pardon me."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for purpose of an announcement that the Speaker's plan today will be to work through into the neighborhood of 10 o'clock....maybe 9:45. And that the Speaker will provide food in his office at 7:00 o'clock. And, Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Ryan feeding his people?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, you have an announcement also?"

Ryan: "No, I have a request, Mr. Speaker. I would like to request that we....that we adjourn for about an hour so the Republicans can attend the Bill Scott affair this evening."

Speaker Redmond: "There's only one problem, Mr. Ryan,...."

Ryan: "That's the Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "They tell me, they tell me that as age takes hold that we don't have adequate blood supply up into the head and sometimes we forget, but I had a discussion with you about this program, and you agreed, and we ordered food."

Ryan: "Well, we could still have the food, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "And I would...I would suggest that anybody that schedules a dinner at this stage of the Legislative Session does so at his own peril. I don't think we're going to take a Roll Call....."

Ryan: "There's another...."

Speaker Redmond: "If I make myself clear, but I think it would be most unwise to adjourn. Representative Scott, we're talking about you, I mean Attorney General. I elevated you, didn't I?"

Ryan: "Speaker, Mr. Speaker, it was my thought that we could still have the chicken in your chambers and as usual the feathers in mine at 7:00 o'clock, but we could break for an hour and still have that program and have the chicken and then come back the end of an hour's time so we could get over to the Attorney General's affair."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think that would be a good idea. I've been here a while, and I've seen...."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I know that you were very conspicuous in your absence last night, and it was....I understand that you were at



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Senator Hyne's affair, now...."

Speaker Redmond: "...I was in the lobby of the Forum 30 accepting a... complimentary ticket from the Attorney General for his affair tonight..."

Ryan: "Well, then, you ought to take advantage of that."

Speaker Redmond: "And...and maybe if I can get somebody to spell me for a few minutes I may get over there, but in terms of breaking for an hour, I...hours have a habit of running into two hours, and I think that would be a bad idea. 668, Representative Terzich. The feathers in Ryan's and...the drumsticks. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Minority Leader of the great sacrifice that I had to give up today. One of our most famous Croatians, Mayor Bilandic, was sworn in this afternoon, and I had to miss this very important ceremony. So I think we should all congratulate Mayor Bilandic and wish him well on the new position."

Speaker Redmond: "Are we on 668, Jack? Jack, 668, did you read it? Representative Terzich on 668."

Terzich: "Thanks....Senate Bill 668 authorizes the County Boards to increase the maximum salary for the members of the Election Commissioners in municipalities of a population of more than two million and I...at the present time they must receive at least twenty-one thousand per annum and serve on a full-time basis holding no other office. I believe there's approximately five, and this will simply give the County Board the authority to...for three thousand dollar adjustment in their maximum."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure that this legislation is necessary. In fact, I'm not even sure that one would call this legislation. It's just a little attempt to help out the friends. Actually, we've already passed a Bill that allows the members of the commission affected to have outside employment. The members of this commission have been taken care of very generously in the last few weeks by this General Assembly, and now we have another Bill that would increase their salaries. I think that this Bill does not deserve our attention. I don't think it's...legislation. I just think it's giving a little help to our friends, and they're not friends of mine, and I don't think the taxpayers can afford it."



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? Representative Terzich to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it was very unreasonable for the previous speaker to put in the bag the job that all of the Elections Commissioners are doing. This particular Bill simply increases the maximum allowable that the Cook County Board may allow these people for a raise. Now, they're doing a very, very fine job. There hasn't been a salary adjustment in over two years, if not longer, for these people. It's a full-time position for the Election Commissioners and holding no other office. And I think it's very, very unreasonable for this General Assembly to deny these people a chance for a salary adjustment. Now if the salary adjustment is to be made, it has to be approved by the County Board. This Bill simply authorizes and increases the maximum. It does not give them a salary increase. It's only a three thousand dollar adjustment from its present maximum, and I think that's a very, very reasonable amount. I think the maximum amount involved here is fifteen thousand dollars, and if the General Assembly wants to go piddle around for that amount of money and deny that right to a few people it's a shame, shame and double shame on them."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Stearney, for what purpose do you arise?"

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like...."

Speaker Redmond: "Short Debate. Only one opponent permitted."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I stand in favor of this particular measure, I think...."

Speaker Redmond: "Short Debate doesn't have any provision for that.

Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryan, don't look so cross."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is another case of your anxiety. Would you be kind enough to let the Gentleman explain his vote, I believe that's in the rules on Short Debate and that's what he's trying to do."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, since you've explained it so well for Representative Stearney. Representative Stearney, if you are explaining your vote....."

Ryan: "You've got the wrong position as far...."

Speaker Redmond: "As Representative Ryan has so clearly indicated, explain



4.

your vote."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. And it must be borne in mind that none of this...these funds will come out of the State General Revenue Fund. It merely allows the...the particular municipality to...to pay the salary increase. And I think it must also be borne in mind that we have very qualified individuals sitting as members of the Chicago Election Commissioners and most especially the Chairman of that Election Board who is a retired naval official, an admiral. He's been in the Secret Service. And I think with that type of...with those credentials, being very highly qualified, I think the salary of thirty-eight thousand dollars is very appropriate. And I think the General Assembly should at least ratify this and allow the...allow the municipality to pay that salary increase if they wish but it's appropriate that we give them that opportunity and that alternative. Thank you."

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

On this question there's 68 'aye'....Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I need two votes to put it on Postponed Consideration, so I ask for a poll of absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe and Representative Getty; Postponed Consideration."



Speaker Redmond: "751."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 751. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 751 would establish a minimum of \$150 per month retirement allowance for those retired state employees who have attained the age of 65 and have given 20 years or more creditable service. There are about 340 of these individuals who are similarly situated. And the effort is to bring them up to \$150 retirement allowance per month. This would diminish because maybe these people are very old people and their money would come from the retirement trust fund. And I ask for your support of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of this particular Bill has a meritorious purpose no doubt. No one can deny that it's well that a person on retirement have a pension of \$150 a month. But we are completely doing...taking away pension rights from other people by taking money like this out of the Pension System. The cost of this is over \$128,000 a year. Pensions are not designed to be a welfare vehicle. They are designed to compensate people based on their salary while they have been working. And I would hope that you would not pass this particular Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Pierce to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a decent thing that we can do for those state employees who gave at least 20 years of service back when salaries were low and back when they contributed what to them were good dollars at that time, that are



probably worth 2 or 3 of our dollars today. It's only... They didn't get Social Security; they weren't eligible for it back then. And certainly this type of minimum salary for those people who devoted at least 20 years, and many of them 30 years and more, to state service is deserved. I understand the Pension Laws Commission approves this type of pension. These are older people. These are people whose only retirement, only retirement for the years of service in the State of Illinois Pension, and they took advantage of the only pension available to them. And that pension is woefully inadequate even with this minimum of \$150 per month. How can we deny these people \$150 per month. They must make a 1% contribution. The Pension Laws Commission has approved this. It requires 20 years of service. They're quietly living at starvation in small little apartments and rooms around the state while we forget about them. And they worked for the state and put in 20 years, and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106... 108 'aye' and 27 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Corneal Davis. For what purpose do you rise?"

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a point of personal privilege. I want to report to the House and to the Speaker on the results of the 'Soul Food Soiree'. Total to be expended for the House and Senate Welfare Fund is three thousand and five hundred dollars. 20 black Legislators divided three thousand and five hundred dollars. Comes to hundred and seventy-five dollars per Legislator. 14 black Representatives in the House is making the presentation to the Speaker there; 14 times 175, two thousand four hundred and fifty dollars. Emil Jones has it there. He'll give you... And six black Senators. 6 times 175 dollars is one thousand and fifty



dollars which we'll present to the Senate for the Welfare Fund. We want to thank all of those who supported it. And we definitely came out, came out ahead of the game. We'll see you next time."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you very much, Representative Davis."

Davis, C.: "I've been here long enough to know how them welfare works... I've been here, and I've seen Members pass, in fact, I've participated in their funeral and all that sort of thing. And I've seen this House come to the rescue of many widows. And the flowers and their respect and everything that they pay. It's worth that. It's worth that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones, J.D.: "Be recorded 'aye' on 751."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Byers. Objection has been raised. I anticipate that maybe next year that the Croatians will have a dinner. In view of the fact that they have the Mayor now why probably... 797. Representative Martin."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 797."

Speaker Redmond: "Peggy Smith Martin."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Peggy Smith Martin."

Martin, Peggy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to bring back once more Senate Bill 797 to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. The Amendment was just filed a moment ago, I understand, to this Bill. And I would like it please brought back."

Speaker Redmond: "You want to bring it back to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Was this Bill taken back to Second Reading this morning?"

Martin, Peggy: "Yes, it was."

Madigan: "I haven't seen the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."



Martin, Peggy: "It has not been distributed."

Madigan: "Well, don't you think it ought to be distributed, Mr. Speaker."

Martin, Peggy: "Its been filed, but not distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll have to take it out of the record until the Amendment is distributed. 948. It's back to Second Reading. 948."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 948. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create sanitary districts and to remove obstructions in the Des Plaines and Illinois rivers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle."

Doyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an act... it removes the requirement that the records of certain of the district business transactions be sent to the Governor and the General Assembly. What they want to do is eliminate that and just send the records of all the contracts, paid bills, etc., right to the Auditor General's Office because it seems that at the end of every fiscal year they walk in with big boxes and dump one in the Governor's Office and the House Office and the Senate Office. And they want to eliminate this and send it directly to the Auditor General's Office where the respective branch of the General Assembly and the Governor will have the right to inspect it any time. And I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Telcser, are you rising in opposition?"

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm really not sure. I want to oppose it. And I hate to have the Gentleman start a Roll Call because then he's obligated to Postpone Consideration. I'm not quite sure why the Governor has to be eliminated or the Legislature from receiving



these reports. I'm not trying to hurt the Bill. I guess you can't ask a question or something on a limited debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle."

Doyle: "He's not being eliminated. The records will go directly to the Auditor General's Office."

Telcser: "Yeah, but now don't they go to the Governor and the Legislature also? Don't they what? Don't they now go to the Legislature and the Governor?"

Doyle: "They do and that's what they want to eliminate."

Telcser: "That's my question. Why should the Governor and the Legislature be eliminated?"

Doyle: "You'll have access at the Auditor General's Office. This was Senator Rock's Bill. And it came out 50 to zero out of the Senate. And it passed out of Committee, House Committee 13 to 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if I might respond to Mr. Telcser's inquiry, it is true that the current requirement is that these reports be filed with both the Governor and the General Assembly. But experience has shown that neither the Governor nor the General Assembly examines the reports. But in reality it's the Auditor General that performs the examination. So that what you are saying with this Bill is not that they will no longer file the reports, but only that they will file the reports with the agency which actually does the examination, and quite obviously is the appropriate agency to do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you rise?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker. I just want to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McMaster: "If it is already done in practice that the reports come to the Governor and the General Assembly and are then turned over to the Auditor General, I see no



reason for changing that practice. I see no...nothing to be gained by avoiding the steps that have been gone through before. I think it's just logical to leave things the way they are."

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

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if this was a Bill coming out of federal agencies, I think that you would find... That's got enough votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye' and 28 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 949."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 949. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Abortion Law and the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes, Jane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill prohibits the advertising of abortion or any connected surgical procedure. The Act, however, does not apply to licensed doctors or hospitals. Presently, it is considered unethical but not illegal for doctors to advertise such operations. This Bill is supported by the Right to Life Groups, and the Illinois Medical Society has no objections. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Senate Bill 949. This is certainly... is a very good Bill. The recent decision by the U.S. Supreme Court certainly gives credence to our claim that this Bill will also hold up as constitutional. Besides this, I consider it a personal affront when I'm looking at the newspapers and I review



these numerous amounts of abortion advertisements. Now we all know that these abortion clinics are very lucrative. And I think that either we should stop these advertisements or we ought to require these abortionists to advertise in the death notice section. Now there were over a million, four hundred thousand abortions in the United States last year alone..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'ayes', 43 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 998."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 998. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 998 is a clean-up Bill from the State Board of Election. What it does, it allows people that who were convicted of a crime but not confined to a penal institution, it allows them to cast a ballot. In other words, it allows them to vote. It's in line with our concept that you're still innocent until proven guilty, and it's mandated by the 1970 Constitution anyway. So I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Clerk. Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, this is another one of those problems with the Short Debate Calendar. I don't know what my position is on the Bill. I would have liked to have asked the Sponsor whether or not this Bill, where it says a person not confined includes those persons who have been convicted but have been given probation. For all practical purposes, they are not confined. And unless I can get an answer to that, I'm going to vote 'present'."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Pierce, do you seek recognition? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Well, I don't know if there's much of a hangup, but I would imagine even if they extended it a little bit it would still clear the air as to whether or not a person has the right to vote. And I really can't understand why there are so many 'present' lights up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to know. I have the County Jail in my district. Are these gentlemen eligible to vote from the county jail? Can they be registered from there?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider. For what purpose do you rise?"

Schneider: "I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Caldwell 'aye'. Waddell."

Waddell: "Point of clarification. It seems that the analysis that we have says one thing and the digest says another. In the digest it says, 'shall not be entitled to vote'. Does this mean then the period that he'd been adjudged guilty but waiting for sentencing he could still go ahead and vote? I'm at a loss to cast an intelligent vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk. Clerk will take the record. What's this record here? 89 'ayes' and 23 'no'. Representative Conti."

Conti: "This is a very important Bill to many people. And I think Mr. Waddell asked a very important question. And I think we could bend the rules a little bit on Short Debate when you're affecting peoples lives the rest of their life. Now on the analysis, there is two conflicting statements here. The analysis I have is upon completion of sentencing. The digest that he shows is



that someone is waiting for it. Now we're affecting a person's life for the rest of his life. And I think this Bill should be taken out of Short Debate and into Long Debate. And if his analysis is right, I would be against the Bill. If my analysis is right, I would like to vote for this Bill. And I don't want to be playing games with people's lives because we decided on Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, James: "Mr. Speaker, the switches were locked. I'd like to change my 'present' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'present' to 'aye' Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Well, I suppose it wouldn't be in order but the Constitution provides that a person can regain his voting rights upon completion of his sentence without restoration rights by the Governor. It does not say that you can have your voting rights while you're still under sentence."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye', 23 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1033."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1033. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act providing for the creation and management of forest preserve districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to have leave of the House to have my name taken off as a Chief Cosponsor of this. For some reason or other it was put on erroneously. And also ask leave to have Representative Giorgi handle the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Chairman have leave to be removed as a Cosponsor? Chief Cosponsor. There is no objection, leave is granted. Representative Giorgi. Representative Madison. For what purpose do you rise?"



Madison: "Mr. Speaker, are we on 1023 or 1033?"

Speaker Redmond: "Are we what?"

Madison: "On..he has changed it now. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "It's 1033. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1033 is an effort to clearly define those circumstances under which a forest preserve district may obtain land outside the district but contiguous. Under this Bill the district shall have ...not have the power of eminent domain, but shall have the power to acquire property by gift. And shall have the same control and power over this land as the land...if it was in the district. The approval of the County Board of the county in which the new land is located is necessary before it can be annexed. Senate Bill 33 is...also states that the new land acquired cannot be purchased by the district. And that any land that is annexed by any method must be contiguous to the land in the district. It passed the Senate without any opposition by a vote of 53 to none. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any opposition. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker. If Mr. Adams is on the floor, I think he had some opposition to this. I would like to have him talk to it. Harold, are you there?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Tom, for raising this objection for us. Our objection to the Bill, I guess, is rather a minor one. It involves a situation where Winnebago County apparently at least feels that they will acquire by gift some land in Ogle County, the neighboring county. And I think it's rather strange that we're going to allow one county to expand across its county line into another county to establish a forest preserve. It seems to me that if the people who own this land in Ogle County or any other county in the state for that matter want to donate something for a



county park or a county forest preserve that they logically should be giving this land to the county in which the land is located. I think it's a rather bad precedent to start a practice whereby we're going to allow one county to be controlling park land within another county's border. So from that standpoint, the problems of policing this land and so forth, I think it's best that we do not allow this practice to happen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I should think you would be happy to have neighboring county pay for all the upkeep for the forest preserve. And you people can use a forest preserve. Because a forest preserve is open to everybody no matter what county they live in to use. And certainly if Winnebago County wants to pay for the upkeep and the maintenance and the forest ranger and so on, then the people of Ogle are free to use the forest preserve without any charge on their taxes, their forest preserve taxes. They should be happy to have somebody else pay for the forest preserve in their particular county. I think it's a good Bill and I vote 'aye.'"

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. In the law the approval of the County Board of the county in which the new land is located is necessary before it can be annexed. No one is going to sneak into another county and grab any land. This is a case where a person wants to donate the land. And Winnebago County Forest Preserve is an outstanding forest preserve district in Northern Illinois and knows how to handle that land. And more people will enjoy that land. It's a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye', 31 'no'."



The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1174. Von Boeckman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1174."



Speaker Redmond: "Von Boeckman on the floor? Out of the record. 1188.

Representative Luft on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1188. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Luft: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Senate Bill 1188 does is simply provides statutory basis to what is now a Department regulation. That regulation permits contractors with the Department of Transportation to pass on general increases in freight rates for railroads, barge lines and motor carriers. I would ask for a favorable Roll."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 11 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1220."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1220. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to regulate the granting of assistance to indigent war veterans and their families. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima. Former Representative Jack Bowers is walking down the middle aisle."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1220 amends an Act regulating assistance to indigent war veterans and their families. Includes Viet Nam era veterans among those eligible for election as Superintendent of Veteran's Assistance of any county or for selection as an employee in the Superintendent's office. That's all it does and I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

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 wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1259."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1259. A Bill for an Act relating to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioners of banks and trust companies. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Out of the record."

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

1264. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1264. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Broker's and Salemen's License Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Hoffman's replacement in there?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1264 amends the Real Estate Licensing Examination Act. It passed the Senate 52 to nothing. It's a Bill that's been worked out through the Department as well as through the and with the Illinois Association of Realtors. This provides that tests be given each applicant must be administered by the Department for or by an independent testing agency. Some of you are aware of the problems that we've had in the past with this, and this particular Bill is opposed by no one to the best of my knowledge. And I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, I'm not sure if I'm in opposition, but this Senate Amendment deletes the requirement that the... once you pass your salesman test that you don't have to take anymore courses to get your broker's license. And currently it requires 60 hours additional training. And I think quite frankly that that's a good provision that they take this additional course and additional training. So I think I would be in opposition to this Bill to do away with lowering the requirements so that a person could become a broker."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Gentlemen please be in order. Take Cal's saccharin away from him. Have all voted who wish? Clerk



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 20 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1271."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1271. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Cemetery Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Yeah. Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1271 is the Cemetery Care Act. The Comptroller has charge of these funds that protect these care funds. And now that some of these funds that exceed two million dollars, the law states that they can only bond them up to a hundred thousand. We want to remove the hundred thousand and leave the ten percent in. There is... I understand there is no opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1298. Representative Luft."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1298. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1298 is, I think, a never-ending attempt to present to the Legislature more information on the budget. We amend the Civil Administrative Code and require that the budget be presented with integrated line items and program data and requires the budget to include a capital development section with year by year data on capital cash requirements and debt. Summarizing it, the budget must be submitted with line items and program data. The budget should contain performance data, presenting an estimate for the current



fiscal year, projects for the budget year and information for the three prior fiscal years comparing Department objectives with actual accomplishments. I think this Bill will go a long way in providing us with the needed information we must have to make legitimate and effective decisions. The Bill is supported by the Economic and Fiscal Commission. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? 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 149 'aye' and 1 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1299. Representative Steczo."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1299. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fiscal Note Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1299 was proposed by the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission in that it amends the Fiscal Note Act to require Fiscal Notes prepared by the Capital Development Board for all legislation authorizing capital expenditures to specify by year and principal or interest payments required to finance those capital projects. I understand that there are no problems with this Bill. It's had wide bipartisan support. And I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye' and 4 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1312 was taken out at the request of the Sponsor. 1357."



Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1357. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to coroners. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1357 does three things. It defines the autopsy section in that it requires of a death as otherwise unexplained. He has the right to order present languages under circumstances which are suspicious, obscure or mysterious. Number 2, it changes the rights of the jurors. It used to be that they had to look at the body, and now they may look at the body before an autopsy. And the third portion says the coroner shall control the internal operation of his office and procure necessary equipment, materials and services to perform the duties of his office. And I move for the favorable consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1361."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1361. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act which became law in 1974. And from the time that it became law, there have been no Amendments made to the Act. Since that time it first went into effect, the Board has met in session for 37 business meetings. And Senate Bill 1361 incorporates changes in the Act which the staff of the Board as well as the Board itself feel will make it function more



effectively. In addition the changes, many of them are routine changes, others are a little bit more substantive. I'd be happy to answer any questions that might...you might have regarding these changes."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't really know if I want to explain it. I'd like to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's all you've got a chance to do. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 159 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 216. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had some action on this Bill both earlier this week and on Second Reading. It's pretty clear what it does. Right now there's a mandatory provision in the law for a rehearing on parole every twelve months. And what this Bill will do as amended in the House will provide that the Board, if on their own motion, can extend that twelve months to a period of up to three years; or on their own motion, to have a hearing less frequently than the mandated twelve months. And I would urge the support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 216. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise?"

Totten: "Well, just a point of order. This may be Short Debate, but it's not short gavel. We've hardly got



a chance to look at the Bills before you're rolling up the Roll Call on them. And I wish you'd just give us a little more time."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 449."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 449. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to currency exchanges. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill...or Senate Bill 449 is part of the currency exchange package. We passed an identical Bill out of the House some time ago. This was on the Consent Calendar until we found out there was a typographical error. What it does, it increases the minimum amount of cash required to be kept on hand by a currency exchange to four thousand dollars up until January 1, I believe, 78, and then five thousand dollars thereafter. What had happened was that there was a dollar sign, comma, five '000'. So we had an Amendment to make it dollar sign, five, comma '000'. I urge the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "Was Amendment #1 adopted?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, it was."

Houlihan, Dan: "It doesn't show on the Calendar, that's why I was wondering."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 1 shows, I believe, on page 9."

Leinenweber: "We're on page 7, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, pardon me. No wonder it shows on 9. Representative Kempiners. The Amendment is down here. And there does seem to be a question as to whether it was adopted."

Clerk O'Brien: "No, there are no Amendments adopted."



Speaker Redmond: "It wasn't adopted, evidently, Representative Kempiners. Leinenweber. I'm in terrible shape here. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I ask leave to take the Bill back to Second Reading. And I thought we did adopt it."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill...or Senate Bill 449 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. It's on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 449 on page 1, line 25, by deleting five thousand and inserting in lieu thereof five thousand dollars."

Leinenweber: "I explained the Amendment. It was a typographical error with a misplaced comma. So I would urge the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentlemen's motion for adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Amendment is adopted. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Could I have leave to have this put back on Short Debate or on Consent Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman asks leave..."

Leinenweber: "It was on the Consent Calendar. It was removed solely for the purpose of that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave to put it back on the Order of Consent Calendar or Short Debate? Which? Short Debate, I think, is faster. I kind of remember that Amendment. I don't know what happened to it."

Leinenweber: "I thought I remembered it too. Could I have leave to suspend the appropriate rules to consider the Bill on Third Reading today?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Read the Bill. It's on Third Reading. 449."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 449. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to currency exchanges. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 157 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1148."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1148. A Bill for an Act relating to conservation rights and real property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. Katz. 1148. Out of the record. On the Supplemental Calendar Number 1. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate, there's Senate Bill 21. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes. An Amendment is being prepared to Senate Bill 1148. While we're at it, I would just as soon that you would return it and leave it on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 1148 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. It will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. 21."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 21. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Director of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to convey land in Alton. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 21 was on the Consent Calendar until about an hour ago. Three years ago the Department of Mental Health transferred approximately 600 acres of land to the City of Alton for the sole purpose of developing a city park. Since then they have discovered that an additional 59 acres that have been of no use to the Department. and they wish to transfer the remaining 59 acres to the City of Alton with the stipulation that it will also become part of a park. And with a further stipulation that the City of Alton will provide perpetual



care and maintenance to a small cemetery there. It's located on one corner of these 59 acres. And I would request an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone stand in opposition? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am reluctant because of the sponsorship to oppose this Bill. But I opposed the one two years ago also. The land that was transferred then and the land that's about to be transferred by this Bill is very valuable ground. It belongs to the State of Illinois. And one of the most rapid growing areas in the State of Illinois. Now you and I both know that within a reasonable length of time the State of Illinois is going to need more land over there for one purpose or another. I pled with them then, and I plead with him now to lease this ground to the City of Alton. If they want to use it for a park for a dollar an acre, that doesn't bother me. But this land is ideally located on a four-lane highway just west of Alton in an area which would be desirable for any state property. I think it's a mistake to give away state property. If we went to replace this ground, it would cost us ten thousand or more an acre. In fact, this ground has a minimal value of five thousand dollars an acre. There was no appraisal with this. There was no appraisal of the other. I don't think the State of Illinois can afford to be giving away this type of property, which obviously would have a use later on."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Steele to explain his vote."

Steele, E.C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. This is more or less a routine transfer of public land which is still going to be used for public purposes. It has been declared a surplus by the Illinois Department of



Health. It is needed by the park which is being expanded. A great deal of local effort, soccer fields and baseball fields are going into it. This ground is needed for an entrance as well as for expansion of some of these facilities that the local people are putting in. It's going to serve a wide area at no expense to the state because the expense is going to be put in from the local effort. And I would urge your support of this needed Legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. For what purpose do you rise?"

Katz: "For a point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Friedrich indicated that no appraisal had been filed with the Clerk with regarding this Bill. I'm inquiring as to whether that is so. Because if so, it would be in violation of Rule 32(g) of the House Rules. I would like to know if such an appraisal was filed as required by the Rules of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that the appraisals are filed in the Committee records. You'll have to get those. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Rule 32(g) says..."

Speaker Redmond: "In Committee or Second Reading."

Reilly: "Well, it says that, 'Other than to a governmental entity, unit or entity', so the rule doesn't apply."

Speaker Redmond: "I think your point is clearly taken, Representative Katz. Representative Reilly is now appointed Assistant Parliamentarian. No pay. Clerk take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 18 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 30."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 30. A Bill for an Act to create a Law Enforcement Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 30 also was on the Consent Calendar until a little while



ago. I understand there's some Members who simply desire an independent vote so they might vote 'present' or against it. Senate Bill 30 is identical to House Bill 1685 which we passed out of this House. This Bill, Senate Bill 30, was passed by the Senate 50 for 1 'present' and 1 negative vote. It came out of the Committee 29 to nothing. It simply provides for the creation of a Law Enforcement Commission. I'd be glad to answer any questions. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 5 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 170. Representative Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 170. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hart: "I'd like to have leave to take this back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Be returned to the Order of..."

Hart: "The Amendment incorporates the provisions of House Bill 1312 which passed out of this House with a substantial majority. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Hart. Amends Senate Bill 170, on page 1..."

Hart: "It incorporates the provisions of House Bill 1312 with reference to adoptions which we passed with a substantial majority earlier in the Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 207. Representative Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 207. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning mechanics' liens. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich on the floor? Out of the record. 371."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 371. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the law in relation to mechanics' liens. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill is on the Consent Calendar also. There's a lot of confusion about it. But it makes no substantial change whatsoever. As a matter of fact, what it does is tries to inform the subcontractor of his duties because it duplicates a certain portion of the statutes in so that the notice requirement is put into both Section 5 and Section 21 of the Statutes. So if the subcontractor just reads one part, he'll see that he does need to give notice. And the only thing deleted was a reference...the reference isn't needed anymore because the actual language from the one Section is put into the other. So I ask an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "What I understood, the Gentleman's explanation was that the Bill does absolutely nothing. And I hardly find that justification to add it to the already overburdened 4 volumes of the Illinois Revised Statutes. If it doesn't do anything, then maybe that's a typical Senate Bill. But I don't know why we should consider Bills that don't do anything when the Senate doesn't consider our Bills which don't do anything either."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'aye' and 18 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is



hereby declared passed. 607."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 607. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was on the Consent Calendar till Representative Mugalian knocked it off. He isn't here now, but if he's within hearing distance, perhaps he'd like to return. What this Bill does, it amends the Capital Development Board Act. Adding two new provisions, one of them allows the local School Board or Community College to have authority to select their own architect and engineer for their projects. And another provision allows the School Board and Community College to establish priorities in those instances where there are two or more projects for the district. The Bill was amended in Committee. I believe the Amendment was offered on behalf of Representative Chapman. I don't see her here either. What that does is under your term for state agencies. It includes the Illinois House Facilities Authority. I'd ask a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? This is Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. Anyone in opposition? 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 109 'aye' and 20 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Motions. Is Representative Ryan on the floor? I know it. Representative Ryan. Okay. We'll go to Senate...Where's Ryan. That's Tuerk, that's not Ryan. They just look alike. Okay. Senate Bill 347. Representative O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 347. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."



O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 347 replaces the Public Aid..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. For what purpose do you rise?"

Madigan: "Where does this Bill appear on the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "This is one that's on Short Debate."

Madigan: "Short Debate?"

Speaker Redmond: "We went over it, and Representative O'Brien didn't have his files. He had them over in the State Office Building. He had them in that suitcase that had the bomb in it over at..."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 347 replaces the Public Aid Committee composed of the President of the County Board and 4 Township Supervisors to 5 Township Supervisors and merely takes the President of the County Board off the Committee. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call. It's an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed Representative Schlickman is not on the floor. But I'd like to report that the next World Champion's won again 4 to 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Motions. Is Representative Ryan on the floor? Motion with respect to House Bill 2414. Representative Ryan is recognized."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I move to suspend Rule 31(b). Bypass Committee on House Bill 2414."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."



McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman explain the Bill please?"

Ryan: "Yes. This is the increase in the bond authorization for transportation bonds. Hundred and fifty million dollars."

McClain: "Is this the one where Chicago gets fifty million, the suburbs fifty and the other 96 counties fifty million? Is this the same one?"

Ryan: "It's the same one. Representative, you've done your homework. That's exactly right."

McClain: "Well, could you tell me what would be the skim off from the Roads Fund to pay off...?"

Ryan: "Is your question on the motion?"

McClain: "Yes, I am. What would be the amount of money paid from the Road Fund per year to pay off the bonds for this hundred and fifty million?"

Ryan: "I didn't hear your question. The amount of money to do what? I didn't hear you, Representative. There's a lot of noise over hear on this side."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain is recognized. We'll get to everybody in due course."

McClain: "Representative Ryan. In the Road Fund, there's a 7% skim off or a skim off from the Road Fund to pay off Series A bonds. I just wondered what the cost would be from the Road Fund."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten. For what purpose do you rise?"

Totten: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is a motion, and he's not speaking to the motion. Motion is to bypass Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "That's right. Speak to the motion."

McClain: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hesitate to stand in opposition to this motion to bypass Committee; but I think we'll all recognize what this Bill is. This Bill is a cross-town agreement that no one likes except the City of Chicago."



In fact, if anybody was really to get inside the head of Representative George Ryan, he doesn't like making this motion, I'm sure. This is fifty million for the City of Chicago. Fifty million for the suburbs. And fifty million for the other 96 counties. It's a 'carrot' for 96 counties to be dangled in front of everybody. I'd like to suggest to you that those people that are concerned about the Road Fund, which the Road Fund will have to be paid off...be paying off the bonds, I would suggest to you that you consider strongly this motion to bypass Committee. It would be my observation that this Bill ought to be placed in the Committee. We can waive the appropriate rules. Hear it in Committee tonight or tomorrow morning, tomorrow morning and for us to get full knowledge what this means. But I should suggest to you that 7% skim off from the Road Fund to help pay off this Road...this Series A bond authorization of a hundred and fifty million, fifty million going to the cross-town, fifty million for the suburbs and fifty million going to the other 96 counties. It's something that the Committee system ought to look at. And not for us to bypass Committee just because a political deal has been made."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Now that he's quiet, I have no further points of order. But he hasn't spoken to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker. I was just catching my breath."

Speaker Redmond: "Well."

McClain: "I was talking to the motion, saying that I think that the Committee System ought to look at the Bill. I said that twice in my presentation. And I don't understand the Gentleman's point of order."



Speaker Redmond: "I think that you made your point on the motion. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would also oppose this motion. This is a..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain. For what purpose do you rise?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker. According to the rules, I understand I have ten minutes. I don't see any timer. I don't understand how you can suggest that I've already used up my particular time."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. I'll get back to you for five more. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also join Representative McClain in opposing this motion. This is a major proposal. It is a gigantic project or the projects contained therein are of great impact. And it's specific in importance to the City of Chicago. This is the cross-town expressway. A project that has been extremely controversial for a number of years. A project that involves the displacement of people in industry in Chicago. A project, the expense of which will be borne by taxpayers all over the State of Illinois, and it is something that should be looked at carefully by the Committee. It should not be rushed through in this manner. And I'm very surprised at the Republican Leadership for attempting to rush this project and this deal through. I would hope that...that my fellow Members would join me in opposing this motion and sending this Bill to Committee where it can be heard and acted on in a deliberate fashion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I rise to correct the Gentleman from Quincy. This is not of interest to the people of the 96 downstate counties; it's of interest to the people of the 97 downstate counties. I'll tell you one thing, McHenry County



is an urban area when they start collecting the RTA tax, But it sure isn't an urban area when they start passing out the urban money for transportation in improving roads. This also doesn't just include a hundred and fifty million dollars. We're talking about 1.5 billion dollars. And this is just a little seal that's being put on the top of this little package that was put together in secret. Now let's get all the worms in this package out in Committee. Even if it means I've got to get up in time to get to a 6:30 Committee meeting tomorrow morning instead of a 7:30 Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission meeting, to be followed by a 8:00 a.m. House Appropriations Committee meeting to be proceeded by a 10:00 p.m. adjournment. Assuming the deadline 'junkie' is up there tonight at that time to be able to let us get out, so I can get 5 hours of sleep tonight. It's that important. It certainly should not be jammed out of Committee without a vote of the Committee. And that assumes, by the way, that it will even go to the Transportation Committee. Nothing else important has gone to the Transportation Committee. This will probably end up in the Executive Committee or maybe back in the Rules Committee or maybe back in the Reapportionment Committee. God knows where it would go with this Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor of this motion yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kane: "Representative Ryan, can you tell us where House Bill 2414 is now?"

Ryan: "It's in the Committee on Assignment."

Kane: "When was it introduced?"

Ryan: "I can't give you the exact date. I don't remember. But it came out of Rules Committee yesterday or the day before. Yesterday, I think it was."

Kane: "How long was it in Rules Committee?"



Ryan: "I don't know. I didn't keep track of all that. I follow my Bills pretty close, but I don't keep track of it that close. It was introduced the 3rd of June."

Kane: "So it's been here for 20 days."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker. Point of order. The Gentlemen are not speaking to the motion. They're speaking to some other... that we don't know about. And I would ask that they would confine their remarks to the motion and save the time of the House."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, from what the Digest says, this Bill was introduced on the 3rd of June. Since that time some three weeks have gone by and nothing has happened to this Bill. Evidently, the Sponsor has not been very diligent in pursuing this Bill. It hasn't come out of Rules Committee as far as he knows. In fact, he doesn't seem to know what's happened to it in the three weeks since its been introduced. And I would say that if the Sponsor isn't interested in the Bill that much to pursue it for three weeks, that at least it ought to go to Committee and let us have a hearing on it, find out what's in it. It may be a good Bill; it may be a bad Bill. But I think that for a project of this size that we ought to at least have a Committee Hearing where people who want this program have to answer questions, have to justify the program. I remember it was only a few short years ago that another Governor offered a rather large bonding program that seemed to fall apart when anybody looked at it closely. And I think that if this Governor wants us to adopt a rather large bonding program, if he's for an open administration, and if he's for open Government, if he wants to level with the people, then he ought to have at least the guts to come before a Committee and answer questions and explain and give a rationale for his program. And I would urge the



defeat of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have had numerous Bills that we have tried to discharge Committee or bypass Committee. I think that it's an affront to the Committee system in Springfield and to the State Legislature. If we're going to have Committees, let's use them for the purpose. This Bill has had plenty of time to be heard in Committee. And I think there's been enough back-room deals on this thing now, and we should have it out in the open. Have a Committee where everybody can ask questions of the Sponsor; where we can find out about who's in favor of this, or people that are opposed to this concept and come to Springfield to testify. Once again we're cutting the public out, and the public does not have a chance to testify on this important piece of legislation, spending money that they do not have any input in. I think that this Bill should be motion denied, and the Bill go to Committee and have a hearing and maybe at that time I could support it if we had a hearing. And I would recommend a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I also rise in opposition to this motion to bypass Committee. As Representative Kane pointed out, this Bill has been here with us for quite some time. And there's absolutely been no effort to take the Bill to Committee. I think it's very obvious. The purpose of it being to try to get into the short time of the Session that we're now in, to keep people from having the opportunity to ask questions and to know what's going on and to keep the Members from the various districts from finding out really what this means to their districts, and what projects are supposed to be included in their districts. If we had more time it should be stated, and it should be stated for everyone on the floor of this House and everyone on the floor of the Senate,



exactly what can be expected, what projects will be completed, what will be acted upon if these bond issues are passed in their districts and every other part of the state. Instead of having this business of going around the floor telling people from this district you're going to get 5 and 6 and 8 million dollars, and from this district you're going to get 5 and 6 and 8 million dollars. And believe me when you get all of them together, if they have to put them together, it'll add up to far, far more than the money that either is available or will be made available from this Bill. We've been through this once before when we had a Road Bond issue. And everybody throughout the state was given all these grandiose plans of the kind of projects that were going to go into their state. Finally afterwards it was added up, and we found out how many they had promised that could not possibly be provided. And you're still wanting them and still waiting for them. I think we should hold this up in Committee. And they should come up in here and give us the complete plan for the complete State of Illinois on every single project. Otherwise I don't think we should be bypassing Committees. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland. Representative Sevcik."

Sevcik: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. I'll get you back to explain your vote. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I would request an 'aye' vote on the motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion to advance House Bill 2414 without reference to Committee and placed on the Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative McClain."



McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to point out what you're doing here. A vote 'aye' means you're bypassing Committee. You're not getting the opportunity to find out exactly what the Governor's program is on this hundred and fifty million dollars...fifty million to the City of Chicago. Fifty million for the suburbs and fifty million downstate. There's no way possible that you have any idea what you're voting on. In terms of the skim off yearly, the payoff, this kind of Road Program, you're talking about ten million and a half a year to pay off this...the interest on these bonds. Ten and a half million dollars. There's no way. I guess you're going to get the 107 votes because the deal has been cut. I don't understand how the Republican Party that have a majority of the Members downstate can vote for this. You know full well that it's a 'carrot' dangling in front of you. You know full well that the Governor made a deal for political posturing. You know full well that you don't like your vote. I think you ought to stand up for your own area and vote against it. There's no way that you like it. George Ryan doesn't like it. The Republican Party doesn't like it. You ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, in 1951, we were promising my district an 'I-2 55' South Bypass, and we've been promised that every since. I've voted since I've been in this House for several different Road Bond Issues, or Bond Authority rather, and each time I was told in advance that that's what it takes to get 'I-2 55' Bypass. Each time we didn't get it. Now I want to tell you I was told that's what it takes this time. Well they can take that '2-55' and do something else with it. I'm against this."

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



Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am surprised so many Members are blindly voting this on to the floor. We're depriving ourselves of a valuable opportunity to make an assessment of what the impact of this legislation is going to be on the Road Program for many many years to come. I think it's a gigantic mistake. And if it happens to get a 107 votes, I would like a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also am rising in opposition to this move. We've had two and a half miles of four lane-highway that's been planned by the State Department of Transportation for five years in my district. It's been sitting there. They purchased the property. And every year again like Representative Flinn has said, 'well next year we'll have it'. It's going to get top priority. Well if it gets top priority, I'll talk to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulcahey. Do you seek recognition? On this question there's 117 'aye' and 38 'no'. Gentlemen. Representative Byers has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Ryan has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Meyer. For what purpose do you rise. Representative Ted Meyer."

Meyer: "Please vote me 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you want to be recorded."

Meyer: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "'Aye'. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. ...absentees. Representative Holewinski. For what purpose do you rise. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker. Just to suggest that if it's inappropriate, that if it is appropriate that we have an Oral Roll Call on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Well. Poll the absentees. I'm not too sure that at this state of the game that that does anything."



Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett, Chapman, Conti, Friedrich, Johnson, Kornowicz, Madison, Peggy Smith Martin, McAvoy, McGrew, Peters, Polk, Schlickman, Schoeberlein. That's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf. For what purpose do you rise?"

Wolf: "I'd like to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf desires to be recorded as voting 'no'. Every Member take their seat please. Members please be in your seat. Representative Deuster. Hudson. Bradley. Edgar. Dyer. Campbell. Please be seated. Representative Hudson, please be seated. Before we get started, Representative Daniels, do you desire to introduce your very distinguished guest? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce Judge Alfred Woodward, who's assigned to the Second Appellate Court in Elgin, Illinois. Judge Woodward."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that he's the famous father of a famous son. Who's his son?"

Daniels: "Judge Woodward's son has a very famous background. Coming from DuPage County, Wheaton, Illinois, being a Republican who's a man in the true spirit of DuPage County and goes to integrity in Government...his name is Robert Woodward."

Speaker Redmond: "Of 'Woodward and Bernstein'...and 'Watergate' Representative Kane."

Kane: "Parliamentary inquiry: How many votes does this motion require?"

Speaker Redmond: "107. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. All Members be in your seats. Representative Conti, be in your seat. Conti. For what purpose do you rise?"

Conti: "I'd like to be verified voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Conti recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Proceed."



Representative McBroom. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, I have to leave the floor temporarily. May I be verified also?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative McBroom be verified? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Please sit down. Be in your seats."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Anderson, Antonovych, E.M. Barnes, Jane Barnes...."

Speaker Redmond: "E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Go ahead."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Beatty, Bluthardt, Boucek, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Don Brummet, Caldwell, Campbell, Capparelli, Collins, Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Edgar, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Friedland, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Griesheimer, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Dan Houlihan, Hoxsey, Hudson, Huff, Huskey, Dave Jones, Emil Jones,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond. Representative Richmond please. Richmond."

Richmond: "May I be verified? I must leave the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman desires to be verified. Representative Richmond. Permission granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Keats, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Marovitz, Matejek, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McBroom, McCourt, McLendon, McMaster, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Mudd, Nardulli, Neff, O'Brien, Pechous, Pierce, Porter, Pouncey, Pullen, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan, Sandquist, Schuneman, Sevcik, Shumpert, Simms, Stanley, Stearney, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Sumner, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Totten, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, Wikoff, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

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



Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt in his seat."

Representative O'Daniel. For what purpose do you rise?"

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote to 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'."

Holewinski: "Representative Brady."

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

There he is."

Holewinski: "Representative Brummet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet. There he is. How

is he recorded? Brummet is there. Proceed."

Holewinski: "Representative Jack Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Jack Davis. He's in the back of the hall."

Holewinski: "Representative Doyle."

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

Holewinski: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Ralph Dunn is in his seat."

Holewinski: "Representative Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "Friedland is in his seat."

Holewinski: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan in his seat? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove it. There he is over there."

Holewinski: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Von Boeckman. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Here he comes. Here's Von Boeckman."

Holewinski: "I have no other questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the score? On this question there's 119 'ayes', 38 'nays'. And the Gentleman's motion carries. House Bill 2414 will be...Committee will be bypassed.

It will be placed on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Senate Bills, Second Reading. We have some Bills...emergency status. Senate Bill 435. I know it. 435. Representative Wikoff. Senate Bills, Second



Reading. It's the University Appropriation Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 435. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation, reappropriation to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill Amendment #1 failed in Committee. Amendments #2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions or floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions. Floor Amendment #4. McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 435, on page 2 by deleting Section 1.3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew. McGrew. What's your pleasure Representative Wikoff?"

Wikoff: "Mr. Chairman, I do not have a copy of the Amendment. And I would ask that it be moved on to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes, did you seek recognition? Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you rise?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker. Have these Amendments been distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Amendments #2 and 3, I believe, have. Is that correct?"

Satterthwaite: "Those were considered in Committee. I'm talking about the ones that have come in from the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "No. The Sponsor of the Amendment isn't here either. What's your pleasure Representative Wikoff?"

Wikoff: "Let's move it to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 436. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker. Could you tell me how we got to Senate Bill 435?"

Speaker Redmond: "We went to the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, and the subject matter was University Appropriations. And that's how we got there."

Ryan: "How did you... Why don't you start at the beginning of Senate Bills, Second Reading, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, because there is somewhat of an emergency on these matters."



Ryan: "It's an appropriation Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "It was pointed out to me that this was a category that I can call and that's what we did."

Ryan: "Is that in the rules, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, that is in the rules."

Ryan: "Which rule is that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "26(b)."

Ryan: "Boy I tell you, you're too much for me. You really manipulate that Chair of yours."

Speaker Redmond: "It's in the rules."

Ryan: "Which rule is it, Mr. Speaker?"

Representative Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind you that this morning you stopped at that Bill, and that's why you started up again on that number."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I wasn't in the Chair at the time, and I guess that's the reason."

Ryan: "What do you mean this morning. We haven't even had a Roll Call when you were calling Bills in here this morning, Mr. Speaker. You didn't have an Attendance Roll Call. Nor did you have a quorum. I don't know why you can go to 435. If you're going to go to Senate Bills, Second Reading, you ought to start back over here where you belong."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor this morning when you called all the Bills on Second Reading up to 433, and that's why you went to 435."

Ryan: "There was you and twelve others, Representative Giorgi. And I objected at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "37-1. And I may call appropriation Bills first. I was wrong on the number. But I knew there was a rule. Now if you'd feel a little happier we'll go back to 35. I think we already did that. I wasn't in the Chair at the time. Representative Mudd. 35. Not in the chair. Out of the Record. 36. Representative Winchester. Out of the record. 435. We've moved that one to Third Reading



already. 436."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 436. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations and reappropriations to the Board of Regents. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 437."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 437. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations for the contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 438."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 438. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 failed in Committee. Amendments #2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions or Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed. Floor Amendment #4.

McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 438, as amended, on page 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew on the floor? McGrew.

I don't think so. Representative Stuffle, what's your pleasure?"

Stuffle: "If Representative McGrew isn't on the floor, are we going to proceed with his Amendment or have someone handle it or what?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's up to you to decide."

Stuffle: "I'll handle his Amendment if he wishes. Or if you wish."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I don't know whether he wanted it offered or..."

Stuffle: "Move it to Third Reading, I'll bring it back."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading, 487. Representative Peters."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 487: A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Public Aid. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee. And Amendment #4 was withdrawn. Amendment 5 was adopted in Committee. Amendments 6 and 7 failed. Amendments 8, 9 and 10 were adopted in Committee. Amendment 11 failed. Amendments 12 and 13 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any motions or Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 487 by Representative Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker. Before we proceed to that, might I inquire of the Clerk whether he does have a notation of an Amendment 14, which failed in Committee?"

Clerk O'Brien: "14 did fail in Committee."

Peters: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Amendment 10 deleted from the appropriation for aid to families with dependent children the sum of thirty eight million, five hundred and one thousand dollars. The argument made was that this eliminated that amount of funds which purportedly went to individuals who were ineligible. Needless to say, the Department is very much concerned about this reduction and opposes this particular reduction. The appropriation for FY 77 on this particular line was seven hundred and twenty eight million dollars...seven hundred and twenty three million dollars. There was some 'lap' spending in it. This year the appropriation in this area is approximately ten million dollars over what the actual spending was for last year. For this Amendment to, in fact, pass, thirty eight million dollar reduction would end up putting the Department in a sense in the position, in the realistic position, as we all know, of having to come back to this General Assembly for a reappropriation of these funds."



Might I suggest to the Members also that a previous Amendment, an Amendment 8 which was added to this Bill, reduced this appropriation by some six and a half million dollars in this particular line item, the Democratic staff and the Republican staff. There was some consensus of opinion that this line item could stand a six and a half million dollar reduction. That Amendment was adopted. I have not filed a motion to table that particular Amendment. But Amendment 8 or Amendment 10, excuse me, which does take out this thirty eight million, five hundred thousand dollars from the line of aid to families with dependent children is a drastic reduction, which the Department just cannot stand. And again, I say puts us only in the position of coming back and giving a supplemental appropriation. And I would ask that Amendment #10 be tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.M.: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I concur with the Sponsor of this Bill and with the Sponsor of this motion. What any... Amendment #10 will do is turn us back to the days that Representative...from Cook, who I consider my mentor, has told me about when the General Assembly intentionally underfunded the Department of Public Aid to insure that they would have to come back for a Special Session to set the appropriate and necessary funds which they knew was necessary in the beginning. Now if we want to go back to that kind of appropriating and that kind of funding for an agency of state government that has direct services for human needs, then Amendment #10 is the way that you desire to go. Let me give you some figures relative to Amendment #10. What Amendment #10 in fact would do, taking into consideration the six and a half million dollars that the staff recommended and that we adopted, Amendment #10 would bring the Department of Public Aid in this line item of aid to the 'AFDC' aid to family with dependent



children. It would bring this line item twenty eight point five million dollars below, below if you will, the current expenditures. It will allow for absolutely nothing. That even taking into consideration that this was the one area, the one area, of the budget that did have some...and was reduced in the current fiscal year, taking all of that into consideration and then to amend this line even further to amend it some twenty eight million dollars below what it is necessary, necessary in the current fiscal year to run this program. And to say that this is being moved in a manner to make them more efficient is in fact digging a hole and putting your head in the sand and saying that the wind will not hit your body because your head is buried deep in the dirt. Now believe me, Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what you will do, in fact, if you do not support Representative Peters and his motion, is insure, insure that you will come back here for a deficit for a supplemental in this line plus any other. But you definitely, definitely will be billing a deficit for this very important line in this budget. I support Representative Peters' motion to table Amendment #10. I realize that the Sponsor of this Amendment in his efforts to try to rearrange certain priorities in the budget, he's sincere in what he's attempting to do, but in this instance I must follow what I know is the fiscally most responsible manner to go and ask that you table this Amendment. So that we can be insured that this Department would not be impaired, impaired if you will, to make them come back for deficit in a line that I am sure that none of you would desire to do so. So I would solicit your support for Representative Peters motion to table Amendment #10."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'm going to vote in favor of the Amendment, as I believe I did in Committee."



And I just want to point out an error in the talk of the previous speaker. He eludes to a fact-quote-a fact-unquote- that if you vote for this Amendment and it is successful, that will be the only motivation and the only real reason why you will be back here in a Session this fall. And it will cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois an extra amount of money, which truthfully is not true. I think everybody in this House that knows anything about our procedures at all, knows that we will probably, will be back here in October anyway. And that if there is a Special Session called by the Governor to do this very thing that he alludes to, it can happen concurrently with that Session. So, sometimes, even though people are against something, they misrepresent the true facts. And I just want to straighten that out. It is not a fact that if you vote for this Amendment and it is successful whether Representative Peters or Representative Barnes says it, it is still not true. The fact of the matter is, that we can be back here in October and probably will be in a Veto Session. And this can be taken care of if necessary at that time. So I don't think there's any motivation for scare tactics of that sort. And I've heard this at least ten times and maybe even more during the Session of the Committee. I've heard it every time somebody doesn't want to see anything passed one way or the other here. And I think it should be cleared up. Thank you very much."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly.

For the past four years each and every year the Walker Administration grossly underestimated the cost to Public Aid. In each and every one of those years a huge supplemental appropriation was thereafter filed. I would suggest that when we finally have a budget that accurately estimates the revenues and the expenditures in the State of Illinois that it would do well for us to support that budget. Now the newspapers in Rockford have already printed the press release, or; that is, printed the article resulting from the Sponsor of the Committee Amendment.....his action. And now that that article has been printed we can get back to the business of the House and pass a budget which really will accurately reflect what the cost of Public Aid will be. Now honesty in the Public Aid budget is probably hard to take but here it is. And if you support Representative Peters' motion, then we won't have such a supplemental next year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker said we had a supplemental appropriation, but that's not true in all of what he said because we did have a lapse of the appropriation for the aid to dependent children. We had a lapse of thirty nine million dollars in that line. And I think Representative Skinner knows that. And what we had to do was appropriate more money for the hospitals and dentists and doctors and chiropractors in that line item for the providers. We did have a lapse of thirty nine million dollars in the last Public Aid budget in that one line item, and that's what we're attempting to address here. This was adopted in Committee the other night by an overwhelming vote, and I think it should stay in the budget as it was presented to us in Committee and as the Amendment was adopted by a majority



of the Members in the Committee. So I'd recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters to close. Representative Mulcahey. Pardon me."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this was my Amendment. It was put on the Public Aid budget a couple nights ago. And I would just like to explain something that has not been brought out. The Public Aid Department estimates that there are 8.3 percent of Public Aid recipients on the Public Aid rolls that are ineligible. The Federal Government gives us a 3 percent leeway. This reduces it to 5.3 percent figure. This is where the total of thirty eight billion dollars comes from. I did not even include in this particular Amendment the overpayments that the Public Aid admits to. This would probably be another thirty million dollars. But this Amendment didn't even include this. Indeed, as somebody stated earlier, I feel that we should take this money out of the Public Aid budget now. If they want to come back in January for a supplemental appropriation, they can do so. Because for all indications, the money is supposed to be there. This is not going to crucify the Public Aid Department; it's a two billion dollar budget. Now those that say that this is not the way to do it, well, I submit to you they've been saying that for the last fifteen years. But nobody has come up with an answer as to how to resolve the problem. So if you're not going to come up with an answer as to how to resolve the problem, I think this is the only reasonable approach to take. I urge you to vote 'no' on the motion to table. And incidently, the Rockford Morning Star did not print that article, and I don't 'cater' to press releases for the sake of press releases."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

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



I reluctantly rise to speak in opposition to my spokesman on the Appropriations II Committee. However, I supported the Amendment. I listened to the debate. I listened to the Director of the Department of Public Aid admittedly embark himself upon a course of removing ineligibles and overpayments from the rolls in an aggressive course and for that he was complimented. But because of that, because of their overestimate last year of the 'ADC' case-load, because of a rising economy and because one of the previous speakers is no more knowledgeable about the budgetary matters than I think the Department of Public Aid or anyone else. I am going to support the remaining... of the Amendment and oppose the motion to table because I think we are committed to that course, and we should tell the people of Illinois that the Department of Public Aid is committed to that course of reducing ineligibles, of lowering the budget by thirty-eight million dollars that did lapse last year for the Gentleman from McHenry. So I believe that our estimates and our figures and our thinking is as good as anybody else's on this. And I'm willing to face the idea of a supplemental next year if we're wrong. So I would urge a 'no' vote on the tabling Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. In my haste to correct something that Representative Barnes said, I inadvertently quoted myself as saying that I would vote for this when I really meant to say that I was going to oppose the tabling motion. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I surprisingly rise to support the Minority Spokesman's motion to restore this money to the Public Aid budget, something I thought I'd never do. I think it was clear from the testimony in



Committee the other night from the Director. And the Sponsor of the Amendment admitted that we would be back in January or sometime facing a deficiency. And I think it's just as irresponsible for this Legislature to pass an appropriation Bill that's too low, when we know we're going to have to come back for a deficiency as it is to pass an appropriation Bill as we did with the case of 'DOT' far over what's allowed in the Governor's budget, knowing it will be vetoed. So for that reason, I urge you to support this motion to table Amendment #10."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Some years ago I worked for the Department of Public Aid for nine years and the last three years I was in the Department of Excess Assistance. And our job was to ferret out the fraud by reading the case records. Now the Gentleman's moves are very laudatory. But for the Public Aid Department to do what they want them to do, you'd have to have soothsayers... and clairvoyants as caseworkers. When in fact you have college kids just out of college because the salary scale is so low. The big problem is we want to ease the solution to the Public Aid problem. You cannot walk up and say, 'Yes, Miss Jones is going to cheat this year'. You can't say that Mr. Smith is going to not report his income that he gets from 'OASI' when he gets it. If this were possible, then the posture taken by the Sponsor of this measure would be fine. The only way you're going to cut down on any fraud is to make the caseworkers secure in their jobs and knowing that they don't have to worry about all these special reviews. It would give them an opportunity to properly manage the caseload. And when they properly manage the caseload, the amount that is in fraud will be reduced. The only adequate answer is not this cutting off the funds and make them work with a short stick, but to give them



an adequate stick. And knowing Representative Peters, he's not giving them one penny more than what they can live on. So if Representative Peters is asking for more money, believe me everybody should vote 'green' on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

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

Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Representative Peters to close."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you much for your attention in this regard. Let me just remind the Members of the House that Amendment #8, which was offered by Representative John Dunn, did reduce this particular line item by approximately six and a half million dollars. Both staffs were in agreement that that budget could stand that kind of reduction. I've also concluded, as you heard the remarks of the Chairman of the Committee Representative Barnes, that this particular line item cannot stand a thirty eight million dollar reduction. To talk about coming back only means to protract this kind of a problem, to bring up the entire question again. To continue to polarize the issue, and for those who talked about what was done in the past, let me say that last year this line item carried seven hundred and sixty-one million dollars. The Walker Administration did make, did make some efforts and substantial efforts to cut this line back. The final amount spent on this line was seven hundred and twenty-one million dollars. We appropriate in this budget seven hundred and thirty-three which is about twelve million dollars more. The Committee said it's a little tight, let's take out another six and a half which we did. That brings it down to seven hundred and twenty-eight. Seven million dollars more than last year. If you want to take out another thirty-eight million dollars,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

you're bringing this budget down to six hundred and ninety million which is thirty-one, thirty-two million dollars less than we spent all of last year. There's absolutely no way the Department can do the job. There's absolutely no way that we can keep faith and trust with ourselves in saying we're passing out a budget that meets the need by this kind of reduction. And I would ask and join with Representative Barnes and asking your support of my motion to table Amendment #9."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the motion to table vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I supported this Amendment in Committee. It seems to me that as long as we give the Department of Public Aid as much money as they say they can possibly spend in this line item, they have absolutely no incentive to try to make sure that they keep ineligible people off this...the rolls. No one is going to lose any money by having this line item cut. If the legitimate recipients are there, they will get paid at the same rate whether this item is cut from the budget or not. If we find that the Department does its job well, eliminates the ineligible clients, I feel sure that there will still be enough money in this line item to cover it, even in the event that they are not able to live up to the standards we'd like to have them live by. If they need more money they can certainly come back next spring when we're in Session. We will be here making a budget next year. We were here when the Department came in and needed a deficiency appropriation this year. We'll be here next year. There's absolutely no additional expenditure. The best thing we could do is to provide some incentive for the Department to weed out the clients who should not be on the rolls. Anybody who is unhappy with ineligibles being paid claims through this Department should certainly support the motion here



to defeat tabling the Amendment that was adopted in Committee. We should be voting 'red' on this. It's a good government kind of issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have never been convinced that starving people is a good government issue. Now there was thirty-eight million dollars that was originally in this budget that was allowed to lapse. Representative Peters is absolutely correct. That thirty-eight million dollars actually should have gone for a cost of living increase and for emergency assistance. Now we're not going to get a cost of living increase, and we may or we may not get emergency assistance, but at least the Department is showing its willingness to engage in a pilot project to discover this. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want to point something out to you, that in ten days one Member of this House gets in his per diem allowance a total of three hundred and sixty dollars which is more than a family of four gets in a whole month, or three hundred and sixteen dollars. And I think that this Amendment ought to be supported. I think that we really ought to be going further in getting a cost-of-living increase. But to hear someone talk about cutting welfare recipients' food and subsistence and instead giving it to providers where 90 percent of the fraud occurs and saying that this is a good government proposal is really an astounding thing to hear. And I hope we'll see more 'green' lights up there."

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

Mulcahey: "I have an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. How many votes does this take to table, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Simple majority."

Mulcahey: "Oh, golly. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 112 'aye' and 24 'no'. And the Gentleman's motion prevails. Representative



Van Duyne. Is he in his seat?"

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, do you mean 2 to 1? Simple majority is 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "No. No. No. No. Majority of those voting."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, Byers, amends Senate Bill 487, as amended, in Section 6. and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment reduces the amount of monies that's used in the Public Aid Budget for abortion. With the Supreme Court ruling of Monday, it shall be the public policy of each state to determine if they want to do that. What happened in the last year that they were.....a total of 5,256 cases of first trimester abortions, 336 cases in the second trimester, there was 15,500 therapeutic abortions. It leaves the money in for therapeutic....where the mother's health is in danger and it reduces the line items in the physicians line by about 800,000...the hospital outpatient by a little over a million dollars. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #15 to House Bill 487."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, an Amendment identical to Amendment 15 was offered in the Committee by Representative Byers and it did fail on a very close vote of 10-11. That Amendment would exclude, from this budget, the sum of \$1,779,740 which is the estimate of the cost paid by the Department of Public Aid for the medical cost in relation to nontherapeutic abortions. I have to indicate to the Members of the House here the position of the Department and that position is that they feel bound and obligated to provide this kind of medical attention. This issue is one which I think probably well must be really....decided by all of you in terms of your individual consciences. I have to indicate to you, however, in my roll as the Spokesman, and my roll as the Sponsor of this Bill, that the Department is opposed to the reduction of this amount of money, \$1,779,000."

Speaker Redmond: "....Representative Leinenweber."



Leinenweber: "I'd like to speak in favor of Amendment #15.

This House...some....about a month and a half ago, when it considered House Bill 333, introduced by Representative Bradley and myself, very clearly stated its collective opinion that the State of Illinois ought not to fund non-therapeutic abortions. I'd like to point out that the Department's definition of a therapeutic abortion, in accordance with a memorandum that they gave the Staff, is nowhere near the definition of a therapeutic abortion contained in House Bill 333, which this House passed. So this is a very minimal sum of money that's being reduced. It's much less than would be reduced if the House Bill 333 is enacted into law, and it's on Third Reading in the Senate. So I think this is a good Amendment. It'll bring the will of the House into the appropriation for Public Aid Department and I, along with the previous two Gentlemen, urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Madison."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Byers, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's decision relative to nontherapeutic abortions, if the state or ...through the Department of Public Aid, makes a decision to continue paying for nontherapeutic abortions, is there anything in this Amendment that would preclude them from doing that?"

Byers: "No."

Madison: "All this Amendment actually does is take away dollars. Is that correct?"

Byers: "Correct."

Madison: "And even if we would adopt this Amendment, the state would still be able to continue to fund nontherapeutic abortions if they wanted to? Is that correct?"

Byers: "That's correct."

Madison: "Thank you very much."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I join with my colleagues, Representative Leinenweber and the Sponsor of this Amendment, certainly with the Supreme Court's recent ruling permitting states to remove these funds, Public Aid funds....I am very much in support of this proposal and I do think that those that are very much Pro Life in their views should also support the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania. Representative Leinenweber, please sit down."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Catania: "Representative Byers, is there anything in this Amendment or in this Bill that says that we think that fathers ought to accept responsibility....for these unborn children?"

Byers: "No."

Catania: "There's nothing that makes a statement that says that the fathers have equal responsibility with the mothers, and that we don't want to put the full burden for making these decisions and raising these children on the mothers?"

Byers: "That's correct."

Catania: "So we're completely ignoring the responsibility of fathers in this instance? Is that correct?"

Byers: "We're just reducing the appropriation."

Catania: "And we're not in any way saying that fathers have equal responsibility with mothers for children that are conceived? Is that correct?"

Byers: "We're just reducing thewe can't do that in an appropriation Bill."

Catania: "Thank you, Representative Byers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak...on this Amendment. Anybody who thinks this Amendment is going to



prohibit their Public Aid funds, the monies that they pay with their tax dollars, prohibit these funds from being used for abortion, are only fooling themselves. A lot of people who are opposed to abortion, and I am one, I do not support some of the efforts that others are taking in this area. A lot of people think that a person who has an abortion does it lightly. I don't know, I've never been involved in one, one way or another, but I suspect that they give it a lot of thought because it is a dangerous procedure at any stage of the pregnancy. But these people who do have them are forced to have them for one reason or another. What they will do is take the money that should be going to the food and clothing and shelter of their other children and they'll get the cheapest abortion they can find, which means that your money is going to be used for it one way or another. The cheapest abortion that they'll find will be the backroom abortionist who uses a coat hanger and a lead pipe. Now if you want to consign the poor people of this state into that type of a situation go ahead and vote for this Amendment. I for one do not want that hanging over my head."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a symbolic Amendment. Actually the Amendment does nothing but reduce the appropriation for the Department of Public Aid. It in no way prohibits the Department of Public Aid from authorizing abortions for Public Aid recipients. I might point out to you that for those of you that are Pro Life and you think that you ought to vote for this Amendment, it's a sham. I respect Harold Byers' view. He is trying to carry out a symbolic gesture. The Department of Public Aid should not fund nontherapeutic abortions for Public Aid recipients, but the Director said, in Committee, that this in no way would prohibit the Department from funding these kind of programs."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

So an 'aye' vote basically is a symbolic gesture, it does nothing as to prohibiting nontherapeutic abortions for Public Aid recipients. Secondly, I should point out also to the Membership that you should know that what we are doing is authorizing abortions for those that are wealthy and not for those who are poor. Although I've always been one hundred percent Pro Life, I think legislative intent aside, it does nothing more than just be a symbolic gesture and I reluctantly ask you to vote against the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Byers to close."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's all been discussed in the discussion and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion, the adoption of the Amendment. 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 78 'aye' and 54 'no'; the motion carries, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16. Mulcahey. Amends Senate Bill 487 as amended, in Section 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #16 appropriates fifty seven million dollars for rate increases for nursing homes due to the implementation of a cost related reimbursement system for FY '78. Now this particular Amendment at one time read to make it effective back to July 1st of 1976 when this particular federal mandate should have been implemented. However, the Federal Government has extended that date to January 1st. Nursing homes indeed testified to the Human Resource Committee that this particular amount of money is necessary. In the new nursing home reimbursement system that is going into effect in January 1st of 1978 by way of the Federal mandate requires a cost-related system. The Department of Public Aid has budgeted fifteen million dollars for this new mandate, this cost-related system, but it's going to cost more. If this Amendment is not adopted, the Department of Public Aid is going to be back in January for a deficiency appropriation for these nursing homes. And I ask now for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the... Representative Levin."

Levin: "Yes. What is the Department's position on this Amendment? Do they want this additional money at this point or not?"

Mulcahey: "Representative Levin, I think you're going to have to ask the Department."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a similar Amendment was considered by the Committee which would have added to this budget the sum of eighty three million dollars for nursing homes. This Amendment adds fifty seven million dollars for nursing homes. And the Department is opposed to



this Amendment, opposed for a number of reasons. Not because the nursing homes cannot use the increased appropriation and increased funding. We all know, and we've been contacted, I'm sure, by nursing homes in our area pointing out the great need that they do have. Fifty seven million dollars however, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is a sizable, sizable sum of money that we're talking about. And before you vote on this, I ask you to consider the fact that in January of this year the Department will be mandated because of federal regulations to pay at least near actual care costs. If we end up sticking this kind of money in this budget now and making it retroactive in a sense to July, when this budget comes available, what we're going to end up doing is really giving to the nursing home people the opportunity to raise their rates so that when they do come in before whatever rate review board might be set up, they're going to come in at a much higher rate than we can expect. The budget presently, presently increases the nursing home appropriation by the sum of thirty million dollars. We have provided thirty million dollars more in this budget than last year. The Department and people involved feel that that is adequate to carry them across and over this crunch period of time. Let us not add to the inflationary spiral of medical care costs by tagging on to this budget fifty seven million dollars for nursing homes. Fifty seven million dollars that we could not afford for any cost of living increase for Public Aid recipients. Fifty seven million dollars that we cannot afford really at all. I ask you to defeat Amendment #16."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.M.: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be very, very brief, here embodied in this Amendment is a request for fifty seven million general revenue dollars. Plain and simple. New requests fifty seven million. Yes, this is fifty percent



reimbursements after the fact that after it's spent, and assuming that everything will be correct, you will receive 26.5 million back sometime in the future. But this is right now, this year out of the current budget of new dollars available, fifty seven new dollars out of the General Revenue Fund. And we couldn't find any new dollars last night for Elementary and Secondary Education."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ewell: "Representative Mulcahey, who wants this Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Ewell: "Who wants the Amendment?"

Mulcahey: "The nursing homes and me."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "May I say this and comment I think he's put his finger exactly on the point. The nursing homes are coming to the General Assembly and saying, 'This is what we want out of new dollars'. The state only has so many dollars available. And I think if we're going to tighten the belt, the belt has to be tightened all the way around. Perhaps some of the neediest people in the only section in which we have had a decrease has been actually in welfare recipient money. However, we find that the nursing homes, the doctors, the hospitals and all other agencies of medical care are putting the state out of business, not the amount or the grants that are given to the crippled, the aged, the blind and the dependent children. And I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Ready for the question? Questions on Representative Mulcahey's motion to adopt Amendment #16. Representative Mulcahey to close."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Indeed it was pointed out, twenty eight million dollars of this will come back from federal reimbursement. This is going to cost the state twenty eight million dollars of



General Revenue Funds. The nursing homes in the State of Illinois have never had a cost-related increase. There are nursing homes throughout the State of Illinois that are closing up day after day. They're losing, as much as 5, 6, 7 thousand dollars a month. They cannot operate anymore. And we sit here and say that we can't do it. It's our responsibility. It has been mandated that it's our responsibility to supply these nursing homes in a cost-related basis. We haven't met it. And if we don't meet that responsibility right now, as I indicated earlier, the nursing homes are going to be back January 1st, 1978, and they're going to have the same problem. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #16. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last Amendment was for abortion, and this one is for senior citizens who are forced to be in nursing homes. You say you're paying for the nursing home, you're not, you're paying for the care of those people. You're penalizing the people who have saved their money so that they can be in a nursing home; and because we don't pay for the ones we are in charge of, we raised the price in the nursing home. That's the only way that they can keep abreast of things. I think it's a very foolish thing that we do now not to reimburse these nursing homes for the care of the people that we are responsible for."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 55 'aye' and 81 'no'. And the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. We had a very serious security problem. We just want you to know that you're in good hands. And Representative Johnson is recognized for the



purpose of explaining how well you're taken care of."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a fairly serious moment. I think probably I ought to ask for a voice vote on an additional appropriation, both for a new suitcase and some bolstering of our bomb squad. My administrative secretary and her husband came over to our fair city last night both to watch the Legislature in session and to do some work. And in the course of the day, my secretary went into our offices over in the 'L' wing and left her suitcase which contained various items of personal belongings of hers and her husbands, including her husband's jeans and some hair curlers and things like that. And when she went in, she left the suitcase outside. Then we had a bomb threat and when she came outside, there was six bullet holes inside of her suitcase. Well, somehow the bomb squad thought that was the best way to detonate a bomb. The closest they came to a bomb was an alarm clock and a pair of dirty socks. But just for the Members of the House and so forth, we'll probably be back with a supplemental appropriation for underwear and a new suitcase and maybe for a new couple of members of the bomb squad. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker. May I point out to Mr. Johnson we have a formula for this and it goes through the Court of Claims."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dave Robinson."

Robinson: "It was probably one of those underground police spies who investigated this and found that suitcase."

Speaker Redmond: "A couple more appropriation Bills here. 331. Representative Telcser, do you want that one? Representative Peters, we moved that to Third."

Peters: "Did we move that to Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "We did."

Peters: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "331. Telcser, do you want that one?"



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Reilly has an Amendment, and I don't see him in his seat. Is Representative Reilly on the floor somewhere?"

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want that one, Representative Telcser?"

Telcser: "I don't see Representative Reilly, so I guess we'll have to wait with it."

Speaker Redmond: "How about 322? Abramson. Out of the record Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. 629."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 629. A Bill for an Act to amend Acts herein named in relation to the reduction fares of public transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. David Jones. 629. Amends certain Acts in relation to reduced fares for public transportation."

Jones, J.D.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 629 amends the student and elderly reduced fare program to extend from June the 30th to July the 15th, the fourth quarter filing deadline for mass transportation carriers seeking reimbursement. That's just what it does, that because under the present deadlines it's impossible almost for those concerned to meet the proper deadline. And the Department of Transportation is in agreement with this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "Perhaps...This is Short Debate isn't it, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Right."

Houlihan, Dan: "Well then perhaps the Sponsor of the Bill could respond in explaining his Bill. It would appear that what is being done here is to change the fiscal year obligation as far as these reimbursements. By shifting from June the 30th to July 15th, the fourth quarter filing deadline. What I'm curious about is what effect this has on the current fiscal year period as far as the appropriation to 'DOT' for this purpose and how that would compare with what it would be for the next fiscal year. Perhaps



you could respond to that."

Jones, J.D.: "Yes. The information that I have is that there would be no fiscal impact on the Department or its carriers. The background need for this, the legislation establishing the student and elderly reduced fare programs require 'spotting' by June the 30th. This denies the carriers and the necessary 'leave' time provided in the statutory filing dates for other three quarters and has not proven realistic. Since the report requires actual accounts to be made, carriers have found this requirement difficult if not impossible to meet. This legislation would therefore be amended to institute a schedule with which the carriers can reasonably comply. This is the rationale of the need of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 845. Representative Jesse Madison."

Madison, Jesse: "Mr. Speaker. Is it soup yet?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is it what?"

Madison, Jesse: "Is it soup yet?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not quite. The chicken has to walk through it two or three more times."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 845. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 845 deals with railroad crossings and a notification of the local units of government and highway authorities that would be involved. There was an Amendment put on in the Senate that makes it somewhat different from the Bill that I had sponsored here in the House. But I thought that it



gave the two choices, two clear choices concerning this issue for which one the Governor may choose from. So I would just simply ask for your favorable approval of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Ed, could you tell me, would this in anyway mean that maybe the Illinois Commerce Commission could say under unusual circumstances that the state or the local municipality or the railroad would have to pick up the entire tab for the improvement at the grade crossing site?"

Kucharski: "This has nothing to do with improvements. This deals with the closing of crossings, as I understand it."

McClain: "Well, in the Digest as I read it it says, 'reconstruction, alterations, relocation and improvement'."

Kucharski: "What was your question again? Who pays for it? What was your question again?"

McClain: "My question is, can the 'ICC' mandate either a municipality, the state, or the county or township to pick up the entire tab of that improvement, or reconstruction or relocation of that grade crossing site? Would the 'ICC' have that power?"

Kucharski: "The existing law which still...be preceded we would still follow the...what we're doing right now as far as the closing of the crossings are concerned, whatever the cost or whoever picks up the cost right now, that would be maintained as to what we are doing right now."

McClain: "Well, I'm just reading the Digest, Ed, and it says, 'authorized by the 'ICC' to prescribe the division of costs'. And that would mean to me that the 'ICC' could then mandate a municipality, for instance, like the City of Chicago to pick up the entire cost of the relocation or reconstruction of a grade-crossing site, which could run several million dollars."



Kucharski: "As far as I know the Bill would..."

Speaker Redmond: "Short Debate, Gentlemen."

Kucharski: "Save money in time required for hearings will not, however, increase the revenue transfers into the fund. I don't know where else the cost would occur."

McClain: "Okay. Well then just speaking to the Bill if it could aid. I rise reluctantly in opposition to this. It might not mean a lot of money to the City of Quincy or the City of 'Marblehead' or Lincoln Park, but to a city like the City of Chicago, the 'ICC' if found in hostile hands could mandate the City of Chicago to pick up the entire tab of reconstruction of a major grade-crossing site. I think opposition to this Bill ought to be heard or at least the Bill ought to be discussed more thoroughly than we're able to now. I'm going to vote 'present' at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword. For what purpose do you rise? Okay, Representative Van Duyne. For what purpose do you rise? It's Short Debate."

Van Duyne: "Well, may I ask a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. You may explain your vote."

Van Duyne: "Okay. I'll explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Van Duyne to explain his vote."

Van Duyne: "Well, as I understand, this reading the Bill and the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, Representative McClain may be a 100% right, but in certain cases he may be a 100% wrong too in that they may also lay this on the railroads. Sometimes the railroads just use these crossings and just delay maintaining them and upgrading them. If the Commerce Commission has this authority, why it might be for the better for local governments, rather than place the whole blame as he alludes to on the local government. So I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted...Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I think let's clear up one point. Right now they



can apportion those costs at a hearing. This I think just goes ahead and lets them apportion it if everybody agrees to the apportionment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill... Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Before we leave this order of business, Mr. Speaker, would the record show that I sincerely thank Representative McClain for attempting to protect the City of Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "915. On this question 129 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 915."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 915. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller. Tom Miller."

Miller: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 915 is the housekeeping Bill to bring current state law in conformity with the cost of the value of property here in the State of Illinois today. Currently under state law, the Illinois Commerce Commission must approve the sale of land with a value of fifty thousand dollars or more or must approve a lease involving a rental of not more than five thousand dollars a year. And under the terms of the Bill, we merely increase the fifty thousand 'cap' and the five thousand dollar 'cap' to one hundred thousand and ten thousand dollars per year. The present state law has been in effect for about twelve years, and I think it would be proper that we elevate these levels of approval by the 'ICC'. And I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan in opposition."

Houlihan, James: "Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Bill. The Commerce Commission opposes it. It cuts down their jurisdiction and makes unnecessary changes. And I think we ought to defeat the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye' and 23 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1028. Representative Getty."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1028. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1028 amends the State Universities Retirement System. It provides simply that a teacher under that retirement system who has been granted a leave of absence as is presently provided under the law for three years may extend it to the fourth year provided, as the Bill is amended, that he pays the entire costs of the pension, including the employer's contribution. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1115."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1115. A Bill for an Act to amend..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter on the floor? Take this out of the record. On Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 362. Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 362. This Bill has been read a third time previously."

Martin, Peggy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, I'm standing here to appeal to you to give me another chance by voting for House Bill 362, which appropriates only one million dollars for



a grant to the Chicago Park District for a field house in Lindblom Park. If you will recall at Lindblom Park,, the measures are twenty by forty-seven; that's sitting on seventeen acres of land. We would like to have a field house that would serve some forty thousand young people and adults. You know that we talk about crime in our cities and in our towns, and we are partially responsible for that, when we as a body, a Legislative Body, do not appropriate money for field houses for young people. Please don't think that I'm being facetious when I say that, but I think that this is a part of your responsibility as a Legislator, as a Body of Government. We need this park desperately. We don't want our young people committing crime. We would rather have you have them playing in 'Lindblom Park' field house once it's built than destroying property and doing all the other things that we are paying much more money for than we would be paying for if we had Lindblom Park. I know you're tired of the issue; but, believe me, if you don't vote this Bill out, you will not have heard the last of it because we will be coming again and again and again with the Lindblom Park legislation. We need it very badly. We don't want to bore you with it. It's that our need is so great in that area. Just think, over twenty thousand young people, and yes, certainly over twenty thousand adults. I appeal to you again to help me pass this Bill out. I want to remind you that, ~~again~~, that this Bill was introduced in the 78th General Assembly, and it was passed out of this House. It went to Conference Committee. A Conference Committee that was made up of all Republicans, not one Democrat and not one time did anyone tell me that this Bill was coming up in Conference Committee because I would have appealed, appeared at that Committee myself. And a lot of you...who are sitting on the Republican side was so faithful and helpful in helping me get this Bill out or helping me get this Bill passed on that night. And



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

now I ask the same good Republicans, good Democrats, all people in this House of Representatives to please help me pass House Bill 362. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "There being no discussion. All those in favor ...No discussion? No opposition? Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The issue and the arguments are the same as they were the last time, yesterday or the day before that this Bill came up. We have a park in Champaign; I'm sure there are a number of situations in Champaign, in Rockford, in Moline, in Chicago and southern Illinois where the need is exactly the same as it is here. Everybody has needs in their districts. And if we use the philosophy of please help me pass this Bill, and I use the same philosophy in my area and all the other 176 Members of the General Assembly use the same philosophy in theirs. The fiscal responsibility, what there is of it in this state, would be completely evaporated. This is the year when we're asking the Department of Children and Family Services and school and every other branch of the budget to pull in their belts. And how we can afford this particular luxury at this time is completely beyond me. As necessary as some people might think it is, or as nice as it might be, we just flat out can't afford it this year. And I would urge, based on that, a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. You have to consider this from the humanist point of view. Those of you from downstate who have fields in abundance where you can hear the birds and listen at the crickets, we in Chicago have none. You have trees by the thousands, and this park will have only a few. You have grass that is abundant, that runs in acres, and it runs from one field to the other. And I admire these things. You have open spaces so that you may breathe and look up and see the moon and the stars, while we in the city are confined to nothing but concrete. I say to you, you have beautiful



streams that run across your land, we have nothing but overflowing gutters. You have creeks, sloughs, backwaters, all those things you possess. And we in the city only want a chance to have a few trees and a park, and a park that is needed. And we plead with you, we ask with all humility that you send a few of these bountiful things that you have to the poor children in the cities. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Daniel."

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."

Ladies and Gentlemen on the Democratic side of the aisle. The food is ready in the Speaker's Office. We'll get the switches. Peggy, don't worry. It is also ready in Minority Leader's Office. Take it out of the record. I believe that we have some Bills that, where the Sponsor wishes to come back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Mudd, Mr. Deavers. On Senate Bill 1367. Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Senate Bill...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take that back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Does the Gentleman have leave to take this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading? Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1367. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deavers. Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Would he read the Amendment please? I move for the adoption."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1. McBroom...Amends Senate Bill 1367, on page 1 by deleting all of lines 1 and 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan, do you have a copy of the Amendment?"

Deavers: "Mr. Mudd, would you give Mr. Houlihan a copy of your Amendment right quick? I move for the adoption. I think it's been explained."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan, do you have a copy of the Amendment? Mr. Deavers moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Maybe I missed it; what does the Amendment do?"

Deavers: "Turn on Mr. Mudd, will you please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment is being placed on Representative Deavers' Bill. Amendment #1, what happened is there was a Bill like this that had some technical problems in it. In the last few ...moments of Committee because of the technical problems was held in Committee. It was corrected. It's in proper form now, and is just being added to this Bill. And what it does, it appoints a nonvoting member to the Illinois Liquor Control Board who is a licensed holder, retail licensed holder. He's a nonvoter, and he's just there for more input to the hearings."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I would oppose this Amendment. It's far more than a technical adjustment to the Bill. The concept that we've already, I think, rejected and should be rejected. What it does is just take recognition that we should be putting special interests on our Boards that are supposed to be in charge of regulating. I think that that is an improper and unacceptable concept. I don't think that the regulated should be doing the regulating. And I would ask the Members to reject Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I arise briefly in support of Representative Mudd and Representative Deavers. This differs from Representative Holewinski when he says this individual is a nonvoting member. It simply puts on the Liquor Control Board someone to give some advice that is familiar with the industry. And I see nothing at all wrong with it. And I would certainly hope that the



Members on this side of the aisle would support Representative Deavers and me as well as Representative Mudd."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker, I also agree it is a good Amendment. We've got lawyers sitting on the Bar Association. You don't have any laymen on there. I'd like to be appointed to their association sometime. I think I could help them a little bit."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know why we always raise the 'red herring' when we have a Bill that relates to the Retail Liquor Industry as though the retailers are some sort of ogres. We passed the Licensing Act here by a considerable margin a little while ago. We have all kinds of licensing acts where professions are the voting members of those Boards. And now we have a situation where we have a non-voting member. A retailer can be a nonvoting member. How can you say that they are regulating. They do not have the power to regulate. I think that this is a fair Amendment, where the industry feels that it can have some input at a meeting, but not be a voting member. I think that makes common sense. Especially we as a Legislature have given all kinds of power of authority to other professions to trade to be on those Licensing and Examining Committees. It's just fair, I believe. And I support the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of inquiry. Has this Amendment been distributed? I don't seem to have it with my..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk. The Clerk indicates the Amendment has been distributed. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Lechowicz."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just a question of the germane-



ness of this Amendment to this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair rules that the Amendment is germane.
Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I'll explain my vote if you're in a place to vote,
Mr. Speaker. I'll speak to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Question is, shall Amendment #1 to Senate
Bill 1367 be adopted? All those in favor signify by say-
ing 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. In the opinion
of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Is there a request for
a Roll Call? Is that request supported by five Members?
How many requested the Roll Call? Three? O.K. Roll
Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all
those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the
record. On this question there are 97 'ayes', 24 'nos',
1 voting 'present'. And Amendment #1 is adopted. Are
there further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Davis."

Davis, Jack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the appropriate
time I'd like to move Senate Bill 622 back to Second
Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Where's that at, Mr. Davis?"

Davis, Jack: "It's on Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Regular Calendar?"

Davis, Jack: "That's correct."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan, do you have a copy of that
Amendment?"

Houlihan: "There are three Amendments, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "622."

Houlihan: "If you'll give us just a minute, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "All right."

Houlihan: "At the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, I don't care
if it's now."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. At this time we'll go to the Order
of Postponed Consideration. And there appears Senate
Bill 478. Mr. Bradley."



Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to have leave of the House to return Senate Bill 478 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave that this Bill be brought back to the Order of Second Reading. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #1 does, it addresses itself to the problem of collecting income tax on earnings that are earned in the State of Illinois by people who are not living in the State of Illinois. The...We had a Bill in the Senate brought over to the House that would do that and addressed itself to that very problem. However, the Department of Revenue at that particular time had a problem with the mechanism in collecting the taxes, and they asked that an effective date of January 1st, 1979, be placed on the Bill. And the Amendment that I have to 478 does have that proposed Amendment, does have the January 1st, 1979, so that they will have sufficient time for the Department to institute satisfactory administrative procedures relative to this proposal. They anticipate and they believe that the amount that could be collected would be quite substantial. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 478."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 478. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no', 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Back to the Order of Postponed Consideration Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, would you call House Bill 359, which is on Postponed Consideration, for the purpose of bringing



it back to Second Reading?"

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Postponed Consideration.

Senate Bill 359. The Lady requests leave that this Bill be taken back to the Order of Second Reading. Is there leave? Leave being granted. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Representative Leinenweber has an Amendment to offer."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1. Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 359 on page 3 by deleting lines 5 through 8 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schwartz, do we have a copy of this Amendment? 359. Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you. First of all, is this the only... is this the actual first Amendment? Someone had said there were two other Amendments. I don't know if the Clerk properly numbered them or not."

Speaker Madigan: "We have 1 and 2, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "All right, that's correct. Which one is #1? Is it the one that's fourteen lines long or is it the one that..."

Clerk Hall: "Fourteen lines long."

Leinenweber: "Okay. Fine. First of all, Senate Bill 359 among other things makes records of a juvenile offender available to his inspection or the inspection of his family or his attorney. It was felt by myself that this would lead to a fishing expedition. And in all cases upon an arrest, the juvenile would demand to see the entire police file, some of which he would be entitled to, but pursuant to the appropriate discovery rules, rather than by the statutes of the State of Illinois. So all Amendment #1 does is make the information available, except if the Law Enforcement Agency can show to the court a good reason that it should not be. For example, it might be an investigative record of the file which contains some information which would be privileged from discovery. It's merely a safety valve to prevent an absolute fishing expedition in every instance of juvenile court work. So I think it's a good



Amendment. It's my understanding that it has the approval of the Sponsor. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just...relative to this Amendment #1 that in the legal profession, if it's only fourteen lines long, I think that that merits everybody's support just on that one principal if it doesn't have any content at all. I would move a do pass. Do adopt it's adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Is it adopted? So I can go on mine."

Speaker Madigan: "No, we're still on this Bill, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. Any further discussion? Mr. Houlahan. Question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2. Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 359 on page 2 by deleting lines 35...32 through 35 and so on."

Leinenweber: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman requests leave to withdraw Amendment #2. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Amendment shall be withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "This Bill shall be placed back on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Mr. Richmond. Did you wish to move House Bill 408?"

Richmond: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Is that on Third Reading though? Did you want to move that on Third Reading? Or amend it?"

Richmond: "No. I wanted to move it on Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Why don't we wait for a while."

Richmond: "Yeah, I think so."



Speaker Madigan: "Right. Mr. Davis on...Is it Senate Bill 622 Mr. Davis."

Davis, Jack: "Yeah. Yeah, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. It is Senate Bill 622 and we would like to return it to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of three Amendments. I don't know what sequential number that the Clerk has. Perhaps he could enlighten us."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman requests leave that this Bill be brought back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Davis."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was tabled in Committee. Floor Amendment #2. Levin. Amends Senate Bill 622 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Amendment does is that it amends a Section of the Insurance Code that deals with the Illinois 'fair' plan, which is the 'pulling' arrangement for homeowners who are not otherwise able to get insurance coverage. Under the law as it has existed since 1969, the Director has had the authority to extend coverage to include as an option homeowners' coverage. He is not so exercised. All this Amendment does is to direct the Director to investigate the need for additional coverage through the 'fair' plan, to cover homeowners and to report back his determination to the Legislature and the Governor in six months. It does mandate that he exercise..."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in...Mr. Davis."

Davis, Jack: "I'd just like to say, Mr. Speaker, the Senate Sponsor and myself have no position on the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Jack Davis. Amends Senate Bill 622 on page 1, line 26..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, Jack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 deals with Section 2 of the Bill. The industry, and the Department of Insurance, and the Senate Sponsor and myself all felt that Section 2 of 622 might cause some adverse restriction in the marketplace. Consequently, Amendment #2 is offered to alleviate that situation and open up the marketplace a little bit by excluding industrial accident and health insurance from Section 2. It's really a very simple Amendment. I think it's a good Amendment that needs to be included in Section 2. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the Sponsor would simply explain what the Bill will now do with that Amendment added, if the Amendment is added. I'm not sure I follow what the effect the Amendment is going to have."

Davis, Jack: "Well, Section 2 deals with the option of when a policy is issued of noncancelable insurance in the area of health and accident insurance. That a cancelable policy has to be offered at the same time in all areas of the industry. This Amendment would exempt industrial health and accident policies from that particular provision."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Van Duyne: "Jack, I really don't understand it myself. But I'd just like to hear it from you. This really doesn't allow any company to cancel out anything like Workmen's Compensation."

Davis, Jack: "Oh heavens no. This is not a...Bill or anything like that, LeRoy. This Bill is exactly what it says it is. I really have no idea why I am the House Sponsor, but I am and I'm trying to help Senator Knuppel, the industry and



it deals only with industrial health and accident insurance. And the Amendment itself is to open up and to allow more availability of this type of insurance if the non-cancelable and cancelable policies are offered at the same time."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Schuneman. Amends Senate Bill 622 on page 1, line 20 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is just a technical Amendment to this Bill, to correct an error which was discovered in a conversation with the Department of Insurance on line 20. We change the word 'and' to the word 'or'. It's all it does. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Would you just elaborate a little further? I think 'and' and 'or' you can create some changes. If you say 'and', it means maybe more costs or more benefits; 'or' I don't think means more. So could you...that a little bit."

Schuneman: "This has to do, Zeke, with the cancellation provisions in a health and accident policy. And this merely provides that the policy can't be canceled or amended unless the insured signs the acceptance of the change that's being made in the policy."

Giorgi: "You mean the insurance company signs...How about the policyholder, . the guy that thinks he's insured and isn't insured all of a sudden."

Schuneman: "They're the ones whose signature is required by this."

Giorgi: "The policyholder?"



Schuneman: "Right. They can only cancel it if the policyholder signs the agreement."

Giorgi: "Good enough."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? Mr. Davis."

Davis, Jack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Schuneman is quite correct. Section 1 of the Bill is contradictory, and this is a benefit to the policyholder. And we support the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "This Bill shall be placed back on the Order of Third Reading. Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1097 is on Short Debate. I'd like to bring it back to Second, have leave to do that for purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to bring Senate Bill 1097 back to the Order of Second Reading. Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading."

Leverenz: "Amendment #2 is the Amendment we discussed a couple of days ago. And the Bill as it is deals with the license plates for second division vehicles. Amendment #2 eliminates opposition from the Secretary of State's Office in having all second division vehicles lose the weight class identification on the plate on one... We will leave Class A throughout intact for 1979. And it would act only on those above Class F. I ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted."



Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Leverenz. Amends Senate Bill 1097, page 1..."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 has a technical error in it. I'd ask for that to be withdrawn. We'll go with Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "The gentleman requests leave of Amendment #3 be withdrawn. Leave being granted, Amendment #3 shall be withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Leverenz. Amends Senate Bill 1097 on page 1, lines 1 and 6."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 would put my House Bill 501 into Senate Bill 1079. That Bill passed out of here earlier on a Roll Call of 118 with 15 'nos'. And it is the single rear license plate Bill. And I ask for adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Garmisa and I are Cosponsors."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis, which Bill are you addressing?"

Geo-Karis: "Senate Bill 626."

Speaker Madigan: "And where is it at on the Calendar?"

Geo-Karis: "It's on Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bills, Second Reading?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, and Mr. Garmisa will be on his way up pretty soon, but I know he doesn't mind if I go ahead with these two Amendments. We're both agreed on them."

Speaker Madigan: "Call the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 626. A Bill for an Act to license and regulate landscape architecture and to provide



penalties in violation thereof. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any motions to table Amendments 1, 2 or 3?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #4. Mr. Houlihan, do you have a copy of Amendment #4? And Mrs. Geo-Karis, do you wish to address the Amendment? Mrs. Geo-Karis. Mrs. Geo-Karis. Mrs. Geo-Karis. Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to move the adoption of Amendment #4. And I have the joint consent of Mr. Garmisa, who's now on the floor."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I'm sorry I misunderstood her. I thought she was ...said she was going to table #4 and go with #5 because 4 was technically incorrect. Is that correct?"

Geo-Karis: "Representative, I had filed #4, the original 4, so I never called it. So they said as long as I didn't call it...Maybe he ought to read me #4. Would the Clerk read me #4 please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis, what is your pleasure regarding Amendment #4? Do you wish to move for its adoption or do you wish to withdraw it?"

Geo-Karis: "Well, if you'd let me explain, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Just a yes or no. Do you want to move it or don't you?"

Geo-Karis: "I'm not sure which Amendment #4 it is. That's why I'm asking."

Speaker Madigan: "Let's take this Bill out of the record. You meet with Mr. Houlihan and find out exactly what you want to do. Are there other Bills where the Sponsor wishes to bring the...Mrs. Martin."

Martin, Lynn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1098 on Regular.."



Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bill 1098. Which page is that on? On the Calendar. On page 6. Senate Bill 1098. Mrs. Martin, what is your pleasure?"

Martin, Lynn: "Back to Second for Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady requests leave that this Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Lynn Martin. Amends Senate Bill 1098 as amended on page 12, line 27 and so forth."

Martin, Lynn: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, recent projections from the Department of Children and Family Services indicate there will have to be additional line item transfers. There is no new money involved in this at all. It's just moving various grants from line to line in keeping with the costs of what's really being spent. It's my Bill, my Amendment. I ask you to adopt this Amendment please. The total figure is four hundred thousand dollars. Excuse me. No new money. No new money."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. Mr. James Houlihan."

Houlihan, James: "Mr. Speaker, I think the mover of that motion to adopt Amendment #2 ought to explain where that money is coming from and where it's going to. It changes some of the priorities that was in the Department. And I think it ought to be explained on the floor."

Martin, Lynn: "First of all, it doesn't change priorities, Representative. It's merely where the money is going and has been spent. It's as follows: Into private institutions, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars; and training, twenty-nine thousand, one hundred dollars; counseling services, thirty thousand, nine hundred dollars; and homemaking services, fifty thousand dollars. And that's where the money is being spent. And that's an



accurate appraisal."

Houlihan, James: "Representative Martin. That money is being transferred from where?"

Martin, Lynn: "Well, the various other line items that still have money in them, and I'll tell you what they are again. adoptions, fifty thousand dollars. foster care and day care."

Houlihan, James: "That's my point, Representative Martin. You're taking money out of foster care, and you're putting it into counseling. I think that's a change of priorities. I think that's a mistaken..."

Martin, Lynn: "If I may. I think I would not disagree with day care as a priority. This is money that is going to be spent in the 77th fiscal year. This is not the new priorities in the 78th fiscal year. This is what's happened before and now has to be paid for. Basically, this money will all lapse if it is not transferred into these other funds. Okay. It is not going to be spent in those priorities, but next year as you heard today in the Appropriations II Committee, the priorities that you care about, and many of us do, such as day care, will be met and there will be more efficient use of funds."

Houlihan, James: "Mr. Speaker. Representative Martin is putting the cart before the horse. I suppose we have to go along with the Department in the fact that they're going to spend the money here because they say they won't spend it in the other line items. But what that does is completely vacate the appropriations process. What they've done is they said they're not going to spend the money where we asked them to spend it, where we appropriated it. And what they're doing is setting up new priorities, and we're going to have to spend the money there, and you can do diddly about it. I think that's a bad procedure. And I think it's a bad Amendment that you would be sponsoring it."

Martin, Lynn: "Well. I'm sorry you feel that way. I would remind



you this is for 77. There are ten days left. I can't change the priorities from the old administration."

Houlihan, James: "Representative Martin, that's my point.

That's my point, Representative Martin. They're coming and telling us with ten days left that they have already set the priorities. We're trying time and time again in the appropriations process to appropriate the dollars in certain areas where we think the need is greatest. What they're doing is they're coming to us in the last ten days and saying, 'We're going to spend this money this way, we've already spent it, we've already committed it, and we ask you now to approve retroactively, or after the fact, what we've done'."

Martin, Lynn: "Well, Representative Houlihan, this is paying for kids placed in private institutions. I don't know how you can argue with that or what you would do with that. And I don't know how you can argue with the new Director who's going to meet your priorities in the year to come. This is 77th, ten days left. I think it is a reasonable Amendment. I'd ask your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mrs. Martin. Can you tell me who's going to receive the thirty thousand dollars that you have in there for counseling? Is that a private firm? Some doctor? Is it an institution? I can see that you care nothing about foster care..."

Martin, Lynn: "It goes throughout the state to institutions, private groups. It's not going to feed the doctor's pocket."

Giorgi: "Is it true this is counseling for abortions?"

Martin, Lynn: "No, it is not."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it. And the Chair recognizes Mrs. Martin."

Martin, Lynn: "I have to ask for a Roll Call. We've got to



have the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady requests a Roll Call. All those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 35 'nos'. And Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be placed back on the Order of Third Reading. Mr. Garmisa. Mr. Walsh, the Chair is perfectly capable of managing the affairs of the House. We're going to recognize Mr. Garmisa at this time, Mr. Walsh, despite your objections."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1039 was on the Consent Calendar yesterday, and I ask that it be taken off of it for the purposes of an Amendment, brought back to Second and...I'd like to have leave of the House."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman requests leave that this Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Garmisa. Amends Senate Bill 1039 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and 2 and so forth."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "I would like to table Amendment #1 and adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, where was Amendment #1 adopted? In the Committee or on the floor?"

Garmisa: "It was a Committee Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The order of business is Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee. Mr. Garmisa moves to table Amendment #1 and on that motion the Chair recognizes Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor of the motion yield to a question?"



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I'd like to help you. That's my Amendment."

Garmisa: "Well, I'd like to explain what I'm doing with tabling Amendment #1 and adopting #2, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz, do you agree? Thank you. Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "What I want to do here, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is to try to resolve some of the problems that are adherent in Amendment #1. Especially those that were brought to my attention by Representative Friedrich, and Don Totten had some second thoughts about the Amendment #1 as we adopted it. And this would more clearly define the purpose of Amendment #1. Amendment #2 makes it clear that what we propose to regulate is the three-wheeler vehicle, a tricycle, not a bicycle. This Amendment like Amendment #1 refers to a vehicle propelled by an electric motor, but it states that the tricycle must have fully operative pedals for propulsion by human power. Now this would distinguish it from the motorcycle type of vehicle. And this Amendment does continue the exemption from having to pay a vehicle registration fee for the elderly and the handicapped as did Amendment #1. But it also adds the qualifications that in order to operate an electric motorized tyricycle the operator must be licensed. The Members, I want you to note that this Amendment applies to a motorcycle tricycle that has a maximum attainable motor speed of not more than ten miles per hour. And for the safety of both the operator of these tricycles and other motorists on the road where exclusive 'bike lanes' are not provided, we require that tricycles be equipped with an orange pennant affixed to a staff at least 60 inches in height. And we also restrict in this Amendment, the operation of this tricycle on the roadway only during the daytime. I would ask for the operation or for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1039."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Simms."



Simms: "Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Simms: "Representative Garmisa. Your Amendment requires that a tricycle operator must have a driver's license?"

Garmisa: "Not necessarily a driver's license."

Simms: "What must they have then?"

Garmisa: "He must be licensed by the Secretary of State."

Simms: "What is the average age, do you think, are tricycle owners in Illinois?"

Garmisa: "Over 65."

Simms: "My two year old has one. Would he have to have a... Over 65?"

Garmisa: "Over 65."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Garmisa, does this address itself to the golf carts as well as the bicycle with the two wheels in the back and the basket?"

Garmisa: "No, there's quite a bit of difference. There won't be enough power in this motor to operate a golf cart. The size of the wheels are 24-inch wheels, and this would rule out a golf cart."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Garmisa: "This is designed merely to help the elderly and the handicapped that sometimes want to get on a bicycle, and they cannot ride a two wheeler. They get into this thing ...They need self-propulsion actually to start up this type of vehicle. And then after that, an electric motor takes over. They can ride for as much as twenty-five miles before they have to recharge the battery on this thing, is the way I understand it. This is something that is adopted in 39 other states, we should adopt here."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know about you, but I can tell you that if this is the only kind of nonsense that we've got to go through, I'd like to vote that we adjourn. We've had to eat our



dinner sitting at the table. We can't leave here tonight because Speaker Redmond wants to meet his phony deadline. And if it means that we have to stand here and talk about this kind of nonsense to go through this is crazy. And I'd like to request a Republican Conference immediately."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, you seem to have submitted two requests of the body; one, that we adjourn, and another, that we have a Republican Conference. Are they synonymous?"

Ryan: "Take them in order, would you please."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Ryan, you're not recognized for that purpose. And the Chair recognizes Mr. John Dunn."

Dunn, John: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Dunn, John: "I really don't understand. What happens if you can get one of these bicycles going more than ten miles an hour? Then what? Then can you ride them after dark? Do you need a license? And I ask this in somewhat in seriousness because..."

Garmisa: "I understand you're asking it in all seriousness."

Dunn, John: "...go ahead and say, I do ride a bicycle and these geared bicycles are very easy to get up to fifteen, twenty miles an hour."

Garmisa: "Yes. But we're talking about a tricycle, and the tricycle is somewhat quite a bit slower than a bicycle. And in order for you to go over ten miles per hour, you're going to need a motor that is not being licensed under this Act. I resent, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that while I was up on a Bill that I consider for the upmost importance to myself and to a lot of the elderly and handicapped in the State of Illinois, that the Minority Leader of the House would get up and refer to this Bill as being a lot of foolishness, that we in this House are wasting our time on. My Bill is just as important as many another Bill that's being passed here tonight and every night that we're here. And I consider this Bill



important, and I consider it important to a lot of handicapped and elderly persons. And I resent very much this Bill being referred to as a nonsense Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Garmisa, your point is well taken. And the Minority Leader will be admonished not to criticize peoples' Bills. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would extend my apologies to the Honorable Representative Garmisa. It wasn't his Bill that I had in mind, it was the dialogue that was going on at the time."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think 'Benny's' got a good Bill here because I as a handicapped person can't ride a two wheel bike without falling off of it. But if he puts it on a three wheeler, maybe I'll enjoy riding around a little more in my retirement. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Brummer: "Yes, I had a 'Moped' Bill up earlier this afternoon. This appears to be a three wheel 'Moped' from the pictures and the diagrams that I have seen. Are there any restrictions with regard to the highways that this vehicle can be driven?"

Garmisa: "Wherever you can operate a bicycle you can operate this type of vehicle."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen. Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Garmisa to close the debate."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that everybody in this House knows exactly what



this Bill does and what it's trying to accomplish. I would ask for a 'green' light from everybody in this House."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall...The question is, shall the Gentleman's motion that Committee Amendment #1 be adopted? Therefore, if you are in favor of tabling the Amendment vote 'aye'. If you are opposed to tabling the Amendment, vote 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. Mr. Garmisa to explain his vote."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask that we table Amendment #1 so that we could adopt Amendment #2, which is a much more restrictive Amendment, and it keeps these vehicles where they belong, operating at the time they should be operating."

Speaker Madigan: "Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 12 'nos'. And the Gentleman's motion to table Committee Amendment #1 carries. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Garmisa. Amends Senate Bill 1039 on page 1, by deleting lines 1 and 2 and so forth."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1039."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. And on that motion the Chair recognizes Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I'm confused. What does it do? Did you already debate that in your other..."

Garmisa: "I had just explained what Amendment #2 does, and this is what all the debate was about just prior to the..."

Bowman: "I thought at that time that you were just... Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed....In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Garmisa: Maciga. "Mr. Speaker, this was on the Consent Calendar yesterday. I would ask leave of the House to put it back on the Consent Calendar today."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave that this Bill be placed back on the Order of the Consent Calendar. Is there leave? Not hearing any objections, the Bill shall be placed back on the Order of the Consent Calendar. Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now that I'm unconfused, I'd like to have leave to table Amendment #4 on Senate Bill 626 with joint concurrence with Cosponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "What is the Bill, Mrs. Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "Senate Bill 626."

Speaker Madigan: "626. And what order of business is that on?"

Geo-Karis: "It's on Second Reading, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bills, Second Reading?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "What page is that?"

Geo-Karis: "Hold on just a minute, I'll get it. It's on 13, Sir. Page 13."

Speaker Madigan: "On page 13 of your Calendar there appears Senate Bill 626. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 626. A Bill for an Act to regulate the professional landscape architects. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any motions to table those Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "There are no motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4 was withdrawn previously. Floor Amendment #5..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, on Amendment #4. Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to table Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk informs us that it has been with-



drawn already. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Amends Senate Bill 626, as amended, in Section 5 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Amendment #5 clears up the language and sets forth that nothing in this Act prohibits any homeowner or agency of the state or unit of local government or any other person or entity from hiring or contracting for landscape or gardening services of any entity or individual. And I'd like to move the adoption of Amendment #5 with the concurrence of my Cosponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Amends Senate Bill 626, as amended, by deleting in paragraph A of Section 6 and so forth."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with the leave of my Cosponsor, the Chief Sponsor, I'm asking for leave to have you adopt Amendment #6 which says in essence that the applicant has before admission...the applicant before admission examination must have a diploma or graduation certificate of a college, school or university with an approved curriculum and not landscape architecture, or the equivalent in actual practical experience that is approved by the Department. And I would like to move the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those



opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall remain on the...No further Amendments. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Third Reading. Is there anyone else who wishes to return a Bill to the Order of Second Reading? Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like leave to return Senate Bill 826 from the Short Debate Calendar to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment by Representative Simms."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave that Senate Bill 826 be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Is there leave? Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Has the Amendment been printed?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beatty at Mr. Houlihan's chair."

Beatty: "We don't have that Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Has it been printed? We'd rather leave it on...where it is now. When we get the Amendment, worry about taking it back."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle, could you confer with them regarding the Amendment?"

Stuffle: "It's not my Amendment; it's Representative Simms' Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Simms, could you confer? Thank you. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate concurred with the House in passing the Bills of the following titles to wit. House Bills number 212, 231, 252, 270, 279, 312, 314, 324, 330, 360, 374, 399, 426, 429, 451, 469, 471, 472, 473, 480, 481, 485, 508, 517, 520, 541, 563, 584, and 601 passed by the Senate June 22, 1977, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives,



the Senate concurred with the House in passing the Bills of the following titles to wit. House Bill 112, 121, 258, 317, 328, 364, 392, 406, 432, 449, 468, 491, 509, 534, 544, and 571 together with Amendments passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Madigan: "Back on the Order of Senate Bill 826. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Simms."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Simms. Amends Senate Bill 826, on page 1, lines 1 and 5 and so forth."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 was brought to correct a problem. It was brought to my attention which allows 'ROTC' noncertified teachers to participate in the 'IMRF' Pension System. I've checked this out with the Illinois Pension...the 'IMRF' and the legal counsel did assist us in drafting it. We've checked it with the Pension Laws Commission. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 826. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Third Reading. Are there any other Bills where the Sponsor wishes to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment? Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to return 323 to the Order of Second."

Speaker Madigan: "Where does it appear on the Calendar, Mrs. Sumner?"

Sumner: "I'll have to find it. On page 3."

Speaker Madigan: "On page 3, Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 323. The Lady requests leave that the Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Leave being granted, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of



Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. McClain. Amends Senate Bill 323, by deleting the last Section of the Bill and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McClain requests leave that that Amendment be withdrawn. Leave being granted, the Amendment shall be withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6. Ryan. Amends Senate Bill 323 as amended, on page 4 line 23 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 earmarks a drug treatment grant for the 'Near Northside Guidance Center'. And it adds forty-eight thousand, two hundred and fifty-seven dollars. And I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. Is there any discussion? Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Yes. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Levin: "Where is this facility located, and why is money being specifically earmarked for it?"

Ryan: "I don't know the exact address, Mr. Levin. There was a request made by me to add the forty-eight thousand dollars for this particular guidance center. And I was convinced that it was needed, so I volunteered to offer the Amendment."

Levin: "Either side of what city?"

Ryan: "Chicago."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall Amendment #6 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #6 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Are there any other Sponsors who desire to bring their Bills back to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment? On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 127. Mr. Terzich."

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

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, arise?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to renew my request for a Republican Conference at this time."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, your request will be duly noted in the record. And Mr. Terzich, if Mr. Terzich is available would he please come to the floor. Mr. Terzich. Mr. Schneider. Mr. Schneider, do you plan to handle Senate Bill 203 which deals with a DuPage County problem. You don't wish to move that at this time? On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 210. Mr. Barnes. Mr. Eugene Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 210. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Secretary of State for the Chicago Blind and Physically Handicapped Regional Library. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Take that out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 312. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 312. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 312 adds a Section to an Act to revise the law in relation to counties authorizing a .015% tax over and above the general corporate tax limit in counties having less than one million inhabitants to cover the cost of publication of county notices. Now this Bill was brought to the attention of the Senate Sponsor, Senator



Joyce, by the Urban Counties Council. And it's their Bill. What it does is give the counties with less than a million inhabitants the authority to levy this tax. Presently, they do not have the authority to do so, and that's exactly what the Bill does. It exempts the publication tax from the scope of the county tax. It exempts provisions necessary to make this tax a separate tax in accordance with Illinois case law. And having to avoid to enact an...provision. I'd be glad to answer any questions. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 312 pass?"

1 : All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, could we hold that in advance? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Ryan: "Representative Yourell, is there a referendum? I didn't hear you say. Is this with referendum or without?"

Yourell: "This is without."

Ryan: "Without. And how much tax increase is this for?"

Yourell: ".015 for publications."

Ryan: "For what?"

Yourell: "Can be only used for publication purposes, and no other purpose."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 312 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think particularly the Representatives here from all the six other counties should really take a good look at this and put their green lights on. If you recall a few weeks ago, we passed a Bill which in effect raised the rates that may be charged by the newspapers for publications



of county notices. Lists of assessment, tax lists, property tax lists and so on. Now the counties are going to be socked with this higher cost. We've said time and time again in this Session we don't want to throw any programs at local governments without giving them the means to pay for this. This is something that the locally elected officials of County Boards would have to choose to levy. Lobbyists for the various County Boards from the County Officials Association and from the Urban County Council appeared at County and Township Affairs Committee and testified in favor of this legislation. The counties want this. We would appreciate help. And I do appreciate help from all the green lights I see from our friends in Cook County. It doesn't affect you, but it will help us to help ourselves. And I would appreciate a green light."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Excuse me, I think that what Representative Dyer said should be noted because this is permissive legislation. It does not mandate counties to do something that the General Assembly says they should do, and then not provide the funds that implement the Revenue Bill to make that possible. This is a Bill in the true tradition of making county government more violable to the people. If they want to levy this tax, they must levy this tax and stand the test of election with their constituents. This is not something that we in the General Assembly are mandating elected public officials on any level to do. This puts it squarely in their lap. If they want to levy it, fine. We're saying that you don't have to if you don't want to. But if you do, you must need it and want it or be thrown out of office if the people in your county do not think that you need it / in levying an additional tax on them. It can be used only for publication purposes. And I think it's a good Bill. It should be passed because the



counties desperately need this money. And I would suggest that you vote for this Bill to help your county out."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm certainly not going to vote for this miserable Bill. But then again I didn't vote to raise the publication costs 50%. Those of you that did it, seems to me, ought to complete the circle and pass this Bill which isn't quite as forthright as it should be. It would be a little more forthright if we just had the County Treasurer write a check from the proceeds of this tax to the local weekly newspaper."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 71 'ayes', 73 'nos'. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr... I'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration. So that the County Board Members can get to you fellows and show you the light of day."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave for Postponed Consideration. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 210. Mr. Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 210. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Secretary of State for the Chicago Blind and Physically Handicapped Regional Library. Third Reading of the Bill."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, thank you very much. Senate Bill 210 appropriated three hundred and eighty-nine thousand in capital development funds to the Secretary of State's Office for the part of the state's share of the costs of building a regional library for the blind and the physically handicapped. This is the... the third step that was involved in the initial appropriation for the purpose forestated in the construction of the libraries for the blind and the physically impaired. I would solicit your 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 210."



Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 210 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 131 'ayes', no 'nos', 8 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 210 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to request a Republican Conference in Room 118 immediately for approximately 30 minutes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Do you wish to announce the Democratic plans? Mr. Ryan has requested a conference. Do you wish to announce the Democratic plans? At Mr. Collin's desk."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm at this desk now, and I'm going to have to to scream!"

Speaker Madigan: "Right. So we can hear you."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think there's any need for the Democrats to go down to 114 or 118 and have a conference. If you'll just file into the Speaker's Office in groups of ten, I can tell you what the subject matter of the conference is, and then we can relax."

? Doorman: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members, please be in their seats. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 323. Representative Sumner."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 323..."

Speaker Redmond: "How about 338? 338. Dave Jones."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 338. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Historical Library. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones. Out of the record.

363. Gaines here?"



1.

Speaker Redmond: "McMaster here? 382."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 382. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 382 has the effect of exempting the current records of the Township Supervisor of General Assistance from the custody of the Town Clerk. Accounts must be audited, accounts audited must be certified by the Town Clerk within ten days and the Supervisor must pay such accounts within ten days. Currently, this day period is twenty days. It eliminates the need for certification by the Town Clerk as a precondition to General Assistance payments. Let me say that practically all over the State of Illinois the current records of the Township Supervisor of General Assistance are not kept in the custody of the Town Clerk. They're kept by the Township Supervisor himself as a Supervisor of General Assistance. I would urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill, and I would try to answer any questions that might come up."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

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

McMaster: "Is this a political attempt of yours, Jaffe, or are you going to malign the Governor again or are you going to malign the Secretary of State, or who are you after tonight?"

Jaffe: "No, I'll malign, probably, some of the terrible township government."

McMaster: "Go right ahead...."

Jaffe: "But I would like to find out some information, if you'd be kind enough to give us any."

McMaster: "Any time...."

Jaffe: "Okay. Now does this...this changes some of the duties of the Clerk, is that correct?"

McMaster: "No, it does not."

Jaffe: "Well, but it changes some record keeping does it not?"

McMaster: "No, it does not because I said I believe in one township in the State of Illinois the court has ruled that the statutes were unclear and in that one township the Clerk of the township would keep the records of the Supervisor of General Assistance."



Jaffe: "Yeah, well let me just...."

McMaster: "...Is not true, Aaron, in any other township in the state to my knowledge."

Jaffe: "Well, I'd ask too, Tom, except for one thing, it happens to be my township. Is the.....of that, it happens to be Niles Township in Cook County?"

McMaster: "I believe you're right."

Jaffe: "Yeah.. I know it...let me just address my Democratic friends and tell them that this is really a Democratic-Republican issue in Niles Township. And basically...."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do not want to be interfered in this legislation on a political issue for one township."

Jaffe: "Well..."

McMaster: "I think we considered the whole state, Mr...."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe, proceed with...."

Jaffe: "...In opposition to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and as the Gentleman has indicated this...this Bill affects, really, only one township in the entire state and that happens to be Niles Township, and quite candidly, it happens to be a fight between Democrats and Republicans. The Clerk of the Township is now a..Democratic. This Bill was introduced by the Senate Sponsor in order to take some of his powers away, and I would submit to you that it's a...directed towards my township. And it's purely a political fight, and I would urge my Democratic friends on this side of the aisle to vote 'no' against this Bill because all they're trying to do is take away some power from the Democratic Clerk in Niles Township."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Do I understand correctly that under your Bill the current records of any Township Supervisor of General Assistance will not be in the custody of the Town Clerk?"

McMaster: "Will you...will you repeat that question, please?"

Geo-Karis: "Do I understand, from your Bill, that the current records of



3.

249.

a Township Supervisor of any Township of General Assistance, do I understand that those records of the Township Supervisor will not be in the custody of the Town Clerk any more, if your Bill passes?"

McMaster: "Representative Geo-Karis, this is not a case of any more, it's a case of never has been."

Geo-Karis: "Well, in...just so I can clarify myself, we have...we have Zion Township, Libertyville Township, these are...townships in my district, now their Clerks have the custody of the records."

McMaster: "No, the township records but not the township records of the General Supervisor of General Assistance, Geo. There's a difference between the two sets of records."

Geo-Karis: "You mean...do I understand correctly, then never before has the Township Supervisor of General Assistance records been in the Town Clerk?"

McMaster: "That's right."

Geo-Karis: "Well, then, if that is true why is the Bill necessary? Just...I'm not trying to quibble...I just want to understand it, that's all."

McMaster: "Because as Aaron Jaffe said, in the one township, in Niles Township there was a battle....I have been informed, I believe, that all of his township officials are of the same political affiliation. Nevertheless there seems to be a quarrel between some of the people within that specific township. That is why they went to a court case to determine who had the custody of those records due to uncleriness of the statute. The court ruled that the Township Clerk would hold those specific records in that specific township and let me put emphasis on this, Representative Geo-Karis, that is the only township in the State of Illinois that is that way."

Geo-Karis: "That is not, what, Sir?"

McMaster: "Pardon?"

Geo-Karis: "That is that way, did you say?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman. Greiman, will you turn him on?"

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you'll have to...we have to give some full faith and credit to the



decrees of the court and how they interpret our statutes. The Senator who has put this Bill in is a Committeeman from that township, from my township, on the other side. I...I don't think we should use this form necessary...necessary to resolve problems between parties. He has thought so. And he's made some sweeping changes, and I want your attention to them whatever party you're from, whether you're Democrat or Republican, you know? It eliminates the need for certification by the Town Clerk as a precondition to General Assistance payments. It means that...it's like literally giving the...the Supervisor, the General Assistance Funds, unaudited, telling him put it in your pocket and do whatever the heck you want with it. I think that there's...we're entitled, we taxpayers, we taxpayers that I hear from the other side so often, we taxpayers, are entitled to have some kind of an accounting. Entitled to have somebody watching over the payments as a precondition of certification. We taxpayers are entitled to that. It eliminates the...the requirement of needing to audit the town accounts. Why shouldn't there be that requirement? And lastly, what's so unusual, I might ask you, about the Clerk having the records of the township? Who else has them...who has the records of every other governmental agency? The Clerk of the office is a Clerk like the Secretary of State here is the keeper of our records, and that's the way it should be. And this is the...political reason, and this Bill should be soundly defeated regardless of whether you're a Republican or a Democrat, or even regardless of whether you happen to live in Niles Township."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster...."

Greiman: "...Great spot to live in."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Greiman, I am sorry but you have completely misrepresented the Bill. This does not preclude the audit of the records of the Supervisor of General Assistance. As all township records, they must be audited. What you have said in regard to the Township Clerk authorizing payment of General Assistance Bills is true because the Supervisor of General Assistance must pay those Bills within the specific amount of time for payment of Bills to keep the township on a clear basis. And I don't think that he can go running to the Township Clerk when he



5.

251.

has to pay a bill to take care of these poor...welfare recipients of General Assistance within the township. You want these people cut out? You want them to wait and not be able to get food because the Supervisor cannot pay the Bills because he must run to the Town Clerk to get his own case? Okay. Shame on you, Al, for hurting those poor people on General Assistance. I'm ashamed of you. Doubly ashamed..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen." Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I cannot understand how this could be a political issue since all the officials including the Supervisor and Clerk in Niles Township are of one political party. The Supervisor of General Assistance in a township act is entirely responsible for General Assistance and therefore it is in keeping with the spirit and tone and letter of the township act that he should be in charge of keeping current records just on an efficiency basis. And that he should be the sole signer of the checks. There is an audit by the Town Board. This Bill is required in order to allow General Assistance recipients to receive their checks when they need them, that's the whole purpose of General Assistance. I would urge you to vote 'aye' on this Bill. It simply is in conformance with existing branches in all townships of Illinois except one, which is operating under an order by a court which extended its authority to write new legislation instead of judging on what is in the law currently. This will confirm what is currently in the law, and I urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman on a point of personal privilege."

Greiman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to comment on the speaker previous, Miss Pullen, that I just was handicapped by the fact that I read the synopsis of the Bill. And I had to take what I read. And I stated it accurately. It takes away traditional record keeping, it takes it away. It takes away the precondition of certification, and I'm just reading from the Bill and from the synopsis. Now if the Bill is wrong and the synopsis is wrong or my powers of reading are meager, I apologize to the House but I did not misstate it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the court has already decided this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

question, so for that, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Representative McMaster to close."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I might close on this very good Bill, I think that we must realize, as evidently some of the questioners or speakers this evening do not, that I think it's necessary that we take care of the indigent people on Township General Assistance. I regret very much that some of the people on the floor of this House have no more compassion for those people on Township General Assistance than they have exhibited tonight. I think for the prompt payment of township bills for people on General Assistance, I think it's necessary that we pass this legislation. It does not preclude the auditing of the records of the Supervisor of Township Assistance, General Assistance. That must be done as all other township funds must be audited. I think it's very necessary that we pass this legislation. I would urge your support by giving us a green light."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Gentleman a... the House Sponsor of this Bill a question, but I was preempted from doing that. But I have in my possession a letter from the Township Clerks of Cook County and in that letter they say they oppose Senate Bill 382, and here we are in the General Assembly telling the Townships and the Township Clerks what they must do when they really don't want to be under this law. So I would suggest we respect the judgment and the opinions of the Township Clerks of Cook County and vote 'no'."

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

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I think it should be recognized that the Township Officials of Cook County are in support of this Bill. I think the previous speaker mentioned the Township Clerks, and I have talked to several of the Township Clerks separately,



and they do not agree with this letter of the Township Clerks Association of Cook County. Again, the Township Officials of Cook County is in support of the Bill."

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

On this question there's 75 'aye'....Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Postponed Consideration, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration."



Speaker Redmond: "458. Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "Mr. Speaker. Representative Brady is in proximity I think to the chamber here. And if he is within sound of my voice, I would ask that he come to the chamber immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "458. Representative Giglio."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 458. A Bill for an Act in relation to executive orders. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentlemen standing in the aisle between Representative Giglio and the Chair please be seated. Proceed. Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 458 is an act that provides the executive orders issued by the prior Governor are null and void sixty days after the inauguration of the new Governor, unless extended by the new Governor. What it is, is it's just a simple Bill that gives the authority of the new Governor when he comes in to run the Executive Branch the way he wants to run the Executive Branch. And the things that he campaigned on are going to be his doing. And if the people have faith in the new Governor, then I feel that the new Governor should have the power and the right to do what he wants to run the Executive Branch."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? 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? Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote. I rise in opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio. For what purpose do you rise? "

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker. There seems to be some misunderstanding about the Bill, and I've been asked that I take the Bill



out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 557. 557. Representative Mugalian."

Clerk O'Brien: "557. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian. Mugalian. Representative Mugalian. Mugalian. 557. His microphone dead? Representative Willer. Is your microphone live now? Proceed. Representative Mugalian. Representative Giorgi, for what purpose are you rising?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. Just to caution the House that this is the most hardy effort that we're going to make this session, and they all ought to pay attention."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The synopsis on this Bill is accurate. I would like to say at the outset that Representative Antonovych will close. He is the hyphenated House Sponsor. This Bill was sponsored in the Senate by Senator's Nimrod and Netsch. And it affects the Capital Development Board and provides that up to one half of one percent of the budget for public buildings may be devoted to fine arts work. The Act works relatively simply and without a lot of red tape. The very simple mechanism that sets up a local Fine Arts Review Committee so that there's local control over the kind of art that will be in these buildings and accessible to the public. There is also a Public Arts Advisory Committee that consults with the Capital Development Board, and a designed architect has a final decision as to the kind of art that will be employed in the building so that there is artistic integrity. Now this has no fiscal impact in fiscal 1978 and will have a fiscal impact of approximately three hundred thousand dollars out of Capital Development Bonds in 1979. I commend this Bill and ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."



Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It strikes me offhand that we need this Bill about as much as the statue of David needs another arm. I cannot for the life of me see why it is necessary to create a Fine Arts Review Committee to oversee the introduction of art or art objects or whatever into the construction of new buildings. It would seem to me that the architects hired, the architects brought in to play as we build new buildings would have the intelligence and would have the artistic feel, after all architects, architects are trained in the field of art, most of them. They have a highly developed sense of what is artistic and what is not. Why they cannot be left to their own judgment in these matters is beyond my comprehension. The Sponsor has indicated no immediate fiscal impact. But there will be a tremendous fiscal impact in the following year. And I will suggest that here is another area into which the government interjects itself into a field best left to private enterprise. And what we're witnessing now will be only the beginning. And in a few years this will call for an ever-escalating budget. And it would seem to me, my colleagues, that in these times of fiscal constraint it would be well to take a very careful look at this particular Bill. There seems to be no real need for this. I do not understand the necessity of an Arts Review Committee, a special board to tell us that we have to spend a certain amount of money for the introduction of fine arts as we build these new buildings. And surely this will automatically increase the cost; it can't be otherwise. And I would urge you, my colleagues, in the interest of fiscal responsibility, in the interest of some handle on an ever-escalating and increasing bureaucracy. Another layer. I would ask you to think carefully before you vote for this Bill. I would ask you indeed to vote against it."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, James: "Mr. Speaker, I had my light on when you arbitrarily took that Bill out of the record and violated the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Which rule?"

Houlihan, James: "The rule that as a Member, that a Roll Call is taken."

Speaker Redmond: "The Roll Call hadn't been started on that Bill."

Houlihan, James: "The Roll Call was up on the board, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "It was not up on the board. I hadn't called for the Roll. He started to explain it, and he asked to have it taken out of the record. And there was no question put. According to the rules, it was proper. Are you addressing 557? Are you addressing 557? Representative Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. I'm not charging that the last speaker was being bigoted and prejudiced."

Speaker Redmond: "You're out of order, Representative Giorgi. Anybody else want to talk on 557? Anybody want to talk on 557? Representative Collins. Whoever is standing between me and Representative Collins, will you please take your seat? I almost didn't see him, and that's pretty nearly lethal."

Collins: "I think you broke my microphone by talking so softly into it earlier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Thank you. I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 557. Not only from a fiscal point of view, which I think it is irresponsible to add this kind of cost to public buildings, especially at a time such as we are in now. But I think that this Bill really is a slur if not an insult to the entire profession of architecture. The function of an architect



is not merely to erect a building, but it is to create something that is not only a utilitarian but hopefully has a beauty as well. A building comes from an architect's drawing board, I believe is a manifestation not only of the architect's talent, but also of his artistic talent. This is his creation. And we think of the great architecture of the world, whether it be in this country or Europe, the beauty is not in what surrounds or what is hung upon it, but what the edifice itself presents to the eye of the beholder. And even in Chicago where we have such great art as the 'Picasso' and the 'Chagall' and others, these great creations were done in conjunction with the architect's scheme. He contemplated this addition in his plaza in the creation of his building which again is to be a tribute to his talent and to his artistic talents. So I really think that we are presumptuous even though the Bill includes the architect who does design the building on the so-called Review Board. It also has the Arts Council which makes it kind of laughable. But I think that we are really insulting this man. And we are casting aspersions upon his talents when we say that he cannot create something that will not stand on its own and must take an appropriation by us so that we may hang some kind of objects of art on the building or in the building. And without us and without our appropriation, his creation cannot stand on its own. Architecture is an art form. And I think that it ill behooves us to add public funds at this time to say that architects can't get along without the General Assembly. And I certainly think that we should reject this Bill summarily."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "What is the difference between the Public Arts

Advisory Committee and the Fine Arts Review Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."



Mugalian: "The Fine Arts Review Committee, Representative Darrow, is a local Committee that helps make a determination as to the kind of art that it was...shall be and whom the creator shall be. The other agency that you mentioned is merely a Consultative Committee that consults with the Board itself, the Capital Development Board. To give them some ideas about how the thing should proceed."

Darrow: "And what is your estimate of the cost to the State of Illinois for this Council?"

Mugalian: "For the consulting body, it's approximately three thousand dollars. It's mostly expense money. For the Fine Arts Council, it's approximately thirty thousand dollars."

Darrow: "Well now, in our staff analysis we have that the, this would be between two hundred thousand and three hundred thousand out of the capital budget. Is this... Would this estimate be correct?"

Mugalian: "Yes, that's the total cost."

Darrow: "The total cost. And I would assume then that you feel that this three hundred thousand dollars would be better spent on this than on full funding for education?"

Mugalian: "Oh, not at all."

Darrow: "I would just point out that you didn't feel that we should fully fund schools last evening. And here you're looking for a three hundred thousand dollars. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is really one of the finest Bills to come to the House floor this season. There are two things here that I'd like to call to your attention. First of all, what we're talking about is nothing less than the state being a patron of the arts. And I think most of us tend to forget that much of the great art that is to be found hanging in the museums of the world, in the Art Institute in Chicago and in the 'Louvre' in Paris are works of art which were commissioned by the government at the time.



Now the state being a patron of the arts is something that is...has not been practiced for quite some time and at least...that it was practiced during the Renaissance. It seems to me that it is high time that we realize that we are a civilized society and that we ought to patronize the arts. Finally, we suggest to those people who talk about the architects really designing the art into the building. I'm the son of an architect, and I appreciate the fact that the architects care about the artistic quality of their buildings. But there is certain kinds of art that has to be designed into a building and the architect is not the person to do it. Let me cite Michelangelo's example. Now many of you have either seen the creation by Michelangelo which is the 'Sistine Chapel, the 'St. Peters in Rome. Many of you have seen it in person, and many of you have seen prints of it. But let me tell you that creation could not be squeezed down and condensed into a canvas to be hung in a building. That creation could not have been prepared by the architect of that building, that had to be done by the master himself. And really what we're talking about here is providing the proper kind of showcase for truly world class art. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Representative Mugalian, to close. Representative who? Representative Antonovych."

Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are several questions that have been raised concerning Senate Bill 557 that I would like to clear up at this time. One is that one of the responsibilities of this Legislature to improve the quality of life for



the citizens of the State of Illinois. Another question deals with the very concept of art in architecture. I'll try to clear up both of these concepts by the following example. Let me ask you, how many of you have ever paused by the fountains downstairs in front of this Capitol? And let me ask you if this was not indeed a pleasant experience? Now this is the kind of art we're talking about. And it's functional in that those fountains downstairs are part of the cooling system of this building. Now the reason we have created some boards is to protect the...from such Representatives like Collins, in that this is not going to be in any way restricted to modern art. It brings in...the architect it brings in, the Director of the Illinois State Museum, it brings in the Director of the Illinois Historical Society as well as members of the community. Now these people will decide what type of art will go...should be created to enhance the...value of this building which will not only be used by the occupants, by the government workers in that building, but will be viewed by visitors, by the citizens that pay taxes to create that building which will go to that building for government service. But this need not only consist of pushing papers and making telephone calls. We have to increase their entire experience with government. Now the ordinary citizen does not have occasion to visit the art galleries and the museums on a daily basis. I could ask any one of you when was the last time you visited the Art Institute. And I don't think that was that recently. Now we're restricting this to public buildings which are viewed by the public; it's not some place that's hidden away. It's restricted to one half of one percent of the construction cost; it need not be that limited. We're not telling the architects how to build the building. We're just providing that part of the funds, a very small part will be reserved to enhance the scenic beauty of the concrete and glass



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that makes the building, in so that it will create a better feeling for everyone concerned. And I ask everyone to vote 'yes' on this measure. And if you have any reservations, don't vote 'no' because I really don't think you'll be able to explain this to your conscience or to your family or to your constituents. Thank you."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's not too many times that I disagree with my compatriot Representative Collins. This is one time that I do agree with him; I believe that I am the only graduate architect in the Legislature. And I do not believe that this is something that you can legislate. The architect either has the ability or he does not. Passing this law is not going to make any building a creation of art, and I happen to be one of the supporters of art. But by your actions on the floor of the Legislature today is not going to create a semblance of art in anything that is done in the State of Illinois."

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

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To explain my vote. I would agree that you can't legislate art, but I think you can legislate intent. And if an architect knows that the people of the State of Illinois want to take some pride in their buildings and those things that are constructed with their taxpayer dollars, I think architects will take that into consideration. We could operate this Legislature from ...hut with a tin roof, but we don't do that. We have an elegantly appointed chamber here and those of you who have been on the tours that are conducted of this Capitol know that when the guides come in here with the tours they take a lot of time to point out the intricate



artwork in the ceiling of this chamber. The reason we do that is because the people of the State of Illinois are proud of this building and proud of the elegantly appointed pictures that we have here. We should take pride in what we do, and we should be proud of all our buildings in the State of Illinois. And I think this is a good Bill, something badly needed. And it should express the kind of intent that we want to give to our architects so that the buildings that we construct will be something we can be proud of without excessive costs."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This has to be a good Bill if you take a look at your Digest and see who the Senate Sponsors are. Senator's Netsch, Nimrod, Daley, Chew, Wooten and Kosinski. With that combination, it just can't be a bad Bill. I urge its approval."

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

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, when this vote was open to take the record, a number of Members were whistling. And I wish, Mr. Speaker, that you would thoroughly chastise, Mr. Speaker, those Members that use this senseless whistling when we start. And I don't think... I think that they're acting very..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think your point is well-taken. And I think it is a disservice and not fair to your Members, your fellow Members. If you have a Bill that you think enough of to put in and fight all the way through the House and the Senate, it seems to me that we're entitled to have a full, deliberate discussion and a full, deliberate vote by our Members. And I think your point is well-taken, and I would request that you refrain from that practice. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask everyone here that



has a 'red' light on that board or hasn't voted yet, if they have been into Chicago to see the 'King Tut' exhibit. That is the most dramatic example of the fact that art outlives men, empires, women, ..., outlives a whole culture. Long after everyone of us is gone from this room any art that could be created under this Bill will last. And I think we owe it. If there's any doubt that this would be popular with the citizens of Illinois, think of the lines that form every day to see that exhibit. The most popular vote you could test in this Session would be to vote 'yes' for this Bill. It would attract tourists to Illinois which we say we want to do. It would be effective; it would be an inexpensive way to create something less than for our grandchildren. I urge you to rethink those 'red' lights."

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

Mann: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, sometimes I think that we, and I mean that collectively, tend to minimize and undervalue the heritage of our State. This is after all the state that produced an Abraham Lincoln and a Steven Douglas and a John Peter 'Altgeld' and a number of distinguished Senators and Governors. It's a state that is regarded and called the 'Land of Lincoln'. Perhaps the most critical state in many presidential contests. A state with a gross national product of over a hundred billion dollars. And within that context, it's here in Springfield where you and I operate, and operate proudly as Members of a great, deliberative body. Now there seems to be something fashionable about being anti-intellectual. There seems to be something fashionable about 'rapping' art or 'rapping' permanence. Well let me say to you that for those of you who respect yourselves and who respect this body and respect this State Government, I think you want to leave something lasting beyond your words which will never be etched in concrete. Think it



over. Let's not undervalue the traditions and the culture of the 'Land of Lincoln'. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you'll look up in the gallery, you'll see some fine art. You'll see portraits up there in the gallery immediately behind the Speaker of some of our former Speakers, including a Gentlemen that served us so ably and so well and was respected on both sides of the aisle, the former Speaker Bob Blair. You'll also see the 'Little Giant' Stephen Douglas and our hero Abraham Lincoln in this 'Land of Lincoln'. But art, fine art is not something that you can force; it's something that happens automatically and spontaneously out of love and respect and out of affection. One reason for voting 'no' against this Bill is you can't force fine art to happen. And this Bill also limits it to one half of one percent. What kind of a Capitol would this be if the statues and the paintings and all the beauty was limited to one half of one percent? I urge more 'no' votes. I think we're going to have fine art, and we're going to have it the proper way, the way that it flows out of the human heart of artists and the people who are interested in the beauty and heritage and the history of this great land."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I've just made a check and a quick survey, and I understand that the Arts Council wasn't even in existence when this ceiling was built. And I like it the way it is. And some architect figured that out. Ok?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 87 'aye' and 58 'no'. Representative Mugalian. Representative Mugalian. Mugalian. I guess it isn't any better now



than it was before. You want to use Representative Willer's? Representative Conti. For what purpose do you rise."

Conti: "I had a telephone call out there I answered. I'd like to vote 'aye' on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti as 'aye'. Representative Mugalian. Representative Jones 'aye'. What's the score, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 89 'aye' and 58 'no'. The Bill having... Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I know there's not 89 votes really voting, but I'm not going to waste time verifying this."

Speaker Redmond: "The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 597. Johnson."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 597. A Bill for an Act in relation to the transfer of funds from the Highway Safety Fund to the State Treasury. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson. Out of the record. 621. Representative Neff."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 621. A Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 621 provides for the regulation of special or chartered bus operations by the Illinois Commerce Commission. At the present time there is no regulation of bus charter services. This results in unexpected buses with no insurance being operated on our Illinois highways. Passengers in these buses have no protection in case of accidents. This Bill would provide for their regulation. Anyone today who is conducting a special or chartered operation would be authorized to do so, continue by simply making a 'grandfather application' with the Illinois Commerce Commission. But after January the 1st, 1978, no one may conduct special or chartered operations until the certificate of public convenience has been obtained. Those holding a certificate would have to comply with a safety inspection as well as having adequate insur-



ance on file with the Illinois Commerce Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "Question to the Sponsor, if he'll yield."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, Dan: "Could you tell us why this Bill is necessary?"

Neff: "Well, at this time no chartered buses are inspected or have to be inspected to obtain a certificate or have to have insurance. And at the present time all chartered buses, if they so desire, may be operating without any insurance on the passengers and so forth."

Houlihan, Dan: "But don't you refer to in the Bill, any carrier of passengers by motor vehicle? Don't they have to be... don't they have to be insured and licensed by the Commerce Commission?"

Neff: "A chartered bus doesn't have to have inspection or

doesn't have to carry insurance under the present law."

Houlihan, Dan: "Well, what would this do to the Chicago

Transit Authority, for example, which engages regularly in the practice of chartering its buses?"

Neff: "Well, I would say this, Representative, that if they're being chartered they would have to make sure they're inspected. And I'm sure those buses are inspected and would be almost positive that they have inspections and so forth."

Houlihan, Dan: "So apparently then, what you're telling me is that they would be subject to this. And that they among other bus companies in this state that provide the same type of service would have to now come under the provision of this Bill for a certification and licensing before they could continue what has been part of their operation for apparently a good number of years. Why haven't you 'grandfathered' in existing operations such as that that I have referred to?"

Neff: "Well, they are 'grandfathered' in up until January the 1st of 1978."

Houlihan, Dan: "Where is that in the Bill? Clarence, would you be amenable to taking this out of the record and to



see if we can work this out which would be as far as what our problems are here?"

Neff: "If you so desire, I'll be glad to do it."

Houlihan, Dan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Out of the record. 623."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 623. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk. Out of the record. 732. Christensen. Are you sure? Somebody told me the objections were withdrawn on that. 735. That's the Kankakee River Conservancy... Kankakee River Commission."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, why didn't you call that Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Sponsor didn't want it called. Representative Ryan. Yeah, 735."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 735. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Prosecutor Advisory Council Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "735. Kempiners. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 735 was the subject of great debate on Second Reading when Mr. Stearney amended the Bill. I would assume that seeing his Amendments were successful..."

Speaker Redmond: "Telcser. Proceed."

Kempiners: "I'm assuming that seeing his Amendments were successful; he would not have problems with the main thrust of the Bill, which basically provides that the Council would have authority to create an Appellate Prosecutor Division to prepare, file and argue criminal appellate briefs in reviewing courts on behalf of State's Attorneys with... in counties of populations with one million. It also creates a separate fund for these counties whose cases are being argued to deposit money into. And with his Amendment, the third part of the Bill would reduce the salary of the Executive Director to five thousand dollars annually, and the other Amendment would move the principal office to some-



where in the Mississippi River. In conversations with the Representative who is not present tonight, he indicated he does not have a problem with the main thrust of the Bill; his problem is with the Council as it exists. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109 'aye', 19 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 693. Representative Neff. Representative Neff. 693. Did you ask me to recognize you? That's on Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, on page 8. Did you want that returned to the Order of Second Reading, Representative Neff? Is Representative Garmisa on the floor? I guess I got the wrong one here. What Bill was it, Representative Neff, that you asked be returned to the Order of Second? Was it Darrow? Did you want that one brought back to Second? Okay. 345. Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. What Order are we on here?"

Speaker Redmond: "You asked me to return 345 to the Order of Second."

Ebbesen: "Oh. All right, yes, Mr. Speaker. I was looking at 762 which is my legislation that is coming up next, but you're back on Second Reading, is that it?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know where 345 is."

Ebbesen: "Fine, Mr. Speaker. I'll take that Bill then."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is 345?"

Ebbesen: "It's on Second Reading. Senate Bill 345 is on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "345."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 345. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, could I have a little bit of order, please? There's an awful lot of noise."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 345. And really it addresses itself in my opinion to probably the most serious problem that the State of Illinois along with 49 other states including local government and the Federal Government face. And of course, it's a Pension Bill and the problem that I'm talking about is pensions. Now it's not only a problem here in Illinois, but it's a problem throughout the entire country at all levels whether it be the local, state or federal. And because government doesn't have the word 'no' in its vocabulary, we find ourselves in the posture relative to the overall Pension System. Now for years this trend...Mr. Speaker, I can't hear what I'm saying. Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, seriously for years the trend has continued that more and more people are working for government and the request for more and more pension benefits. And we're having less and less the word 'no' to some of these add-on benefits as a response. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to get all my information gathered together here. Today Illinois is looking at an unfunded, accrued liability in this area of pensions of over seven billion dollar deficit. And I just want to draw your attention, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the 1977 report from the Department of Insurance relative to Public Employee Pension Funds. Now if you'll look at page 13 sometime when you're back in your office...Mr. Speaker, I hope you're paying attention."

Speaker Redmond: "With difficulty."

Ebbesen: "It is difficult. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very, very serious Amendment that I'm addressing myself to. I want to call your attention to page 13 of the very latest report from the Depart-



ment of Insurance. When in 1975 during that survey, we were five billion seven hundred and forty-eight million dollars plus in unfunded accrued liability. And I happen to be a member, as many of you know, of the Committee on Pensions, the Pension Laws Commission, the Board of the General Assembly for the Retirement System, and I've followed very closely what's been taking place. We've tried to keep the lid on add-on benefits in the Pension System. I'm talking about the General Assembly, the Judges, the Teacher's Retirement, the State Employees and what have you. We've done a somewhat effective job on that, but the one point I draw your attention to--the 1977 report shows that in two years we have increased the unfunded accrued liability by one billion, two hundred million dollars plus, and that's a 22% increase in a two-year period. And to me that spells nothing but trouble out there in the future. Now I'm not going to point the finger at this General Assembly or the 79th or the 78th, because we can go back 35 years give or take under various administrations, Republican or Democrat in which the state has failed to live up to their financial responsibility. Now we all also know that the employees are 100% funded. 100%. But the state has failed miserably, miserably to put in their fair share. And I call your attention to the fact that this year for the first time, since I've been down here, we had a Governor who is willing to put in and appropriate the dollars for whatever we pay out in that system. We're going to pay dollar for dollar into the system. However in the previous four years, we were compounding the problem under the previous Administration in which we were always shy, never equalling what we were putting in as to what was going out. And to me we are walking towards the danger point. We all can look east at New York, we know it can happen. It can happen here in this state. And that's what this Amendment addresses itself to. I say that there is an



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

awful lot of nervous people out there, roughly between 500 and 600 thousand people who either are participating or will participate in these Pension Systems in the years ahead. We are getting today, we are getting the service and we're continually transferring the payment, the obligation, ten, fifteen and twenty and thirty years out into the future. And there's a point of no return on that in what this Amendment says that there should be a moratorium for the balance of the 78th General Assembly as far as add-on pension benefits are concerned. Now as a Member of the Pension Laws Commission... Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you're not listening. Mr. Speaker, could I have some attention please?"

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

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ebbesen keeps saying we're not listening. We're very definitely listening on this side. And if I...I don't understand what you're saying but I think that in looking at the Amendment, the Amendment now is the Bill. And I would advise all the Members of the House of Representatives to pay strict attention to what Mr. Ebbesen is doing with Amendment #1. If I understand what you're doing, you're putting a moratorium on any changes in any and all pension plans in the State of Illinois. And if this is the case, and I'm wondering in the language if the constitutionality...and I think it's something, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Ebbesen has asked for attention, and I think he should have it. And I would ask all the Members to become very aware of what Amendment #1...and take a look at it. And, Joe, I for one would appreciate it if you would describe Amendment #1 and not go into details of where we are with the various pension plans."

Ebbesen: "Well, thank you very much, Representative Bradley. I appreciate that. I think that...and I appreciate your



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

comments and observations that I should have some attention. What I guess I'm saying is that we have to have, in my opinion, some type of a moratorium so that the State of Illinois can demonstrate... We can start right here in this House of Representatives and get it concurred in by the Senate and signed by the Governor, a moratorium for the balance of the 80th General Assembly. And I'm talking about add-on benefits. This would in no way have any effect or diminish or decrease any benefits that anybody is receiving or entitled to as they exist today. What I'm saying is that we have to put a handle on this. And I think that the people of the State of Illinois would look towards us as someone who is providing some leadership for the 49 other states for Federal and local governments that the pension system is the most critical problem in this country. And I for one would appreciate the fact that the...that we could demonstrate this type of leadership. I'm calling for a moratorium for the balance of the 80th General Assembly. And if it's working well, it would enable the Committees on Pensions in the House and the Senate, the Pension Laws Commission, in the meantime to address themselves after the moratorium with a temporary halt to add-on benefits. And I want to emphasize that. Give them the opportunity to study what we can afford and what we can't afford. And bring some semblance of sanity into the Pension System. I would ask you to look at the '77 report. If you take the unfunded accrued liability assets versus this, we are 30 percent funded for all the state's responsibility as far as the Pension System is concerned. Now you can talk about, well look how can we close this down. You're saying, you're serving the functions of Committees. I say, perhaps we should do that for a year and a half. We all know, say that we've had the impact statements, we've been casting intelligent votes. Not too much is getting out. But I've been here long enough to know that these Bills that create



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

a devastating, a very devastating posture on the Pension System, they have a way of surfacing and getting to the Governor's desk, in many cases get signed. And I would be happy to respond to any questions. But I would ask for your approval of Amendment #1, which would become the Bill. And then on Third Reading we can vote it up or down accordingly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After that brief explanation by Representative Ebbesen, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. This Amendment #1 deletes everything after the enacting clause and inserts language which had been included in House Bill 26 of this Session, which did not get out of Committee, and language which was similar to House Bill 1798 of two years ago, which was also defeated by this House. What this Amendment does is to provide a moratorium on all new pension legislation, beginning on the effective date of the Act, and that moratorium is to continue until January 10, 1979. Now this Amendment provides, in part, that any Act amending, adding to or repealing the provisions of this Code which would otherwise become law after the effective date of this Amendatory Act of 1977, shall not have the effective law before January 10, 1979. This language frankly...the legislative prerogative to introduce legislation. Furthermore, if we assume that next year all substantive legislation must be deemed as an emergency by the Rules Committee before assignments of a Standing Committee. Is this Amendment at all necessary? And I suggest to you that it is not. Also there has been a Subcommittee that the Personnel and Pension Committee created which has recommended to the Governor through the Pension Laws Commission various alternatives to alleviate the funding inadequacies of the five state supported systems. This raises very substantial questions. Is there going to be, if this Amendment passes the need for a Pension Committee,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

a Pension Laws Commission, Legislative Staff for the Pension Committees? But the basic question is, can Legislators be prohibited from amending the Illinois Revised Statutes. I think the answer is clearly no. The Bill as proposed here in this Amendment is frankly unconstitutional. It has to be defeated. And I suggest that we give it a negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, so that we soon can lock the doors of this place tonight, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Ebbesen to close."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm very happy that Representative Houlihan saw fit to bring up that Subcommittee report for the Pension Laws Commission. I happen to have been the Chairman of that Subcommittee and the recommendations of that Subcommittee that did go to the Pension Laws Commission included a recommendation that the State of Illinois should, which the present Governor has now initiated, that we include a normal cost every given year, plus the interest on the unfunded, accrued liability so we don't compound the existing problem. And that we also come up with some type of a program...a long-range program which we could advertise over 20 to 25 to 30 to 40 years. To bring the funding level up to what I don't call 100 percent funding because we all know out there, there will never be a 100 percent funding. We're going to have something like an optimum level funding which would be two-thirds of 100 percent. But anyway in advertising over and above the cost there, that would be a recommendation over a period where we'd pay in every given year so that we would eventually get that up to where we're out of the danger



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

zone as far as these pensions are concerned. And all saying to this House is it's imposing upon ourselves, a restriction upon ourselves, a bylaw that there shall be no more add-on benefits. I'm not talking about decreasing existing benefits, but no more add-on benefits relative to the Pension System. And I would encourage an 'aye' vote. And thank you very much for your attention."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is no more critical problem to the financial solvency of the State of Illinois than the problem raised by the Gentleman from DeKalb. I think that future generations will record that he was not 'Cassandra' and that in fact he was correct. Our Pension Systems are much more liberal than in private industry. Private industry cannot begin to afford the kind of Pension Systems that we have in government. We are going to have to recognize that the time is going to come when we're going to have to face up to those financial responsibilities. And I'm going to vote 'aye' because I think a moratorium of two years while we consider how to deal with the problem is in order."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We address the big problem about Pension Systems. However I would like to commend the Legislature in the last four years on their control of the pension benefits that have passed out of this House. This year we received compliments from the Taxpayers Federation, and as I believe there is less than a million dollars in costs have been passed through this here Legislature this year. This particular Amendment would not be effective in the fact that we haven't been passing any Pension Bills in the years that we have had appropriations only. It does have to go through the Committee on Assignment where



only emergency Bills are heard. And I think that the Legislature should be commended on the job that they have done in the last four years with regards to pensions and the control thereof. This particular Bill...or Amendment would negate the Legislator's right to introduce a Bill on pension benefits whether or not the employee wanted to pay the entire cost of those Pension Bills. If we wanted to, then we should eliminate the Pension Laws Commission with this Amendment. We should eliminate the Pension Committee. And we should also eliminate the Legislature. And a 'no' vote is the correct vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 'aye' and 79 'no' Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Did you rule on that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I said there was 74-79."

Ebbesen: "Could I have a poll of the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt, Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania desires to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman, Ewell, Friedrich, Gaines, Kent, Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent, 'aye'. Representative Friedrich, 'aye'. Representative Winchester, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Lauer, Laurino, Madison, McAvoy, Murphy, Neff, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Sevcik."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sevcik, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.G. Steele, Von Boeckman and Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "79-79. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Perhaps I can encourage somebody to give me one



'aye' vote. And when we come to the Bill we can vote it on Third Reading. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 79 'aye' and 79 'no'. The motion is lost. Consideration Postponed. Wait a minute now. Are there any more... I declared the result of that. I declared the result. I can tell you what's going to happen here. Representative Madigan. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker. I understand there was a Member of this side that wanted to vote. The Sponsor of the Amendment wanted to have a verification. And again you've misused the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "I declared the results."

Ryan: "You know, Mr. Speaker, wrongfully you declared the results. Admit your error and back up and do it the way you're suppose to."

Speaker Redmond: "When you're Speaker, you back up and do it the way you want to."

Ryan: "You bet I will, I sure..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker. I move that we adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Question on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. We're now adjourned until 10 in the morning. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Appropriation I Committee, 8:30 in the morning. 8:30 in the morning. Appropriation I Committee. Thank you very much. 8:30."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
9		Lechowicz	Question
		Skinner	
		Speaker Madigan	
10, 11, 12		Schuneman	Yield
13		Skinner	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Madigan	TOOR; Roll Call for attendance
		Lechowicz	Excused absences
14		Speaker Madigan	
		Ryan	Excused absences
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment is germane
		Polk	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Skinner	
15		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan, D.	Explains 'no' vote
		Speaker Madigan	
16		Kane	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
		Skinner	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
	11:32	Epton	Explains vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment #2 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
		Speaker Madigan	
17		Bowman	
		Speaker Madigan	
18, 19		Kosinski)	Questions
)	
		Bowman)	Response
		Speaker Madigan	
20		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Madigan	
21		Getty)	Yield?
)	
		Bowman)	Response
		Speaker Madigan	
		Ebbesen	
22		Speaker Madigan	
23		Bowman	To close
		Speaker Madigan	
		Willer	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
		Macdonald	
		Speaker Madigan	
24		Mann	
		Speaker Madigan	
25	11:50	Hudson	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
26		Houlihan, J.	Explains vote



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: June 22, 1977

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
27		Stearney	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
		Robinson	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
28		Mugalian	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
		Friedrich	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
29		Martin, P.	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bowman	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
30		Ewell	
		Speaker Madigan	
31		Griesheimer	
		Speaker Madigan	
32		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Katz	
		Speaker Madigan	
33	12:10	Waddell	Explains vote
		Speaker Madigan	
		Wolf	
		Speaker Madigan	
34		Younge	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
35		Schoeberlein	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Gaines	
		Speaker Madigan	
36		McAuliffe	
		Speaker Madigan	
37		Catania	
		Speaker Madigan	
38		Sevcik	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bowman	Requests Oral Roll Call
		Speaker Madigan	
39, 40		Clerk O'Brien	Oral Roll Call
		Speaker Madigan	
41		Clerk O'Brien	Calls absentees
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment #3 fails, Third
		Bradley	
	12:40	Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 600
		Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Jones, E.	
		Speaker Madigan	
42		Bradley	Question
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 600, Second, No CA
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #1
		Speaker Madigan	
		Dunn, J.	Move to table #1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #3
		Speaker Madigan	
43		Jacobs	Leave to table Amendments #3
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #9
		Speaker Madigan	
		Brummer	Withdraw #9
		Speaker Madigan	Leave
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #10
		Speaker Madigan	
		Dunn, J.	Leave to withdraw
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #11
		Bradley	Withdraw #11
	1:43	Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #12
		Speaker Madigan	Not printed
		Dunn, J.	Advance Bill to Third
		Speaker Madigan	
44		Skinner	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment #12 withdraws, Third



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 720, Second
		Speaker Madigan)	
45		Mautino)	
		Speaker Madigan)	Bill read second...pre...Floor
		Clerk O'Brien)	Amendment #6
		Speaker Madigan	
46		Schuneman	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Tuerk	Question
		Mautino	
		Speaker Madigan	
47, 48, 12:50		Schuneman	Amendment #6
49		Speaker Lechowicz	
50, 51		Hanahan	Against
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ebbesen	Supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
52		Conti	Supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
53		Mautino	Opposes
		Speaker Lechowicz	
54		Cunningham	Supports
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Deavers	Motion at proper time
		Speaker Lechowicz	
55		Tuerk	Supports



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brummer	Against
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Dunn	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
56		Giorgi	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	1:15	Giorgi	Against
		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Madigan	Against
		Speaker Lechowicz	
58		Dunn, J.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
59, 60		Schuneman	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jacobs	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schuneman	
61		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #6 fails
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #7
		Tuerk	Leave to hear 7, 8 9 together
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendments 8&9
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
62		Tuerk	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
63		Mautino	Opposes
		Tuerk	
64		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mautino	
		Johnson	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	1:33	Tuerk	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
65		Friedrich	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendments 7, 8, 9 not adopted
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment #10
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	Withdraws Amendment #10
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #10 tabled
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment #11
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mautnio	Explains #11
66		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #11 passes
		Clerk Hall	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Third Reading
67		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1019
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mautino	Senate Bill 1019 and 720
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment #2
		Speaker Lechowicz	
68		Schuneman	Explains Amendment #2
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schuneman	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mautino	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #2 fails
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment #3
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tuerk	Withdraws # 3, 4, 5
		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave granted
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment #6
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	Withdraws #6
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment #7
		Speaker Lechowicz	
69		Mautino	Explains Amendment #7
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #7 passes
		Clerk Hall	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Third Reading
		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1023 and Amendment 3
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Capparelli	Explains Amendment #3
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #3 is adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
70		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment #4
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty)	Error in Amendment #3
)	
	1:40	Speaker Lechowicz)	Correct it on face
		Clerk Hall	Rereads Amendment #4
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ryan	Withdraws #4
		Speaker Lechowicz	Third Reading
		Cunningham	Inquiry
71		Speaker Lechowicz	House Bills, Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads House Bill 1044
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kent	Explains House Bill 1044
	1:45	Speaker Lechowicz	House Bill 1044 is passed
		Clerk	Reads House Bill 1349
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR
		Clerk	Reads House Bill 2361
		Speaker Lechowicz	
72		Hanahan	Explains House Bill 2361
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner)	Questions
)	
73		Hanahan)	Response
	1:47	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Polk	Supports Hanahan
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brummer	Move previous question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
74		Hoffman	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Meyer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House Bill 2361 is passed
75		Clerk O'Brien	Reads House Bill 2402
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	1:50	Walsh	Explains House Bill 2402
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bradley)	Yield
)	
76		Walsh)	Response
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Collins	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Byers)	Yield
)	
77	1:55	Walsh)	Response
		Speaker Lechowicz	
78		Cunningham	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Robinson)	Yield (Speaks on the Bill)
)	
79		Walsh)	Response
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Walsh	To close on House Bill 2402
80		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan, J.	Explains vote
81		Speaker Lechowicz	House Bill 2402 passes; House Bills, Second
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads House Bill 2410, Amendment #2
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	2:02	Totten	Explains Amendment #2
		Speaker Lechowicz	
82		Brady	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
83		Barnes, E.	Hold the Bill?
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	House 2417, too!
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
84		Brady	Move House Bill 2417
	2:07	Speaker Lechowicz	Opposes Amendment #2, on House Bill 2410
		Barnes	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
85		Totten	To close on House Bill 2410, Amendment #2
	2:10	Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #2 fails, Third



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads House Bill 2417
		Speaker Lechowicz	Third Reading; Senate Bills, Consent Calendar
		Houlihan, D.	Remove Senate Bill 497 from CC
		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave granted
86		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Deavers	Remove Senate Bill 1367
		Speaker Lechowicz	
87		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Consent Calendar
		Speaker Lechowicz	Removing various Bills
		Conti	
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds
		Speaker Lechowicz	Reads Bills removed
		Houlihan, D.	
88		Speaker Lechowicz	
	2:18	Adams	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Consent Calendar passed
89		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Committee Reports
		Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bills, Third, Short Debate
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 23
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Inquiry (Priority of Call)
		Speaker Lechowicz	Priority Call after S.B. 23
		Jones, E.	Explains Senate Bill 23
90		Speaker Lechowicz	
91		Collins	Opposes Senate Bill 23



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	2:22	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jones, E.	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bill 23, vote
92		Jones, E.	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Point of order
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jones, E.	Continues
		Speaker Lechowicz	Poll of absentees?
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls the absentees
	2:33	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bowman	'Aye'
93		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pechous	'Aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Willer	'No'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mugalian	'No'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		O'Brien	'No'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Davis, C.	'Aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	'No'
	2:30	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Steczo	'No'



Second tape

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
94		Mann	'No'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jones, E.	Postponed Consideration, Senate Bill 23
95		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 27
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Martin	Explains Senate Bill 27
	2:40	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brady	
96		Speaker Lechowicz	passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 152, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz)	
		Greiman)	TOOR
		Speaker Lechowicz	
97		DiPrima	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 230, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Simms	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	
98		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 743, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		DiPrima	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan, J.	
99	2:47	DiPrima	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 870, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Sandquist	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
100		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 1359, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matejek	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
101		Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
102		Johnson	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Katz	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
103		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	2:56	Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Dyer	
104		Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bill 1359 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 350, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
105		Pierce	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
106		Robinson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
107		Pierce	
		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
		Clerk O'Brien)	
)	
		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
		Waddell)	
)	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
108		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 1301, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brummer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
109		Griesheimer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	3:10	Wolf	Opposes
		Speaker Lechowicz	
110		Griesheimer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedrich	
111		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Conti	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
112		Brummer	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 73, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
113		Johnson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leinenweber	
	3:21	Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bill 73
		Byers	Point of personal privilege
114		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
		Ebbesen	Vote 'no' on Senate Bill 73
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Harris	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 206, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
115		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hart	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
116		Terzich	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
117		Skinner	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Lechowicz	
118		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Harris	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Getty	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	
119		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 360



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Willer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	
120		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Willer	
	3:35	Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bill 360
		Capparelli	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 419, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
121		Hoffman	Leave to hear 420
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 420
		Hoffman	
122		Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bill 419 and 420 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 708, Second Reading, Third Reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Luft	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
123		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 779, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 1012, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
124		Mautino	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	3:44	Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bill 1012 passed
125		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1379, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Senate Bill 1379
		Totten	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
126		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
		Conti)	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	
127		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Keats	Change to 'no' on 1005
		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
		Totten)	
128		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 122, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Terzich	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	3:55	Marovitz	
129		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Sumner	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Byers	Point of order
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Martin, L.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stiehl, C.	
130		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 129, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	
	4:00	Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 139, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	
131		Speaker Lechowicz	
132		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	Move to table Senate Bill 139
		Speaker Lechowicz	Tabled



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 145, Third
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 145 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 287, Third
133		Bartulis	Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 505, Third
	4:07	Mahar	Senate Bill 505
134		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 509, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		O'Daniel	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 533, Third
135		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 537, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 591, Third
136		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 663, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
137		Houlihan, D.	
	4:17	Speaker Redmond	Passed
138		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 668, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Announcement
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan)	Request 1 hour recess
139) Speaker Redmond)	Denied
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	On Senate Bill 668
		Speaker Redmond	
140		Mugalian	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
		Stearney)	
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
141		Ryan)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stearney	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	Postponed Consideration
142		Speaker Redmond	Postponed Consideration; 751



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 751
		Speaker Redmond	
		Younge	Explains Senate Bill 751
		Speaker Redmond	
		McCourt	Explains 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
143		Pierce	Explains 'aye' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
144		Davis, C.	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Redmond	
		Davis, C.	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, J.	Votes 'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 797
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 797
		Speaker Redmond	
		Martin, P.	Return to Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan)	Question
)	
145		Martin, P.)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 948
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 948
		Speaker Redmond	
		Doyle	Explains Senate Bill 948
		Speaker Redmond	
146		Telcser	Opposes



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Doyle)	
)	
		Telcser)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Comments
		Speaker Redmond	
147		McMaster	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		O'Brien	Comments
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 949
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes, J.	Explains Senate Bill 949
		Speaker Redmond	
148		Kelly	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 998
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 998
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giglio	Explains Senate Bill 998
		Speaker Redmond	
149		Madison	Explains 'present' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giglio	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stearney	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Schneider	Question; 'aye' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	Point of clarification
		Speaker Redmond	
150		Conti	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	Votes 'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 998 passed; Senate Bill 1033
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 1033
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	
		Speaker Redmond	
151		Madison)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Giorgi	Explains Senate Bill 1033
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMaster	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
152		Rigney	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pierce	Explains 'aye' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giorgi	Explains 'aye' vote
153		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 1033 passed; 1175



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 1175
154		Speaker Redmond	TOOR; 1188
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Luft	Explains Senate Bill 1188
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 1188 passed; 1220
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 1220
		Speaker Redmond	
		DiPrima	Explains Senate Bill 1220
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 1220 passed; 1259
		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1259
155		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	TOOR
		Speaker Redmond	1264
		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1264
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	Explains Senate Bill 1264
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
156		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 1264 passed; 1271
		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1271
		Speaker Redmond	
		Capparelli	Explains Senate Bill 1271
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 1271 passed; Senate Bill 1298
		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1298
		Speaker Redmond	
157		Luft	Explains Senate Bill 1298



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 1298 passed; 1299
		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1299
		Speaker Redmond	
		Steczo	Explains Senate Bill 1299
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; Senate Bill 1357
158		Clerk Hall	Reads Senate Bill 1357
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deavers	Explains Senate Bill 1357
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 1361
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 1361
		Speaker Redmond	
159		Kempiners	Explains Senate Bill 1361
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mautino	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 216
		Kempiners	Explains Senate Bill 216
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 216
		Speaker Redmond	
160		Totten	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 449
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 449
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	Explains Senate Bill 449
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.)	Question
)	
		Leinenweber)	Response



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	No Amendments adopted
161		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	Take back to Second
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 449 on Second
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment 1
		Leinenweber)	Adopt Amendment 1
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	Amendment 1 adopted, Third; 449
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 449
162		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 1148
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 1148
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR; Senate Bills, Third, Short Debate--Senate Bill 21
		Katz	Req. on Senate Bill 1148
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 21
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 21
		Speaker Redmond	
163		McPike	Explains Senate Bill 21
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
164		Steele, E.	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Reilly	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 30
		Speaker Redmond	
165		Ewell	Explains Senate Bill 30
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 170
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 170
		Hart	Return to Second for Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	Okay
		Hart	Adopt Amendment 3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment 3
		Hart	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment 3 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
166		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 207
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR; 371
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 371
		Speaker Redmond	
		Beatty	Explains Senate Bill 371
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
167		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 607
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 607
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	Explains Senate Bill 607
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; 347
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 347



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	
168		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan)	Question	
		Speaker Redmond)		
		O'Brien	Explains Senate Bill 347	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; House Bill 2414	
		Ryan	Suspend Rule 31(b)	
	Speaker Redmond			
169		McClain)	Question	
		Ryan)		
		Speaker Redmond	Response	
		McClain		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Totten	Point of order	
170		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain	Opposes	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Totten		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain	Continues	
	171		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Holewinski	Opposes motion
		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
172		Skinner	Comments
		Speaker Redmond	
173		Kane)	Question
) Ryan)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell	Point of order
174		Kane	Opposes motion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
175		Tipsword	Opposes motion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Sevcik	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Requests 'aye' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
176		McClain	Explains 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Flinn	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
177		Holewinski	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
	5:39	Lucco	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed; Byers requests verification
		Meyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	
178		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Introductions
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti	'Aye'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
179		Speaker Redmond	
		McBroom	Wants to be verified
		Speaker Redmond	
		Richmond	Leave to be verified
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
180		Spekaer Redmond)	Questions of Roll
		Holewinski)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
181	5:50	Speaker Redmond	119 'ayes'-House Bill 2414- bypass Committee, Second Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 435, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Wikoff	Wants it moved to Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Satterthwaite	
		Wikoff	Third Reading (moved to,)
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
182		Ryan)	Argues
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Giorgi	
183		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 436, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 437, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 438, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #4
		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
184		Stuffle)	
)	
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
	6:00	Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 487, Second Reading
185		Peters	Moves to table #10
		Speaker Redmond	



	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
Third tape	187		Barnes, E.	
			Speaker Redmond	
	188		Van Duyne	Favors Amendment
			Speaker Redmond	
	189		Skinner	
			Speaker Redmond	
			Byers	
			Speaker Redmond	
	190		Mulcahey	
			Speaker Redmond	
			Davis, J.	Urge 'no'
			Speaker Redmond	
191		Van Duyne	Personal privilege	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Edgar		
192		Speaker Redmond		
		Gaines		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Darrow	Moves previous question	
193	6:17	Speaker Redmond		
		Peters	To close	
194		Speaker Redmond		
		Satterthwaite	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mann		
			Speaker Redmond	
			Mulcahey	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
195		Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	Inquiry
196		Speaker Redmond	Amendment tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #15
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
197		Leinenweber	In favor of #15
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Yield
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
198		Kelly	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania)	Yield
	6:30	Byers)	
		Speaker Redmond	
199		Kempiners	Speaks against
		Speaker Redmond	
200		McClain	Against
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
201		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #16
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Levin)	Questions
)	
		Mulcahey)	
202		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
203		Barnes, E.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell)	Question
)	
204		Mulcahey)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
	6:42	Kent	
205		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #16 fails, Third
		Johnson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
206		Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 629, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	
207		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 845, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
208		Kucharski)	
)	
209		McClain)	
		Speaker REdmond	
		Van Duyne	Questions
	6:55	Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
210		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 845 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 915, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Miller	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
211		Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 1028, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Getty	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	
212, 213		Martin, P.	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Johnson	Oppose
		Speaker Madigan	
214	7:06	Ewell	
		Speaker Madigan	
		O'Daniel	Moves previous question
		Speaker Madigan	TOOR
		Deavers	Leave to return Senate Bill 1367 to Second
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
		Deavers	
215		Speaker Madigan	
		Deavers	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Madigan	
216		McBroom	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Unknown	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Macdonald	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Lechowicz	Moves previous question
		Speaker Madigan	
217		Holewinski	Question's germaneness
		Speaker Madigan	
		Giorgi	
	7:15	Speaker Madigan	Amendment adopted, Third
		Davis, J.	Senate Bill 622, leave to return to Second
		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan	
		Davis	Appropriate time...
218		Speaker Madigan	
		Bradley	Leave to return 478 to Second
		Speaker Madigan	Leave granted
		Bradley	Amendment #1
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment adopted, Postponed Consideration
219		Willer	Senate Bill 359, leave to return to Second
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
		Speaker Madigan	
220		Leinenweber	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
		Ebbesen	Moves adoption of Amendment 1
		Speaker Madigan	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 1 adopted
		Clerk Hall	Reads Amendment 2
		Leinenweber	Withdraws Amendment 2
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk Hall	
		Speaker Madigan	Postponed Consideration; question on House Bill 408
		Richmond	
221		Speaker Madigan	
		Davis, J.	Senate Bill 622
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Levin	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Davis, J.	
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 2 adopted
222		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 622
		Speaker Madigan	
		Davis, J.	Explains Amendment 2
		Speaker Madigan	
		Holewinski	
		Davis, J.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
		Van Duyne	Question
223		Davis, J.	
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 3 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 4
		Speaker Madigan	
		Schuneman	Explains Amendment 4
		Speaker Madigan	
224		Giorgi	Question
		Schuneman	Explains further
		Speaker Madigan	
		Davis, J.	Supports Amendment 4
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 4 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	Senate Bill 622 placed on Third
		Leverenz	Senate Bill 1097 return to Second for Amendment
		Speaker Madigan	Okay
		Leverenz	Explains Amendment 2
225		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 2 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 3
		Leverenz	Explains Amendment 3 withdrawn
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 3 withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 4
		Leverenz	Explains Amendment 4
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 4 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan)	Senate Bill 1079, Third; Senate
)	Bills, Second Reading
		Geo-Karis)	
226		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Senate Bill 626
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 4
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan)	
)	
		Geo-Karis)	
		Speaker Madigan)	
)	
		Geo-Karis)	
		Speaker Madigan	
227		Martin, L.	
		Speaker Madigan	Senate Bill 1098
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 2
		Martin, L.	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan, J.)	Questions
)	
228, 229		Martin, L.)	Explains further
		Speaker Madigan	
		Giorgi)	Question
)	
230		Martin, L.)	Roll Call
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 2 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	Senate Bill 1098, Third
		Garmisa	Senate Bill 1039
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Garmisa	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Leverenz	Question
231		Speaker Madigan	
		Garmisa	
		Speaker Madigan	
232		Simms)	
)	
		Garmisa)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Leverenz)	
)	
		Garmisa)	
		Speaker Madigan)	
)	
233		Ryan)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Dunn, J.)	
)	
234		Garmisa)	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Vitek	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Brummer	Question
		Garmisa	Response
		Speaker Madigan	
		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
235		Garmisa	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Garmisa	
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 1 carries
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 2
		Garmisa	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Bowman)	Question
)	
		Garmisa)	Response
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 2 adopted
236		Clerk O'Brien	
		Garmisa	Return Bill to Consent Calendar
		Speaker Madigan)	
)	
		Geo-Karis)	Table Amendment 4 to Senate
)	Bill 626
		Clerk O'Brien)	Reads Senate Bill 626
)	
		Speaker Madigan)	Questions
		Geo-Karis	Table Amendment 4
237		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 5
		Speaker Madigan	
		Geo-Karis	Adopt Amendment 5
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 5 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 6
		Geo-Karis	Adopt Amendment 6
238		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 6 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	Placed on Third Reading
		Stuffle	Return Senate Bill 826 to Second
		Speaker Madigan)	
)	
		Beatty)	Question
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Madigan	
239		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
		Speaker Madigan	Senate Bill 826
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 1
		Simms	Explains Amendment 1 to 826
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment 1 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	826 on Third
		Summer)	
)	
		Speaker Madigan)	Return 323 to Second
240		Speaker Madigan	Senate Bill 323 to Second
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 5
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment 6
		Speaker Madigan	
	8:12	Ryan	
		Madigan	
		Levin)	Question
)	
		Ryan)	
241		Speaker Madigan	
		Ryan	Requests Republican Conference
		Speaker Madigan	'Duly noted'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 312, Third
242		Yourell	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Ryan)	Yield
)	
		Yourell)	
		Speaker Madigan	
243		Dyer	
		Speaker Madigan	
244		Yourell	
		Speaker Madigan	
	8:22	Skinner	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Yourell	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 210, Third
		Speaker Madigan	
		Barnes	
245		Speaker Madigan	Passed
		Ryan	Requests Republican Conference
		Speaker Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Madigan	Recess until 9
246, 247	9:09	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 382, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMaster	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
248		Jaffe)) McMaster)	Yield
		Speaker Redmond	
249, 250		Geo-Karis)) McMaster)	
	9:17	Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Redmond	
251		McMaster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
252		Leverenz	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMaster	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	
253		McMaster	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMaster	Postponed Consideration
254		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 458, Third
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Giglio	
	9:28	Speaker Redmond	
		Levin	
		Speaker Redmond	
255		Giglio	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 557, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Redmond	
256		Hudson	
257		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Redmond	
258		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow)	Yield
)	
259		Mugalian)	
		Speaker Redmond	
260		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
8:43		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
261, 262		Antonovych Speaker Redmond Wikoff Speaker Redmond	
263		Dunn, J. Speaker Redmond Meyer Speaker Redmond Byers Speaker Redmond	Supports
264		Dyer Speaker Redmond	
265		Mann Speaker Redmond Deuster Speaker Redmond Friedrich	
266		Speaker Redmond Conti Speaker Redmond Collins Speaker Redmond	Passed
	9:55	Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	Senate Bill 621, Third
267		Neff Speaker Redmond	
268		Houlihand, D.	Question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Neff	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	Senate Bill 735, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
269		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Ebbesen	
270		Clerk Hall	Senate Bill 345, Second
271, 272		Ebbesen	Amendment 1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
273		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	
274		Speaker Redmond	
275		Houlihan, D.	
		Matijevec	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
276	10:20	Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
277		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ebbesen	Poll absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
278		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion is lost
		Ryan	
		Madigan	Moves adjourn---
		Speaker Redmond	House adjourn until 10 a.m.
		Matijeovich	Announcement

