

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

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. It was Edmund Burke who said: 'All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing'. Let us pray. Almighty God, the Author and Giver of all good things, Who in Thy infinite wisdom hast given to man the choice of good or evil; we pray this day that Thou wilt look favourably upon the Members of this House of Representatives; fill them, O Lord, with Thy power and might that they may constantly and diligently labour for that which is good and well pleasing to Thee; that in so doing they may effect good for the people of the State of Illinois; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Senate Bills Second Reading. Senate Bills Second Reading, 96."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 96. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 103. I neglected to advise the Body that Representative Geo-Karis is in the chamber."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 103..."

Speaker Redmond: "Which chamber, is Representative Ryan's inquiry. Representative Deuster. Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, since you announced that Miss Geo-Karis is in the chamber, would it be proper to refer her as a chambermaid?"

Speaker Redmond: "103"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 103. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois



Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 104."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 104. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "106."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 106. A Bill for an Act in relation to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 110."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 110."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "I'll take that for Representative Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 simply allows the delegates to a mini-convention to be picked at the primary election. I'd ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 116."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 116. A Bill for an Act to substitute the word 'person' for 'man' in several Acts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Campbell. Amends...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell. Your Amendment."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 116, page."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to...leave of the House to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing no objections, the Amendment #1 is withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Campbell. Amends Senate Bill 116 on page 1 by deleting lines 1 and 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell. Representative..... You want this one out of the record?"

Ryan: "....Mr. Speaker, that we were going to take Bills without Amendments, now either...."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Ryan: "We are or we aren't."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this one out of the record." 125, is there any Amendment on that?" 125."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 125. A Bill for an Act..... Senate Bill 125. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create a division in the Office of Attorney General for the investigation, enforcement of law....relating to civil and equal rights. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 143."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 143. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the exercise of the right of Eminent Domain. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 159. There's a floor Amendment on 159."

"We'll take that out. 205. On which one? 159? The Calendar shows a Committee Amendment. Is there any floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "159. Is there any motion or....floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 159. A Bill for an Act in relation to



Executive Orders. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion or floor Amendments? Take it out of the record. 205."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 205. A Bill for an Act...."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 286. Take that out of the record. 293. Take that one out. 305. 310. Out of the record. 496. Floor Amendments on 496? 501. Out of the record. 639. Which one? 639? What's the status of 639, is there any floor Amendments? Whose... whose floor Amendment is it? Are you withdrawing it? Well, I can't make up your mind for you. Take it out of the record. I can't guarantee that any of these will be called again except appropriations. 752. Take that one out. 830. Floor Amendment on which one? 830. 862."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 862. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Financial Assistance Act for nonpublic institutions of higher learning. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Has there been a fiscal note filed on that Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Says it's on the Calendar that it's filed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, there is a fiscal note filed."

Ryan: "Can we take that one out of the record for now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1068. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "I thought you moved that one to Third and it didn't have any Amendments or...and a fiscal note was filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Minority Leader has requested that it be taken out of the record. Now, you discuss it with him and.... I don't know why."

Darrow: "Was that after it moved to Third?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, with a sparse attendance we're not quite that...."

Darrow: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "1068. Floor Amendment on 1068? Out of the record. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I'd like to present the Amendment if I could."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Representative Ryan doesn't want us to proceed



on any that have floor Amendments. You talk it over with him and if it's satisfactory, it's all right with me. 1148." Take 1148 out of the record. 1177."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1177. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion or...."

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions or floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Floor Amendments? Third Reading. 1203."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1203. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act authorizing municipalities to incorporate. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any floor Amendments on 1203? Take it out of the record. 1308. Whose Amendment is it? Representative Campbell on the floor? How do you stand on them? You want them or don't want them? Get back on your seat there. Get back to your seat. Read the...read the Amendment."

Campbell: "Out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Don't you want to proceed on this? I would recommend you do."

Campbell: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1308...."

Speaker Redmond: "Please break up the Republican Convention over there. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Campbell. Amends Senate Bill 1308...."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Don't have to ask leave, just withdraw Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Madison."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Madison."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your pleasure with respect to Amendment #2?"

Campbell: "Well, I would object to Amendment #2...."



Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Sponsor is not here to offer it....Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, what are we doing with this...with this Bill? It's got a floor Amendment....the Minority...."

Speaker Redmond: "...Nothing we can do, we've got a hundred and sixty-seven Members here...."

Bradley: "Then I would...I would like to make a point, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know what the Minority Leader's objection is to proceeding with these Amendments that you've tried to move Bills through, but we've."

Speaker Redmond: "That may have been resolved, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, we sat and listened to the Whip last night...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's all right, that may have been resolved."

Bradley: "Well, at twelve o'clock...."

Speaker Redmond: "Why would you act like Ryan, now?"

Bradley: "Well, I don't like to hear those same remarks at eleven o'clock tonight that those Bills weren't called or those....everybody given a chance to move their Bills along as we sat and listened to that dissertation last night. We're here to do the work and let's get on with it so we can get out of here at a decent...."

Speaker Redmond: "I would like...I would like to suggest that the chair wants to go through Second Reading and I don't guarantee that I'll be back here any other time today. My idea is that the people who have Bills on Third Reading that are in passage stage are entitled to have them called. Now, we're ready to proceed on Amendment #2 on House... on Senate Bill 1308. Is the Sponsor of the Amendment here? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe Mr. Madison might be willing to have me pinch hit for him at this point. I couldn't do it as well as he...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...."

Chapman: "This is a good Amendment and I think should go on this Bill. But you know...."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the Amendment? Explain the Amendment."

Chapman: "Well, I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman, I mean Campbell."

Campbell: "I don't want to take advantage of someone who isn't on the



House floor who has an Amendment to offer and I've...I therefore would rather at this point in time and I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll take it out of the record."

Campbell: "...Don't think it's fair and I...take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Let me make my point very clear that I said in the beginning of the 79th Session that I don't think that it's fair for a person proposing an Amendment to hold up moving a Bill from Second to Third when they're not here to present their ...the motion on the Amendment. Now that is your decision and we'll take it out of the record. 1378."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1378. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Fobinson. Amends Senate Bill 1378 on page 1, line 1 and 6."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Robinson here? Since Representative Robinson isn't here we won't hold up moving this Bill to Third Reading. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the Session was called for nine o'clock. We've gone through Senate Bills on Second Reading and I move that all Senate Bills on Second Reading except appropriation Bills be tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Didn't hear you. We're moving...we're moving Senate Bill 1378 to Third Reading. Senate Bill 639. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have offered Amendment #1 to House Bill, or Senate Bill 639 and while I...I have substantial problems with that Bill, out of respect for the Sponsor and his colleagues from that district, I will be pleased at this time to withdraw Amendment #1. I want...just wanted to assure the...the Body, at least those of us who are present here at this time that withdrawing the Amendment if not, should not be taken as indication of my support for the Bill necessarily but that I do believe the Sponsor has the...the right to have his Bill moved onto Third Reading at this time and we can go up or down later. And I wish to be recognized when the floor debate comes. So I...I hereby withdraw Amendment #1 on that basis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman has withdrawn the Amendment."



Any further Amendments? Be quiet, you're ahead. Any further Amendments on 639?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 639. A Bill for an Act authorizing Department of Transportation to make and execute agreements. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. I understand that on 1378, you better put that one in again. Is there any other Amendments? Mr. Clerk, are there further?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Amends Senate Bill 1378 on page 1...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proponent of the Amendment here?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "Whose motion...whose Amendment is #2? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 is a cleanup Amendment to allow the....Senate Bill 1378 to conform with federal regulations. I'd ask for its adoption."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Kane. Amends Senate Bill 1378."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane on the floor? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 changes the filing date from 99 days to 57 days prior to a primary so we would be filing later in the year. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's motion is for the adoption.... Representative Totten. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Even though I'm on the Roll Call and just barely here right now, I wonder if the Sponsor would repeat what that Amendment did?"

Speaker Redmond: "Darrow."

Darrow: "Yes, what this does is, in filing your petitions for the primary election, you would file them 53 days...59 days prior to the primary instead of 99 days as it is now. So you...."

Totten: "That's for...is that for...includes general elections?"





Darrow: "Just primaries, general primaries."

Totten: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say....Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Darrow."

Ryan: "Representative Darrow is the Sponsor, how come Kane's name is on it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's hyphenated."

Ryan: "No, not even hyphenated. Plain Kane."

Speaker Redmond: "You explain it, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Well, evidently the Republican page has distributed an Amendment with just Kane's name on and left the hyphenated Darrow off...."

Ryan: "They've distributed the wrong Amendment, Mr. Speaker, we better take it out of the record."

Darrow: "No, it's the correct Amendment, they've...I guess the hyphen and the Darrow just didn't come through well."

Ryan: "Well, now...."

Darrow: "Do you have any objections?"

Ryan: "I don't mind it if you play it straight with me, Clarence, but I don't like that...and that kind of nonsense. I think you ought to take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Darrow: "George, do you have any objection to this? It's a simple Amendment, we'd like to move it out."

Ryan: "Simple! It's eighteen pages."

Darrow: "That's the only change. If you...."

Ryan: "I think you ought to take it out of the record. You...you can have another shot at it later in the day...."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll take it out of the record." 116."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 116. A Bill for an Act to substitute the word 'person' for 'man' in several Acts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?" 116."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 was withdrawn. Amendment #2. Campbell. Amends Senate Bill 116 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."



Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the House addressed itself to this problem on June the 2nd by a vote of a hundred and three to three. And this simply places a referendum on the operating deficit for the Danville Civic Center and I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. At this time I wonder if we might have a word from one of our Members who has just gone through a harrowing experience. Representative Sharp. It was discovered down in his section of the country that the father is very important to deliveries. 159."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 159. A Bill for an Act to create an Act relating...."

Speaker Redmond: "You want that out? How about 205?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 205. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Stanley here?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this Bill out of the record. Better take 286 out, too. 293."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 293. A Bill for an Act to provide for payment of General State Aid for schools. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the status on 293? Are there any Amendments? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, I'd like to move to table Amendment #1 which was adopted in Committee because Amendment #2 will become the Bill. Amendment #2 provides for bimonthly payments of School Aid, the general distributive fund. This Bill's agreed to, at least at this juncture, by the Illinois Office of Education, the Comptroller's Office and the Bureau of the Budget. I move to table Amendment #1 which was adopted in Committee, is my first motion."



Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Representative Brady is not on the floor, he's the House Sponsor. I wish we'd hold this where it is."

Hoffman: "Representative Brady is in agreement with this Amendment and so is the spokesman on...on both sides of the aisle and Education. And I've discussed it with the Leadership on both sides of the aisle."

Darrow: "I think...."

Hoffman: "If there's any problem I would be happy to bring it back but I know...."

Darrow: "...Like to talk to Representative Brady for...."

Hoffman: "There's no problem with this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't we move it to Third and then if there is any problem we'll bring it back."

Hoffman: "I'll bring it back."

Darrow: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "He's an honorable man. He comes from an honorable district."

Hoffman: "There's no question about that. That's...."

Speaker Redmond: "Who are your colleagues?" Who...who are your colleagues? Who is the big bull elephant out there?"

Hoffman: "...I...well, I'm not going to pursue the other side of that question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Hoffman's motion to adopt Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment...motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 205."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 205. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Could we just pull this one out of the record for a while?"

Speaker Redmond: "205? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, the reason why I asked for the pull is...a quite



few number of Amendments on this Bill of some importance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "I think there were only four Amendments filed yesterday, that doesn't seem like a sizeable number to me. I'd like to go with it, Mr. Speaker, if that's possible."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I just...on a point of inquiry. I thought we were going to move onto Third Reading. I'd just withdrawn an Amendment on that basis. Are we back on the Second Reading and...and...?"

Speaker Redmond: "I never got off of Second Reading. Representative Stanley wasn't on the floor so I pulled it."

Bowman: "Well, what is...my question is, what is the posture of the House? We're continuing on Second Reading and...and floor Amendments are now being considered?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're not going to be on this very long but I'm going to give everybody a chance."

Bowman: "But...question is, has the Minority Leader withdrawn his objection to having Amendments heard at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "In the very limited context."

Bowman: "I'll discuss it with him, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Talk to him and see what..... Representative Lechowicz, what's your posture now?"

Lechowicz: "Still the same."

Speaker Redmond: "What do you want to do, Mr. Stanley?"

Stanley: "Speaker, I'd like to proceed with the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to suggest again that it seems to me it's become very apparent that the Republican Bills, the Minority Leader says 'that's fine', we'll move along with them. If they are Democratic Bills he objects to them being moved. I think that's a terrible way to proceed. That we've gone through Second Reading one time already. Let's go on to Third Reading and leave those Bills where they were...where they are. They've had an opportunity to be called and the Minority Leader insists that only Republican Bills be called and that seems to be the way he says things are fair. When it's a Democratic Bill, take it out of the record, and...and I strongly



object to this procedure."

Speaker Redmond: "Your Speaker is a Democrat, Representative Bradley, and I am proceeding according to a certain plan and the Minority Leader is not, as usual, obstinate self this morning. So I don't... it had nothing to do with calling only Republican Bills. They just happen to be the call of the cards. So, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I know what the Gentleman said. I don't if he's been....whether he got here on time or not this morning but evidently he hasn't been awake if he did. I haven't objected to Republican or Democrat Bills at all. I objected to one Amendment that I know of."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Speaker has implied that...that if we don't move these Bills at this point in time there's a chance that some of these Bills on Second Reading we would not get back to and I think this is an important piece of legislation. Like anything on Second Reading we ought to proceed with it."

Speaker Redmond: "205. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Dan Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 205 on page 1, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, handle Amendment 1?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of Amendment #1. Amendment #1 would provide that any newspaper of general circulation...."

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

Stanley: "This...this...this Amendment is Representative Houlihan's not Representative Lechowicz's."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I've recognized Representative Lechowicz to handle it. We're having certain latitude here. Go ahead, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is...would provide that any newspaper of circulation which endorses candidates for elective public offices would also be covered by this Act. I think that this issue has been discussed on this floor a number of times and the importance as far as the endorsements of not only of the general newspapers



but of the major media newspapers throughout this state, and if this Act is such a good, excellent provision, it should be incorporated into law. It was the thought that the newspapers and the endorsements and the effect that they cause would also....should be included by the coverage of this Act as far as the Campaign Finance Article of the Election Code. I believe this Amendment was adopted once before in the House Bill and then, in turn, through some quirk of nature was removed. But I strongly support Amendment #1 and it would encourage the House Membership to move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stanley on the Amendment."

Stanley: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is merely a smokescreen Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen. It takes away from the intent of the Bill and I think that it intends to destroy via conference committee or some other vehicle. And I would recommend that we defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. 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 45 'aye' and 79 'no'. The Gentleman's motion lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. D. L. Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 205 on page 1, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz on Amendment 2."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there really should be no opposition to this Amendment. What we're doing is we're requiring that both political parties and all organizations file under Senate Bill 205 and included with Amendment #2 would be the Independent Voters of Illinois who are a bipartisan group and I'm sure would have no objection to be included under provision of Senate Bill 205."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to oppose the Amendment. As Representative Stanley said on Amendment #1, those who oppose this Bill are...are seeking to have Amendments adopted simply to have the Bill go back to the Senate on concurrence motion and hopefully have it get lost in the shuffle at the last couple three



days. Let me simply tell you that when the Independent Voters of Illinois organize for a campaign they do report just as we do. Their campaign activities are relative to some money they receive and money they expend. They now are covered under the law. They do report their campaign funds and activities. I again repeat what Representative Stanley said, the Amendment is simply a subterfuge to help kill the Bill. And I hope that every Member of the House will vote 'no' on Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think there are at least two things wrong with this Amendment. One is, it is a red herring in its most extreme and kind of dog in the manager, sour grapes kind of stuff. The other thing wrong with it, as I understand it -I don't have it before me, it specifically names an organization. That is like a bill of attainder. It's a totally unconstitutional kind of legislation to name a specific organization. Like in all legislation concerning counties we have to refer to counties, the population over two million. You cannot draft legislation and name a single person or individual or organization. So it's faulty on two grounds."

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

Keats: "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 vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you rise?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on behalf of the Independent Voters of Illinois who are mentioned in this Amendment. I...I think if they knew, if they knew that they were being double dealt or dealt with innuendo, I think they want to be...they want to have a clear and concise and lucid and explicit and implicit method of reporting. And the way they're conducting their business now, they aren't reporting in this manner. One, they...they divide their organization in two parts. One part is the election activities and the other is the day-to-day activities. And I think if they knew they weren't conforming with the law they'd appreciate this law. And I think if you want to do the Independent Voters of Illinois a favor you'd vote for this Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "On the question of the previous question, there's 5 'aye' and 112 'no' and the Gentleman's motion lost. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Stuffle: "Ted, how come common cause isn't in this?"

Lechowicz: "Because they don't endorse candidates and the Independent Voters of Illinois do. And as was pointed out by Representative Giorgi, actually I think they've got a two tier bookkeeping system; one during the normal course of the year and the second one as far as the election of candidates. And what this Bill under the provision of Senate Bill 205 are concerned, you've got to keep an accounting on a day to day basis in recording procedure. And since they do endorse candidates I thought it was only proper that they be included in the provisions of Senate Bill 405. It's not the intent of mine, in offering this Amendment, that it's a red herring in anyway. I think that if they endorse candidates they should be held accountable like any other organization. I strongly recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 'aye' and 87 'no'. The Bill... or, Gentleman's motion failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. D. L. Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 205 on page 1, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is quite similar to Amendment #2. The only difference is this is the Independent Precinct Organization which also endorses candidates. And in the opinion of many of us that it's entirely strictly within the City of Chicago but since they do have a very good and effective organization this should also be included under the provisions of 205."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, the same arguments apply to this Amendment. The IPO does report on its political activities. This has the same defect of the other two...same two defects as the other two Amendments."





And I might add that the Bill without these Amendments affect a totally complete political organization. So it's fully appropriate that it does report audits or income in disbursements because it's totally and solely a political organization."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I repeat, all of these organizations that are... that are...that are....that has the theory that they're the only ones that understand good government want to be made honest. They want to be told to report, cross every 't', dot every 'it'. These people are crying to be told how to report so that their books are so clean that the guardian angel couldn't find any fault with them. Why do we deny them this right and this privilege? Let's give them the opportunity to report everything. That's what they want. We want to hear everything."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 'aye' and 82 'no'. And the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Robinson, Reilly. Amends Senate Bill 205 on page 1, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "We would withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdraw Amendment 4. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. The last one that I didn't take is 1203. Representative McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1203. A Bill for an Act authorizing municipalities to incorporate. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. McPike. Amends Senate Bill 1203 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1203 was on the Consent Calendar. The Democratic staff



in analyzing it found a few problems with it and so we had the Reference Bureau redraft it and Amendment #1 simply clarifies the original intent of the Bill. I move the adoption of Amendment #1."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading." Did I call 1308, Representative Campbell? The last one, 1068."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 103....1308. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code.. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Madison. Amends Senate Bill 1308 on page 2 by deleting all of line 19 through 26."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1308 is an Amendment that deletes an element of the payment of rates related to profit. At the present time the status of House Bill 1308, Mr. Speaker, is to establish a cost-related rate...reimbursement rate for nursing homes. The Bill sets forth certain elements of costs that is to be recognized in terms of this cost-related reimbursement. And one of the elements that's listed in the Bill is profit. Now, Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me that whether you are certified public accountant or whether you're a layman it kind of stretches the point to even suggest that profit is an element of cost. And so this Amendment seeks to delete that element in the Bill. And I solicit your support."

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

Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. One of the reasons why I do, I direct your attention to the second Section, Subsection 4, on page 5 which reads as follows: 'The method of payment shall assure the opportunity for a profit but shall not guarantee or establish a specific amount as cost'. I think this



language makes clear that the proposed payment system would provide an opportunity for a proprietary facility to realize the profit but does not guarantee a profit, a specific amount of profit, as part of the cost determination procedure. Also, in the Federal Register by HEW, dated July the 1st 1976, includes the following with respect to what may be included in calculating profit elements as a part of cost determination. This return on owners at equity of proprietary providers is the only item of profit that may be included as an item of allowable cost. And I therefore would ask you to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

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

Madison: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "How do we get people to invest their money in a proprietary operation if there is no opportunity for profit? I...I'm a little bit at a loss, I've been around a while and I don't figure that one out."

Madison: "Well, Representative Friedrich, that this Amendment certainly does not seek to...to deprive proprietary nursing homes of making a profit. This Amendment seeks to indicate that the State of Illinois is not going to be involved in subsidizing profits. The Bill at the present time, although Representative Campbell is right in that even in the Federal Regulations it sets forth an opportunity for profit, it makes that optional to the state. And..."

Friedrich: "Well, I think my question is, do you know of anyone who would build a nursing home if they knew in advance there was no opportunity to make a profit?"

Madison: "Well at the present time as I understand it, Representative, the states are reimbursing the nursing homes at something like fifty-eight percent of their cost right now and they're losing money. And yet nursing homes are springing up all over the place. The only thing I'm saying is, on their cost-related basis where we seek to at least guarantee that nursing homes will be reimbursed one hundred percent of their costs, that we should not be involved in subsidizing profit. We not only have proprietary nursing homes, we have nonprofit nursing homes."



There is no opportunity for the nonprofit nursing homes to introduce an element of profit in their reimbursement rate and so the rates on that basis have become discriminatory."

Friedrich: "Well, let me get the final question. I guess this is what I should ask first. Do you consider interest on an investment profit?"

Madison: "Do I consider interest on an investment profit?"

Friedrich: "Yes."

Madison: "Well, it depends on how you use the term.... If you define to me what you mean by investment then I'll tell you what...."

Friedrich: "Well, suppose a nursing home costs a half a million dollars and the going rate of interest now, prime rate, is seven percent. Would seven percent on a half million dollars be considered profit or not?"

Madison: "Well, we...this does not seek to...to deny them from making a profit, Representative. These nursing homes not only have patients that are subsidized but they also have private pay patients."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Simms: "You indicated, Representative Madison, that you do not feel the state should subsidize profits to private nursing homes and you feel that private...that the private nursing homes should subsidize the State of Illinois."

Madison: "No, I do not and that's why the Bill is being introduced in the first place."

Simms: "Well, do you feel then that in taking in consideration profit, do you consider that debt-service is part of a profit picture or not? You know what debt-service is?"

Madison: "Yes, I do. And any expense is part of a profit picture. The whole idea of profit is to match revenue against cost, Representative."

Simms: "Well, I think the point that Representative Friedrich was trying to make, I think he was making it very clear, that a proprietary home and a non-for-profit home still have to pay back on their investment, the interest on that money irrespective of the principal involved. And I'm concerned...."

Madison: "Well, this is just an element of the cost that's recognized."



There's no...is no desire in this Amendment to remove interest as an element of cost. It is by any generally accepted accounting principle an element of cost. Only thing I'm saying is that profit is not an element of cost."

Simms: "Well, if profit is not an element of cost, how do you feel that the nursing home industry, whether it be proprietary or non-for-profit are going to be able to replace equipment, are going to replace buildings and take into consideration the element of depreciation if they don't receive some profit on their investment?"

Madison: "The Bill sets forth within it...within it those definable items that are an element of cost. It also includes depreciation, Representative Simms, which is a form as you're aware of...of...of making available to proprietary homes an ability to...to...to replace obsolete equipment, et cetera, et cetera. That is a definable element of cost. It is an acceptable element of cost. Profit is not an element of cost. It is a result of matching costs against revenue."

Simms: "Well, what you're really asking then is for the non-for-profit and the proprietary homes in the state to subsidize the...the State of Illinois in other areas of government in the operation of keeping patients in homes that can't maintain their own care. I was..."

Madison: "No, Representative, what I'm asking..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Simms: "Well, in speaking...in speaking to the Amendment, I don't think the Sponsor of the Amendment has in basis of the general knowledge of actually what...as Representative Friedrich was trying to explain, of what the cost of operating and doing business happen to be. And part of the free enterprise structure in the State of Illinois and in our country is predicated on some reasonable return on investments for that type of services rendered. And I think that Amendment #2 to this legislation should be considered by the House of Representatives in light that people are entitled to make a reasonable, and I emphasize the word reasonable return, on dollar investment."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question?"

Madison: "May I close, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I understand the...the



problem Mr. Friedrich and Mr. Simms are having so I'd like to call your attention to page 5 of the Bill which specifically includes interest. And it includes this as one of the elements of the payment rate. It says that the reasonable, capital cost determined by utilizing incurred interest rates and the current value of the investment including land and a depreciation factor based on estimated depreciable state line life utilizing composite rates will be a part of the element of the interest rate. In response to the point which Mr. Campbell made, the Federal Register does not require that profit be included as an element of the payment rate. It says that the state may do this. It seems very clear that Mr. Madison's good Amendment does not foreclose profit. It simply does not assure profit to a nursing home. Since this sets up a prospective rate structure, a nursing home which is operating efficiently and economically it is going to make a profit. But in our free enterprise system we don't want to provide profit for anyone. We simply want to provide a profit for those people who can operate an efficient, economical nursing home, in this instance, and I hope you vote 'yes' on Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1308."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain. Anyone else? Representative Madison to close." Representative Neff, will you please be seated? Representative Madison to close."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was just assuring Representative Neff that I felt this was an Amendment that he could not support. In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this is an attempt to establish a cost-related reimbursement basis for nursing homes. It includes profit as an element. The HEW regulations specifically set out this as an option on the part of the state. It leaves it to the state. What I'm suggesting is, the State of Illinois ought to take the position that they are not going to guarantee a profit. The Bill in the profit element that sets forth in the Bill, it does not indicate at all what the limit is...would be allowable on a profit. It says, it uses language that is vague and it's going to leave it to the Department to make the determination. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this element of profit in this Bill can become a political football in terms of allowing the Department to determine what that profit should be. Can you just imagine a Department position in promulgating



rules and regulations to an...to an industry on profit element when it becomes clear that that industry may or may not be donating very heavily to a Governor's campaign for election. What I'm suggesting is that it could be used as political football. I'm also suggesting that the other elements in the Bill are sufficient enough to allow a nursing home to reap a profit based on efficient management. It is not designed, in my estimation, to guarantee that inefficiently operated nursing homes ought to be guaranteed a profit. The...the language in this Bill as it relates to profit is too vague and too general and is my feeling that the State of Illinois ought to exercise its option that the Federal Government gives it to not include profit as an element. And I solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a conflict of interest in this matter and as usual I'll vote my conscience."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I respect very much what Representative Madison is trying to do. However, I again refer you to what Chuck Campbell said in the second part of the provision that Mr. Madison is trying to delete. That provision says that 'Method of payment shall serve the opportunity for a profit but shall not guarantee or establish a specific amount of the cost of the profit'. And I suggest to you that this Amendment ought to be defeated badly."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 55 'aye' and 86 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Mugalian. Amends Senate Bill 1308 on page 3, line 28...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment merely clarifies the intent as to the effect of the new system and states that it shall not be sooner than January 1 of 1978. I believe that the Sponsor of



Bill has not objections. And I would therefore not take anymore time...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "...Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an objection to this Amendment. I'd like to suggest to you that what it does, if you look at the Amendment, it says, 'The Department...the Department shall establish an effective date for each facility in the State of Illinois'. If we're really, truly interested in having....a cost related system for nursing care homes you can't now let the Department have a...an effective date for each facility in the state. I'd suggest to you that what it...could happen is the Department will never set effective date for facilities. Or then, again, only set the effective date for the very expensive and the ones that are making specific amounts of profit. Or then, again, it could be used for political purposes. As far as I'm concerned, I think this guts almost the entire Bill. Instead of an effective date immediately what it does is sets up effective date for each facility. And I think that's wrong and I think it ought to be voted down."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 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 76 'aye' and 55 'no'. The Gentleman's motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Campbell. Amends Senate Bill 1308 on page 5, line 2 by inserting after the word and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a four part Amendment and the first part of it simply is a nonsubstantive change which makes the sentence gramatically correct. The second part of the Amendment on page 5 by deleting lines 6 and 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the following





composite rate. This proposed change relates to the manner in which capital costs are to be determined. The language which is being deleted, that is, and the current value of plant and equipment is not generally accepted accounting principal in terms of determining capital costs, ...Is fairly clear that HEW favor determining depreciation on a historical basis. Therefore, having this language in the Bill provides a very good reason to believe that the federal reimbursement might possibly be in danger. And I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything discussion? The question's on....

Representative McClain."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Mr. Campbell, could you explain to me, in putting in Title XIX of the Federal Social Security Act, what does that possibly do to...to this Bill as far as getting a cost-related material for...for the homes?"

Campbell: "Well, would you ask...would you repeat your question?"

McClain: "Well, Title XIX, when we locked that into the system in determining the cost-related matter for the nursing care homes, what potentially could that be? Does that put us almost entirely under the...the Federal Government?"

Campbell: "Just keeps the Bill in line with a mandated federal legislation."

McClain: "That provision's mandated? Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Please come to order. Representative Levin."

Clerk O'Brien: "Oh, yes, there is."

Levin: "Number five."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Back up. Second Reading. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Levin. Amends Senate Bill 1308 on page 3



and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment really deals with two issues. First...the first part of the Amendment simply clarifies that the rate of reimbursement is directed toward the individual patient and his or her needs and classification and not at the category of nursing home that that individual was in. There is some question in the language of the Bill as it's currently constituted as to which way it's directed. The second issue addressed by this Amendment deals with those nursing homes that may not be fully up to standard in terms of quality and care. And it simply authorizes that rates may be adjusted downward for service deficiency found at individual facilities. I know there are an awful lot of very good homes. There are some bad homes, however, that give a...a bad name. I know there is concern in the General Assembly, you know, that the bad facilities, you know, not be...rewarded equally with the good facilities. I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Campbell. Representative..."

Campbell: "I have no objections."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Mr. Levin, it would just mean that...your first part of your three part Amendment, would this mean that all services must be uniformly paid for throughout the state?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "No, I believe this would be set up by geographic location based on what the average cost of...for a particular class of patients in a geographic location."

McClain: "Where...where would you see that? That...that's my problem, I don't see that in that part. I see that you group it in terms of different kinds of facilities but I don't see a geographical difference."

Levin: "It is in the Bill, Section 5...5-5.1."

McClain: "Well, I like your second part. I'll get to the five point. I'm trying to look at that, your second part where you ask for public comment, I appreciate that. But your third comment about a rate may be



...may be moved downward if there are service deficiencies. What... who makes that determination, the Department?"

Levin: "Yes. That is in the Federal Reg, this simply puts it into the statutes to clarify. And I think that it's something that will help many Members here of the General Assembly because there is a concern about, you know, some of the nursing home facilities not being up to standard."

McClain: "So that...so that phrasing is not harmful. This is almost a regurgitation of the federal rules?"

Levin: "That is correct."

McClain: "Verbatim."

Levin: "That is correct."

McClain: "Well, then, why would some people be coming to me being fearful of that...of that phrase?"

Levin: "There is a question, at least this was raised in my discussions with some of the nursing home people, whether or not in terms of some of the federal regulations. And this sounds kind of silly to me whether or not the Department would have the authority to enforce the Federal Reg. I guess they don't want to have the Department have the authority to enforce the provision relating to penalties for deficient...quality of care. I personally can't see how the Department would not have that authority. But if there is a question this Amendment would take care of that."

McClain: "Well, all I know is a couple of nursing care home people did come to me and they asked me about this provision and they seem very fearful of it. Is it possible that the Federal Government could come in for one deficiency in service whereas...and then the Department come in on top of it?"

Levin: "The state does the federal certification."

McClain: "So...."

Speaker Redmond: "...Bring your inquiry to a close so we can move on."

McClain: "Well, okay. Mr. Speaker, then, I hesitate to do this, but I speak against this Amendment also only because if it...if the Department already has this power because they do the certification from... this Federal Government then they already have that power. However, if they don't have this power, then we're inserting something that



might be a duplication. It seems to me in talking to people in nursing care home industry, that this provision they're very fearful of. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope that you will support Amendment #5 because this is a quality of care Amendment. Many voters in my district come to me, and I'm sure you're having the same experience, concerned about the kind of care their relatives, their friends are receiving in nursing homes. This provision makes it very clear that not only can the rate be increased, and that's what the Bill does, but if there are service deficiencies in individual facilities that rate can be adjusted downward. This is a way that you have of really doing something for your district in helping to provide quality of care for helpless residents of nursing homes. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? Representative Levin to close."

Levin: "Just to close, I just would like to point out two things. First of all, that under the existing Federal Reg and in the Bill a nursing home facility that wants to upgrade itself can receive federal funding to do this. So that the only nursing homes that need fear this Amendment are those that just don't want to do anything. I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. 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 57 'aye' and 80 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Leinenweber. 1068."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1068. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections from an Act concerning conveyances. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Leinenweber: "I want to withdraw it, one Amendment. No, I don't think so. Well, I'll just ask for leave to withdraw that to make sure."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Leinenweber....."



Leinenweber: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He withdraws Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 1068 on page 1, line 20."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2...or the need for Amendment #2 was brought to my attention by the Democratic staff. Senate Bill 1068 merely provides that on a deed of conveyance, the deed, quit claim deed or a mortgage, that the names be typed under the signature and that a space be included on the deed or a mortgage for purposes of the Recorder. It was felt that the Bill in the original, the deed's requirements may have affected the validity of the deed. So Amendment #2 merely specifies that the failure to have the names typed or to leave the space does not affect the validity of the deed or mortgage. So I move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 1068 on page 1, line 20 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I wasn't aware there was...is there....oh....I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 should have been withdrawn too. I'd like to move, having voted on the prevailing side, move to reconsider the Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman having voted on the prevailing side moves that the vote by which Amendment #2 was adopted be reconsidered. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it."

Leinenweber: "I move to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn."

Leinenweber: "I'd like, now, move to adopt Amendment #3 which was the one I thought we adopted in 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1378, Laurino, do you want to call that one? Laurino, 1378? Senate Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar. 39."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 39. A Bill for an Act in relation to a tax on severance of coal. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had taken this legislation out of the record two days ago and today is the last day to go with it. So I'm...going forward with Senate Bill 39 which is a coal severance tax legislation originally sponsored in the Senate by Senator Gene Johns. Basically, what this legislation does is put a severance tax on coal mined in the State of Illinois but sent to out of state users. The proposal as presented includes a five percent or thirty cents per ton, whichever is greater, tax on the severance of coal being sent to other states. From the proceeds of this particular tax, fifty percent will go to the coal producing counties, twenty-five percent to the State's General Revenue Fund, fifteen percent for the State's Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Act, five percent for the Black Lung Health Centers and five percent for the Mine Subsidence insurance fund. This legislation is supported by the Illinois Farm Bureau. It is of major importance to the State of Illinois because we are one of the largest holders of coal...coal in the nation. We have...we have excellent coal high in BTU content and is used by many industries throughout...throughout the United States. We met approximately a week ago with Governor Thompson concerning this legislation because there were many concerns on the five percent severance tax. It was proposed by the Sponsor of the legislation, Senator Gene Johns to the Governor, that he reduce the five percent down to three percent. Those in attendance, both sides of the aisle, House and Senate, were there and it was the agreement of the Sponsor, Gene Johns, and everyone there that it would be reduced by amendatory veto from five percent to three percent. And I'd be happy at this time to answer any questions you may have on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Leinenweber. Two minutes, timer's on."



Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I would...this is a tax increase on the coal industry. It only affects the coal sold outside the state but it'd certainly put our coal mines, the businesses and the business of selling coal at a.....competitive disadvantage to sellers of coal from other states that don't pay this three percent, it's a three percent add-on, that they must add to their price presumably or cut into their profit. I don't think that's the way to help the coal miners of this state by making their product less competitive than their competitors from other states. I think it's going to lead to a dampening affect on the market for Illinois coal. I don't see why we should do this. We've already penalized business in the State of Illinois and the Workmen's Compensation, Unemployment Compensation areas and this would be an added disincentive and I would oppose this in interests of the coal mining industry in the State of Illinois and the many workers that are employed therein."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hart to explain his vote."

Hart: "I'd just like the Members to know exactly what this Bill does. Willard Ice has written a series of letters on this Bill and he says that the Bill is unconstitutional. It's unfortunate that the Bill, the Senate Sponsor refused to allow any Amendments to be placed on this Bill, and in the present form it would apply about a ninety cent severance tax on coal. If it was Constitutional, I think it would hurt the competitiveness of Illinois coal. And even though this would mean some money, quite a bit of money to my county and a couple other counties in my district, in the present form the Bill is completely ....completely should be defeated. And I hope that the Bill won't get sufficient votes so that we can get some sensible Amendments on it. I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just to correct some of the previous statements. They talk about the Illinois coal being at a disadvantage because of this three percent or thirty cents per ton that would be put on it. Let's recognize that many other states have a severance tax also, almost all of the states surrounding us. Let us also recognize



that coal sold within the boundaries of the State of Illinois does pay a sales tax of five percent. I think another thing should be noted. For instance, in mines in my counties does sell most...practically all of their coal out of the state. There is no sales tax paid on that coal. Therefore, my county has no benefit whatsoever from the sales tax on coal that...a portion of which is supposed to go back to the County of Oregon. I see nothing wrong with this. I think we have cleaned it up so we are willing to reduce it to three percent. And I think that it's a Bill that should pass. I think it has a lot of merit."

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

Steele, E.G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'no' vote, I think it's unfortunate that this Bill was not improved on Second Reading with more Amendments. It places a great burden, frankly, on many of the job producers that are on the borders of Illinois near Missouri and Iowa. For instance, one of the job producers in our area is going to place another two hundred thousand dollar cost on because our industry or our job producer buys power from a Missouri utility who in turn buys Illinois coal that's going to be taxed another two hundred thousand dollars just for that one industry. Now there aren't enough jobs in East St. Louis now. There aren't enough jobs in Rock Island now. And there aren't enough jobs in Alton and Wood River now. And to place another two hundred thousand dollar tax on these industries, each of them which create jobs or else lose jobs if they have to not be competitive, I think is an undue burden. And I would urge more 'no' votes until this Bill can be improved."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, one minute to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this tax would go, five percent to the Public Health Black Lung Center establishment funds, five percent to the mine subsidence insurance program fund, fifteen percent to the Abandoned Mines Reclamation Fund, twenty-five percent to General Revenue Fund and fifty percent to the county in which the coal was mined. This tax is not unconstitutional. The case that the detractors of this Bill cited, high service... (unintelligible)... Company I have right here. And it was a Pennsylvania case and it was allowed, a severance tax was allowed in that case."





This is a Supreme Court decision. I think this is a good Bill because we have better coal than western coal. Our coal does not deteriorate our water streams as much as the western coal does. Our coal has more BTU's. It does have more sulphur but I think there's a great market for our coal and I think we have a good purpose for this Bill. I urge your consideration in favor of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz to explain his vote. One minute, the timer is on."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as some of the previous speakers have said, this will be reduced by amendatory veto or the Governor in almost cutting this five percent in half to three percent. We are paying this now to import out-of-state coal and I think it's only fair that situations exist here where out-of-state purchasers pay that tax here. It's a form of sales tax. Look at the ownership of these big coal companies, too, and you'll find out that the petroleum industry is involved there. And the large companies that own them, I don't think they're based here in the state. I ask for your green vote on this measure."

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

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker,...Representative Stiehl, I believe, wanted to be heard. I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

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

I think there's one very important issue that we're considering here and that is the fact that why should the people in Illinois pay more for Illinois coal, which is mined in Illinois, than the people in Missouri and Indiana and Kentucky. Why should they be able to buy Illinois coal cheaper than the citizens of Illinois? Now every other state that shipped in coal into Illinois charges a severance tax to the citizens of Illinois. And I see nothing wrong with this Bill. This is a good Bill and it's in the best interest of the citizens of this state. There's no reason why they should pay more for their coal than out-of-state people. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich to explain his vote. The timer's on."



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Illinois has an un... almost unbelievable supply of coal, God-given coal, as a natural asset. It should be used, at least the people of Illinois should benefit from it. There's nothing new about this. We pay...the oil companies pay a mineral tax and the royalty owners pay a mineral tax on the depletion of oil now, so why shouldn't it be paid on coal? As Representative Stiehl has said, we certainly should be able to have the same tax that the other states have around us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to explain his vote. One minute. Timer is on."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I find it completely unbelievable that we, as an independent branch of government, are sending a Bill to the Governor that he's going to amend and send back to us. If we're going to send him legislation, let's send him legislation the way that we want it, not that we expect him to change. We've got time to bring this Bill back to Second Reading. We can amend it and we can send it to him the way that it should be. The other question that I think that we need to consider is whether or not there is a difference, where there is a choice in this Bill between a five percent tax on coal and also a fifteen cent or thirty cent per ton, whichever is greater. I think that needs to be looked at. There are some people who...who think, including Willard Ice, that this is going to end up with a total sixty to ninety cent increase in the price of coal per ton going out of this state. And I think if we're going to be responsible, that we should put this Bill in the shape that we want it before sending it to the Governor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I sit on the Energy and Environment Committee which heard this piece of legislation and I was concerned about the competitive position of Illinois coal in the national economy and tried to get some answers to some questions which would allow me to determine what the impact of this tax would be on a competitive position. Frankly, the industry didn't do a very good job of supplying the figures. They sort of mumbled it through. My conclusion, based on what figures I could see, is that we can in fact place this...afford to place this severance



tax on Illinois coal that's sold out-of-state without serious effect to our competitive position. I am somewhat concerned about the magnitude. I had planned to support a...a three percent tax. I am pleased to...to hear that the Governor does plan to use his amendatory veto in this respect and I plan to sustain that veto if it...when it's returned to the House. I don't think that's...that's acting irresponsible. I...I think we can be quite confident that the Governor will do that. And ...and I would urge all of you to support this legislation now, send it to his desk and then sustain his veto...amendatory veto when it is returned."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the House Sponsor of this particular piece of legislation is my Democratic counterpart in the 37th District and I'm just so happy to find in this Sesssion that I have got something that I...legislation that I can support. He's had some mediocre legislation up till this time and I couldn't support it right down the line. I would, you know, it goes into another subject matter, perhaps. But in any event, even those who are standing in opposition to the Bill, say that, you know, we - could...with a few Amendments that we would have a better Bill. Well, we'll never have a better Bill. We're at this point...with the posture of the legislation that if it means it has to go to the Governor and with some amendatory language in it, well then, that's fine. But it will never get that amendatory language if we don't send it down to him. And I think we've come this far with it. I think it merits an 'aye' vote and I would encourage others to join me with a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it passed 89 votes, I yield my time to the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I don't argue with the need for the need for a severance tax. I'm sure we may need one, I don't argue with the need for the counties and the local areas where the coal is being removed from receiving some benefits so that they can restore the land and restore their economy when the coal gives out and the coal mines move



away and the companies move away and for the black lung purpose, for the reclamation purposes. But we're just kidding ourselves with this Bill. You cannot tax coal moving in interstate and foreign commerce and not tax coal consumed here in Illinois under the severance tax. A severance tax itself is perfectly constitutional but not a severance tax, not a severance tax that gives an exemption to coal used and consumed in this state but taxes coal moving in interstate and foreign commerce. That's an unconstitutional burden on interstate commerce. It's a joke. It won't stand up. It's not constitutional. If it helps the people get reelected then maybe I hope it passes 'cause they're all friends of mine. I don't know if it will help them get reelected when the courts strike it down but maybe they can blame the courts. It's unconstitutional. We've passed unconstitutional Bills before, I suppose we will today. But this Bill, if the Governor doesn't veto it, won't stand its first court test. That we're fooling the people, we've done it before and we'll probably do it again."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thanks...thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the Members of the House, we're paying severance tax, thirty percent severance tax, on coal that's shipped into Illinois from Wyoming and from the western states. And the fact that we're exporting coal and not charging a severance tax on it is a loss to the State of Illinois. If this tax were a tax on the people of Illinois, I would certainly would not be for it. But if it's going to be a tax on the people from out-of-state and it's going to help our coal mining, coal producing countries, going to add a little revenue to the Abandoned Mines and Reclamation Fund why, I think it's a good Bill. And I hope that enough people will join us so that we can get a good, strong vote up there. And thank you."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to point out that Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana is working to impose a federal severance tax on...some coal and I could point out also that in the State of Illinois our users pay a sales tax on the coal that they use. Now, basically, what we're talking about here is the users of energy



in the State of Illinois, and it was pointed out by the Cilco Company, are paying about twenty dollars a year more for their energy because of the severance tax that's imposed upon it by Montana and Kentucky who bring in the majority of coal into the State of Illinois. What we're saying here, and Representative McMaster made an excellent point in Committee and later at the meeting with the Governor, that we probably should not have a sales tax for the users here in the State of Illinois. And the severance tax is the proper and efficient and effective way to...to go with this type of program. I've listened to people on the other side of the aisle who are voting 'no', saying that they're opposed to this tax but they have to understand that we're putting money into the General Revenue of the State of Illinois with this proposal. We are putting money into the Land Reclamation Act. We're putting money into the Black Lung Centers and they're all needed programs and the funding is needed here. The natural resource that we give up everytime we send out a ton of coal to additional states are...we're losing because our users are paying a severance tax for the coal coming in. It's an equal program. It's a good piece of legislation and I ask for your support. I'd like to see some more green lights on the board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with many reservations, I voted for this Bill in Committee with the understanding that after further study on the floor of the House, I would be able to oppose it if I so thought it was appropriate. I believe, as Representative Pierce does, that the double standard in the taxation method of this Bill are unconstitutional. Therefore, I have to oppose this Bill. And even if it does come back with changes by the Governor, I still think that it would not hold up in court. Therefore, I have to vote against the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle to explain his vote. One minute, timer's on."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly on this particular in voting 'no'. I think the position taken by Representative Hart and Kane are accurate. I think it ought to be clear that....to Mr. Mautino who's worked hard and Senator Johns is a good friend of mine,



that some of us aren't against a severance tax on this side. We just can't vote for this particular Bill. I think we ought to be frank in saying there's a fear this Bill, that the Sponsors don't want this Bill to go back to the Senate for fear it'll be killed. But if it's going to be amendatorily vetoed it's got to go back there anyway. I think we ought to put it in shape before we send it out of here so we can all vote for a severance tax that's Constitutional and fair in amount in who it covers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears in looking at the vote on the board that this Legislature is bent on killing every possible advantage our businesses have in this state. Let's face it. When we put on a severance tax we become less competitive. To those of you who have not had the opportunity to tour southern Illinois as I did two-and-a-half weeks ago, you will find it an extremely depressed area. An area that is just going to start climbing back into its economic status once we start mining coal as we did many, many years ago. By placing this tax on there we reduce our competitiveness. How is it the Republicans that are supporting this Bill think that we should raise money through taxes and not through more jobs? I think the more jobs we have the more economic benefits you'll get for the State of Illinois and not through a five percent or even three percent severance tax. I think this should be a definite 'no' vote for business."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very rarely do I agree with Representative Pierce but I think he hit the nail on the head and I, too, stand up in opposition to this Bill. And I think it was well put by Senator....I mean Representative Pierce. And...and also, I may add, on behalf of the coal miners of the State of Illinois, I beg you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye' and 52 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 348. Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 348...."

Speaker Redmond: "Ryan on the floor? Out of the record. 466, Daniels."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 466. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 466 creates the Patient's Compensation Fund to compensate patients of hospitals and other licensed care facilities for claims in excess of one hundred thousand dollars for medical malpractice claims. This very same Bill passed this House on May 19th by a vote of a 124 to 1. The Bill has been reviewed carefully, approved by the Department of Insurance and we ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Anyone in opposition? Ready for the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138...141 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. I understand that Representative Deavers is going to handle 348, is that correct? Will you put that one back in?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 348 authorizes school districts in a joint agreement to acquire, build and establish and maintain a sited building within two miles of the boundary of any school district which is a party to the joint agreement. And the reason for that presently, an individual school district is authorized to acquire and do the same thing within the two miles of the district. And what this does is just broaden it to include joint agreements. And I move for the favorable passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Jaffe, welcome aboard."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Short Debate, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Oh, this is Short Debate? Maybe...I just have a question. I just want to know why school districts would want land two miles out of their boundary. I...I just don't understand. Maybe he could answer it in closing argument."



Speaker Redmond: "We'll answer that in close. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Deavers, will you explain to Representative Jaffe."

Deavers: "In explaining my vote, Aaron, what you've got here, you got some counties and school districts where the borderline and this way in a joint agreement they can go from one county to another and it'd still be within the two miles. We've passed a similar Bill which was Ryan's Bill, House Bill 816, that does the same thing."

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

On this question there's a 140 'aye' and 1 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed.

687. Some question as to whether that's on Second or Third Reading.

Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to proceed with this Bill. We didn't call it on Second. It's listed here on Third. I resist any Amendments that have been filed to it and would like to proceed with the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania is recognized."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this was taken out of the record on Second Reading yesterday and I really don't know how it got to Third Reading on the Calendar today. You will recall that after lunch it was taken out of the record and on Second."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, what is the posture of this Bill? Record shows that on June 24th it was recalled to Second Reading and we haven't moved it from Second to Third. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "I...I would like to move it then at this time...."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll take...is there...we'll put it...it's on Second Reading, so we'll go to....there's been some confusion on this one, so for this one Bill we'll go to the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading. Is there floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Amendment #2.

Catania. Amends Senate Bill 687 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to thank the Sponsor for his patience in this regard. He did agree rather reluctantly yesterday to let it go to Second and then it got held up there and I can understand his unhappiness with the fact that





it didn't move yesterday. He has been extremely tolerant. What this Amendment does is to say that all of the residential facilities in the state have people in the custody of the state, that's people in the mental health facilities, the children's facilities and state hospitals, will have public health inspections just as the prisons will. The itself says that prisons will have them. This adds other innocent people who will also be entitled to public health inspections. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I...I have to reluctantly oppose this Amendment now. It...it's a tremendous change in the legislation. It requires inspection of all residential facilities, the costs are going to go up. I think there's some sixty-four other facilities. When I agreed to take this back, I was not aware of the complete background on this Bill, or this Amendment, which is actually another Bill that had failed earlier in this Session. The Senate will not agree to it. The Senate Sponsor doesn't want it on. And I'm going to ask the House not to approve this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "Mr. Speaker, I support the...the concept which is embodied here in the Amendment but I'm under the impression yesterday the Chair ruled that this Amendment was nongermane because of the way the title is drafted. And I wonder if the Sponsor was going to correct it or has corrected it?"

Speaker Redmond: "There was no ruling on that, Representative Dan...."

We took it out of the record. Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Johnson: "If there's been no formal request, I would question the germaneness of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I...I think the Sponsor of this Amendment indicated that she didn't care to hold up this Bill for it and if...now for the second day in a row we've had nothing but trouble with her Amendment. And I would ask her to withdraw her Amendment as she had indicated she would."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."



Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the Parliamentarian indicated that the content was germane."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you respond to his inquiry?"

Catania: "Well, if the Parliamentarian...."

Speaker Redmond: "He requested...he requested you whether you would or would not withdraw the Amendment."

Catania: "If the Parliamentarian is ruling that it's germane I think we can just proceed with the Amendment very quickly. And I would like to proceed...."

Speaker Redmond: "You're not responding to the question."

Catania: "I would prefer to proceed with the Amendment if it's only going to take another five minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you answer his question, will you or will you not withdraw the Amendment?"

Catania: "No."

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

Bradley: "Well, if it's possible I'd like to address myself to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. That's the...that's the place we fired so it's now on debate on the Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "In the opinion of the Parliamentarian....Amendment is germane. Now proceed, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "All right. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the Lady on her Amendment. The concept has been adopted by the House on, I believe two different occasions, sent over to the Senate. I think that the Amendment addresses itself to something that the...the House has already approved on two different occasions. We ought to go ahead and adopt the Amendment to Senate Bill 687. It's been our posture that we're in favor of the concept and I strongly support the Lady on her Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing, you seek recognition?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, only to close or explain my vote on this. I think we...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm reluctant to oppose the Sponsor of the Bill on this Amendment but I am pleased



to support this Amendment. I believe it is long overdue to have inspection of our public residential facilities. If we can force inspections and threats of closure on private residential facilities we should certainly expect the same kind of standards enforced in our public institutions. And I would urge you to support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Question...the 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 Catania to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As I pointed out earlier, this Bill in its original form covers the 28 state correctional facilities. It provides that we will have public health inspections of the 28 corrections facilities. Now, if we're going to have public safety guarantees for prisoners, I think the least we can do is the same thing for mental health patients and children in the 33 other facilities. That's 28 prisons, we need, we need to do it for the 33 other facilities. It's an additional total cost of twenty- thousand dollars (\$20,000) in fiscal year '78. The Department of Public Health says they can handle it. It's supported by Public Health, the Department of Corrections, the League of Women Voters, the Illinois Association for the Mentally Retarded, the 'Howe' Association for the Retarded and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, in explaining my 'no' vote here. I think all of us can be had once and I've been had and I will remember. But this is an important piece of legislation because the Federal Courts are looking down on our prison system. This Amendment is not acceptable across the rotunda. We need...this is a Senate Bill and we need it to keep the Federal Courts off of our prison system and I would ask that we defeat this Amendment. This measure has been defeated in this...in the Legislature twice. If the Lady wants to have it for a Bill next time, let her have it."



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

Skinner: "Just what is the Senate afraid of? We can't even inspect our own institutions where we're keeping retarded kids? I mean, I just went through an inspection of a...of a home in my...my District, the Windgate Home. And if the state institutions are as clean as it is, we don't have anything to fear. There might be something programmatically with Windgate or state institutions but certainly not cleanliness. Now why can't we inspect state institutions? I mean, is the Administration afraid of it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Dyer to explain her vote. Timer is on."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I think if you just think of the stories you've seen in the newspapers about the Windgate Home for Retarded Children and some dreadful exposés of that situation you will agree we do need these inspections. The Senate Sponsor originally had no objections to this Amendment. I'm sorry there's been a misunderstanding between people but it still is a good Amendment and should be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Catania: "I think Representative...Davis wants to speak."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies...I join with distinguished colleagues in asking why can't we inspect these prisons? Why? Is there any reason why we shouldn't? Any reasonable reason why we shouldn't? Is there any reasonable reason why we shouldn't see what the conditions are in there, what the health conditions are in there? I don't understand why there's opposition even to this Amendment. It would seem to me that all of us would want to join in because we want to know the conditions that exist in the prisons. We hear a lot about them and we read a lot about them. But they should be inspected."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as far as I'm concerned the Amendment is better than the Bill. It's not very often that we have an Amendment that makes a Bill so much better than when it started out with. Now we're talking about people that are, and kids, that are unfortunate, that can't help themselves



that are retarded, that may be mentally ill. Are we going to stand here and say that our first priorities are prisoners? Before mentally retarded? Before people that are mentally ill? Our first priority ought to be the safety and the health of people that cannot, unfortunately, help themselves. I...we all know John Grotberg. He served in this House. He's the Senate Sponsor. He's done so much for the mentally retarded, mentally ill, the physically incapacitated. He would be all for this. Then the only answer could be that the Administration's against it. Will the Administration stand here and say that its first priority are prisoners rather than the mentally retarded? I would hope not....."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Catania to explain her vote. Timer is on."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Department of Corrections has asked for this Bill because they are in Federal Court and this is to help get them off the hook in Federal Court. That's the reason why they are going to correct the situation in the prisons. Now, all we're asking is that you take it one step further and help the innocent people, the people in the mental health facilities, the people in the children's facilities, the people in the state hospitals. Their relatives assume when they put them there that all those institutions have regular house inspections just like private residential facilities. But they don't now. Occasionally there's one or two that has that kind of inspection. There is no routine inspection in those public health facilities. I wouldn't try to put this Amendment on the Bill if I didn't think that it was an extremely important situation that we have to deal with. Representative Pullen wasn't feeling well, she came on the House floor to tell you how strongly she feels about it. I would ask for your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question.....77 'ayes', 77 'no'. Representative Bowman. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the suggestion as in this Amendment that nobody's looking at these institutions, they definitely are. We have doctors in charge. We have a committee to visit and examine state institutions."



They investigate complaints. And I notice even one of the Members who's one of those who investigate says we ought to have some more investigation. This Amendment is not needed."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 77 'aye' and 77 'no'.  
Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Lady has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to explain my vote but since you allowed the courtesy to Representative Friedrich I think I should have it too."

Speaker Redmond: "The last time I extend that courtesy to anyone.  
Representative Madison. Timer is on."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I only rose in terms of the comments that Representative Friedrich made about the commission of his that examine state institutions. I happened to serve on that commission, Mr. Speaker, and in a two year period we made one visit in two years."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative....Lady has requested a poll of the absentees. We'll poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Collins, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Ewell,  
Gaines, Giglio, Griesheimer,....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Griesheimer: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'no'. Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, change my 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative  
John Dunn."

Dunn, J: "Change me 'aye' please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Record me as 'aye', Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Tipsword."

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



Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative DiPrima. DiPrima desires to be recorded as 'no'. Have you completed the poll of the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Not yet. Huff, Kornowicz,...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kozubowski, McAvoy, Nardulli, Schisler,...."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Stearney, Van Duyne, Von Boeckman, Williams, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams, 'no'. Representative Lynn Martin."

Martin, L: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'no' please?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Martin, L: "Would you change my vote to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lynn Martin desires to be recorded as 'no'. What's the score, Mr. Clerk? This question there's 80 'ayes' and 79 'nays' and the Lady's motion....Representative Anderson. Anderson desires to be recorded as 'no'. On this question there's.... On this question there's 79 'aye's and 80 'noes'. Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "How....recorded, Mr. Speaker? I think I'm recorded 'no', please make that 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'yes'. Record the Speaker as 'no'. What's the count? On this question there's 80 'ayes' and 80 'noes'. Representative Miller, 'no'. 80 'ayes' and 81 'noes' and the motion.... 79 'ayes', 81 'noes'. Representative Catania, for what purpose do you rise?"

Catania: "Sorry to take up the time of the House but as I said, I wouldn't do it if I didn't think we owed it to the people in the mental health facilities and the children's facilities. I request a verification of the 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, if necessary at the proper time I would request a verification of the affirmative. I think this is dilatory. The motion is lost and I would think that we would go on to the next Amendment."

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



McBroom: "I must leave the floor, may I be verified 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "May the Gentleman be verified as 'no'? Representative Edgar, for what purpose do you rise?"

Edgar: "Would you please change my vote from 'yes' to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Harris."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change my 'yes' vote to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I don't...I don't think this is going to lead us anywhere and please record me as 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative Cunningham. Change the Gentleman from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Collins, 'no'. Representative Beatty, 'no'. Representative Shumpert, ....well, Beatty, 'no'. We had Collins, 'no'. Shumpert 'no'. Beatty 'no'. Shumpert 'no'. What is the count, now? Representative Collins desires to be recorded as 'yes'. Proceed with the verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Anderson, Jane Barnes, Bluthardt, Boucek, Brandt, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Campbell, Capparelli, Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Doyle, Ralph Durn, Ebbesen, Edgar, Ewing, Farley, Friedland, Friedrich, Garmisa, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Hanahan, Harris, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Hudson, Huff, Huskey, Johnson, Keats, Kempiners, Kent, Kosinski, Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Madigan, Lynn Martin, McAuliffe, McBroom, McCourt, McGrew, McMaster, Miller, Mudd, Neff, O'Daniel, Peters, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Reilly, Rigney, Ryan, Schisler, Schuneman, Sevcik, Shumpert, Simms, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Sumner, Taylor, Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, Waddell, Wall, Walsh, Wikoff, Williams, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Representative Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson is right behind you. Representative Ewing, for what purpose do you rise? Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, what is the count before we start the verification?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? 76 - 87. Representative Catania."





Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there. Representative Bartulis, do you seek recognition? Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Wolfe? Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'."

Catania: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Catania: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Capparelli here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Catania: "Representative Deavers."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Catania: "Deavers. Gilbert Deavers."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Catania: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Ralph Dunn here? How is he recorded?"

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

Catania: "Is he removed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Catania: "Representative Ebbesen."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Catania: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Farley? He's back there."

Catania: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Catania: "Representative Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "Friedland? He's back there."

Catania: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan? Hanahan on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "There he is coming in."

Catania: "Representative Hoffman."

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



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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Ralph Dunn has returned. Put him back on."

Catania: "Representative Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey? He's there."

Catania: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "Laurino? He's here big as life."

Catania: "Representative Kucharski."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Catania: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz? He's down in front."

Catania: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe? How is he recorded? Remove him."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Catania: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "He was verified before."

Catania: "No, not McBroom. McGrew, Sam McGrew, was he verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew, is that who you said? McGrew is right down..."

Catania: "Oh, okay. I didn't see him in his seat. Representative Mudd."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd here? How is he recorded? He's in the back. Representative Mudd. Is that Mudd back there? Yeah. He's in the back."

Catania: "Representative Pouncey."

Speaker Redmond: "Conti is here."

Catania: "Representative Pouncey."

Speaker Redmond: "Pouncey? He's back there. Hard to see but he's back there."

Catania: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Catania: "Representative Tuerk."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Deavers, did we take him off?"



He's just returned. Gene Hoffman has returned, put him back on.  
Put Deavers back on."

Catania: "Representative Wall."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there."

Catania: "And Representative Wikoff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff is back..."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think it's lost but I do thank you  
for the time."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the final score? On this question there's 75  
'ayes' and 84 'noes'. And the Lady's motion fails. Any further  
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Martin, Catania. Amends Senate Bill  
637 by deleting line 18 through 28."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Martin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peggy Smith Martin. Representative  
Ewing."

Ewing: "I don't believe that Amendment's been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Has it been distributed? Has Amendment 3 to 687 been  
distributed? ....Floor Amendment. The Page advises me it has not."

Ewing: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, if this has not been distributed, I would like  
to move that the Bill be moved to Third Reading."

Martin, P: "I object."

Speaker Redmond: "It seems to me that it moves automatically if there's  
not an Amendment....to Third Reading...."

Martin, P: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Senate Sponsor of this  
Bill yesterday...last evening when Mr. Ewing on the floor and Mr....  
Senator Grotberg had no objections to my Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, after Representative Martin indicated that to me,  
I talked to Senator Grotberg. I tried to explain to her that her  
...the Amendment wasn't needed. We're not precluding anybody from  
inspecting the prisons. You're only setting standards. Senator Grotberg  
did not agree to the Amendment according to what he told me. And since  
it's not been distributed, I would ask the Bill be moved to Third...."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Third Reading now."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1025. 1025. Representative Brady, 1025."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1025...."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman between Representative Brady and the Chair please be seated."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to bring it back to Second Reading for Amendment by Representative Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, we'd like to have an idea what the Amendment is about...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you'll get that when they move the adoption...."

Daniels: "Well, you asked if there were any objections, that's when we are....maybe could have Representative Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "I did speak to Mr. Leinenweber, Mr. Daniel, I did let someone on your side know. I wasn't aware of your particular interest but I did want you to know that I had discussed it in detail with Mr. Leinenweber. What the....Amendment 2, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to table and move on to Amendment 3. What Amendment 3 does is to make clear that the purpose of making...."

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

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman moved to table Amendment #2. Are there any objections? Has it been tabled?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't know where Amendment 2 is."

Lechowicz: "Yeah, well, it was...it was 2 on the board and he moved to table...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, now. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. As far as the record is concerned, there was one Committee Amendment. Is that correct? How about the Floor Amendments?"

Lechowicz: "What he should do is withdraw 2 and go with 3."

Clerk O'Brien: "There was Amendment 1 adopted previously. There was Floor Amendment #2 by Katz offered....."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz withdraws Amendment 2. Was that ever adopted? Was Amendment #2 ever adopted? Was Amendment #2 ever adopted?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, 2 was offered."

Speaker Redmond: "And Representative Katz withdraws Amendment #2. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "Now Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, when you first recognized me, I questioned what the Amendment was about. You asked for objections. I objected at the time. You didn't recognize me at the time and I inquired of the Chair the Amendment was about because I don't approve of going back to Second Reading unless, (1) we know what's happening...."

Speaker Redmond: "If you will be quiet he will explain....Amendment #3."

Daniels: "But you...you've already removed it to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's a courtesy we normally extend to a Sponsor. You get what you deserve, Representative Walsh. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I think some time will be saved if you move onto the next matter, I'll go over to Mr. Daniels and explain it to him in detail and then we will take it up."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll take this one out of the record temporarily. 1039. This is what is known as the express track."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1039. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave of the House to move this back to Second Reading. My colleague, Representative Von Boeckman has an Amendment he would like to offer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, before we take this Bill back, could we have some idea what the Amendment does?"

Speaker Redmond: "Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first I'd like to explain the Amendment. All the Amendment does is incorporate House Bill 614. It passed out of this House with no dissenting votes."



It deals with the age on a person being able to drive...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "I'd like to withdraw our objections."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Be returned to the Order of Second Reading.

Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman, explain the Amendment."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to table Amendment #3. It was withdrawn in error...."

Speaker Redmond: "....Amendment #3. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Von Boeckman. Amends Senate Bill 1039 as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as I stated, 614, House Bill 614 was amended in the Senate and...and those Amendments killed the Bill.

So therefore I have permission from the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor on Senate Bill 1093 to incorporate the House Bill 614. All it does was require that the age limit be reduced to 16 rather than 18 to operate a motorcycle above a 150 cc. This...this...614 Bill was put into Subcommittee for a complete study before it was brought before the Motor Vehicle Committee...Representatives Kosinski, Leverenz and McCourt. It passed out of Committee with no opposition in this House. All the requirements are still in the Bill. It puts parental responsibility on the....rather than the state on 1618. I ask your favorable vote."

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

Walsh: "Now, are we...is this Bill on Second Reading or on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Second Reading."

Walsh: "Well, this is a very significant Amendment, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if it reduces the age limit for riding a motorcycle from 18 to 16. I would certainly oppose that and would urge that everybody else do it. And I suggest to you, also, that in order for this Bill to pass, if the Gentleman wants to persist with this Amendment, in order for this Bill to be called today within our Rules, he must extend the Rules that provides that it cannot be called the same day it's



amended and that will take a 107 votes. And I intend to pursue the requirement that he get a 107 votes if this Amendment is successful."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Johnson: "Representative... Representative Von Boeckman is it true that short of taking a certified driver training course the driver age now for automobiles is 18 in Illinois. Is that right?"

Von Boeckman: "Beg pardon?"

Johnson: "Be 18 to drive a car unless you take a driver training course, right?"

Von Boeckman: "Right. And...."

Johnson: "And you have to be 18 to drive a motorcycle with the same exception, right?"

Von Boeckman: "Right."

Johnson: "You're saying now that you want to change it to 16 even without a driver training course?"

Von Boeckman: "Oh, no, no."

Johnson: "Okay. well, tell me what you're saying then. I didn't... I couldn't understand a word you were saying when you were talking about the Amendment."

Von Boeckman: "Well, let me explain. All the same requirements are... for a motorcycle as it is for a car. You have to pass the required schooling examination. You have to have a regular driver's license. On top of that, you have to pass a motorcycle driver's test and have a motorcycle license on top of that. See all the requirements are still there. You can't drive a motorcycle with just a regular driver's license."

Johnson: "So what...what substantive change in the law would your Amendment make then?"

Von Boeckman: "Well, we are the only state in the union that has 16 year old requirement. All...all....I mean 18 year old. All the other states have 16. And this is...we're trying to bring it in compliance with other states. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leverenz: "This, then, would be in the area of motorcycles, we would actually be reducing the requirement for the State of Illinois to bring it into conformance with that which is needed in other states?"

Von Boeckman: "No. All the other states have the 16 year old requirement and the same as what I'm trying to do here."

Leverenz: "Let me restate my question. We are, then, relaxing the motorcycle requirement in the State of Illinois to bring it into conformance with other states."

Von Boeckman: "Correct. We now allow a 150 cc to be driven and they're motorcycles."

Leverenz: "That's true. Then, what I'm trying to do is get your feelings, too, then in an area similar, we would then think about relaxing the requirements of a motorcycle classification for mopeds and that would bring that into line with other states."

Von Boeckman: "Well, it could but this doesn't have nothing to do with the Amendment, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I understand. We heard this in Committee and I recommend the adoption of this Amendment to relax the requirements in Illinois. We passed it out of Committee by I think overwhelmingly and it is true that the Amendments in the Senate killed the Bill. I ask for your favorable consideration of this Amendment."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with what was just said by Representative Leverenz. This went into my Subcommittee, all the questions that are being asked here on the House floor were asked in that Subcommittee. The Subcommittee was satisfied with the action it took and unanimously recommended the Bill do pass. This Amendment is essentially that Bill. It brings us in conformance with other states. I recommend we bring, we accept this Amendment and thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I object to this whole procedure. Senate Bill 1039 was heard in the Committee and it was an absolute nothing Bill and the Sponsor pleaded with us to let it out. We did. He agreed not to put any Amendments





on it, the Bill went on the Consent Calendar. Now we've had it back three times for Amendments for various Bills. I asked the Sponsor, does he still agree that this Bill wasn't going to have any Amendments on it like it did in Committee. This has been nothing but a shell Bill since it's come over here in this House. And I don't think we should put any Amendments on it at all. We should return it to the Consent Calendar in its original form where it did nothing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this legislation with this Amendment on it does make it a good Bill. These 'mopower' units are being sold in other states and they've been used in other states legally. I just had a school teacher come to me....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Question. Shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed....opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Von Boeckman to close."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again, I think we had a lot of debate on it and I ask a favorable vote on....."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. 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 42 'aye' and 63 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Since this wasn't amended it would seem that we can consider this for passage now. Read it on Third Reading, Representative...or Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1039. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1039, as amended in the House, would legalize the vehicle known as an electric motorized tricycle. This is a tricycle type vehicle which has three tires and has fully operative pedals for propulsion by human power but which is equipped with an electric power



drive system to supplement or substitute for the power provided by the operator. These vehicles are now in use in other states and have proved to be of enormous value to senior citizens and the handicapped. However, in this Bill, we seek not just to make these vehicles available to the senior citizens and the handicapped in Illinois, we have also placed great emphasis on the safety of the operator and the motoring public alike by requiring the operator to be licensed. By making the vehicle highly visible and by limiting its operation to daytime use only. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, many of our citizens live on a fixed income and simply cannot afford to own an automobile and public transportation, if it is available at all, is not convenient for taking those short trips to the store, to the doctor or to church that we all might have to make. Similarly many of our handicapped find it impossible to operate a two-wheel bicycle but need some form of transportation that is an alternative to the automobile. Mr. Speaker, we do not suggest that this Bill will meet all the transportation needs of our senior citizens and of our handicapped population. However, we do believe that Senate Bill 1039 would provide them with the ability to participate more fully in our society and will allow them to dignify that only independence and the freedom of mobility can provide them. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respectfully solicit your 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 1039."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman. Representative Keats, please get down, sit down."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield? Representative, a couple of questions."

Garmisa: "Short Debate."

Schuneman: "A couple of questions."

Garmisa: "Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Short Debate."

Schuneman: "I'm sorry. I don't stand in opposition. You better recognize somebody that's opposed then."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich in opposition? Any... Representative Totten in opposition?"

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



I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 1039 not only on the subject matter of the Bill but because of what's been done with the Bill. The Bill as it originally came over to the House, defined pedestrian as any person on foot. That's all it did. The Bill was held up in Committee because it undoubtedly was one of the biggest shell Bills that we've had in the Session of the General Assembly. I gave the Sponsor of the Bill a vote to get it out of Committee because he said he would...we'd put it on the Consent Calendar and there wouldn't be any Amendments to it. So far, it's had four additional lives since that time and we've tried to put four Amendments on it. The Sponsor also told me that if there were any Amendments put on it he would table it and I agreed to let it out of Committee for that reason. Well, here we are. We've got at least one Amendment on it; we've tried four. If it goes over to the Senate we'll try and put a couple of other Bills onto it. And if it comes back here we'll try and put a couple more onto it. I think the time is to kill it before it has nine lives and do it now. The subject matter of the Bill now isn't even well drafted and causes a lot of problems. And I think the Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Friedrich to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have followed the progress of this Bill as has Representative Totten. It started out as a nothing Bill and Amendment #1 made it a real bad Bill. And now, I think, it's in pretty good shape. I think this does serve a purpose. I would suggest to the Sponsor if it's possible when it goes back to the Senate they might put some restriction on the area where these things can be used. But I think this Bill's a need that should be taken care of and I'm happy to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Wait a minute. Have all voted who wish? Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, J: "Mr. Speaker, just to explain my vote. I just wanted to observe that we all like more forthrightness and openness in government and we pass vehicles out of here all the time with no wheels on them at all."



This one has three wheels on it and I think the Sponsor should be congratulated for being forthright."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all....Representative Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, on this particular piece of legislation, I think it is good legislation. Other states have it. I don't live too far from a boundary line of Iowa and I do find that people are buying them in Illinois. I asked a man the other day why he didn't buy one at the ...in Illinois and he says, 'Well, the way the laws are now we can't sell them'. So I think this will help business in Illinois and help many people."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Von Boeckman, to explain his vote. Timer is on."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, even though my Amendment got beat which I felt was a good Amendment, I do feel that senior citizens need this type of vehicle and I will switch my 'present' vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all...have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 92 'aye' and 52 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...hereby declared passed. 466. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be in hopes that....you know, we took this back to Second and was an Amendment in Senate Bill 687 that didn't have any Amendments, that Amendment failed. Perhaps we could take that for immediate consideration. Representative Ewing's Bill, while we're still on this Short Debate so we don't get...don't lose that Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "466. 466. That's the one that Representative Daniels was out of gear on and I...yeah, I know we moved it. Representative Katz. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. What was the number of the Bill, Representative Katz, that you...."

Katz: "Senate Bill 1025, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, 1025 then."

Katz: "Mr. Brady, the Sponsor in the House had just asked that it be moved back from Third Reading to Second Reading. Mr. Daniels had some questions and I've now satisfied Mr. Daniels' questions and would like to take that back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to return it to Second Reading?"



It's on Second Reading. My memory is you withdrew Amendment 2, is that correct?"

Katz: "Yes, that's...Amendment 2 was withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "What's Amendment 3 then?"

Katz: "This is a Bill that has to do with obtaining medical records so that doctors will not have to be sued. Amendment #3 does two things. It provides and makes clear that in the case of psychiatric treatment that the records will be available in a lawsuit upon a claim of malpractice thus limiting it to the situation that the Amendment is designed to correct. At the same time, it deletes a word that by mistake was put in the Bill in an earlier Amendment which is the word, 'in summation'. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1025."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for 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. 466. If.....687. Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 687. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Prison Inspection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniel."

Daniels: "With...with leave of the House I could move that for him, Mr. Speaker, I think it's rather noncontroversial at this point."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Here he comes. He didn't feel secure with you handling it, Representative Daniels. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "We're back on this very good legislation...and it very simply provides that the Department of Public Health will make an inspection for sanitary conditions in all of our correctional institutions at least once a year. And they will cooperate with the Department of Corrections in this and I would ask for a favorable vote on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Martin in opposition."

Martin, P: "May I ask a question, please..... I'd like to speak against



the Bill, then, because of the fact that the Amendments were rejected.

Number one, I'd like everyone to understand that...."

Speaker Redmond: "No cameras up there in the gallery."

Martin, P: "That I think that House Bill 687 is really too restrictive.

It just limits it to the Department of Mental Health and I feel that the fire department and the building department should have also been included. And it also...gives notice, a five day prior notice to the examining of....any of the institutions. We happen to know, those of us who go into penal institutions, when they know you're coming they automatically clean up for you. So to put them on a five day prior notice I think certainly would be a detriment to the job that the Public Health Department would be trying to do. Secondly, I feel that other agencies should go in because some of the buildings are so old and delapidated that they certainly should be able to inspect and recommend the kind of work that would bring this into safety conformity. And I just feel that with the...the restrictions on those of us and especially citizens and other concerned organization, are going to be restricted from going into the institutions because they are required to know about this legislation, the institutional architecture of the construction. Would you tell me please, what a public health personnel is going to know the institutional architecture and construction of any building that they may go in that is a penal institution? And for that reason, I would request a 'no' vote on Senate Bill 687."

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 Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is another useless piece of legislation. Who would suggest that the Department of Public Health doesn't have the right now to inspect our prisons? We've got a Governor who told the Department of Public Health and Department of Corrections both it's his responsibility to see that they both act. I don't...why don't we form another Committee to inspect the inspectors and inspect the inspectors? I don't know how much legislation we have to have to tell people they're supposed to do their duty."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 124 'aye' and 25 'no'. The Bill



having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed.

1259, Representative Ryan!"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1259."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I have no objection if you want to hear 1025 the way it was amended with leave of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "1025."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was explained by Representative Katz when he amended it further to further protect. I think this is a good Bill. which allows in the Evidence Act that the disclosure is proper and open so that you can get to the records without filing for a malpractice action necessarily. And it gives the proper protection for psychiatric records and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave to hear Senate Bill 1025 for passage? Need any further explanation? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you rise?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, aren't those lights awfully bright? My goodness, we sit in here from morning till late at night and I just wish that we could have a little bit dimmer lights instead of having them so bright."

Speaker Redmond: "A request has been made to permit filming for TV for a very short while and they will hurry up."

McMaster: "But you can have dimmer lights."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think they work with dimmer lights."

McMaster: "That wouldn't hurt them too much either."



Speaker Redmond: "Well, that would...that would frustrate many of our Members, though. Maybe if we eliminated the press, and the television and the radio, that the...probably the business of the House would move along a little faster. Would you like that, Representative Cunningham? Cunningham objects. Senate Bills, Third Reading. On this question there's 149 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Senate Bill 1, Representative Sevcik."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Sevcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Senate Bill 1 has been thoroughly discussed before in regards to the outlāwing of the messenger services to race tracks. And I'm going to ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Byers."

Byers: "I would just like to say that this Bill, once we close up the messenger services, it will be about a quarter of a million dollars a week for the State of Illinois. I do think we've waited too long...Representative Holewinski's had a Bill over in the Senate, they've been holding over there. For what reason, I don't know; but I'd recommend an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye' and no 'nay'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 29. I understand that this Bill is being heard on Second Reading so it's not ready for passage. To give you some idea of where we stand, we have about 80 Bills on Third Reading. And by any standard, that looks like midnight. Representative Matijeovich."





Matijevich: "Speaker...Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, now that you told us where we're at, I'd like to tell you where the Senate's at. I...I've got their Calendar, 33 pages, and their deadline for House Bills is Tuesday. So I wouldn't worry too much about us over here. And they're adjourning today at 2 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "The only thing I can say, though, is that we have to have final action today by midnight. And that has nothing to do with the Senate. Now, Representative Lechowicz.

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to add to that just a little bit. The Senate is adjourning at 2 o'clock to go on the Committee action, come back on the floor at 5."

Speaker Redmond: "I think what the Senate does is really immaterial because they're working on our Bills over there. Maybe if we hadn't given them so many they wouldn't have to work so long. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, I'm in full agreement with your position. But I have a question. We have a rule that says, Senate Bills out of House today by twelve o'clock. Do we have any rules about House Bills out of the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes and we took care of that about two or three weeks ago. Everything but appropriation Bills."

Houlihan, J: "When you said you took care of that, what do you mean?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we had all House Bills out of here...."

Houlihan, J: "You...you mean there are no House Bills now in the House that will be passed into law?"

Speaker Redmond: "No substantive Bills. Any...any Bill that was put in that was substantive: Bill that was not exempt is not an appropriation Bill or is exempt is gone."

Houlihan, J: "That Bill is dead then?"

Speaker Redmond: "What Bill are you talking about?"

Houlihan, J: "2414."

Speaker Redmond: "That...that was exempt by action of the Rules Committee. There is no deadline on that one."

Houlihan, J: "It was exempt by the Rules Committee, it's a Committee Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "According...according to the Rules....that's an exempt Bill. Representative Simms."



Simms: "An inquiry of the Chair. If we are here then until midnight, is your intention that we would not be here then tomorrow?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't....you know, the thing that...that troubles me, it...never since I have been here in my nineteen years have we failed to work both Saturday and Sunday the last weekend of the Session. Now that has been traditional and I think everybody has known that from the very beginning. And I don't want to be here anymore than anybody else but if we stay here until midnight, it seems unlikely to me that people come from the far reaches of the state such as Rockford and other places is that you don't have enough money for their schools that they will be able to go home. And what we have normally done is when we work late, is that we've come in sometime in the afternoon on Sunday. Now we have...we have a hundred and some odd Bills on Concurrence and the Senate has another hundred that they could flood us with. So there is plenty of work. We're going to have to strain ourselves to get through on the 30th as the thing now stands. It seems to me that this weekend has been destroyed already. And I think most of us planned on being here tomorrow. And I'm sure that...and some of us if we weren't here why the rest of us would rejoice, Representative Simms. But that's the way it looks to me and we have about eighty Bills and I don't see how we can do anything except.... Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, let's get on with the order of the business of the House, work on till midnight and come back here tomorrow as we were elected to do to the job."

Speaker Redmond: "You're a man after my own heart. 29, Representative Giglio. It's now on Second Reading, I understand. I...has...it was read a second time. Are there any Amendments on this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Deuster...."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.... Ladies and Gentlemen, House... there are five Amendments. The Sponsors of the Amendments are all in agreement that these four would be tabled and would like to adopt Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendments 1 through 4 have been withdrawn. Is that correct? Amendment #5."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 29 on page 1 and so forth."



Deuster: "This Senate Bill 29 is designed to try to make as uniform as possible the dates throughout the State of Illinois which voter registration is allowed and the Amendment as it now stands pretty much leaves the law all over the state at 28 days with just a couple of exceptions and that is in...under existing law where there is precinct registration day which normally occurs before a General Election in the City of Chicago and Cook County. There is the closedown at 35. From a substantive point of view this is an improvement because in the suburban areas it is...cutdown is 45 days. It allows changes of 35. So that before...the result if we adopt this Amendment is all over the State of Illinois before the primary, the law will be uniform that you can register to vote up till the 28th day. With respect to the General Election where in Cook County they have precinct registration days, it'll be uniform throughout Cook County, 35 days. Urge the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 29. I'll be happy to answer any questions. And this has pretty much been agreed and discussed with the Members of the Election Committee on both sides...the Chairman and the ranking Republican Member."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, if the Gentleman would yield, would he please tell us how this will solve the basic problem which generated the Bill which was having the Chicago media, electronic media, urging people to register by a given deadline?"

Deuster: "That's right. The way it solves that problem is that throughout Cook County and particularly in the suburban Cook County area, the...the law is going to be the same as it is in Chicago from whence these media announcements emanate."

Skinner: "I don't live in Chicago or Cook County nor is my District there and that is not the problem you describe. How will it solve the problem of those people who are in McHenry County and Kane County who can hear WBBM?"

Deuster: "Well...."

Skinner: "And Lake County where you're from?"

Deuster: "Yeah, that...that...."

Skinner: "Right. That's the question."

Deuster: "The answer to that question is that the people in Lake County and



McHenry County will be able to register just as they do now up till the 28th day. They'll not be hurt. But the people on the Cook County side of the...of the Lake County line, like in Buffalo Grove who hear the media and hear about the...the cutdown, they can register up to a certain number of days up to 35 in Chicago whereas out in their area it's 45. We're changing that so that it's 35, it's the same as in Chicago."

Skinner: "All right, then, the people who win are the people who live in suburban Cook County and your constituents and my constituents will still be as confused as ever."

Deuster: "No, they'll be the same as ever. ....They're confused, why so be it but it's an improvement for suburban Cook County and it moves in the direction of uniformity. I think it's a step in the right direction. And the reason that there has to be the...the closedown at 35 days in Cook County is because when they have precinct registration day they've got to get all the binders and so forth."

Skinner: "I understand what you're saying...."

Deuster: "And act...yeah.... doesn't affect...."

Skinner: "If...if I may.....the Bill, Mr. Speaker....I understand...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner on the Bill."

Skinner: "I understand what the Representative is saying and it certainly doesn't solve the problem that stimulated the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #5. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carries, Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 36."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 36. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester. Winchester on the floor? Take it out of the record. 97. Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Representative...Representative Winchester had an emergency appointment with the dentist and I would appreciate if we could get back to that when he comes back. He should be gone not too long."

Speaker Redmond: "97."



Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 97. A Bill for an Act to change references to 'men' in various existing Acts to 'persons'. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is another...."

Speaker Redmond: "...Sit down there."

Terzich: "Senate Bill 97 is the same as part of House Bill 655. It amends the Chicago Regional Port District Act. The Bill renders various existing Acts, sex neutral and stipulates that all provisions that impart the masculine gender shall also impart feminine and I would urge your support of Senate Bill 97."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take...."

On this question there's a 124 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 123."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 123. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again, another....Senate Bill 123 provides the same as House Bill 663 which passed. It amends the Revenue Act. The Bill adds sex and national origin to a list of offenses of which the House was found guilty. If it...of it...it could lose its property tax exemption. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 123."

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 a 143 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 128, Representative Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 128. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Senate Bill 128 is the same as House Bill 660 where it amends the Illinois Municipal Code, the municipalities are allowed to prohibit discrimination in housing based upon religion, race, religion and sex. Panic peddling the real estate is declared illegal. The above provisions



apply to the purchase, sale and rental and other dispositions of real property."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 129 'aye' and 10 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 131."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 131. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections and the title of an Act to prohibit solicitation, inducement or sale or purchase of real estate on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that everyone who votes of these Bills, they don't see why there's any reason to vote for ERA if we keep on voting on these Bills. Senate Bill 131 provides the same as House Bill 660 where it amends the Section of the Criminal Code consisting of an Act to prohibit the solicitation or inducement of sale of purchase of real estate on the basis of race, color or religion sex, national origin or ancestry. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 131."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 168, Totten."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 168. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 168 amends the Election Code to matters I think we're all very interested in. First of all, it provides that in order to vote in a party primary a person must be enrolled in that party in order to be able to vote in that party's primary. The Bill specifically says that if you have already voted in a party primary you are enrolled in that party and you may vote in the next primary. You need not do anything. It says also that should you desire to be a new voter in a primary



you must enroll in that party's primary by going to the Office of Registration during the hours of normal registration and so declare your party affiliation within the period up to 28 days before the election. It also says that if you should desire to change your party registration you may do so on that period up to 28 days before that party....before that registration closes. Prior to a few years ago, the State of Illinois had a law that said there was twenty-three month's requirement ....were locked in to a party primary. The court has stricken that provision down. And now Illinois lacks a law regarding party primaries. Several states have adopted them and have been held up Constitutionally in court. This one is patterned similarly after the New York Court Decision and now puts Illinois into conformity with what many court decisions say about being enrolled in party primary. But there's philosophical reasons for this being so and I'd like to touch on a few of those. First of all, the history of our political system in this country has been one that has been sustained on a strong two-party system. There have been many who have attempted to destroy that strong two-party system and see it come tumbling down. Well, let me remind the Members of the House who sit here today that if we do destroy our two-party system we only have to look to farmlands to see what happens when more than two parties exist. Today in many countries where there's a multiplicity of parties they are unable to govern. And I think our system which has survived for over two hundred years with a strong two-party system is one that we should try and strive very hard to protect. To destroy that system by not allowing parties to select and nominate their own candidates in primary by making sure the people who are doing that selection are so...essential would be a sad mistake and a sorry day for this country and for the State of Illinois. That's one of the reasons why Senate Bill 168 is put forth. But there are many others also. Let me remind you also that there are many, again, who would like to see our two-party system destroyed and many of those exist in the media and the press today who would like to have more influence over the selection of candidates. And by destroying party enrollment, they can through the editorial pages and the TV, enhance the candidates of others who are not for a strong two-party system or do not adhere to those principles of the system that has



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

made this country one that's had a political system that has survived successfully for many years. Again, let me remind you, that those of you who are Members of fraternities and different lodges and so on don't look to members of other lodges to come and elect your officers. You make sure that they are dues paying members of the organization for which they belong. Well this to some extent is a dues paying organization. Political party is one that requires its members to be enrolled and they have to be...or should be enrolled in order to select their party officers and the candidates that will be appearing in that adversary proceeding known as a general election. That's a good system. And it has survived and it's one that we need to continue. I no more want members of the opposite coming into my party or those who may declare themselves as independents to come into my party to select the party officers anymore than those who are on the other side of the aisle would want that to happen either. It's happened before in this state and I think we need to make the changes to insure at least minimally that it won't happen again. Let me also remind you, at least I can... I can speak for myself on this, I think for many Members on my side and on the other side. I am proud to be a Republican. And I think many of you are proud to be Democrats. And we declare ourselves in a party primary as such and we run on that party label because we adhere to certain principles and we're willing to run on those principles. There are many today who even though when they come down here and take a seat and they declare on one side of the aisle or another, seem to find it more fashionable to declare themselves as independents or independent Republicans and independent Democrats. Yet, when they come down here they line themselves up with one side of the aisle or another. Well, I'm proud to be a Republican and I'm proud to be an enrolled in my party's primary and attempt to forward those principles as a party official that I think are necessary and as an elected party officer down here in the General Assembly. I think all Members who are elected here ought to, or at least who are going to run on a party label, ought to be willing to be elected by those people who are willing to come forward in the primary and declare themselves as a member of that party. Third, let me point out, that there are...there are many who think that by going to a primary situation as this Bill would do would foreclose





many people from voting in a primary. Well, let me tell in states which have similar systems or which have more closed primaries than that which we would have under this Bill in Illinois, there are no valid statistics to show that party turnout at a primary would be significantly less than what it would be under this Bill. That's just a lot of hooey. And it is just not substantiated by what other states have. Let me conclude by saying there are other advantages also in that you would have a list of who would be eligible to vote in your party's primary prior to the election. And your volunteers and those who you ask to go out and support you and yourself would be able to target rather than spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on additional brochures trying to get everybody in your district out to vote in an election when still, no matter how hard you try, very seldom does the turnout exceed twenty percent of the registered voters. Under this system it would be the same but it would allow you to target your efforts in a more reasonable manner and save money on an ever escalating cost of campaigning in this state. I think the Bill has many other merits. I'd be happy to answer any other questions and solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ann Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have no questions to ask of the Sponsor, I know exactly what he's trying to do. This would set politics, government, back fifty years at least if this Bill was to pass. I defy any Member of this House to show me one voter who is not a patronage worker not employed by the government through the party, find me a voter who likes this idea. I have not found one in my district, one in the state. The average voter views this with total horror. Now you say we are down here to represent the people. This is so unrepresentative of the people of the state that it's pathetic. We know exactly why you're trying to do it. We know exactly why you're going to get support on both sides of the aisle. It is to lock in the party and the primary to keep out those who call themselves independents, yes, an independent Democrat. And I am proud to be a Democrat. But I see changes that need to be made in my party. Who is kidding who about this? It may be that we spend too much time down here locked up in this House and we forget what the people in the state are saying to us. The people do not



want this Bill. You cannot show me one shred of evidence that they do. You are doing this for selfish reasons, for political reasons. And it is certain it will set back good government a long, long way. I urge you to defeat this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cissy Stiehl."

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

I know that all of us in this House are agreed on the importance of a strong two-party system. And I know that we all agree that throughout the year it has been the same strong two-party system that has strengthened and sustained our system of government. And the most important reason that our two major political parties have remained so strong is because they have represented the views of mainstream America. Unfortunately, in the past years we have seen an erosion of the strength of these political parties. Now, clearly, this is not the time to place further restrictions on the voters in this most important step of our elective process...the selection of candidates to run for public office. This Bill could better be called the 'Primary Lockout Bill'. And consider, Ladies and Gentlemen, consider very carefully the consequences if this Bill should become a law for if we continue to construct roadblocks in the path of the voter it will be deeply resented by the electorate in the State of Illinois and party membership will drop to the point that you can hold future political conventions in the closet if you pass this Bill. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in opposition to Senate Bill 169. I think it's clearly contrary to the direction we should be taking. Instead of closing the doors in a political participation we should be encouraging more people to participate. Every national survey that has been done recently indicates that more and more people are identifying themselves as independents or aligned with either the Republican or Democratic Party. Now...now what we are doing is further discouraging identification with either of those parties, with either of the major parties, by putting a barrier in the path of participation in the primary. So we're telling voters they have to do is decide what primary they want to vote on before the issues and the campaign are crystallized. Before



they might know where they want to vote. What we're therefore encouraging is simply primary participation by those who often blindly ally themselves with a party and discouraging those, or locking out those people, who would be attracted to participation by the issues or ideology of the party. I think this is clearly a very bad idea and would encourage my colleagues to cast a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "The Sponsor...will the Sponsor...is the first woman to second...will the Sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Are you saying by your Bill, then, that you must be declare your party affiliation at least 28 days before a primary election?"

Totten: "...What you voted in a prior primary."

Geo-Karis: "All right, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's high time that we get out of the Neanderthal thinking that we are going to push people to declare themselves in voting. I don't think it's a very democratic system. It's not a very good Republican system. I am just as proud as the Sponsor to be a Republican. But the Republican believes in free enterprise. Free enterprise means a choice, a right of choice. And a right of choice should be inherent in every American. I feel that gone are the days of the back filled...smoke filled rooms when the politicians dictated to the people. We may be in politics but the people have a right of choice and they're far more intelligent today than to be led by the nose. If we're going to push them to be...announcing their affiliations way in advance just so that we can make, shall we say, party convenience for some of us? It's sad. Let's go out and fight for votes. Let's do it the honorable way and not worry about restricting people's right of choice. This is not very good and we're going backward. I can tell you in my counties the predominant people, predominant votes....feeling is to have an open primary and not to have four hundred names for the open primary against two against it. And I resolve...I respectfully ask that we don't go backward. This will make the party stronger if we don't go for this Bill because you can declare yourself, you don't if you don't want to."

Speaker Redmond: "James Houlihan."



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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Totten, if I move into your district and register to vote some three or four months prior to the election.

I've moved in, say, during the summer and I go to register to vote, and then we proceed to the election, what am I required to do if I want to vote for you or against you?"

Totten: "If you want to vote for me then....."

Houlihan, J: "...Well, let's say if I want to vote for you, let's assume that. Assume the defeat of this Bill and I still want to vote for you?"

Totten: "Well, at the time of registration, you had to declare...you had to enroll in one party or another. If you wanted to make up your mind later on, you had to do it before 28 days before....."

Houlihan, J: "At the time of precinct...precinct registration?"

Totten: "Whatever the 28 days period is, right, or at the in-precinct registration. The Bill also provides that at the time of a general election the Clerk will distribute to the Judges of Election, forms for those people who may want to change to make it easier so that they can be enrolled in one party or another for the next primary."

Houlihan, J: "In other words, Representative Totten, if I wish to vote in the primary not only must I register when I move into a precinct but then I must make a second effort and go to the precinct in-registration polling place and register my party preference if I am able to vote in the primary coming up in March? Is that correct?"

Totten: "You could do it at the same time or later on, if you decide to vote in the primaries, correct."

Houlihan, J: "So, in other...in other words, you're going to require an extra trip to the polling place for someone who wants to participate in the primary election?"

Totten: "Not necessarily, they can do it at the same time they register or later on if they decide to vote in the primary."

Houlihan, J: "But for those people who move in and register and have not yet determined which way they want to vote, you would require an extra trip to the polling place?"

Totten: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt. Pardon me, please bring your



questioning to a close."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, if I could address the...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, J: "This Bill has been suggested to be the protection of the two-party system. I would like to argue that this Bill will be the demise of the two-party system. What this Bill will argue for is the increased polarization and geographic separation of our parties. What you will have is by adopting this Bill is a party in the City of Chicago that is totally Democratic; a party in the suburban area that is virtually, totally Republican. And what you will have in downstate areas is almost all of the electors being locked out of the primary process. You will have those people who are independent Republicans or independent Democrats not making that extra trip to the polling place, being locked out of the selection of candidates and therefore not participating in the fall election. I think this...this Bill probably would be the biggest step to destroying the two-party system, destroying the viability of the fall election accurately reflecting the views and the feelings of the voters at large. What this Bill would do, would put roadblocks before voters. Roadblocks that people, we already know how difficult it is to get people to the polling places. We already know that when many good Democrats move from the city to the suburbs it's difficult to get them out to the polling places. We know that there is local pressure for those people not to declare themselves as Democrats. And what you're asking for is to make it another step, another roadblock for people participating in the...in the primary process. I think that's unwise. I think it would destroy the two-party system. And, generally, lock people out of participation in the process which is so important."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt. The Gentleman standing between Representative Bluthardt and the Chair please sit down. Representative Telcser, our guest from the Senate."

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

Speaker Redmond: ".....Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "You know, at this time I'd like to talk to the nonmachine politicians, so to speak, those who have not already committed themselves because I know those of you who have been told in their machine political



organizations to vote one way are going to vote that way. Now we heard the Sponsor say that he was a lifelong Republican, so have I been. I've been a Republican since the time of Herbert Hoover who I happen to think was one of the best presidents this country ever had. But I am...I am like, you know, most Republicans are thought to be and that is that they are independent of thought and of action. We are not bound down by...by order of our superiors. We use our own thoughts. We analyze things and come to an independent judgment. If you look at this Bill, it's been aptly called a Lock-out Primary Bill. It locks out everybody but politicians, their families and patronage workers. Do you realize that by passage of this Bill you will require a second step before you can vote in a primary in the event you want to change your affiliation? Do you realize that the same method of using a card that you use now for change of address in registration will be used in primary elections? As long as you send in a card saying that you want to change your affiliations from one party to the other, at least twenty-eight days before the primary election, that would be suffice to change your party affiliation. What's going to happen? All you candidates and your precinct workers are going to be walking around with cards full of change of affiliations, will be asking your voters, 'How did you vote, gee, if you want to vote for me, will you take this card or just fill out the card. I'll mail it for you'. We're going to have one hell of a mess if we adopt and pass this law. Law will effectively lock out most people who are disinterested in elections until just prior to the election. Then when they go and try to vote they'll find out they can't vote the way they wanted to because they hadn't changed their affiliation. This is a terrible Bill. It should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, 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 vote 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Totten to close."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Of course, those who stand and argue against it are those or



ones who have not really been long...really strived for the strengthening of the two-party system. And I argue with those that really if this system is to survive in this state and in this country we've got to strengthen it and we've got to do it by making sure that the members who selects our candidates and elect our candidates in primaries are ones who are willing to come forward and make that extra effort to be members of that political party. ...Remind you that how can someone who is not interested of taking the extra effort in belonging to a party be a qualified judge as to who the party officials are that you elect at a primary and who the candidates will be to run against the opposite party in the general election. No more than many of you would raid a fraternity or a lodge to select officers it is valid to argue that the people should not be dues paying members of that party when they go to vote. This Bill deserves the careful consideration and favorable vote of everyone of you who claim to be a Republican or a Democrat."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Robinson to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, it looks like this Bill is going to go down and of course I agree with that. This is an outrageous Bill. Eighty percent of the people of Illinois have expressed themselves through polls as being against this Bill and yet this year, this Bill got introduced in the Senate, made it through the Senate Elections Committee, made it through Second Reading in the Senate, made it through Third Reading in the Senate. Got introduced in the House, made through the House Elections Committee on Second Reading in the House and is only being stopped now. I believe that the people of Illinois should know how close we came to having this kind of outrageous Bill. And I'm sure that they will express their outrage this summer and this Bill should never be introduced again."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson, timer's on."

Johnson: "There's all kinds of philosophical arguments that I agree with about the two-party system and about people making an effort to get involved in a primary but sometimes if you take it to the personal level that's the best argument of all. The best argument of all



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that I can think to support this Bill, and I do support it, is that if we'd had this Bill in 1972, we wouldn't have had Dan Walker as Governor and that alone is reason to vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 39 'aye' and a 110 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Epton, for what purpose do you rise?"

Epton: "I...I certainly thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly hate to pull rank but I would think that my light has been on for quite that length of time. I...I respect your admonition not to waive turns but I do (one) think that the courtesy should have been extended to a Minority Leader, perhaps not the most persistent Minority Leader. One, I would have said I have a conflict of interest because if this Bill passed I doubt if my children would register to vote for me. So that, of course, I wanted to make known. Secondly, I wanted to express my admiration to the Democrat. I don't know how...I'm very proud of being Republican but I don't know how you managed to get the Republicans to Sponsor a Bill of this nature. I compliment you. It's a shrewd maneuver. Finally, I would say, I'm glad to see that those Republicans in the City of Chicago who have often been accused of being stupid, inept, incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial are finally being joined by our colleagues in the suburbs."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills Third Reading. House Bill Third Reading appears House Bill 689. Representative Jones, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jones, J.D.: "Record me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye' or 'no'. Representative Mahar. Jones, 'no'. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on at the very beginning on that Bill and I wanted to speak on the worst Bill of the Session. Now I don't speak very often on the floor of this House as you very well know but occasionally I do like to speak. I wish you'd look down at the corner there once in a while and see if my light is on."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't...get it mixed up with Skinner."





Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady on 689. Representative Gene Hoffman desires to be recorded 'no' on the previous Bill, 168. Representative..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 689. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections in the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "This is House Bill 689."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 689. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, we've spent an awful lot of time on the floor on this Bill so far. It appears that this is the only level that we can get the House to come up with at this time. I think it's imperative that we move the the Bill across because the Senate still has to deal with it. I suggest that we could probably wait till the end of the Session and still find so much disagreement that we're not going to properly fund education the way we should. I believe the full funding can be attained but if this is all we can attain at this time today, I urge your favorable support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative Brady for his remarks and join with him in urging the Assembly to pass out 689."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I remember not too long ago when a Governor in Alabama stood in the door of a school house and tried to stop people from entering and thought that that would gain him higher office. I would submit to you that today, in Illinois, we once again have a Governor standing in the doorway of the schoolhouse trying to stop kids from getting a proper education. And I would submit to you that that Governor thinks that that position, once more, is going to carry him to a higher office. Let me tell you that I think the House should be disgraced for passing out this Bill at this particular time in this amount. I think that



this state can fund, can fully fund the school aid formula. I think that the figures that we have from our own Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission indicate that we have the funds to do it. I think that we have the funds to do it by virtue of decisions given to us by the Comptroller in this state. I would submit to you again that this Governor is a P.R. Governor who is appealing really to the most basic instincts of the human personality and is standing not to fully fund this particular formula. I have a great deal of feeling about this particular appropriation. I think that we ought to take this back to the people and tell them really what this Governor stands for. And at this time I'm going to vote 'present' on this administration...on this Bill, because I think that we have the funds to fully fund education and I think we should do it even if we have to stay here until July 25th, 26th, or 27th or even maybe Christmas time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

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

If I thought anyone on the floor would take the previous speaker seriously I would attempt to rebut what he said. However, I won't do that. I will merely point out something that all of us know, that you can't get blood out of a stone. You can't get money out of an empty treasury. We're going to have trouble as it is with cash flow problems in this state for at least the next fiscal year. And this is a reasonable level of appropriation for this particular program. If anyone should be interested in getting the maximum amount of money for this program it ought to be me. And for that reason, I would encourage your support of the level that we now have in 689."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor... Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be very, very brief but for one who has been saddled with this whole question of the proper level of funding for elementary and secondary for the last couple of months, I



say one thing and in all deference to the Gentleman from DuPage, who I consider an authority in this area, the Gentleman from Cook was absolutely correct in terms of his analogy of setting out the priorities by the current administration. If all of you have kept up with a running count of the amounts of money that this administration has agreed and okayed outside of his so called, 'budget proposals' that he presented to us last January, you will find that more than enough money has been, quote - unquote, 'Okayed by this administration' outside of that initial proposal to fully fund the formula without any...any pressure or any...any additional pressure on the amount of General Revenue Fund new money taken into the state. It is just a clear indication, a clear indication of where the priorities are for this administration. The other day in reading the newspapers and coming to us was again a proposal to fund a negotiated salary increase and I'm not saying that those parties are not entitled to that, but the monies that are involved there and the money that will be involved there in the next fiscal year, comes to quite a bit more than ... more than what is necessary to fully fund the formula. Not only is it quite a bit more, in real dollars and cents it must be somewhere in the area of 20 or 30 million dollars more than necessary to fully fund the school formula. What I'm saying here is that we, as a Body, we as elected Representatives of our constituents all over the state, I believe that we made a commitment, a commitment in the 1970 Consitution, a commitment to our constituency each time we have ran, to say that education was our number one priority. This Governor, this administration reiterated that last year, that education was his number one priority. That's what he told the people when he was running for office but after the day he was sworn in that simply went the way most things that go when you're whistling up a wind tunnel when there's a great deal of sound and fury when you're out on the political hustings on the stump, a great deal of sound of fury that means absolutely nothing once you've gotten to that point of



being sworn in to uphold those so called, 'promises' and I emphasize 'so called promises', that you put out to the people to get to that position. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in all deference to the House Sponsor, who has did everything within his power, everything within his power to insure adequate levels of funding for the kids in this state, I simply cannot... cannot be a party to okaying what I know, what I know, based on the facts that we have received in the Appropriations Committee that this is not an adequate level of funding. This is not what we can afford. My priorities is for the kids, my priorities is for better and upgrading quality education in this state. And I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill until we get a level of funding that carries out that responsibility."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Brady."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like an opportunity to give a short close because of the comments made by those who I think are sincere in their support of education. I'm willing to stay here till as long as it takes to arrive at full funding. Because I think that's the commitment of the State of Illinois, that's the commitment of the Legislature. But I think at this time the best way we can do that, because we have tried and failed as a group, to change this level in the last two days...We're coming down to the wire on timing, we all know we're going to have a problem passing Bills back and forth. I think the appropriate thing to do today would be to vote in favor of this at this level. And I urge each and every one of you who would like a higher level and as for myself, a full funding level which I think is necessary, to lobby as hard as you can your Senate colleagues to make sure that they, in the limited time they have available to them, push the Bill up in that direction. And because of that, I feel that we are going to move this Bill forward. There is more funding available and it will come about by way of passing this Bill over to the Senate today and I urge your support."



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

Flinn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of inquiry. When Representative McMasters got up as soon as you turned the t.v. lights on, I didn't agree with him. But as long as you keep that on, these people are going to stand up with the dream that they'll see themselves on t.v. at 6:00 news and we're going to be here that much longer today. Now I think it's time to turn it off."

Speaker Redmond: "Just to show you the power of Monroe Flinn. Have all voted who wished? Representative Ted Meyers protests. Representative Meyers."

Meyer: "Even in spite of the t.v. camera being off, I would just like to point out to this Body again, that this provides, this along with another Bill provides close to 2 billion dollars in money to non...to public schools and 2 million dollars to non-public schools, which is a two thousand to one ratio."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 158 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. There's one more emergency matter on here."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson on the floor? 2422, on the Order of House Bills Second Reading. It's been read a second time. Representative McGrew, for what purpose do you arise?"

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps a parliamentary inquiry. I...I thought I detected you saying that we're going to think that we're emergency nature and I submit to you that Senate Bill 830 would certainly fit that category. I was wondering if I should move to that...will that go to that order or what?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevecich."

Matijevecich: "Mr. Speaker, I think we better reconsider that Bill on limiting the number of Bills, we've got about two million up there just a minute ago. They took it off but...there were about six numbers of digits up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we wait till that Senate Bill with 15 Bills that takes hold of that, we'll consider your request. Right at the moment, 2422. Mr. Clerk. Representative Farley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Farley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. If Representative Collins is not on the floor...oh, I see Representative Dawson, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Have confidence in the Speaker. Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill, all it does is change the name of the Chicago Regional Port District to Senator Dan Dougherty Harbor. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "It's...it's on Second, I believe, and it's been read a second time. We have...we have to move it to Third Reading. Are there any Amendments on Second Reading?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Move it to Third Reading. Now, Representative Dawson, is...is anyone in opposition? He's calling the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2422. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to contribution of the Deep Water Harbor in Lake Calumet, City of Chicago. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "I'm not in opposition..."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. I understand that you sought recognition. Representative Dawson put the question and I thought you wanted to be recognized."

Collins: "I'm well...Mr. Speaker, you asked for opposition and I'm anything but that...I heartily in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 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? ...All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 163 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. Representative Dawson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave for all the Membership to be on that as a Cosponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objection? Representative Stiehl.... Hearing no objection leave is granted. Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was called off of the floor during the time the time of the vote on House Bill...on Senate Bill 168 and I would ask for leave of the House to be shown as voting 'no'. It won't change the results."

Speaker Redmond: "She asks leave to be recorded as voting 'no'. Is there...leave granted. Hearing no objection leave is granted. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I was down getting an apple when we voted on Senate Bill 168 and would ask similar leave to be recorded as voting 'no' on Senate Bill 168."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Representative Helen Satterthwaite....recognized."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on Senate Bill 152. It will not...change the results."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Representative Abramson, did you get permission with respect to 152? Do you ask leave....to be recorded?"

Abramson: "On 168, I...record me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you...have you received....did you ask permission to be recorded yet?"

Abramson: "On 168?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know, I thought, I have a memo here that you wanted to be added to a Roll Call."

Abramson: "On 168 I want to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman...may....does he have leave to be recorded as 'no' on 168? Hearing no objections leave is granted. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, in Representative Winchester's absence I would like consideration on House Bill 2424 to move it to Third Reading for the purpose of passing it. It is an emergency matter for the Department of Mines and Minerals."

Speaker Redmond: "2424 is exempt, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "It...it is a....emergency matter for the Department, however, if it....I think there's no opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. House Bills Second Reading, 2424."

Friedrich: "Can it be moved to Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments? It says here it's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Friedrich: "Now if I....Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Read it on the Third...."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2424. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mines and Minerals. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a transfer of forty-three thousand dollars (\$43,000) from personal services to contractual services in the Department of Mines and Minerals. They have some obligation utility bills and some contractual services need to be paid. And I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. ....All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative John Dunn desires to be recorded as 'aye' on 2424. Conti, 'aye'. Representative Polk, 'aye'."





There's another emergency matter here and that's Senate Bill 862 on Senate Bills Second Reading. Representative Brady."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 862. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Assistance for Nonpublic Institutions of Higher Learning. This Bill's been read a second time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No...no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "No Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 862. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Financial Assistance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. What Senate Bill 862 does is make an equitable change in the funding formula for nonpublic institutions of higher learning. Representative Jones is a Chief Sponsor with me on this Bill. He has asked me to pursue this matter. This Bill was passed by the General Assembly in the last Session and for some reason was vetoed by the Governor. It is agreed to by the Federation of Independent Colleges. It brings the formula into a more equitable position for all institutions in the private sector. I think it's an important thing. It doesn't change at all any fiscal impact on the state and as matter of fact, there'd be a proration if anything short of that full funding formula exists in Appropriations. And all it does is just straighten it out for all the schools who have had a harder time getting the access to it and I urge your support."

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

Hoffman: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "How much...how much money are we talking about redistributing on the basis of the present level of funding?"

Speaker Bradley: "Turn Mr. Brady on please."

Brady: "There was a recommended amount in the budget for grants and aid of nine point two million dollars (9,200,000). The appropriation process is not finished yet. I don't know whether that will be the



level or it'll be something less or greater than that. And so I can't tell you how the redistribution will come about."

Hoffman: "All right. If the level is approved at...at that level, how much of that money will be redistributed .... or redistributed and who are the winners and who are the losers?"

Brady: "Well, I....might suggest if you want to put it in the category of winners and losers, that under the way the formula will be amended to be changed, there'll be universities like Roosevelt University and there will be the Central YMCA and institutions like that which will gain better revenue and therefore they, I guess, you would call would be the winners. But all the universities in the private sector have come together and endorsed the formula change. So I'd like to stand up and salute them as all winners because they say that there's more equity needed for some."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "You finished, Mr. Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones, J.D.: "Just want to add my support to 862. What it does is include the fulltime equivalent in the grants. Up to now it's been only for fulltime students and the funding for it has been accommodated by ...and approved by the...the BHE and it's in the budget and there's no....from....about the fiscal note and it's just a....including parttime students' equivalent into the...the formula for distribution."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones, arise?"

Jones, E: "Mr. Speaker, are we on Short Debate?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, Sir. Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would strongly encourage your support of Senate Bill 862. The only thing this Bill does, that is the substantial change, is the changes the.... state distribution from the basis of fulltime students to fulltime equivalent students. Actually it opens up access in private education because it is....encourages your private institutions of higher education to open evening classes to make the benefits of private higher education accessible to adults on a parttime basis. I strongly



solicit your 'aye' vote. I think this is an excellent Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, you wish to close, Sir?"

Brady: "I would just urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 153 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar appears....on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 830. Yes, Mr. Jones, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Jones, E: "Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to understand how you're calling the Bills. Now my Calendar indicates 862 was on Second and evidently was moved to Third. But....are you going on priority of call or what?"

Speaker Bradley: "We suspended the Rules last night to read those Bills a second time and then we would be in a position to address them on Third Reading today, Mr. Jones, and that's the...what we're doing."

Jones, E: "Well, then, how are you arriving at calling Senate Bill 862?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Speaker went to that order of business on 862, Mr. Jones."

Jones, E: "But there...aren't there other Bills with a...earlier priority of call on Third Reading?"

Speaker Bradley: "Which one are you referring to, Sir?"

Jones, E: "There are several."

Speaker Bradley: "Which ones?"

Jones, E: "Well, I know 1281 is on Third Reading and it has a priority of call on 6-10. And you...your priority of call was 6-16. I can't understand that."

Speaker Bradley: "Now, Mr. Jones, would you please repeat those ones you said should be called first before 862 or 830?"

Jones, E: "Well, according to my Calendar and the priority of call is...is the date. So I know 1281 has a date of 6-10. And you just got through with 862 which has a date of 6-16. So I was just trying to follow you...."



Speaker Bradley: "Oh you're...we're on Second Reading, 1281 is on Third Reading."

Jones, E: "I know but we just passed 862 out on Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, but under the priority of call that you're suggesting and referring to, 862 appears on the priority of call on the Order of Second Reading."

Jones, E: "That's on Second Reading but not Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "We passed...we adopted in rule change last night that allows us to go to Third Reading with those Bills that were read a second time, Sir, and I think we're right where we should be on the order of call. Senate Bills....Senate Bill 830."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 830. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any motions...."

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 failed in Committee. Floor Amendment #3. McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 830 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

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

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, I have a sheet here that's presumably to have all of the Amendments that were filed. Now I refiled the Amendment #2 that failed in Committee. Now does that appear as Amendment #3 now or does it still ...is it still...what's the posture?"

Speaker Bradley: "What was the question, Mr. McGrew?"

McGrew: "I refiled the Amendment that lost in Committee. And according to a printout here I have from the Junior College it says the explanation of Amendment #3 is different than Amendment #2 that was killed in Committee. Is...may I ask the Clerk if this is the rather long one? I don't have...."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Let me get it from down here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Twelve pages."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I know where we're at now. Yeah, this is...Amendment #3 is an Amendment that is twofold. As you may or may not know, and frankly I've been surprised at the knowledge of the House on junior college funding, what we have done in the past is to allot



so much for junior colleges...Mr. Speaker, may I have a little bit of order, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Let's give the Gentleman some order."

McGrew: "Amendment #3 provides that we will delete the resource equalizer, as they call it, and further provide that every school district shall have the right to levy at a maximum of seventeen and a-half cents an education rate, five cents in the building fund and one cent for adult education. And we have the backdoor referendum provision there. The reason I filed this Amendment in toto, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that we now have a resource equalizer in junior colleges based entirely upon the assessed valuation of that junior college district. We're going to guarantee two hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars (\$282,000) per student assessed valuation. While I may not be quite as opposed to that concept I am opposed to it now because we have a differing tax levy by statutory law. The reason for that is...the of incorporation many junior colleges tried to go at seventeen and a-half cent tax authorization, failed to do so, came back with a fifteen cent. If they fail again we find we have several junior college districts in the state with a maximum of twelve and a-half cents. So what we're doing is guaranteeing everyone at the rate of two hundred and eighty-two dollars per student without considering how much they can actually raise. And that's what we should be addressing ourselves to. So the second part of this Amendment does allow everyone to go to seventeen and a-half cents and we delete the original resource equalizer also. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Brady: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I'm rising in opposition to Representative McGrew's Amendment. It is identical to the one he offered in the Appropriations Committee. It was...that was defeated there. This, I think, should also be defeated. He's putting together two concepts here and one of them eliminating the special assistance or the equalization affect twelve, one-third of the community college districts in a very adverse way. And by eliminating it what he will be doing is just taking money away that is already going to be appropriated. It does not redistribute it. And I'd urge opposition to this Amendment."



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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Brady is exactly correct, it's identical. . . Amendment was defeated in the Appropriations Committee on a vote of 12 'no', 5 'yes'. It is opposed by the Community College Board and the Trustee's Association. A later Bill which will be offered by Representative McGrew will be acceptable and that's Amendment #6. In regard to Amendment #3, I join with Representative Brady in asking opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, the previous two speakers have hit the nail on the head but we should also point out that the particular Amendment before us now would strip at least about, in fact, one, point, three million dollars (1,3,000,000) from a single system in southern Illinois and that is the Illinois Eastern System which is represented in part by myself and Representatives Brummer and Cunningham. It would be very unfair to them. It would put them in tremendous financial straits...regardless of the arguments to the contrary. The Amendment's very technical in terms of putting together two extremely costly and important concepts. I would urge a 'no' vote for those reasons and also because Amendments 6 and 7 as alluded to by Representative Peters will allow us to vote separately on these two important issues."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we previously passed out legislation and...and passed the Senate yesterday requiring that all junior colleges be...all areas of the state be contained within a junior college area. Some areas cannot, because of their assessed valuation, support that without equalization. It is very crucial to various areas of the state that equalization remain. I respectfully request this matter be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman...Gentleman from Cook, or...Mr. McGrew, do you wish to close?"

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, again, would like to ...for those that are not following the discussion. The last two Gentlemen that spoke are exactly correct. There is one downstate junior college that perhaps would not benefit as greatly. They would



receive one point three million dollars (\$1.3,000,000). That is one community college in eastern Illinois. But let me tell you what's happening to resource equalizers as we're using it in junior colleges. The total line item appropriation for resource equalizer in junior colleges is seven point nine million dollars (\$7.9,000,000). Four point two-five-five (4.255) goes to the City of Chicago. Ladies and Gentlemen, they are nearly the only junior college that has the possibility of going to a seventeen and a-half cent rate. Now, I submit to you that it's rather ironic that one of the few junior colleges that cannot go to that....can go to the seventeen and a-half cent maximum is also turning around and getting more because they have a lower assessed valuation. That does not reflect the amount of dollars that they can actually raise at the local level. That is a bad concept. I think we need to do away with it. You and I both know the hassle that's going on in the Senate. I plan to do everything I can to see that the money is redistributed. Frankly, what happened here, was that nearly all these higher education appropriations Bills were voted out of Committee one day before we could even get Amendments filed in most cases. They were reported to the floor that day, read on Second the following and passed out of the House. Now, you know, I'm more than happy to work out things but when you're trying to move at that pace it is impossible. I had the Amendments drafted at the Reference Bureau and we can take care of it in the Senate. I repeat, it's seven point nine million dollars (\$7.9,000,000), four, two-five (4.25) goes to Chicago, one point three (1.3) goes to Eastern. Now if...if we indeed want to mix tax rates and assessed valuation to reflect how much we can get locally that's fine. But don't do it halfway. Amendment #3 is the best approach and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall the Gentleman's motion pass?"

All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 17 'ayes', 117 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Jim Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 830 and so on...."

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



Houlihan, J: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #4 makes a change in the per hour grant for the remedial and developmental line. And it raises it from 932 to 1325. And the reason I'm doing that is that I feel on a basic, philosophical level that the junior colleges should provide an important step in fulfilling some of the gaps in our educational system. They should not try to be like a full college which is providing the baccalaureate and all the other programs but they should provide educational assistance to those people who might...who might not be able to fit into the college system....."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I apologize for interrupting Representative Houlihan. But I am informed, Representative Houlihan, that technically the Amendment is incorrect in that refer to raising 932 to 1325. It should be 1709 'cause Amendment 1, seven dollars and nine cents (\$7.09), Amendment 1 on line change 932 to 709. If we have leave we can correct it on its face. I just wanted to call the Clerk's attention and yours so that we'd know where we we're going on that."

Speaker Bradley: "...Mr. Houlihan, do you concur in the Gentleman's observation?"

Houlihan, J: "Yeah."

Speaker Bradley: "And to amend it on its...."

Houlihan, J: "...Accurate, could we amend it on its face?"

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing...do we have leave? Hearing no objections.... Would you give us the.....correct figures so we could put it on the Amendment now? Yes, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "709 instead of 932. 709."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "What we did...."

Speaker Bradley: "Before you proceed, Mr. Houlihan, we might...the Chair would like to announce to the Members that it's the intent of the.... to break at 2 o'clock for one hour for lunch and come back and work straight through. Proceed, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "In other words, since the Chair's not got a quorum here





they want to break until a quorum won't be back until four or five?"  
Speaker Bradley: "I was listening to the comments over here, I'm sorry, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Just as well. Representative Peters has pointed out Amendment #1 further reduced the remedial and developmental level. What we're saying is we're not going to fund these programs. And the reason we're not going to fund them is because the school administrators choose not to spend the money in these areas. These line items were developed on the per unit cost and because the administrators chose not to spend the money there, then they have a lower per unit cost. But what...and the school administrators in effect are saying is, 'We don't care what you put in in terms of the line item, we're going to spend it as we see fit.. And we're going to spend it only in the areas that we think are important'. And I'm sorry to say that at least in the City of Chicago, I believe that the city colleges' administration is more interested in the more glamorous programs than in providing the basic and necessary remedial skills that are...that are important to putting people in the mainstream of the economic and the mainstream of jobs and putting them in a position where they can be employed and be productive citizens of our state. And I would urge that we amend the remedial and developmental line and increase that fund. And then we follow up with another Amendment which...is... will be offered which will require them to spend that money in that category. Because what they're doing now is they're taking funds appropriated for certain lines and not spending them there and they're really voiding the intent of the legislation. And I would urge adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a couple of questions?" Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Houlihan, by way of the change in the credit hour rate in your Amendment #4, if this were to be fully funded in terms of the Amendment, what would be the cost?"

Houlihan, J: "Representative Stuffle, based on the average number of students there would be somewhere in the vicinity of three point two



million dollars (\$3.2,000,000)."

Stuffle: "And where would that money go? Would it go to Chicago, downstate or would it be spread all around and do you have some dollar figures to indicate the distribution?"

Houlihan, J: "Representative Stuffle, it would be spread all around but I must be honest with you and say that a good bulk of that would go to the Chicago area."

Stuffle: "So if we were to vote for this Amendment as downstaters, if the dollar amount were not sufficient in the appropriation it would take money from the downstate community college district and redistribute it to Chicago?"

Houlihan, J: "Well, Representative Stuffle, I would never describe it that way but I think you're accurate."

Stuffle: "If I could speak to the Amendment, let me say that while it's laudable I don't think it's going to be fully funded and as downstater I can't very well vote to support something that's going to take money away from us. And, also, to point out that the Community College Board is in opposition to this particular Amendment. I assume not only because of its redistribution aspects but also because of its cost. Now we've been here and talked about fully funding education. All of us would like to, I think all of us know we haven't yet. We haven't particularly amended the line item for grants in the community colleges over the years and I would have to urge a negative vote on Amendment #4 for those reasons."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, this relates very much to what I was speaking a little bit earlier in the vast discrepancy between the funding of junior colleges. What the Gentleman from Cook is trying to do is to raise the rate to which the state would pay remedial, developmental education of junior college systems. The City of Chicago Junior College District has roughly two-thirds of all remedial developmental students in entire junior college systems. Their total cost per student is thirty-four dollars, no, thirty-eight dollars and eleven cents (\$34.11) and they are..... I'm...I'm saying it backwards myself. It's thirty-four dollars and eleven cents (\$34.11). They're getting paid at the rate of thirty-eight dollars and forty-some cents. In



other words, for every student that they have in this system right now they're making four dollars from the state above what their costs are. That is with the current funding. This Amendment is going to attempt to increase that more, to another four dollars. So the City of Chicago is already being well paid for these students, in fact, they're being overpaid and the Gentleman is attempting to raise it even more. I vehemently ask for a 'no' vote."

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

Peters: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, just in the case of the Members of the House, our agreement with the arguments made by Representative Stuffle in the fact that the Community College Board and the Trustees' Association do oppose Representative Houlihan's Bill not in terms of what he is attempting to do but what it might end up doing in regard to other programs in the downstate area. So we stand in opposition to Amendment #4."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us how he voted on Representative Jones' Amendment last night which seems to be fairly parallel to this type of a...of a push? The Sponsor of the Amendment. Representative Houlihan, I believe."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Skinner, were you asking how many people supported Representative Jones'....."

Skinner: "No, I was asking whether you did."

Houlihan, J: "I certainly did."

Skinner: "Oh, snucks."

Houlihan, J: "Well, Representative Skinner, one of the things that you'll find out as you grow up in this Legislature is that there is some sense of consistency among some of the Members."

Skinner: "Well, I'm...I'm certainly happy to hear that and I certainly do agree that you've become a better Legislator since Governor Walker's been out of office. Now if I might address the....if I might address the issue at hand...."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Skinner: "This is....Representative McGrew, believe it or not, is right. And it's conceivable that the Illinois Junior Colleges and Trustees' Association can be wrong. They are dead wrong here for well over a



majority of the junior colleges but unfortunately when one has a trade association one gets along, one doesn't make waves. Now, thank God, the Junior College Trustees' Association doesn't represent the ...the State of Illinois because if they did all the money would go to southern Illinois. And that is what this special equalization program does and programs like Representative...the Representative from Chicago's Amendment will do. We are raping the junior colleges in the suburban area and in northern Illinois by supporting this formula change. I think probably the best thing that could happen would be the whole cotton pickin' Bill would go down the tube and we'd be left with a formula of last year. Unless...unless Representative McGrew's Amendment gets adopted which completely does away with special equalization. I certainly hope he has another Amendment coming up and more than seventeen people will figure out he's right."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I realize that this Amendment pits the interest of Chicago against the rest of the community college systems throughout the state and that really was not my intention. I think Representative Peters can attest to the fact that the issue that we were trying to get at in Committee is the fact that this money is being continually gutted from the program because Chicago City College System is not spending what they're being given for these kind of necessary and important programs. But because of the overall impact and the arguments made here on the floor by Representatives Stuffle, McGrew and Skinner, I think it might be best to withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you withdrawing the Amendment, Sir? Leave to withdraw the Amendment and...Amendment's withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Mann. Amends Senate Bill 830 on page 2, by deleting line 19....."

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

Mann: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this Amendment is to provide for the distribution and expenditure of the disadvantaged student grants according to legislative intent. The Community College Board has indicated that the disadvantaged student grant money will be distributed on the basis of the district credit hours in remedial



and developmental courses. This Amendment would assure that this will be done. In addition, the Amendment would assure that community college districts would extend the state disadvantaged grant money for courses and activities related to remedial and developmental programs. In some cases districts have not expended these grant funds for the purposes intended. In effect, this Amendment will increase the amount of state money expended for remedial and developmental courses. This will supplement the reimbursement rate stated in Senate Bill 830."

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

Brady: "Yes, I rise in support of Representative Mann on this. The way the...this is spelled out in the Community College Act, it says that it will be spent and approved by the Illinois Community College Board in their plan and their plan is exactly as the Amendment of Representative Mann states so I see no confusion on it. The Community College Board supports this and I urge your support."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, we also join with Representative Mann in support of this Amendment. And it is supported by the Community College Board and the Trustee's Association. And it does get at the kind of problem that Representative Emil Jones in his Amendment to one of the other Bills yesterday tried to address himself. Funds that go for the particular purpose of remedial and developmental programs should go for those programs and that's what this Amendment would insure and we are in favor of Amendment #5."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman...Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I might also point out that the net effect of this Amendment will be to raise that hourly grant in our next year's appropriation so that we will begin to satisfy the particular problem which I tried to address in Amendment #4. We will not do it in one step but we will gradually move toward an increasing dollar amount spent per unit provided by the Community College System. And in that sense, I think we're moving towards a solution and I would support Amendment #5."

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

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I find myself in...."



peculiar position. Frankly, I am generally in agreement with whatever the Junior College Board is wanting. However, I disagree with them in supporting this Amendment exactly for the reasons cited by Representative Houlihan. It is a tendency to raise this education rate for the developmentally disabled. I submit to you that the City of Chicago is now making money on it. If we fully fund this... or if we add additional dollars to it they're going to be making more dollars off the state above and beyond their call. This Amendment, however, requires that the...must be spent on those program. Well, that sounds fine except how are you going to particularly line item it so that we know that no dollar goes in any other way? I submit to you what happened is that the Junior College Board was browbeat in Committee and they decided that Representative Mann's Amendment they could live with if they had to. And in order, perhaps as I said, placate the Gentleman making the motion, they did go along with it. It is not a good Amendment. I support your...or I ask for your negative vote."

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

McClain: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a very confusing Amendment. I heard this Bill in Appropriations Committee. I'm trying to get it cleared up. I applaud the Sponsor's intention that a community college would have to spend the money for remedial and developmental programs for disadvantaged kids. In Chicago they're faced with...the city college I understand with getting state monies for reimbursement and not spending those monies entirely for those programs. So I applaud the intention of the Sponsor of this Amendment. The question I had and I can't get it satisfactorily answered is, if this now gets inserted into the formula on state reimbursement of dollars, then there's only so much of the pie. If this increases the amount of money that for instance the city colleges will then receive from our state dollars, then community colleges, for instance, downstate will lose money. If the Sponsor would answer me as to that point then I'd be satisfied."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to close the debate."

Mann: "Well, I've been asked a question, I'll be happy to...to answer it.

This does not increase to the amount of money which is going to be



spent by the community colleges. All it does is insure that they spend the existing amount of money in the way that they say they will. We're talking about three point eight million dollars (\$3.8,000,000) which is already been appropriated. There is no change in the amount expended nor will there be in the future."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Gentleman's Amendment. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The question is on the adoption of the Amendment, all in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. And the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote but it seems to me I had my light on for some time and it seems to me since this Bill was heard before my Committee and many comments were made at least the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee would be allowed to have some view or try to clarify by...giving...making available to the House part of the testimony that was taken in that Committee on this issue. I won't go into it any further than that but if we are to use the system of punching our speak light or if we've got to get up to holler at the chair to allow him to know that we're trying to talk, I don't know which way you want to go. I prefer, I prefer the former which is as I understand the best way...the way that we normally transact business here. But if we've got to go to the point where we used to just stand up and holler, I'll do that also."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Barnes, I...I looked at the board here and your light was not flashing when....."

Barnes: "...My light has been flashing for the last ten minutes."

Speaker Bradley: "....Well, Mr....Mr. McClain....well, the chair wishes to differ with you. Clerk will take the record. On this question, 92 'ayes', 14 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6. McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 830 on page 1, line 1 and 5 and so forth."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Amendment #6 provides for minimum qualifying rates of seventeen and a-half cents for the educational fund, five cents for the building maintenance fund and one cent



for adult education. We do have a backdoor referendum here. It would allow all junior colleges to be on an equitable base from which to start. We now have...the City of Chicago has a seventeen and a-half cent. My particular junior college is at twelve and a-half percent... twelve and a-half cents. That is because we had to go to a third referendum before we could incorporate. It has the support of the Junior College Board. It has the support of the Trustees' Association. It came...this originally was a Bill that was before Higher Education it came out of there unanimously. And in the crunch in getting all the House Bills out we did not make. I think it's pretty much an agreed Amendment and I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Gentleman's Amendment...the Gentleman's motion to Senate Bill 830. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if I understand what this Amendment does it means an automatic tax increase in most of the downstate community college district. While I realize that those junior college districts need to have additional money, it seems to me it's the wrong direction for us to go to impose an additional real estate on those districts. We know that the state made a commitment to those community college districts to help them with the funding of the program. If we now give them a real estate tax increase we are simply relieving that financial pressure at the local level, relieving it at the state level but putting it on at the local level. It seems to me that that is the wrong direction for us to be going if the state is going to say that they are supporting the community college system. And I would urge the rejection of this Amendment."

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

Peters: "Yes, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, so that we know the position of the groups involved here. The Community College Board and the Trustees' Association do support Amendment #6. Representative McGrew earlier today offered Amendment #3 which we defeated. He is now breaking up Amendment #3 into #6 and 7. The Community College Board and the Trustees' Association support this Amendment. 6 but are opposed to the next Amendment which is Amendment #7. Thank you."





Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 68 'ayes', 32 'noes' and the Gentleman's motion is adopted.

Further Amendments? Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer,...what purpose do you rise?"

Brummer: "Yes, could I be recorded as 'no' on that Amendment, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7. McGrew. Amends Senate Bill 830 on page 2 by deleting....all of line...."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This is...is back on the resource equalizer as we use it. Let me make this as perfectly clear, if I may use that expression, as I know how. The junior college has four grant areas. Number one is in the various enrollment. That's the programs, the items that were addressed by Representative Houlihan and others that wanted to change some of the rate. I am not touching that. They also have what they call enrollment growth. In other words, if you're increasing enrollment in this area you get additional dollars. I am not touching that. They get a grant for ...special grants for disadvantaged students. I am not touching that. I am touching only one particular, the fourth part of their budget, that is seven point nine million dollars (\$7.9,000,000) in the Resource Equalization Grant. We have thirty-nine junior colleges in this district...in this state. Only twelve, only twelve receive any money whatsoever. The City of Chicago gets sixty percent of this money. They have thirty percent of the students, they get sixty percent of the money and they have the highest tax rate in the state. Eastern Illinois gets ten percent of the money. So two colleges out of thirty-nine get over seventy percent of this fund. Now if you want to know exactly who would get even any infinitesimal amount, let me tell you. Kaskaskia gets a mere twenty-five thousand (\$25,000). Blackhawk does get six hundred thousand (600,000). Sauk Valley gets thirty-seven (37). Danville, one hundred and thirty-four thousand (134,000). Chicago, as I said, four million, two hundred and fifty-five thousand (4,255,000). Thornton, four hundred and ninety-two thousand (492,000). Rend Lake, two hundred and sixteen thousand (216,000). Kiskauwee, sixty-three



thousand (63,000). Eastern Illinois, one million, three hundred and twenty-five thousand (1,325,000). John A. Logan, two hundred and fifty-four thousand (254,000). Shawnee, three hundred and fifty-six thousand (356,000). And Eastern, one hundred and eighteen thousand (118,000). Now if you want to prorate that, I think if any of you will stop to think for a moment, that anyone other than Eastern and Chicago definitely do not get their share. As I said earlier, this does not take into consideration the dollars that they can actually raise on a local level. Seventy percent, seventy percent of this money goes to two junior college districts. Let's put eight million dollars more in that distribution fund and get it all over the state equally."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, this is one-half of the Amendment which we defeated on a vote of 17 'yes' and 117 'no' a few moments ago. Representative McGrew argues because only two districts are getting much of this money that we ought to put this Amendment through. I would submit, as I did before, that the one point three million dollars (\$1,300,000) which goes to Illinois Eastern is substantial part of the budget there. Cutting that out....to close the doors of those colleges' campus in that particular setup. As well, I might add, despite the fact that my own community college, Lake Land, gets nothing. I would note that the president of that community college remains in favor of this particular program and in opposition to this Amendment because he believes it's an equitable distribution. You're not only hurting Chicago by supporting this Amendment, you're hurting a good, downstate community college system that may not be able to recoup this money by redistribution or otherwise. As we did in the previous Amendment that had this language, I would urge defeat of Amendment #7."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, frankly this is the third time today that we've talked, discussed and voted on this issue and I think the Body has spoken on it. This part separated out was the most offensive part. I think it eliminates not only the equalization but it would also eliminate the Amendment that was just placed on here by Representative Mann and how the money would be spent. And I urge



your opposition."

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

Skinner: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a couple of questions."

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

Skinner: "Representative McGrew, what is the tuition at Chicago?"

McGrew: "Oh, I really can't answer it that accurately, Sir."

Skinner: "Is it under five dollars per credit hour?"

McGrew: "All I can tell you is that they do not take that into the amount of dollars that they can raise locally, Sir, I do not know the exact tuition. I've got all kinds of information here. I might be able to dig it out."

Skinner: "All right, the incredible inequity...."

McGrew: "I believe it's eleven dollars an hour, Sir, which is....we're at seventeen and a-half at Sandburg, I believe."

Skinner: "Yeah, well, we're pretty close to seventeen too. And it seems to me that unless one is willing to tax one's students through the tuition rate, that one should not be allowed into this special equalization bonanza. Now there is a reason that your local junior college president may be in favor of this. It's the old trade association reason combined with the possibility that that junior college president may even get a job at one of these junior college districts that get special equalization. Now, these educators get together and they reach an agreement and then they tell you they're for the agreement and then it's up to you to decide whether they've sold out your district or not. Now as Representative McGrew did not read your junior college's name off, the Association sold out your district. And now it's your choice to decide whether to represent your people or to represent the southern Illinois dominated Junior College Trustees' Association and Presidents' Association."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this Amendment. I do understand that there is one district downstate that gets this large amount. I also understand that their district has unusually high costs. They have opted for a four campus junior college. I can't imagine a junior college district doing that and



then...then having to plead for money to...to operate on. It appears to me that those junior colleges, and there are three of them that partially are within my district that I represent, get absolutely nothing out of this and yet they come to me and say they want us to pass these increases in...in taxes allowing only a backdoor referendum and...and apparently are all willing to give up equalization funds. I just cannot possibly understand it. It appears to me that there should be a better distribution of this equalization fund based more upon the ability to locally provide than simply upon the basis that it is now distributed. And it appears to me that this is an equitable proposal in Amendment #7."

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

Keats: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew, to close."

McGrew: "I move for its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, on the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 830, all in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this special equalization for junior colleges is just absolutely absurd and is there strictly to do for a few districts something special. Most of us get no benefit at all from it. It's something like impaction in the School Aid Formula. It is something that some people who were able to put through by pulling the wool over our eyes and thereby get a special grant. Chicago gets most of it. Eastern Illinois gets a large chunk of it and one or two other community colleges get some. Let's stop this ripoff now. Let's get our fair share for everyone and vote green."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 43 'ayes', 90 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8. Ewell. Amends Senate Bill 830 as...."

Speaker Bradley: "Is Representative Ewell on the floor? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."



Brady: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Ewell will not be on the floor and I think I will move these Amendments for him and try and explain to the Body what they do. Stand in the position of supporting them. But I would like to first state that Amendment #8 should be tabled because it was put in with the wrong figure. Amendment #9 of Representative Ewell corrects what he wants to do there."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #8. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9. Amends Senate Bill 830 as amended by deleting all of Section 2-16."

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

Brady: "Yes. What Amendment #9 does is break down the appropriation of the Community College Board into a flat rate grant. And it breaks it down to the two because they, Governor's Office, Community College Board, divided it out into two appropriation lines. And what it does is put one of them at seventeen, seventeen and the other at at dollar seventy-three. This is being sought by Representative Ewell and many Members because of the tremendous confusion arrived at in breaking everything down into eight grant lanes and basing it back on the unit cost which a lot of people feel is not the proper way at arriving at how you can quality fund educational courses. And I urge your support of this Amendment."

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

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To perhaps paraphrase the bond...blond bomber from the other side of the aisle. This is the ripoff of all ripoffs. As I explained earlier, the majority of students in the Chicago system are in the remedial developmental education. They are now getting an additional four dollars per student hour above their cost. We adjusted...by the last Amendment gave them another four million dollars in equalization grants. And now what we're trying to do with this Amendment would say that it cost no more for us to educate nursing programs in my district than it does to get the remedial developmental program in Chicago. This is absolutely the most preposterous Amendment that I...anyone could have thought of in terms of the total funding for junior college. And I ask you to vote 'no'."

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



Peters: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm happy in this instance to agree with Representative McGrew and to oppose Amendment #9. The opposition of the Amendment is also the position of the Community College Board and the Trustees' Association. As indicated by the Sponsor, we would have one set rate for all the categories, the number of the programs would end up suffering. The baccalaureate program would end up losing money. The National Science Industry, the Health Programs, a number of the programs in line items would end up losing money. And a number of these program and colleges would be put at a distinct disadvantage in the kind of programs that they had and the opportunity that they're bringing the people. And we would encourage a 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise to support the position taken by Representatives McGrew and Peters. While the programs mentioned by Representative Brady in Chicago are laudable, it seems to me that supporting this Amendment goes backwards. It goes backwards in taking away the work of not only the community college boards and trustees but the various groups around the state who've worked to break the rate system down so as to put some reasonable cost reimbursement rates in for the various programs. Supporting this Amendment is akin to saying that we should pay the same thing for basketweaving programs as we do for welding programs. I'm not trying to liken those remedial programs in Chicago to basketweaving but I'm trying to say there is a hell of a difference between the cost of one program and another. And this Amendment completely fails to recognize that and it needs to be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brady, you wish to close? Mr. Brummer, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I would rise to oppose this Amendment. It merely makes sense to reimburse on the basis of cost. As Representative Stuffle said in different words, nursing programs for example are one of the more expensive. It doesn't make sense to reimburse on a flat rate. This is the work of the Junior College Board, the Advisory Council. And from a purely economic sense, we ought to reimburse colleges on the basis of their costs and defeat this Amendment."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brady to close."

Brady: "Yes, I think in fairness to Representative Ewell and other Members I would like to say that this has brought about this desire to go to a flat rate grant because of the tremendous confusion arrived at by the Board of Higher Education in their trying to calculate unit costs and, therefore, what a community college deserves in the next year. If an administrator so chooses, he can hold down a unit cost by various ways of administration and therefore lined up getting less money back from the state the following year. And I urge the support of Representative Ewell's motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 830. All 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 33 'ayes', 107 'nays' and the Gentleman's ...Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10. Brady. Amends Senate Bill 830 as amended...."

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

Brady: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I think we have been through the gamut of all types of approaches on community college funding and spending. I was hopeful that it...when I put in my Amendment it would be the final one because of the position that we have passed the appropriation. And in passing the appropriation, Senate Bill 830 comes into a position of being a little out of sync with the amount of money we put over. What this Amendment does is change each one of the eight lanes, or categories, or playback grant amounts in six cent rate and it changes the special second line appropriation item to a dollar, seventy-three bringing it into exact conformity with the appropriation Bill that is now in the Senate and we passed out of here.

I urge your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of the Gentlemen's...Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 830. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes'.....The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "The Amendment was adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Bradley: "No, Third Reading. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, for what purpose do you arise?"

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave to allow Representative Ben Polk to join me as the Chief Cosponsor of Senate Bill 693. It's on Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Bradley: "Any objections? Hearing none, it will..... Mr. Cunningham, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have witnessed anew the advantage of prayful silence that you considered the Amendments on HB.830. But I would be remiss if I weren't to say 'Thank you' on behalf of all the boys and girls who seek an education at Illinois Junior College for your magnamity in rejecting some of these monstrous motions that have been offered. I want to point out in defense of junior colleges in Illinois the rate that we levy is twenty-five cents per hundred dollars which is double that of any of the opposition and triple of that of most of the....."

Speaker Bradley: "You're out of order, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "...Thanks for your kindness."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I would seek leave of the Body at this time since we fully debated this issue to suspend the proper rule and try and vote this out of here at this time."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the House to give Representative Brady leave so we can get this Bill on its way."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any objections? Hearing none...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, on Senate Bill 830."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 830. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Brady: "I thank the Members for their consideration and time and effort to this Bill and I urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor ...the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner. Turn Mr. Skinner on."

Skinner: "Yes. Would the Gentleman please tell us how many signatures are needed to trigger the backdoor referendum of this tax increase and how many days those signatures must be gathered within?"





Brady: "The Sponsor of that Amendment which is now incorporated in part of this Bill, Representative Skinner, tells me that it is an either/or situation of three signatures or ten percent."

Skinner: "And how many days?"

Brady: "21 days."

Skinner: "Well, I would like to suggest to my downstate colleagues that when your junior college board raises the tax rate significantly and there is no referendum that that will be a little too late to say, 'Oh, Gee'."

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

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, I...Mr. Speaker, I just walked around the House. There are about 53 vacant seats in here. It appears that a lot of them have gone to lunch. Maybe we all ought to go to lunch and come back and get on with the order of the business of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "We're very close to that purpose. Mr...Mr. Brady to close."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. It's very difficult in trying to do a piece of legislation like this where we can make all the Members happy with all of the Amendments and all the process. We've all labored long and hard on this. It is very necessary to have this Bill, the Formula Bill, presented as a way of spending the appropriation for the community colleges. Otherwise, without it, we have no way since the Attorney General ruled that you can no longer put rate amounts in the appropriation Bill. This is the only way that the community colleges can get the funding we've already appropriated for them and I urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 20 'nays', 9 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar on Third Reading on page 3 appears Senate Bill 968. The Gentleman from Cook...just a minute, maybe we better read it a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 968. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 968 is a Bill which will authorize the court to hold a presentence hearing after a defendant has been found guilty where he has caused material loss to a victim of a crime. The court can order that restitution be made to the victim of the crime by this convicted defendant. This Bill passed unanimously out of the Senate. It passed unanimously out of our House Judiciary Committee. I know of no opposition to it. And I would certainly ask for the unanimous support of this House in this very good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Willer: "Do I understand in the Senate Amendment 1 that you have removed the pain...pain and suffering part? There's no restitution made for pain and suffering?"

Getty: "It is impossible to calculate that. So it was...the feeling that yes all you could do is reimburse for actual loss."

Willer: "Well, that's okay with me. I just wondered if I read that correctly. Also, what about people who are really quite poor and convicted of crime, as many of them are..."

Getty: "Oh, it specifically requires that the court here having a hearing to determine ability to make restitution."

Willer: "And if there is no ability to make restitution then this does not..."

Getty: "Well...well, then, the court would have to find that there is."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman. He indicates he will."

Greiman: "Yeah. Where...where there is another cause of action, you know, which...based on tort, is there something in the Act that makes clear that that court action that this does not become sort of an exclusive remedy that the tortious remedy still remains?"

Getty: "Well, yes, this..."

Greiman: "Well, would...would it still remain?"

Getty: "This merely permits the court to order that restitution for the actual loss to the victim of a crime be made. Now, you know, we have the Crime Victim's Compensation Act. That means the people of the state, the taxpayers, are reimbursing the victims of the crime. What



this would do is put it on a different posture. It would make a convicted defendant responsible. If the courts found that there was ability to make the restitution for the loss, to make that restitution. That's all it does."

Greiman: "Well, I think what I'm saying is, where there is a....well, let's say there's a tortious act, an assault. I could collect for pain and suffering if I...if I...if I filed an....a tort action. A civil action for tort. Now in this...."

Getty: "This doesn't limit your ability."

Greiman: "This would not...."

Getty: "No. Absolutely."

Greiman: "If I got money from the reimbursement of this statute, it could not be raised as a defense to my tortious act."

Getty: "No, absolutely not."

Greiman: "Would there be a set rate set off in the tort action?"

Getty: "I would think that could be pleaded."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in support of this Bill. It's high time we had some form of restitution available where it is at all possible. We have been victimized and the victim too long with our lives in Illinois. It's high time that we victimized the defendants who cause their onerous crimes."

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

Madison: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question but before I do that I'm wondering if the Chair could explain how we got to this Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "We called the Bill for a reason I think we just explained to you, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Well, I know you went to the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading but that was not the...that was not the first Bill that appeared on the Calendar on the Order of Third Reading nor did it appear as a first Bill on the priority of call."

Speaker Bradley: "You're absolutely correct. Do you want to ask a question, Sir?"

Madison: "Yes. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question. Representative Getty, can you tell me if in the case where the defendant is a child



if a court can order restitution to be made by the parent?"

Getty: "I'm sorry, I didn't understand that."

Madison: "Can you tell me if in a situation where the defendant is a minor, if the court can, under your Bill, order restitution to be made by the parent?"

Getty: "Not under this Bill. There is another matter, I believe, that was before the Body at some stage that...there is an existing law, I believe that provides for five hundred dollars (\$500) and I believe we raised that to a thousand. This has nothing to do with this. The court only has authority over the defendant that is in front of it. And there are safeguards and guarantees here that the court has to hold a hearing to determine ability here. There's no way we could bring in, under this sort of a procedure, using the Criminal Law...there's no way we could bring in a parent to be held liable."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr...Mr. Getty to close."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I earnestly support your unanimous vote for this very good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 162 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar on page 2 appears Senate Bill 203. What purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, arise?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, my switch was inadvertently voted 'aye' on House...Senate Bill 830. I'd like to ask leave of the House to vote it as 'no'. It won't change the result."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as voting 'no' on Senate Bill 830? And Jack Davis 'no' on 830? Hearing no objections it will so be recorded. On Senate Bill...Senate Bill 203, read it a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 203. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider's seat, the



Speaker of the House, Mr. Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 203 in its original form provided for the increase of tax for conducting elections for counties from one cent to two cents. It was passed over here and I had objection to the...in that form, so it has been amended to provide much needed relief for counties in the cost of extending and collecting taxes for the local governmental districts. It authorizes the county to extend taxes, I believe it's up...not to exceed two and a-half cents. In my County of DuPage, the cost of collecting taxes which has been imposed by the State Legislature is something in excess of a million dollars. This tax would return to DuPage not more than seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. This Bill, I believe, is requested and desired and needed by all of the counties throughout the state with the exception of Cook County. And your support is earnestly requested."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Senate Bill 203. This Bill is identical to one that I had, House Bill 702, and I mistakenly let this Bill get called one night right after a big fight, and I don't recall what the fight was, and I wound up with only 86 votes. And it had to get on Postponed Consideration and we ran out of time for that. This is indeed as our Speaker has told you, a much needed Bill. Is one that is supported by Maurice Scott, The Illinois Taxpayer's Association. And...and is one that has been dealt with a Supreme Court ruling, ruling out the old fee collection. The Supreme Court quoted delegate Rigney, Harlan Rigney, our Representative Rigney now, as recognizing the problem. As they were knocking out the old fee system, they recognized that something ought to be done. And of all the attempts that's been made to correct this problem, Maurice Scott said this is the best he's seen and he supports it. And I would ask for a green light."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 116 'ayes', 31 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House....



Senate Bill 321."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 321. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Capitol Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. Mr. McAuliffe wishes to be recorded 'aye' on Senate Bill 203. Hearing he'll so be recorded. Mr. Telcser in the chamber? Mr. Cunningham, you wish to be recorded 'aye' on 203? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 331. Mr. Telcser is not here. Senate Bill 345. Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to handle 321 for Representative Telcser if there aren't any problems with it."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll back up to 321 then, read it....read a third time, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Senate Bill 321 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capitol Development Board and I would move for its passage."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we're trying to get copies of all the Amendments on this so I wonder if it could be taken out of the record for a while."

Ryan: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. Would you like to try 331 for Mr. Telcser?"

Ryan: "No. No."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. 345. Senate Bill 345."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 345. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 345 is not as it is in the Digest. It was...it now was an Amendment that Representative...Terzich and I agreed to and it really applies to the Pension System for the Department of Insurance if they can have uniform application of the Pension Code Provision. And it applies basically to the downstate area and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, his light was flashing and.... The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who



wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 148 'ayes', 2 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 433."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 433. A Bill for an Act to amend the Physician's Assistants Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, Senate Bill 433 has to do with the Physician's Assistants Practice Act. It allows for seven pilot hospitals to have a one-on-one physician's assistant to a doctor relationship. It originally started at three, much work was spent on this in the Committee trying to get a lot of...agreement worked out. And in the one-on-one so that the responsibility would be with the individual doctor. I will answer any questions, urge your support."

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

Mann: "Mike, has the INA, Illinois Nurses' Association, taken a position on this Bill?"

Brady: "To my...to my knowledge, Bob, any nurses' group that I have talked to have taken a firm position against any physician's assistants and I think it's shortsighted."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I briefly address myself?"

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly may, Sir."

Mann: "...To the Bill. First of all I'd like to indicate that I have here a conflict of interest because I am married to a registered nurse who is now teaching at a state institution. But I think what is at stake here is the expanded role that we keep talking about in terms of the nurse. Nurses have to go to school for a long period of time. They have rigorous on-the-job training and we are placing in the medical ladder, if you will, a group between the doctor and the nurse who has less training. If this Bill were coupled with a Bill which would expand the role of nurses in Illinois I think I could be more comfortable with it. As I say, I have a conflict, it is not affecting my vote, but I wanted you to know of it and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Physician's Assistant Act is only two years old and has been effective for less than two years. Even though there are only a 171 persons who in that time



have been certified as physician's assistants and according to the figures provided by the Department of R & E, there is fifty of them that meet the certification requirements of the National Commission. We are expanding or proposing to expand this Act. We've had three Bills amending the Physician's Assistant Act in the present Session and apparently think that physician's assistants are going to do for us in the health area what MacDonald's does for the harried homemaker. The difference is of course that there are a lot more MacDonald's than there are physician's assistants. A Bill that we passed earlier this Session expanded the law to provide for physician's assistants in mental health institutions. It seems to me that if the governing commission in the eight private hospitals that will employ p.a.'s under this Bill do so, there's a likelihood that the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities will be able to use physician's assistants in any kind of a way to solve the limited license, a physician problem as proposed by the Governor earlier this year, and as approved by this...this House. So, it's...it seems to me that we need to wait at this point, to provide a little time to see how physician's assistants work out in our state before we take the few who are available and extend their opportunities for employment. It seems to me, also, that we need to more properly utilize the people we have available now, our nurses and other health professionals, before we look to a group such as the p.a.'s to help us in any constructive kind of way to respond to our health problems. And I will vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "Who is responsible for the acts of the physician's assistants who would be employed in a hospital?"

Brady: "Under this, as proposed, the responsibility rests not only with the hospital who is the employer but with the supervising physician who is requested that his name be turned and approved as the one who is responsible for the actions of this physician."

Kempiners: "What if there is a conflict between the hospital administrator who is paying the p.a.'s salary and the physician who is his supervisor? Who ultimately has the jurisdiction over this individual?"





Brady: "By way of answering that I would like to say that what...these are only teaching hospitals where this is proposed in a two-year pilot program and...and the responsibility is mostly in these hospitals where everyone is an employer. It is not necessarily the relationship of a private physician who is outside of the purview of the administrator being the supervising physician of the physician's assistant."

Kempiners: "I'd like to address the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the answer that was given to my question pinpoints a severe problem that would exist if this Bill became law. I, for one, do not have the hangups that prior speakers have had with the Physician's Assistant Program. I support it. I feel it should be expanded. However, I also personally believe that the physician's assistant, as it is stated in the law that we passed last Session, is responsible only to the supervising physician who should be the employer. We can say here today that in the next two years, even if this is only a pilot program, that this type of conflict will not come to play. But when you're talking about employer who would be the supervisor of the hospital and the professional, the physician who is to assume responsibility for the professional acts of this physician's assistant, you could run into a conflict and put this individual into a very serious situation. The reason that the supervising physician, the employing physician, is responsible for the physician's assistant is that this person is not an independent practitioner. He is subordinate to one who has to make the decision and be responsible for that decision both in a legal and a moral sense. And I feel that putting a physician's assistant on the payroll of the hospital but under a supervising physician who must make independent decisions is a very bad thing to do without clarifying this legal point. And for this reason I think we ought to delay passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Hoxsey: "Representative Brady, I understand the Nurses' Association are in opposition to this Bill. I have a question. Is there any reason or any regulation anywhere that say a nurse is....a registered nurse is not qualified to be a physician's assistant?"



Brady: "I don't know, Representative Hoxsey, I'm not addressing who is qualified or not qualified to be a physician's assistant. I think that's been covered in the...in the regulations for physician's assistants in other legislation that's been handled. All the request here is that one be allowed to be used in certain teaching hospitals."

Hoxsey: "And you can't answer my question?"

Brady: "The...the...in further response to that Representative, the requirement for nursing do not suggest that someone who is a physician's assistant under our act can now automatically become a nurse. So I don't think the reverse is true."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'.. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, to close the debate."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, several people here have said in conclusion of what they feel their opposition to this Bill is that we ought to delay the passage of it: I submit to you that if we delay the passage of it, this Bill fails, then it will not go on and help in critical situations like this was brought forth about. Cook County Hospital and the prison system in Cook County where they feel there is a great need for someone to attend in an area of a physician's assistant would be of tremendous help, give poor people a better opportunity to get some good medical care. And if you're interested in that I think you should support this Bill. And I urge your favorable consideration."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, two years ago we provided for the licensing of physician's assistants. This year we passed a Bill, that I handled in the House, a Senate Bill that upgraded the testing of physician's assistants to the national standards and upgraded that profession. Physician's assistants are here to stay. A delaying won't change it. I know the Nurses' Association are concerned but they shouldn't be. We're going to have nurses. Nurses



are free to take the exam and many have passed already. Physician's assistants are not automatically nurses but if they want to be they can study to be nurses. These...these two professions should not be in opposition to each other, they should work together to improve medical care just as in the Armed Forces the paramedics work with the nurses and the doctors to improve medical care in all fields. If this Bill doesn't pass this year it'll pass in a year or two. It should pass now. It's needed. It's a good concept and there's no use sticking our head in the sand and fighting the physician's assistant. He's here to stay. It's a good profession and we should encourage it to provide better medical care for people throughout the state. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to explain his 'no' vote."

Simms: "Well, in contrast to the previous speaker, medical care in this country is not the battlefield of Viet Nam but it's in the technical hospitals of our country. And I think this legislation, very frankly, is going to more than anything else is going to reduce the quality of care that we have in our hospital and in our medical system today. For these reasons I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question, there's 65 'ayes' and 78 'nays', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we recess until 3:30 for purposes of lunch."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan, could you revise that to give the five minutes for the Clerk...."

Madigan: ".....And to allow five minutes for the Clerk."

Speaker Bradley: "And the Speaker wishes to remind each and everyone of you we'll take just one hour and get right back to work at 3:30. One hour and fifteen minutes."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following



title, to-wit: Senate Bills #196, 197, 201, 205, 257, 326, 345, 434, 507, 564, 600, 639, 671, 686, 693, 708, 710, 758, 803, 811, 816, 846, 854, 863, 911, 1003, 1015, 1050, 1072, 1083, 1094, 1128, 1177, 1283, 1361, 1363, 1371, 1397, 1479, 1507, 1592, 1615, 1651, 1652, 1653, 1654, 1655, 1656, 1657, 1658, 1659, 1660, 1661, 1662, 1663, 1664, 1665, 1666, 1667, 1668, 1669, 1670, 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674, 1675, 1676, 1677, 1678, 1679, 1680, 1681, 1682, 1683, 1709, 1727, 1739, 1751, 1802, 1964, 1983, 1986, 2103, 2132, 2262, 2283, 2310, 2340, 1279, 1284, 1285, 1286, 1297, 1306, 1330, 1347, 1351, 1381, 1390, 1393, 1407, 1411, 1432, 1450, 1456, 1457, 1458, 1459, 1462, 1469, 1472, 1480, 1499, 1541, 1561, 1585, 1600, 1612, 1726, 1731, 1732, 1752, 1767, 1772, 1782, 1798, 1821, 1822, 1874, 1915, 1947, 1950, 1972, 1976, 1982, 1984, 1991, 1998, 2024, 2042. Passed by the Senate, June 24, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following title, to-wit: House Bills #1315, 1327, 1386, 1406, 1412, 1415, 1418, 1428, 1429, 1433, 1468, 1481, 1487, 1502, 1625, 1641, 1729, 1733, 1740, 1742, 1753, 1784, 1789, 1791, 1806, 1928 and 2051 together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of the following Preamble and Joint Resolution, to-wit: House Joint Resolution 45. House Joint Resolution 21. House Joint Resolution 8. Concurred in by the Senate, June 24, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has adopted the following Preamble and Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution 28. Senate Joint Resolution 42. Senate Joint Resolution 47. Senate Joint Resolution 49. Adopted by the Senate, June 24, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

The House now stands in recess until 2:30 p.m. The House stands in



till 3:30."

RECESS

Doorkeeper: "Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will reconvene in fifteen minutes. Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will reconvene in five minutes. All persons....."

Speaker Redmond: "That's all right, I'll make it later. The House will come to order. Members, please be in their seats. Representative Geo-Karis is in attendance. Representative Walsh is not. Oh, Representative Daniels is here. Representative...who are the other Members of that district? The big bull elephant? Father Krueger is here, he fell asleep....in the barber's chair. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I'd just like to inform you that former Legislator, Ron Hoffman, is here."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh! Look who's up in the gallery."

Daniels: "He used to represent part of DuPage, if you recall, till we kicked him out."

Speaker Redmond: "Didn't kick him out. He thought he would go...down-grade himself and go to the Senate. Representative Ted Meyer in Representative Walsh's chair."

Meyer: "I'd just like to report that Representative Molloy's granddaughter who is about one is here also."

Speaker Redmond: "That what?"

Meyer: "That Representative Molloy's granddaughter is here too."

Speaker Redmond: "Say, will you see if Representative Walsh's switch works right? Never seems to vote right and I....."

Meyer: "He thinks you're misdirected."

Speaker Redmond: "Is it not green and red and white and yellow. It's got everything there? Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if you noticed how much better Ron Hoffman has been dressing since he's out of the General Assembly?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's struck up with a bargain with Tim Simms. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope that Ronald never has to strike that kind of a bargain...."

Speaker Redmond: "Better with jewelry and shoes and....."



Geo-Karis: "I was going to ask you, if I may be so presumptuous as to ascertain at this moment being it's such a propitious moment. Where are you going to start on the...on the Calendar when everyone arrives from their sojourn out into nature outside?"

Speaker Redmond: "Lewis Carroll once said, 'You start at the beginning'."

Geo-Karis: "Now tell me where you're beginning. At the end?"

Speaker Redmond: "And he also said, 'Words mean what I want them to mean', so..."

Geo-Karis: "Good. There is no one who can outdo the States of Ireland and I'm glad you're going back to Ireland to thank your forebears because look at all the intelligence they've endowed you with...and you can always get the best of me in an argument. But remember, it's better to be looked over than overlooked."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mike McClain, do you have anything to say? You... Got a call from your wife, Kathy, and said, 'Please keep you up here over the weekend'. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to suggest to you that Representative Simms saves all of his shoes for you. You're the only... you're the only one that gets a chance at the leftover shoes."

Speaker Redmond: "No. No. No. If you talk to him right why he's a pretty frugal man and he doesn't see any reason why things should be wasted."

Hoffman: "Does he save them because he's an undertaker? Who needs shoes in that condition?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very fond of Representative Simms but I told him every now and then when he gets me, shall we say going, I told him I would put him in one of his own boxes and tie the ribbon on and he won't be able to get out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Let's kill all these stupid Bills and get out of here for the weekend. I've got things to do at home."

Speaker Redmond: "All the stupid ones have been killed already. We have nothing left but precious cargo. ....Would you like to try Representative Skinner's microphone, it seems to have been out of order the last couple minutes."

Geo-Karis: "Are you suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Skinner's been out of order?"



Speaker Redmond: "No, it's just...just fine. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Gene Hoffman is here with us today,  
Diana Hoffman. Right over here. Diana."

Speaker Redmond: "An improvement. An improvement, too."

Hoffman: "That's what everyone says."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti to read a few chapters of the  
political problems in Leyden Township, or how to get into a township  
meeting."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I think Representative Conti is an  
expert on bilingual education, I would appreciate hearing his version  
of what he thinks of bilingual education at this point. Representative  
Conti, will you favor us with a couple of remarks in your fluent tongue?  
Representative Conti, will you favor us...what you think of about  
bilingual education? Representative Conti will respond. Go ahead.  
Turn him on."

Conti: "The last time Paul Powell gave me the microphone I filibustered  
for seventeen hours so you better quit while you're ahead, Adeline."

Geo-Karis: "Gee, I never thought you'd speak that long."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

Martin, P: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Martin, P: "On, well, within the last couple of days in my parking space....  
that is C-3, and after just having my car cleaned at Gietl Brothers  
somebody has banged it up on the side door and they have not even had  
the courtesy to come and let me know that they have put a nice dent in it.  
And I would hope that if the person is listening to us, and I'm  
sure he or she is, that they would come forth and, you know, let me  
know that they did it so that I will be able to have that area painted  
over again through their insurance company or ever...how they want to  
handle it. And if they will do that I think that people in the House  
of Representatives are honest enough to come forth on this kind of  
matter. And I would certainly appreciate it inasmuch as this car has  
to last me at least until it does a 164,000 miles 'cause that's what  
they say it can get. And I only have right now about 79,000. So I  
would certainly appreciate it, whoever hit my car that has been listening  
here at me right now would come forth and admit it and do something



about it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder if...I just noticed that the Mayor of Aurora, the former Representative, has walked in, he's down there near Peggy Smith Martin's desk right now. Former Representative Hill is recognized. What does Representative Matijevec have in common with former Representative Rayson? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we also have with us the fine company of Mr. Hoxsey who is the better half of the Representative Hoxsey team. Mr. Hoxsey."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you do. How did you describe him?"

Daniels: "That's the better half...."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what I thought I heard you say."

Daniels: "I thought I'd say that for Giddy Dyer. She hasn't had much to say lately either."

Speaker Redmond: "Giddy rarely does. Been suggested that the thing we should do is to have a relay race between the Republicans and the Democrats. And the contestants are Don Brummet and Taylor Pouncey representing the Democrats. And Gil Deavers and Junie Bartulis representing the Republicans. And Chalkie has volunteered to serve us as starter and he said...he said he would then run down to the finish line and take the finish. He'd be there before they did. Representative Don Brummet."

Brummet: "I don't want anything to do with Gil Deavers, he's got me in trouble already this Session. The day the women brought up the pies we were standing outside here and...and three ladies gave me a pie. And one lady turned to the other and said, 'We'll have to get a hold of Representative Deavers'. And one of the ladies looked at me and said, 'He doesn't need a pie either'."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that same day one of...the Gentleman from Christian County was in that same group, wasn't he? Had his picture in the local paper? It was Representative Tipword, is the one I'm referring to. The day the ladies brought the pies. I see Vince Birchler has objected. He should have been in on that relay race. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, while I...I just got back to my...my desk after having been roaming the floor for a while and I discover an envelope





and in it there is a letter, the letterhead Gerald W. Shea and Associates, Ltd, urging me to support Senate Bill 23. Now I presume that this was not cleared through your office, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know anything about it."

Bowman: "Okay. Well, I look around, I see quite a few other envelopes on tables around...desks around here. And I would like to suggest that Gerald W. Shea and Associates be publicly admonished for this breach of conduct."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think probably the best way is that the next time we have a break we'll station you at the doors, at all three doors, and make sure that nothing like that happens again. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "What's the harm in getting a little letter from Jerry? I like hearing from the old boy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Well, so do I, but it's a violation of rules, we've all been prevented from doing it ourselves."

Speaker Redmond: "That was not distributed by me or cleared through me or...."

Tipsword: "I'm sure it wasn't, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "If we don't lock the door why you don't know what will happen."

Tipsword: "I...I think perhaps maybe that might not be too bad an idea a lot of times."

Speaker Redmond: "Terry, have you got anything to report? Representative 'Boolieboy' Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in the bottom of the ninth, it's 4 to 1, New York."

Speaker Redmond: "You're kidding! Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "I just left the car and my understanding was the Cubs tied it up. bottom of the ninth."

Speaker Redmond: "Chalkie says they tied it up. First and Second, one out in the ninth. Representative Matijevidich."

Matijevidich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sure Don Brummet and Gil Deavers and all those people in the relay race will enjoy being in it but some of us around here remember when you were heavy."



Speaker Redmond: "I think you're right. The bases are loaded. They have a new rule in some of the local taverns that you can't watch the television unless you drink. Put down...put down the mike. (Baseball game). Representative Mulcahey is recognized, to admit error. Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that was not an erroneous statement I made when I made. When I got out at the parking lot indeed it was four to one but I...I should have known better than to assume anything. Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed it was five to four, the Cubs. The magic number is .90."

Speaker Redmond: Representative Lucco, did you at one time have some affiliation with a major league ball club?"

Lucco: "Well, I scouted for ten years and ran a minor league ball club at Johnson City, Tennessee for what I think will be the next National League Champions, St. Louis Cardinals."

Speaker Redmond: "I think the House should be at ease until the fall of the gavel. It doesn't look like...I saw a group going to Bauer's and I don't see them back here yet. Be ten, fifteen minutes."

AT EASE

Matijevich: "For everybody's information the Senate adjourned and will not be back until noon tomorrow, noon tomorrow. Doesn't that make us look foolish?"

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come....House will come to order, Members, please be in their seats. On the Speaker's table, House Resolution 50....1-5-0. Representative Skinner, House Resolution 150. Representative Kucharski, House....out of the record. House Resolution 158, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. House Resolution 213, Giorgi, Matijevich. Representative Jaffe, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jaffe: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker, why are we on House Resolutions? I understand that we....you know, this is the last day for getting out Senate...."

Speaker Redmond: "We're here because...maybe by this system we'll get some bodies here and we'll be able to get going on House Bills Third Reading."

Jaffe: "Well, if you want to get rid of some Bills I have one on Concurrence



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that we could get rid of very quickly."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're not there yet. Representative Giorgi, 213. 158? 158."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 158 was heard in the Executive Committee. We spent quite a bit of time on the problems of many Illinoisans who are not covered by insurance and talking about the Illinoisans that are not covered by insurance, we got into the subject of the...the Americans that aren't covered by insurance. We're finding a lot of people are...the single people entering the labor market don't have insurance. The people that have illnesses that are very costly and very lingering...well, this Resolution 'memorializes' Congress to do something about these people that are not covered by insurance because of the high cost of hospitalization and the high cost of insurance and because the inflationary costs of medical care. And I urge the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Resolution 'memorializes' Congress to give us socialized medicine. I, for one, am not ready for it. We have Medicare for the aged. We have public aid for the poor. And I think that's as far as I'm willing to go and I just want to be on record as opposing this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the...Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition against this Resolution. My colleague from Winnebago, I'm quite confident is meritorious in his concern regarding the health care problems of the people in the United States. As Representative Friedrich has indicated, this legislation indicates the support of the Illinois Legislature for a national health insurance plan which is socialized medicine. It has caused in the United Kingdom and Great Britain a disaster in the field of medicine and the health care delivery system in that country whereby medicine is a...a practice that has been relegated to a computerized type of situation where individual care has suffered. And the individuals have no choice of physician whatsoever. I don't think the United States wants to take that same route of following the path down to socialized medicine and further causing a national debt that our country can ill afford to pay. We can only look at the social security system in this



country and see what a financial disaster that present system happens to be in. I personally think that this area of concern is one that each individual person should take personal consideration of, and if anything else, if that fails, then the state might well consider the plan that Governor Reagan offered in the State of California. But for the Illinois Legislature to 'memorialize' Congress to pass a...a national health insurance program in the form of socialized medicine, I want to be recorded as strongly in opposition to that type of giveaway program."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion... Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "Zeke, when you talk about a national health insurance program, what do you have in mind?"

Giorigi: "Well, it is a little detailed for this type of a Resolution but what I had in mind is, in my Legislative office in the last year or so, I had a girl that had just entered the labor market, a 19 year old girl, that wasn't covered by insurance at her place of employment and had cancer of the leg and didn't know how she was going to solve the dilemma. I had a girl that came into our office that had a back operation, she was dropped by her father's insurance. Was only making a minimum wage and couldn't afford insurance. I had a fifty year old woman come into my office that was just taken off of social security because her children reached the age of 19. And I found that many Americans, many Illinoisans, couldn't afford the insurance, couldn't afford to be sick, couldn't afford to go to the hospital. And you heard from two of the Goldwater Republicans in the House, Friedrich and Simms, to what they feel people should do. You heard Simms talk about the disaster of social security. If we didn't have social security in this country we would have anarchy, we'd have revolutions. They don't seem to understand these things."

Kempiners: "I...I could understand the type of problem you're speaking about. And I think there's a solution. I don't know there's a national health insurance. Would you be willing to bring this back to Second Reading and amend it to read 'a catastrophic insurance plan'



which I think that most of us in the House would be willing to support which I think is what the Congress ought to pass."

Giorgi: "All right. We'll accept that because I have a plan in trying to get some catastrophic insurance passed in the State of Illinois. And I'll take it out of the record and work with you on...."

Kempiners: "Okay, I'd like to look at it, Zeke, and I think I'd like to see you do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, out of the record. Senate Bills Third Reading, Senate Bill 495. Representative Telcser."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 495. A Bill for an Act to make certain...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 497. 497 is Interim Study, I understand. 596."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 596. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 596 amends the Revenue Act. Specifically that section of the Revenue Act which determines the admissability into evidence of a certificate of error in a court proceeding to collect to enjoin the collection of a tax based upon a property assessment. This Section of the Revenue Act is applicable only to Cook County. What we are talking about here is the authentication of a business record for introduction into evidence. Currently, the section of the Act provides that both the Assessor of Cook County and the Board of Tax Appeals must endorse the certificate of error prior to its receipt into evidence in the judicial proceedings. What the Bill does, is to delete the requirements of dual endorsement of both administrative agencies except in the case where a change in assessments would be fifty thousand or more. As amended, the Bill has bipartisan support. Passed the Revenue Committee by a vote of 19 to 2. And I ask for your favorable 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 wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 597."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 597. A Bill for an Act in relation to the



transfer of funds and the Highway Safety Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "This is 597, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "597. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 597, simple Bill. Passed out of the Senate 48 to nothing. And it basically just abolishes the Highway Safety Fund. Provides that the balance remaining in that fund shall be transferred to the Road Fund effective July 1st 1977."

Speaker Redmond: "Any opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass?"

Those in favor vote 'aye'.... Representative Jaffe."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Jaffe: "Why are we abolishing this fund?"

Johnson: "What?"

Jaffe: "Why are we abolishing the fund?"

Johnson: "It's an unnecessary, unneeded fund."

Jaffe: "Well, why, I...I....would you explain that to us why we're abolishing the fund and how much is in there and why is it going to the Road Fund and not the General Fund?"

Johnson: "Pardon me?"

Jaffe: "I...I just want to know why we're abolishing the fund, how much is in the fund and why are we putting it into the Road Fund instead of General Revenue Fund?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thanks you. Perhaps I can answer the Gentleman's question. The Highway Safety Fund, as you know, is administered by the Department of Transportation. And in Cook County, at least, it was a...a form of ...form of priority in that the Council of Mayors established in Cook County, in suburban Cook County, would...attended their needs to the Highway Safety Fund in the Department of Transportation and get these funds. Now, the Federal Government participated in grants to this Fund and now it's my understanding the Federal Government is going to assume the hundred percent funding of this program. I don't know how much is in it but it goes back to the Fund where it should go. And the Federal Government is now going to fund the effort one hundred



percent. And I think it's a good Bill and should be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, can you tell me what possible projects could have been funded out of this source? Out of the Safety Fund?"

Johnson: "Just traffic safety projects."

Leverenz: "Were there any projects ready to go next year and now because of this there won't be any projects? Like stop lights at intersections?"

Johnson: "I've been informed that those that are will be transferred over to the Road Fund, the projects will be ongoing."

Leverenz: "Are there any projects that are hanging over from previous fiscal years and this year that could be funded through this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, for what...."

Leverenz: "What is the fund balance?"

Yourell: "Nothing, nothing changes with this Act except the funding.

The Federal Government will assume a hundred percent funding, the priorities and the projects that will come out of the Highway Safety Fund will remain the same. Any priorities established by the Council of Mayors in Cook County will remain as they are but they'll only be funded by the Federal Government one hundred percent."

Leverenz: "How will the Bill apply that we're passing through the House then on all federal monies going through the appropriation process of the General Assembly be affected in this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Is that Mr. Leverenz?"

Speaker Redmond: "Bill Leverenz, yeah."

Johnson: "What's the question?"

Leverenz: "Are we going to perhaps be putting through all the federal funds through our appropriations process, then we should keep this fund then?"

Johnson: "I've been informed that, no, those funds will be simply deposited into the Road Fund rather than the Highway Safety Fund."

Leverenz: "Thank you. What's the balance?"

Johnson: "Four million dollars."

Leverenz: "Four million right now? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Possibly Mr. Yourell can answer this. Buz, you said this was taken over by the Federal Government to...to supply funds for the



safety projects, I understand? But, will they supply that money interminably or is that just a three year basis?"

Yourell: "This was a participatory effort by the Federal Government and the State of Illinois and now it's going to be assumed totally by the Federal Government. I don't know what their plans are interminably. I don't think anybody can determine how long a fund is going to continue or any favor from any local...any unit of government including federal revenue sharing. That stuff has to be voted, as you know, each Session of Congress."

Kosinski: "I'm not necessarily against it but I sure don't know anything about it and I'd like to know kinda what I'm voting on. Up to this point in time....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what's involved here is funds in a grouping known as the Highway Safety Fund. What we do is we take money from the Road Fund and the Driver Education Fund and put it into the Highway Safety Fund those dollars to be used as a dollar match for federal monies that come in for Federal Highway Safety Programs. They're safety programs. The Federal Government no longer requires that we match on a dollar percentage basis with our dollars, dollars that come from the Federal Government. So there is no need for this fund to exist any longer. They will now allow us to match what's called software, so to speak in terms of highway proposals. So we're not taking money out of someplace and returning it to General Revenue. It comes out of the Road Fund to this fund to act as a dollar, percentage match, for the federal dollars. The Federal Government does not require this dollar match anymore. So we're putting it back to where it came from in the first place and that's the Road Fund."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Johnson to close."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is simply...was established





originally so that we could trace federal dollars. That's no longer necessary since it's a hundred percent reimbursement. This is simply an accounting entry. I...there wasn't any opposition in the Senate or Committee and I would ask for the approval of the House."

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

Geo-Karis: "I won't have to because I see the vote is okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 7 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 600, out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 621. Representative Neff."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 621. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "My button seemed to be misproperly placed and I was recorded as voting 'no' on 621, would like leave to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "May the Gentleman...621, that's just up now. You mean on the last Bill?"

Stanley: "Yes, I'm sorry. 597, excuse me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Representative Stanley requests to be recorded as voting 'no' on 597. Does he have leave? Representative Neff.."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 621 as it now stands has been amended as far as I know to suit any...everybody that had any objections to it. It has two Amendments on it now. This legislation, all we're trying to do here is regulate special or chartered bus operations in the State of Illinois. At the present time chartered busses have no regulations...not required to carry insurance or to carry...and...to be inspected. This would make it required that they would have to be inspected. And...and also carry insurance. Now these busses, charter busses, are used downstate particular....quite often for hauling senior citizens, school children on trips and so forth. And I think this has been something that's long overdue. And as the Bill now stands all municipalities are amended out of it because they do have their own inspections and...and...they do have...carry their



own or most of them are self-insured. Therefore, I think the Bill is a good Bill and would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Jaffe: "Representative Neff, I know....I know in the synopsis in House Amendment #1 you said 'In provision of determination whether a certificate shall be issued' deletes....and evidently this is deleted from the Bill and I think that that makes it a bad Bill. I don't know, maybe you can explain it. 'The adequacy of existing services, the effect of the grant of authority and existing carriers and whether the grants of authority is consistent with the public necessity'. Is it not important that the grant of authority be consistent with public necessity?"

Neff: "As of now that should be amended out of it."

Jaffe: "I don't see that in the synopsis. ....Looks like that that was amended out and I don't know why it is amended out. Why should that be amended out?"

Neff: "Now under the present Bill, Representative Jaffe, there will.... you don't have to get agreement to establish the line which you would have under the present original Bill. But you still have to be inspected and carry insurance and get a certificate of authority."

Jaffe: "But House Amendment #1 which says that you don't have to see whether or not grants of authority are consistent with public necessity is still in the Bill is it not?"

Jaffe: "I'm looking at the synopsis. If I'm looking wrong, you know, tell me. But, you know, it looks like you deleted, you know, some things that would protect the public interest and that's the thing that concerns me."

Neff: "The only thing as I recall it, this is Representative Pullen's Amendment, was put on in Committee. But as I recall it, all this does is take it out to...where they don't have to show a necessity or convenience in order to establish a bus line."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I have a letter from a small bus company and I want to tell you that this is the kind



of Bill that's eliminating small business in this country and people who are trying to get along. Now this small bus operator says, he is in my district, he says he's already regulated by the Federal Department of Transportation, the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Illinois Secretary of State, the Illinois Office of Education and to some extent by the Illinois Commerce Commission. He says can't afford legal fees to go through another licensing operation. It seems to me that if you want to require them to have insurance then pass a law to require them to have insurance. This is a standard kind of licensing operation. It has a grandfather clause. People who are in the business, I guess if they're well connected may be able to continue. But I really have the feeling that when we have this kind of regulation that we're doing it really to help those who are entrenched in the business and those people who want to run businesses, charter operations, small operations, are simply not going to be able to afford all of the regulations and the legal fees that are involved. And this gentleman who does school transportation, the transporting of school busses, he says that he has to comply with the Office of Education requirements. He has to satisfy the school districts in the area. And I want to tell you that the more of this kind of regulation that we pass, the more you're going to have small business unable to continue. The more you're going to have consumers left out because it always results in increasing the rates. And hence, I would have strong feelings that this kind of legislation is of questionable value and we would be better off getting on with the serious business of the state and leaving small business to operate for himself in a free competitive society."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was particularly, originally introduced by the Illinois Trucking Association. And it was their concept, and I think they forgot to talk to some of their members, 'cause this Bill and regrettably since we heard the complaints I was unable to get back to Representative Neff who was very gracious in attempting to clear up the problems in this Bill. So what this Bill will run into by grandfathering in all the old companies, this is an anti-competition Bill if I've ever seen it. All the companies who



are failing to do what this Bill wants done are grandfathered in and they can get away without it. All the new companies who'd like to come in and compete against those companies who are not doing what we want can't get in. So this thing precludes competition in the future. In addition, the companies who will get hurt the most are the small businesses particularly minority-owned bus operators who can't afford the legal fees that are needed to enter into the charter bus business. You are excluding small businesses. You are excluding minority businesses. And I think the Bill really will not do what people want and will probably do far more harm to the charter bus business. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the same letter that Representative Pierce has and I know, also, Mr. Keats. And what that letter referred to was the Scholastic Transit Company was the Bill in the original form which I think was a bad Bill because it created a monopoly. It required that all, in order to operate a charter bus company you had to have a certificate and convenience of necessity. And that you had, in order to get one you had to look and to see who else was in the business. Representative Pullen, I don't usually agree with her but she offered an Amendment in Committee which took out all of these bad monopoly features so that's no longer in there. What the Bill does now, and I don't feel strongly about it one way or the other, is simply to deal with safety and with insurance and that's what you get the certificate of convenience and necessity for. We did a little research on this Bill and we found that that currently is very little regulations of charter bus companies. That there is a provision for the Department of Transportation to inspect these bus facilities. But unfortunately, particularly the downstate areas, I'm informed that there's very little inspection going on. Moreover, the Department of Transportation in order to enforce its provision has to go to the state police. If this Bill is adopted the Illinois Commerce Commission will be able to go in and inspect. And in addition, they will...able to use the threat of pulling this certificate and convenience and necessity to require the upgrading of these facilities. Right now the Illinois Commerce Commission is not able to look at these financial



data of many of these companies with respect to their charter bus operation. What is happening is that the...many of these companies that also have regular routes come in and ask for permission to buy new busses and they get it and they turn around and they use the new busses not only their regular routes but in the charter lines. This would prevent this type of thing. I don't feel very strongly on this but I do want to clarify the record as far as what the status of the Bill is in its present form, what it does and what it does not do."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question or two? Representative, I want to cite an example for you. In the definition in this Bill, I'm trying to see how all encompassing that it is. The small bus operators that carry children to schools that have one or two bus operation, would that kind of operation fall under the scope of this legislation?"

Neff: "I don't believe that'd be listed as chartered bus. Now, a chartered bus as I know them are busses that do haul school children but they haul them on trips and so forth...."

Barnes: "Well, they...they...they would essentially do the same kind of thing. They haul 'em school in the morning, pick them up in the evening, during the middle of the day they take 'em on various field trips and various outings and what do you have but...."

Neff: "Well, Representative, I think those are covered now under the present law as far as insurance and inspection and so forth."

Barnes: "But the problem that I see with your legislation, and that's the reason I wanted to ask that question, I'm quite familiar with it and I don't know how many people are in the General Assembly but I will express my own individual association with them. My kids are picked up each morning and deposited each afternoon in the same kind of bus service. I know the man quite well. He's only got two busses and he's had one heck of a time staying in business. Now it seems to me that you're adding additional responsibilities. He's only got a little two bus operation. You're adding additional responsibilities, additional costs on top of what he already has to adhere to. He has to meet all of those qualifications as were set out by Representative Katz already because he's in the business of transporting



school kids. He has to meet criteria for the Office of Education. He has to meet criteria for the City of Chicago. He has to meet criteria for the Board. He has to meet criteria for the Commerce Commission. He has to meet all those DOT now and to add this on top is simply adding additional burden. And it seems to me, Representative, in all due respect, I'm sure you're sincere is what could very well develop here and to what apparently is developing as you will force those small entrepreneurs out of business. They...they just won't be able to cope with this kind of thing. I know you and I know that you ...you are very sensitive to insuring that small business exist and business and such, so I've been in mistake. But I'm just expressing to you what has been expressed to me by some of those owners and by my own situation that I can attest to. This will create a serious problem for those small entrepreneurs."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Representative Neff to close."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll say in closing I think all the objections that Mr. Katz and some of them have heard have been answered. I've talked to some of the people and as far as I know they've contacted the...the people that wrote these letters, or one person I guess wrote all the letters. And as far as Representative Barnes, I...I don't think we're doing anything here that's going to hurt those people because I'm sure that under the present, hauling school children regularly, that they do have to have insurance and they are inspected. And so, that doesn't affect them at all. All we're trying to do is get these busses and I don't know how many there is, but there is busses that carry no insurance whatsoever on their passengers. And I think ...and the trucks...the busses aren't inspected. And I think there's nothing wrong with asking they be inspected because these people are running, many of them take senior citizens on trips maybe clear across country. And I think it'd be real bad to stop and think that it had no insurance and these trucks weren't...these busses weren't inspected. And therefore I think it's a good piece of legislation."



And I think they should be inspected. And also, carry insurance."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Robinson to explain his vote."

Robinson: "I think there is some misunderstanding about this Bill because people are looking at the staff analyses that were developed before Penny Pullen put her Amendment on. Penny Pullen's Amendment would removes all of the objections that Representative Keats and Representative Katz talked about. At this point the Bill, really, only establishes safety standards and insurance standards for charter bus companies, nothing else. It does not talk about competition. It doesn't grandfather anybody in anymore. That is all out of this Bill. The only thing that is left in this Bill is that the charter busses must be safe and that they must have insurance. And I think that that's the kind of Bill that everyone can...can support."

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

Steele: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I think this is a good Bill and deserves more green lights up there on the board. This is a Bill that's just designed to provide certain basic protections and requirements for groups and busses that take these charter trips. Generally, it's the elderly and the church groups and school groups that charter these busses. And if we're going to place certain safety requirements on regular busses then we want to do it on charter busses. And I think these groups, the elderly and the church groups and the school kids, they're relying on government to provide certain minimum standards of protection and certain minimum standards of safety for these charter trips. If there's an accident without insurance, who's going to protect these people? And so I think this is a reasonable Bill. I think it should be supported with the safety of lives of many people involved. And I would urge you to support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 69 'aye' and 28 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority hereby declared lost. 622."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 622. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

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

For all of you who are at least a bit antagonistic toward insurance carriers I have just the vehicle here for you to vent your spleens this afternoon. It is truly a consumer's Bill and places some severe restrictions on some questionable business practices that existed in the industry with some carriers and I'm certainly not casting aspersions on those houses who write good insurance and take care of their own house. But we all know that there are some that do. Senate Bill 622 is a preexisting disease definition Bill that has limitations on policies delivered in Illinois. There are three basic sections to the Bill that are pertinent and I'll just run over them quickly for you or mumble over them and then answer some questions if they're not too difficult. Section one deals with modification or termination of coverage due to a health change. Limiting insurance companies from modifying policies that are in existence for reasons that change for three specific reasons. Section two deals with delivering a policy that is nonrenewable at same time insuring that the carrier will also deliver a noncancellable policy at the same time. Section three deals with actually defining preexisting physical conditions and limiting the reasons for cancellation of insurance policy...not cancellation buy denying claims based on a preexisting disease. It is truly a consumer's Bill. It came out of the Senate Insurance Committee, I think it was 9 to 2. Out of the Senate, 53 to nothing. Out of our Insurance Committee at 10 to 1. And I think that one objection has been basically removed in Senate Bill 622 Amendments that we adopted the other day. I would stand ready to answer any questions you might have otherwise I would urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass?"

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. ...All voted who wish?

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 130...141

'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 689. Representative Sumner."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 689. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner."





Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill allows the Department of Children and Family Services to notify foster parents, the minor involved and other interested parties of court proceedings affecting this child by certified mail."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Johnson: "Am I correct in saying, Representative Sumner, that notice is now required to be delivered by the sheriff?"

Sumner: "Yes."

Johnson: "What's the reason for the change?"

Sumner: "The foster parents have not been receiving their summonses in the downstate area and it felt that by sending them out by certified mail they will receive them."

Johnson: "Well, isn't it true that if they don't receive the summons by personal service as required now and the court doesn't obtain jurisdiction over the proceedings, at least over the parties that are required to be served?"

Sumner: "That, evidently, hasn't been the case."

Johnson: "Well, my...my point is that that's required by the statute now then we're simply lessening the requirement insofar as service is concerned. Isn't that right?"

Sumner: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think if Mr. Johnson reads the statute they'll find that there's an optional procedure whereby they may use the mail. However, as a practical matter they do neither. What this would do is simply require that they send them out by mail and gives them only that...that single option. So I...I think in many respects this tightens up the existing statute."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the Sponsor would yield for a question, I think we..."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Holewinski: "Representative, doesn't this notice provision only apply to foster parents when they're not a party to the action? In other

words, this...as I recall this Bill in Committee, it only applied where the disposition of award was involved but the...the foster parents were not really parties of the action. Just provides they get notice."

Sumner: "I believe that's right, yes."

Holewinski: "I'm almost positive that's exactly right so that the other service provisions do not change. I think this is a good and acceptable approach and would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone further? Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question. Ready for the question? Representative Sumner to close."

Sumner: "I just urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Clerk will take the record...."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's a 147 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 718, Representative Dawson. Out of the record. 720. Out of the record. 767. Representative Daniels, what purpose do you rise?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a flash just came over the AP that Eric 'Soderhom' banged out three hits including a solo home run. And lanky righthander, Chris Neff, fired an eight hitter to spark Chicago White Socks to an eight to one victory over the Minnesota Twins. There are two percentage points in first place."



Speaker Redmond: "767, Representative Christensen."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 767. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation for expenditures by the Division of Water Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this appropriates \$1.5 million to the Department of Transportation for dredging and improvements of the Mazon River in Grundy County. The Mazon River drains parts of Kankakee County, Will County, Livingston County and Grundy County. And due to the growth and wood drifts that have been created through the years, it's caused serious flooding, millions of dollars of damage in crops, buildings, erosion to the land. And this Bill will allow us to clean it up and take care of the off... fall off of over four hundred thousand acres of land. And I'd appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Deavers: "Representative, is this in the Governor's budget?"

Christensen: "No, it's not."

Deavers: "Didn't we have one... what? A couple days ago that did pretty much the same thing that was defeated here?"

Christensen: "No, we didn't."

Deavers: "Well, what was the one that was defeated? What'd it do different than yours?"

Christensen: "That was for the Kankakee River Commission to study water problems in Kankakee."

Deavers: "Is this money coming out of the General Revenue Fund?"

Christensen: "I would hope so."

Deavers: "That's a very good answer. Mr. Speaker, if I might, I'd like to speak against this Bill. There's no way that we have a million and a half dollars to use to clean up the Kankakee River in Grundy County or Mazon River or whatever other river they got going through there and I hope that everybody will recognize this and defeat this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen, to close."



Christensen: "Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen and Ladies of the House, that is not the Kankakee River. This is the Mazon River. And by cleaning this, we're going to bring much more income to the State of Illinois, so it's really not such a cost after all. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 42 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 886, Representative Lechowicz. Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Well, if you want to run it again and have them not vote somebody else's switch, I won't verify it. But if they do, then I want a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe we've already gone on to the next order here. Representative Lechowicz. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Representative Deavers asked for a verification. You could hear him from up here. Now, he's entitled to that. There are Member's switches that were pushed that are not here. Now, you're spending state money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I heard you say the next Bill. And if Representative Ryan wants to kill this Bill, he should have stood up himself and asked for a verification rather than asking Representative Deavers to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, on 886."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 886. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 886, the intent of this Bill is to provide for a biennial appropriation fixing the respective amounts available for the expenditure annually. The Governor would be required to submit in odd-numbered years an advance budget for the second ensuing year in addition to the constitutional annual budget."



In even-numbered years, the appropriation for the second year of the fiscal biennium would be amended after consideration of the budget for that year. This Bill amends the Civil Administrative Code to require that the Governor submit the advance budget which would be superceded by the budget submitted in the even-numbered years. The Bill also amends an Act in relation to state finance to provide that the appropriation shall be available for expenditures except as limited by their terms for the odd-numbered year. And the... an Act in relation to finance is basically what this Bill amounts to. It would do three things. Beginning in 1979, the Governor would be required in every odd-numbered year to submit a compound budget for the next two fiscal years. The second thing that it would provide, the even-numbered years, the Governor shall resubmit the budget with updating modifications and any related recommendation as the Governor deems necessary. The third portion of this Bill would take affect June 30 of 1979, for fiscal '80 appropriations. More than happy to answer any questions at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion, any questions? Representative Bowman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Bowman: "Am I correct in understanding that this is basically a bi-annual budget?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. It is."

Bowman: "Okay. It is not that we adopt a budget every year and we're simply giving additional information about what the Governor plans to do in the subsequent..."

Lechowicz: "No, actually it would work this way. You'd put in for the fiscal year 1979 and 1980 and in turn, the... by line item as the budget is contained now, you would also set your approximate revenue projection as well and any increases or decreases would have to be justified again to the General Assembly."

Bowman: "May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bowman: "Well, if I'm not mistaken, we had a biennial budget in this



state for some years and it was considered to be quite a step forward when we went to annual budgeting. I, for one, fail to see how this would reduce the workload of the House. The... making projections even one year in the future is a pretty chancy business, let alone two years. And I would think this would simply tie our hands in a way that we can ill afford to tolerate. I urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the last speaker. The annual budgets have been a failure and it's about time we all admit that. It sounded like reform. It wasn't reform. Every time we came down to the General Assembly, somebody created a new crisis for us. Biennial budgeting can be responsible. Not only that, during the second year, we can spend more time evaluating programs, being more accountable. And I think that we, as the Legislature, can be more responsible through biennial budgeting and I strongly support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? Representative Lechowicz, to close."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I've only had the opportunity of serving on the Appropriations Committee for eight years. And in the seven years since Illinois adopted the annual budget, the annual state appropriation has increased by over \$5.5 billion dollars. This year, the state will spend in one year, one and a half times the amount that it spent in it's last biennium in 1968 and '69. During the 60's under biennial budgeting, the race for spending growth was about half as fast. Annual budgets and appropriations are as much responsible for the state's recent financial problems as any other factor. I think this legislation now before us which would bring us close to a biennial budget as our Constitution would allow, this Bill would require the Governor to prepare and present a two-year budget in each odd-numbered year. It would require the General Assembly to enact appropriations for both years during the same year. Due to constitutional requirements, the Governor would still... would have to present an annual budget in each even-numbered year. But



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

under this proposal, that budget would only update the one presented a year earlier and already enacted into law. It would be used only to amend the existing appropriations for change in the economic conditions and as a result of legislation action on the original budget. Fifteen states, may I add, employ such a system. I believe this is a workable plan and can be implemented immediately while a Constitutional Amendment is being considered. I think this Bill deserves your support and I recommend an 'aye' vote."

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

Skinner: "Some of the arguments we've just heard are so specious they just cry out for at least a short rebuttal. I would contend that Parkinson's law applies with government budgets. That is, government expenditures rise to meet incomes. The passage of the state income tax not to shift from biennial budgets to annual budgets is the reason that the state budget has gone up since 1969. Now if you want to vote biennial budgets and don't want to have any control over the Executive Branch, by all means vote 'yes'. But do it for the right reason and that is that you don't want to do any work here in the even-numbered years."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I haven't served on the Appropriations Committee as long as Representative Lechowicz, but this is my fifth year on it. And I can tell the Members of the General Assembly, we don't do an adequate job of budgeting now. And if we put it off to a two-year system, we will not have any kind of a handle, we won't know what the hell is going on, not anything that we're voting on. Probably one of the best things to come out of the 1970 Constitution is annual budgeting. That document is not rife with good things for the government of this state, but this is probably one of the best things that did come out. It does require the administration to come into scrutiny every year. And I would be remiss if I did not speak against anything that would take away that power of the General



Assembly because it seems like we're loading more and more and more of the responsibility of state government on the Executive Branch. I would strongly solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. Lechowicz's Bill. I, too, had harbored hopes that biennial budgeting, that we might be able to get a handle the state's expenditures. As I have witnessed the scene for many, many years, it has not resulted that way. It has resulted in greatly escalating costs of government so that it is very difficult to meet the necessities of state government because of the rising expenditures in so many different fields. I think that stabilizing matters and trying out a two-year system which is what this Bill does, it does not immediately initiate two-year budgeting. But it is a transition that would enable us to see over a two-year period what is going to happen. I believe that it is a desirable thing at least to observe what two-year budgeting would do before we actually do it. Accordingly, I would join Mr. Matijevich and Mr. Lechowicz in urging the support of this Bill as possibly a way out of the morass in which we find ourselves unable to raise taxes and unable to hold down costs and I think this may be a desirable way for the General Assembly to go in the future and this experiment would permit us to try it to see."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. I think it's an excellent idea to try this. I realize that it would be impossible by 1979 to have a Constitutional Amendment which would allow us to implement this. Some of the best leaders in our party on the Republican side have indicated that they were wrong in going for annual budgeting. I happened to have the opportunity to serve with a high-level Committee of the State Chamber at the time that was considered and they felt that it was wrong. I believe that this is the way back. I think it's good and I would ask to get some more green votes up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another one of those reforms that sounds very good. Let me just indicate that if we have a problem in terms of adequate funds as mentioned by one of the speakers and the alternative is for the Assembly to raise taxes. If we're spending too much money, the alternative for the Assembly is to reduce the amount of money that we end up spending. We're kidding ourselves, absolutely kidding ourselves if we think we can prepare a budget for two years. We've got one hell of a time trying to figure out what the revenues and expenses are for one year, much less two years ahead of time. We've got fifteen, twenty, thirty supplementals every year. Do you want a situation where you're going to deal with sixty, seventy and eighty supplementals and have an Executive who's going to give you whatever kind of story he wants to fit the election needs at the time? Then this kind of budgeting is what you want.

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye' and 58 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 917. Representative Skinner. Representative John Vitek."

Vitek: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, on a point of personal privilege. Every time I look over to listen to Mr. Peters, he's an eloquent speaker, I get blinded. Maybe the Sargeant of Arms or something can close that inner window outside. That light... no, the other one even."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "Move those books a little bit. To ask when it's taught there. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 917. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, this is a... what might be described as the Illinois Commerce Commission Christmas Tree Reform Bill. What started off to be a Bill that would merely take the lid off, the lid out of the authorization language of the I.C.C. on expenditures on a biennial basis has turned into something that is slightly different and I will attempt to explain what the rest of it is. Number one, besides the lid, every year we rebate to the public utilities the amount of money which it does not take to run the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Illinois Environmental Institute. This would allow that money to be transferred to the state's General Fund for use for state aid to education among other things. Thirdly, this Bill would abolish the position of Secretary, a twenty thousand dollar a year patronage job that doesn't seem to be... actually job is the wrong word. Plum is the right word, which doesn't produce much results because the, well, the code employees do the work. And fourthly and most important, in my opinion, this would allow the Illinois Commerce Commission to hire an outside firm of management experts to evaluate the management of various utilities. Now, the cost would be paid for by the utilities but then they would be able to subtract that when they figure out their expenses. Now, the fifth thing this Bill does is provide what one might call a consumer advocate within the Illinois Commerce Commission. It would be on the government payroll and that person would intervene on behalf of the consumer. I personally have intervened in two rate cases before the Illinois Commerce Commission and must admit that it certainly would be helpful to have someone sitting in the room on the side of the people besides the hearing officer. The staff of the I.C.C. is competent and dedicated, but unfortunately, they're grossly overworked and they don't seem to be able to ask enough of the right questions to be able to be... to effectively protect



the public interest. Now if there are questions, I'd be happy to answer them. If not, I will yield to those who wish to read the Illinois Bell paper against the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was happy to hear the Sponsor of the Bill state that this Bill is not what it was when it came from the Senate. We have killed three or four measures in the utilities company, in the Utilities Committee several times and they ended up on this Bill. I don't know why the Socialist Party bothers to file a petition to run on the primary ballot here in the State of Illinois. All they have to do is join the Republican Party or the Democratic Party and come down to the House because we are legislating, regulating and stipulating every business in the State of Illinois. Illinois has over two hundred regulated business which is the greatest amount in the nation. I didn't intend to get up and speak against Senate Bill 917, but at this time of the year, we all have excusable reasons for being off the floor and I was in the Senate the other day when I filed a motion and I came back and I found that Amendment #1 and 2 were on this Bill. Last night, this Bill was about to be called and I had to go over to the Senate and I asked that if Senate Bill 917 was called, that I be given the opportunity to ask them to remove the Amendments of 1 and 2. I was assured that the Bill wouldn't be called until I got back on the floor of the House. When I came back on the floor of the House, I found this Bill on Third Reading. They called the Bill. I do strenuously oppose the currently amended version. I am going to quote the Illinois Bell position paper on it because the Illinois Bell position paper is composed of the arguments that Louis Caldwell who was Chairman, Honorable Chairman of that Public Utilities Committee who has done a tremendous job of screening some of these Bills, how Roscoe Cunningham's Bill got into this Bill, I don't know; how the package of 1171, 72, 73, 74 and 1175 turned into one package - House Bill 1172 got into this Bill, I don't know. They tell me it's an agreed Bill. Who agreed to the Bill? Ellis Levin told us that in Committee, that it was an agreed Bill with the Governor.



I do not oppose removing the statutory ceiling to provide the increased funds for the regulation of the utilities. If the Commerce Commission and the General Assembly feel that it is warranted, but I do... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm serious about this Bill and I would like some attention please. The utility and its customers in Illinois are already subject to personal property taxes, real estate taxes, the message tax, the municipal taxes, the sales taxes, the corporation franchise taxes, unemployment insurance taxes, and the Illinois income tax. Now, we're going to regulate and stipulate some more of it. The creation of the office of a public counsel to serve as a consumer advocate, we're going to have our Ralph Nader now. Anytime someone decides to hire a public attorney or public counsel, the public utility companies would have to pay for that special counsel. Now, we got investigators investigating the investigators. It's a new level of bureaucracy. No total budget approval or overall authority by the General Assembly is provided for. And a board, if there's a single consumer itself, is a fallacy. And that is becoming increasingly recognized as national as well as that a public counsel would merely duplicate the existing consumer's advocate office of the Illinois Commerce Commission. I say to you with consumer advocates like this that we have in the House, the consumers don't need any enemies. I urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would agree that this Bill should be defeated at this time and I'll tell you why. As Representative Conti indicated, the Public Utilities Committee in the House gave all of the measures that came before it a fair, considerate hearing. Some of the legislation was passed and came to the floor of the House. This particular Bill, 917, incorporates some four or five Bills that were heard and some of them, I think, were put into interim study, some were defeated. But they're like a hydra, they keep popping up in different forms. I don't know how Representative Skinner got into the act, but he came in during the closing days of the Committee



hearings and as a matter of fact, he really didn't know what his role was. I would say that the Committee on both sides gave adequate attention. They gave considerate attention to all of the proposals. Now, I personally believe that the Illinois Commerce Commission may very well need some looking into. Plans are being made for that. Some of these Bills in 917 will be considered in interim study and we will perhaps face them again. But at this point, it would be my hope that all of you would join me in defeating 917."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me set one point straight. When this Amendment was offered in Committee, it tied seven to seven. The reason it tied was because of a misunderstanding in terms of the position taken by the Sponsor of House Bill 868 to which this Amendment was offered. Representative Lucco indicated he was voting against the measure because he thought the Sponsor was opposed to the measure which was not true. That was the kind of deliberation we were talking about. There was no way an overwhelming defeat for this particular Amendment. As somebody who has practiced before the Illinois Commerce Commission since 1971 and particularly in Illinois Bell Telephone rate increase cases, I can tell you why Illinois Bell is opposed to this Bill. It is because of Amendment #2 which creates an Office of Public Counsel to represent the consumer's interests in public utility rate proceedings. Illinois Bell is opposed because it does not want anybody opposing its rate increase requests. The Illinois Commerce Commission acts as the judge. That's its responsibility - to hear the evidence presented to it by the utility and by other parties in the case before it. Currently, there is nobody there to raise questions, to bring out embarrassing facts other than occasionally a small consumer group to give the Illinois Commerce Commission the evidence to fairly base its decision on. What we have now is a public utility like Illinois Bell with three billion dollars worth of resources, forty-two thousand employees, a staff of attorneys. They put in the case and there is very little resources on the other side. This would



start to balance that out. This is not a pioneering effort. If it were, I could understand the concern. There are currently thirty-eight states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico that have a governmental entity to represent the consumer interest in rate proceedings. Among the most progressive states in the country, Alabama, Mississippi and states like that, so this is not a particularly radical proposal. There is no cost in this to the State of Illinois. There is Federal funding available.

I believe I have ten minutes under the rules, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You do have ten minutes. Proceed. Proceed. Give the Gentleman order please. Under our rules, he has ten minutes."

Levin: "Under the Federal Energy Act as amended last year, there is available Federal funding in order to establish an Office of Public Counsel. It is required, however, under the regulations that the authority for such a public counsel be in law. All this Amendment does is to put in law that authority, the specific authority that is set forth is exactly verbatim what is in the Federal Energy Act requirement. This is a most important reform we can have in the public utilities area for it begins to balance out the resources. Right now, all of the resources are on the side of the utilities and we're paying for them. There is nobody there to stand up, to raise questions, to raise embarrassing facts. That's all this Amendment does. I urge that it be adopted. There is no cost. We... going to be the Federal appropriation, the Federal government's going to be paying for it. Anything else would have to be appropriated. The current consumer division of the Illinois Commerce Commission doesn't perform any function that comes even close to what the Public Counsel would do. I would ask you to think very seriously because I think this is probably the most important consumer vote you're going to be casting. The Illinois Commerce Commission has given Illinois Bell and the other utilities billions of dollars in increases. Much of that has been justified. Some of that has not been. With the passage of a Public Counsel, some of that increase will not be there in the future. I solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."



Keats: "I just want to say, this is the Lawyer Welfare Reform Act of 1977. Every unemployed lawyer in America is in that balcony drooling to get their hands on this Bill. We will give every unemployed lawyer in America... they got tired chasing ambulances cause the ambulances drive too fast. Now, they're going to chase telephones cause they can't go so fast. This is the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard of. We're going to have bureaucrats suing bureaucrats. Great. With that, let's get this Bill killed quickly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on right from the beginning. I proudly move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye'... What's your trouble?"

Skinner: "I don't have any trouble, but you seem to have some."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll put..."

Skinner: "I mean, you want to get to your deadline so fast that you don't want me to tell everybody that this will be..."

Speaker Redmond: "You'll get a chance to close. This is the previous question."

Skinner: "Oh, I do? I'm not aware that you opened the board before one gets to close."

Speaker Redmond: "This is the previous question. This is the previous question. The vote is on the previous question."

Skinner: "My apologies, Mr. Speaker. You're right, for once."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we're getting a little carried away with the frivolity here in the House and I would urge everybody to take a serious look at the legislation with the Amendment. I think an important point that was missed is that under new... under... Are we on the Bill? No, we're on the Bill. Mr. Speaker, are we on the previous question?"

Speaker Redmond: "We are not on the previous question. The previous



question carried. We're on the question of whether this Bill shall pass."

Holewinski: "Well, that's what I thought. I'll continue if that's the case. Under Federal law, there are grants of up to a quarter of a million dollars available to the State of Illinois as long as there's statutory authority to receive them. And what Representative Levin proposes to do by way of his Amendment is give Illinois that statutory authority. All we are doing is pouring Federal money that's available down the drain, making it available to other states by turning down this legislation. I think it is a good piece of legislation as amended and would urge you to reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I thought you told Mr. Skinner he'd have an opportunity to close and that the vote was only on the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "No, the vote... I put the question on the previous question and that carried. Then I went to Representative Skinner, to close."

Tipsword: "He never did."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let him close now if he wants to close."

Skinner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy the senility is receding. There was a fascinating Freudian slip of the tongue at the beginning of this debate when reference was made to the utility companies. I have never contended that the Bill that failed in the utility company... in the Utility Committee did not get a fair hearing. It did get a fair hearing. However, when the Bill that I am Sponsor of got on the House floor, there were Amendments adopted. I did not break any word with Representative Conti. The Chair did. The Chair did not notify Representative Conti that the Bill was being called. I did not even know that he had made two motions to table the Amendments. I would point out this is the administration reform package for utilities. If this passes, nothing... if this fails, nothing passes. Now, the basic regulation of utilities seems to be in question. Now, I don't know what has come over the State of Illinois. We certainly don't want the





regulators to be regulated. Why don't we just give all the appointments to the Illinois Commerce Commission to the monopolies? We'll have one for the railroads and one for the electric companies and one for the gas companies and two for Illinois Bell for their initiative. Or better yet, maybe we could go back to the old system where the monopolies dealt directly with each individual Legislator, back to the Sam Insull days."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 49 'aye' and 97 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 961."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 961. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act providing for a system of probation for the appointment and compensation of probation officers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 961 increased the salaries paid to professional officers and chief probation officers twenty-five hundred dollars. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 961 increased that to four thousand dollars and Amendment #1 in the House reduced that to one thousand dollars. And you know the state has a right to set the salaries and the county regulates them. I solicit your support for Senate Bill 961."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this... Representative John Dunn."

J. Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, according to the Digest, the last Amendment I show in the Digest says the salary increase was raised to a total of four thousand, not one thousand. Would the Sponsor please explain in what regard the Digest may be in error?"

Taylor: "Well, the Digest is in error at this time. The last Amendment was put on in the House here and that Amendment reduced it by three thousand dollars to one now."

J. Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Bowman: "Didn't we get through passing legislation that would create state subsidy for probation officers?"

Taylor: "Would you repeat the question?"

Bowman: "Didn't we get through passing legislation a while back that would create a state subsidy for probation officers?"

Taylor: "Well, I don't know. The one that I have, I haven't passed a Bill out...."

Bowman: "Well, I think....I have a feeling that this is a...a Bill that is likely to increase the state's liability if we're not careful and I think we ought to take a lot closer look at it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Wolf: "Representative Taylor, if you could just tell us briefly before we vote on this, how many probation officers are there, how much money do they make and when did they last get a pay raise?"

Taylor: "Well, I don't know how many probation...this takes care of all 102 counties. And in the...each county, the County Chief Justice has the right to appoint the probation officer. And just how many in each county I do not know."

Wolf: "Okay. Well, how much...how much is the salary now? When did they last get a salary...."

Taylor: "Well, the salaries are regulate...by the area that they're in...they come under three different categories, I think it's one, two and three. In Cook County I think the salaries are around \$14,000 or \$15,000 a year. This raises it to \$1,000 more. It gives the county the right to raise it....but this is permissive legislation now."

Wolf: "When did they get their last increase?"

Taylor: "Two years ago."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly to explain my vote. This is permissive legislation. It's up to the respective county to adopt the provisions that are contained in Senate Bill 961. It doesn't mandate a thing. In fact, that the counties pick up most of the cost of this



program. Now you and I know that the state only reimburses the county up to \$300 for each probation officer and that's been in existence since 1969. And in turn, the last time they did receive an increase was in 1969. This is permissive legislation. And they ...as the Sponsor indicated they increased it by a thousand dollars as far as the upgrading of a probationer's salary. And with the number of Bills that we discuss on this House floor in reference to law and order and the effects of the providing adequate supervision for people .... possibly have had some encounter with the law, the probation officer is one of your first lines of defense in rehabilitating an individual. And this deserves your support. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I'd like to say that I have a possible conflict of interest because my daughter is a juvenile probation officer in Cook County. However, in the true Bernie Epton tradition I will use my good conscience and I'm casting an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted...Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I just have a parliamentary inquiry. It seems this Bill was handled as an appropriations Bill even though it's a substantive Bill. It passed out of the Committee, I believe I'm informed, after the deadline for substantive Bills because there was confusion about whether it was an appropriation Bill. Can you rule on whether this Bill was still alive?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's a little bit untimely. Have all voted who wish? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in support of this Bill which I would ask the Membership to look at. It only needs a few more votes. As Representative Lechowicz indicated this is permissive legislation. It does not mandate an increase in salary to any probation officer. It's up to the individual counties. And in view of all of the probation legislation that has been discussed this Session, I think it is imperative that we must have provision for professional employees who would serve as probation officers. It has the adequate number of votes and I thank you."

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



On this question there's a 101 'aye' and 47 'no'. The Bill having received a Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed.

Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded? (Tape difficulty. Friedrich votes 'aye'.) Hearing no objection leave is granted. 975, Matijevich. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I don't know what happened to me but I meant to vote 'aye' on that.....leave to get on....may I have leave to vote 'aye' on that?"

Speaker Redmond: "On what Bill?"

Geo-Karis: "961....962"

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave to be recorded as 'aye' on '961'? Hearing no objection leave is granted. 975."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 975...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record? 979, Dan Houlihan. Out of the record. 1097, Leverenz."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1097. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill...Senate Bill 1097; has Amendments to it. I think the part from Secretary of State's Office where they were in opposition to making a wholesale removal of designations on the second division vehicle plates, that problem has been addressed by Amendments. The Bill basically eliminates the alphabetical weight classification designation on the actual license plate of second division vehicle. The Bill will not address the weight classification a through f, which is up to 16,000 pounds. Small truck. Amendment 3 was withdrawn. And I replaced it with Amendment 4 that I talked with the Sponsor about - and that is the Single Rear License Plate Bill that I passed out a 117 to 15. I ask for your favorable consideration, Senate Bill 1097."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Would the Sponsor....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, will you sit down?"

Ebbesen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Ebbesen: "Is the Secretary of State now in support of this legislation?"

Leverenz: "I didn't hear the question, Sir."

Ebbesen: "I say, as amended now, you've worked with the Secretary of State's Office and they are now in support of this?"

Leverenz: "They are in support of the part which the Bill originally addressed which we've changed by Amendment and that is the weight classification on the lighter truck, 16,000 pounds and under. Right. A through F."

Ebbesen: "Are there...are there parts in the legislation that they are not in favor of or have they expressed an opinion?"

Leverenz: "No, Sir, they have taken a neutral position on the single rear license plate which would they leave four...approximately four million dollars in the Road Fund. And they are neutral on that. So is the State Police."

Ebbesen: "How about the Department of Transportation?"

Leverenz: "There are no problems to my understanding with the Department of Transportation. They had some question with it which I believe was eliminated by taking the weight classification off of the cab of the truck. That was addressed by Amendment #1."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "...Would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Waddell: "Is there anything in this as to the amended version which changes the weights as it relates to the price of the license?"

Leverenz: "We did not address that question at all, Sir. Merely, we have taken the classification above f, g and on, and it will be removed from the plate. The main purpose of this removal was we produced, I believe it's a 189 different types of licenses. We're talking originally about taking 54 separate license plates that had the different weight classifications a through b, c, d, f, et cetera and taking those letters off so that we were not warehousing multitudes of plates which did not end up getting issued."

Waddell: "Then the second question would be, what will the total effect be by the deletion of these classes, what will the total dollar effect be to the income of the State of Illinois?"



Leverenz: "The income to the State of Illinois will not change. What will change is a reduction or a savings actually in what we've been warehousing and what we have had to produce. I understand that we have had thousands of plates warehoused under those various classifications which were never in fact really issued."

Waddell: "Well, I can see that one thing is a matter of misordering but the other I wanted to be assured that the state didn't get short-changed as to the truck, as to the weight classification related to the dollar."

Leverenz: "Right. The savings will come from the...the less cost in warehousing, the less cost of the purchased product which is the license plate. There will be savings to the Secretary of State's Office there. The other question on transportation, again, the State Police or Department of Transportation questioned how they would catch overweight trucks. There's only one way to catch overweight trucks and that's to stop them and weigh them and ninety-nine percent of the violations issued are caught at weight stations or the special program to catch overweight trucks by the state police."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schuneman: "I notice from the Digest that there's some reference to devices indicating the maximum gross weight. Have all such... has the requirements for all such devices been deleted from the Bill?"

Leverenz: "That is correct. There will be no tag issued of any sort that would be attached to the vehicle or painted on the side of the truck. They've...originally had a concept of half inch wide and two inch tall letters. And it would just be too cumbersome and we removed that provision."

Schuneman: "So how will the troopers enforce the weight restrictions then?"

Leverenz: "Again, the last comment I made was that as I understand it, 99% of overweight truck violations issued are caught at weight stations or specifically in the Chicago metropolitan area they've had a...for the last three or four years a program by the State Police. They have been stopping and weighing the trucks. They've caught them up to a



hundred and thirty-three thousand pounds total and the weight limit in the State of Illinois is seventy-three, five."

Schuneman: "Well, but...but would the...."

Leverenz: "You check...you check the vehicle identification card...."

Schuneman: "Okay...okay."

Leverenz: "It is in the cab of the truck."

Schuneman: "That's the answer. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Rigney: "Well, now I understand and appreciate the problem that you're trying to solve here with these various classifications for license plates. However, the practical matter a state trooper probably makes his initial stop based upon a glance at the license plate and at a glance at the load that that vehicle is carrying. Now, aren't we placing the troopers in the position of having to stop a lot of trucks if they are curious about the weight they apparently are carrying?"

Leverenz: "That, too, would be a good program if they would stop as many of them and check as many of them out as possible. You'll find, and I have talked with troopers myself that are part of the Cook County program where we have a high rate of fines brought into the state, that they are pretty able to see a truck and find...figure out if it should be stopped or not. They do stop them. Again, they check the vehicle identification card in the cab of the truck with the driver. They weigh the truck. They issue the citation for overweight. Fines are in the millions of dollars."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might point. I think probably every truck still will only have one registration card, will it not?"

Leverenz: "And that is correct."

Rigney: "Well, now, if I'm carrying that registration card in my pocket and my son is driving the truck, what's going to happen here? I mean, how is anybody going to know this?"

Leverenz: "Perhaps that would be taken care of by the same way that you leave your driver's license at home and the state police officer has to address himself to that type of situation too."



Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker...."

Leverenz: "...He can call in or he can check it with the registration with the state through the computerized system. This whole program lines itself up with a long term study that has been going on in the Secretary of State's Office that brings the plates...removal of the designations along with the international registration plan for... at this point, interstate trucks."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I'm not going to spend any time arguing about the Bill. I know that everytime you hope to achieve something you quite often have to give up something in order to achieve something new. But in this particular case I think we're giving up a certain amount of convenience here and not gaining a lot in return."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kane: "Amendment #3...is that the Single License...Bill that was put on this as an Amendment?"

Leverenz: "Would you restate the question, I was getting...."

Kane: "Amendment #3 to this Bill, was that the Single License Plate Bill?"

Leverenz: "Yes. As I stated in my opening remarks, Amendment #3 was withdrawn because of a drafting error. Amendment #4 contains in fact ry Bill, as I stated before, for the Single Rear License Plate that passed out a 177 to 15. And it would have a savings into the Road Fund of four million dollars."

Kane: "Is that the Bill that was defeated in Senate Committee about 16 to nothing after all of the law enforcement agencies in the state came in and testified against it?"

Leverenz: "Let me correct myself, 117 to 15. I had it too many votes there. Yes, this went in as a Sponsorship by Howie Carroll who gave me a 'do not pass motion'. I don't exactly know why I received that. And I talked with Senator Chew prior in answer and he said if you want to, take it directly to the floor. And that is my intent by putting a... Amendment on here. I must say, though, to you that you're partially correct that some of the police organizations did come and testify against it. They're in and out of the State of Illinois. They are not all represented by all organizations in the state. I don't believe





you found the State Police in opposition to this Bill as they have been neutral throughout the entire process."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Pardon me."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to address myself to this Bill with the inclusion of the Single Plate License Bill in this Bill. I'd urge opposition to this Bill because this is a program that has been talked about previously in previous Sessions and the law enforcement agencies in this state are against that kind of licensing because it impedes their being able to identify vehicles on the road. And I would urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also would rise in opposition to this Bill as it's amended. The single license plate would give the law enforcement a lot of extra trouble. I've talked to many policemen in Chicago and all the policemen I've talked to are very much opposed to this. I talked Janet Dineen who's a lobbyist for the Patrolmen's Association in Chicago. The Bill slipped through before they knew it was coming in the House and they opposed it in the Senate Committee and they asked Senator Chew to do what he could to kill the Bill. The Sheriff of Cook County I believe is in opposition to this Bill. And I can tell you it would work a severe hardship on the policemen on the beat and out in the street in the traffic cars, it would...it would make it a lot more difficult to identify cars. It would cut down almost in half your...your chances of identifying a vehicle. if you have no front license plates. And it would certainly make it...make it harder for a policeman to do his job. And I'm very much opposed to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dwyne."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question...shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Leverenz to close."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me start it in reverse with Amendment #3 and the previous speaker's statement. My single Rear



License Plate Bill, I did not call specifically the Motor Vehicles Committee, which I am a Member, for a number of weeks. I left it sit. There was no one, to my knowledge, that came into Motor Vehicles Committee. And one representative of a police organization out of the City of Chicago, we talked about it a number of times. The State Police withdrew their opposition. I don't think any police organization of the thirteen individuals representing a half a dozen organizations that came in the Senate Committee can actually tell any Member of the General Assembly how the front plate has helped them personally. Stop a car, certainly you can see a plate on the front of their car. They can't prove what they're talking, it's supposition. And it's good supposition. But I say to you four million dollars to the Road Fund builds a lot of downstate roads. I say to you that other states are using the same system. We have a good concept here. Certainly we need the money. The other parts of the Bill, the question on registration of trucks. The vehicle registration card stays with the truck not with the driver. I believe Mr. Rigney... Representative Rigney brought that question up. That wouldn't be a problem here. This does fit into the international registration plan. It... this Senate Bill came out with good numbers out of the Senate and my Single Rear License Plate came out with good numbers out of the House. I think they're both in the form that can be supported by Members of the General Assembly. I ask for your favorable vote."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill reminds me a little bit of the Multiyear License Plate Bill last Session. All the police organizations came out opposed to it in Illinois and yet their own Chief of Police Association in Washington, D. C., had endorsed multiyear plates. I'm beginning to wonder if they pay any attention to the technicalities of this or whether they're just throwing grain. And the way things have been done that they can't look at the realities. Now this is something this House should know about. We need that one year plate so we can afford the new multiyear plate system. It's going to cost a lot of money to implement it. And



this is one of the ways of saying it. And it would be my opinion that the Administration would favor this type of thing because we do not wish to increase our budget. I think it would be a wise move to vote for this Bill."

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

Clerk will take the record. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my green vote on this question. It seems to me that for, at least the times I've driven through the State of California and for example the State of Missouri, both of these very large and industrious states are in the same posture as the State of Illinois. They use one rear license plate. I think this question has been debated and probably misunderstood for quite some time. But I...pardon? I believe that the one rear plate is a savings to the State of Illinois as portrayed by Representative Griesheimer. This is working well in Missouri. It works well in California which is larger than Illinois. And it seems Indiana's the same way. It seems to me that this is...this seems to be a misunderstood question. And if you really want to do some saving for the State of Illinois in the license plate area the single plate is the way to go."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you. The Board is closed. I will not try to explain my vote. We did pass it out with a 117. I ask that you put it on Postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1124. Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. 1142, Representative Lucco."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1142. A Bill for an Act to create a division of energy within the Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. About two years ago the Members of the Illinois Energy Resource Commission decided to...that there was a need for reorganization and the setting forth of a statewide energy program for the State of Illinois. Since that time the energy crisis of course has come upon us and has been widely noted by many, many people from the Federal Government on down. Since that time we have introduced, that is the Illinois Energy



Commission introduced a series of Bills, 1120 to 1125, for a very, very drastic change in the State's Energy Program. Those seemed to be a little bit strong and so then the...after there was a House Elect Committee on State Government Organization headed by Co-chairman Jim Houlihan and Doug Kane. And they began to look into the reorganization of state government and looked into the possibility of consolidating the energy situation in the State of Illinois. Since then, we proposed, that is this Committee, proposed two House Bills 2400 and 2401. Then these Bills were incorporated and attached to the Senate Bill 1142 which is up for votes today. This particular Bill creates a new department but it does not add a department to the state organization. It takes the present Department of Mines and Minerals and changes the two, the Department of Mines and Energy. Under that Department of Mines and Energy there will be two sections, one on energy and one on mining regulation. Over the entire department will be a cabinet member who would...will be known as the Secretary of Mines and Energy. And under him and working over the total coal production and regulation program will be the Director of Mining Regulations. And that department now is the Department of Mines and Minerals. If you'll recall, the Governor has, that is it's unofficial so far, that the Governor is about to appoint a Director of Energy in the State of Illinois. And I think that this program meets with his approval, that is, we've been led to believe that. And we have some support from the Governor on this program. Yesterday, I must...on a point of personal privilege apologize to a colleague, Representative Getty, who proposed an Amendment to this particular Bill which I had assured him that we could adopt. But after seeing the Amendment, I could not adopt and we had some misunderstandings on that. However, we have some assurance now, Mr. Getty certainly was right in his taking offense, shall I say, and we now have worked it out and hopefully we can resolve this by coming forth with a good compromise. I would be glad to answer questions along this. I think that you know enough about it. I would solicit an 'aye' for this House...this Senate Bill 1142 which would create, not add, a department known as Mines and Energy."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Dan Houlihan."



Houlihan, D: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, D: "Am I correct, Representative Lucco, in assuming as I read it that this Bill does not affect either the Public Utilities Act or the Environmental Protection Act?"

Lucco: "No. In fact, we are trying...my answer is no. We are trying to work out something and we will put an Amendment on it, I...."

Houlihan, D: "Your answer then is it...it does not affect either of those two act, is that...."

Lucco: "It does not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

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

Lucco: "Certainly."

Friedrich: "Representative Lucco, if we go along with your Bill, do you think we could get rid of about three or four of these agencies that are studying energy and reporting to us and save that money?"

Lucco: "That was the real intent in our study of this about two and a-half years ago. There was some 117 agencies in the State of Illinois which deal with energy in one form or another. And there's so much duplication and overlapping that one does not know what...where to go for an answer or what the other agency is doing. So this would consolidate very, very much the energy program."

Friedrich: "In that case I'll be very happy to vote for it. I think we can save thousands of dollars."

Lucco: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lucco: "Certainly. Yes."

Waddell: "I'm aware that we've given the so-called Secretary a ten thousand dollar increase per year plus the fact that we have given an increase of seven thousand dollars to the now Director. Would you tell me how many more assistant directors they've planned to hire under this plan?"

Lucco: "Let me clarify this first. The Director of the Department of Mines and Energy has listed, according to our Bill, a salary of forty thousand dollars. That is our Secretary rather than Director. That



is the position which the Governor himself has already alluded that he is going to appoint. Now then as far as the Director of Mines and Minerals who now become the Director of Mining and Regulation his salary remains as the same figure it is now. He presently has two assistants. Those assistants will remain and they do get an increase of twenty-five hundred dollars each? Twenty-five hundred dollars each."

Waddell: "And how many do you plan to have?"

Lucco: "I didn't hear you, Sir?"

Waddell: "How many do you plan to add?"

Lucco: "No additional assistants at all. There will be a new Secretary of Energy which the Governor already has alluded he's appointing. The Director of Mines and Minerals will remain with different title. His two assistants will remain, no additions added."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would the Sponsor yield?"

Lucco: "Yes."

Hudson: "Representative Lucco, I have been unable to locate, I understand there is an Amendment #2 on this particular Bill, that is about fifty-six pages long and that's seems to be the heart of the Bill. Is that correct?"

Lucco: "No. Amendment #2 failed in Committee. Am I correct, Jim? Representative Houlihan, I think...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Representative, Amendment #2 was....was not offered in Committee and Amendments #3 and 4 were not offered on the House floor."

Lucco: "I might add here...."

Houlihan, J: "If you're referring to the rather lengthy Amendment which creates a new department, that's Amendment #1."

Lucco: "Amendment #1 is the Bill. And I might add, Representative Edgar on your side of the aisle has been very, very much involved in the formulating of this Bill. If you have any questions I'm sure he can help us."

Hudson: "Well what I'm...I'll...I'll go back to my question then. Amendment #1, then, is the fifty-six pages, is that right?"



Lucco: "Yes, Amendment #1 is the Bill. In other words, the synopsis of Senate Bill 1142 has nothing to do with the Bill as it is today."

Hudson: "I would have this...this question in addition. My understanding is, that under...under the provisions of this Bill there are provisions made therefore one stop power sighting. Is that correct?"

Lucco: "Yes. Now that's one of the things that we...right today I think it is as many as thirty-some...thirty-some various things that you may have to go through before you actually final permit. And now this would be the consolidating of all of those."

Hudson: "Well, what would be the procedure involved for this newly created department to set up a one stop power sighting which would include the construction of a nuclear power facility. I presume."

Lucco: "They coordinate and we'll consolidate all of the present permits, forms that one has to file in order to get the power sighting and so forth. It's merely a consolidating process, nothing more than that."

Hudson: "Well, Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Bill. Now I want to do so with every ounce of respect that I can offer to the very fine Sponsor of this Bill and others involved. And I'm sure they're well intended in their efforts but there might be some things here that we would want to consider and I would think that this one stop sighting provision would be one. As some of you recall, a couple years ago Representative Maragos when he was a Member here in the House, had a one stop nuclear power plant sighting Bill which he tried to offer to this Body and it really didn't fly. And it didn't fly because of the complexity of the subject. It didn't fly because the municipalities got into the act that were worried about the right of eminent domain. They were worried about a lot of things. And as a result, after months of work on this one stop sighting Bill, it really came to naught. And now here we have another Bill which presumes in fell swoop, as a matter of fact in a couple of lines, to set up what appears to be provisions of facilities to engage in one stop power sighting. So I think that these things are...that is just one that I....call attention to. And I might...I might offer this, too. That many times we set up a gigantic or what...what may become a gigantic new department. The goals are



laudable, that is to save money, that is to consolidate this and that and the other thing and we end up with a bureaucratic monster in a few years that cost a tremendous amount of money to the taxpayer and really doesn't solve any more problems than are being solved current departments designed to deal with specific areas of the...of the problem of energy. I certainly don't speak against the saving of money. I... I raise the question though as to whether this will be the best way of doing it or not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Well, Represen...if just I could respond to the previous speaker, Representative Hudson. What this Bill does is not try to implement a one stop sighting provision because I remember when we discussed, when we were dealing with this question, Representative Maragos' effort to do this. This does not attempt to do that and I think the problems that you pointed out that Representative Maragos ran into were very real. What this Bill does, is it has one agency to coordinate all of the current problems, or all of the current applications and all of the current sign offs that you have to get to have a power sighting. In coordinating this effort, we believe that this agency will possibly be able to come back to the Legislature with a recommendation of how to simplify the procedure and the practice which it now in...in...practice. This does not change the current practice for sighting. It does not eliminate any of the requirements or add new requirements. But it does put the burden on the new department to go and get all these sign offs for the sighting application. Having had that burden, we feel that the Department might then be able to come back to the Legislature and recommend a single stop sighting program for us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this legislation. For the past three years Members of this General Assembly, especially those active in the energy field, have looked at the possibility of creating a new department. As Representative Lucco mentioned earlier the Energy Commission came in with what some of us thought was somewhat of a grand plan to create to super agency. On the Select Committee on Government Reorganization we suggested that this was too much at





this time. It'd be too much for any time but there should be a cabinet level department on energy but at the same time we should not create a new bureaucracy. It was our feeling that the combination of the Division of Energy from the Department of BED along with Mines and Mineral which is the most important part of energy in this state, mining of coal. Combine that, we could bring emphasis, we should in Illinois to energy without creating a new department, without creating several new jobs and creating a new bureaucracy. I feel this approach is reasonable. It is economical. And also it will give Illinois a chance to begin to develop its energy plan and prepare us for whatever federal programs might come along. I might add that we have in conversations with the Governor's Office throughout our discussions of this Bill. And as five minutes ago, the one person from the Governor's Office who has been designated by the Governor to negotiate on this matter has told me they have no opposition to this Bill. I would urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jesse Madison."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...the 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 Lucco to close."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think this item has been discussed. I would like to reiterate the facts that this does not take away the matter of sighting, shall we say, from the various agencies. It is merely a consolidating, coordinating factor. I believe this will be the first step towards the establishing of a fine statewide energy program which the State of Illinois has not had. We've talked about it for many years but have done nothing about. So I solicit an 'aye' vote for this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 140 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received a Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1143."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1143. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections



of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1143 amends the Unified Code of Corrections regarding proceedings after acquittal by reason of insanity. Under the present law when a person is acquitted by reason of insanity a court may determine that if he has recovered and release him or may determine he is in need of mental treatment and commits a defendant to custody up to twelve months. The superintendent of the hospital may release him at any time. Under the proposed legislation before you, after a finding or verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity....."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very good Bill coming up, I wish you'd turn it up a little bit. We can't hear him at all."

Speaker Redmond: "I think he's mumbling. Representative Daniels, will you speak directly into the microphone?"

Daniels: "Thank you, Sir. After a finding or verdict of not guilty by reason...hello? After a finding or verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity a hearing shall be held under the Mental Health Code to determine whether a defendant is in need of mental treatment. If the defendant is in need of mental treatment, the court shall enter an order so specifying. This legislation has great safeguards for the protection of all people involved. and is in response to an Illinois Supreme Court ruling that held that Circuit Courts have no jurisdiction to determine the law in this respect. And the Supreme Court has asked for guidelines from the General Assembly. Senate Bill 1143 contain essentially the recommendations of the Governor's Commission of the Revision of Mental Health. The Mental Health and Developmental Disability Commission and is supported by many people throughout the State of Illinois and is aligned with the recent U. S. Supreme Court ruling, Jackson versus Indiana. I request your affirmative vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Daniels, this is that Bill that provides the bridge between the Department of Mental Health and the Courts, doesn't it? If I remember correctly in the



past we've had some situations where the Department of Mental Health let people out on the street who they felt were cured and went home and killed their mothers or something of the sort. Would this prevent that?"

Daniels: "This, we hope, will prevent that type of action because it provides...."

Kosinski: "Thank you."

Daniels: "Determination."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly urge an 'aye' vote on this. We've had many tragedies from these mental cases that the Department of Mental Health has let out loose because they say...can't do anymore for them. And I ask for the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...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? All voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 156 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1202. I understand that's been moved to the Interim Study Commission. 1208. 1208. Representative Katz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1208. A Bill for an Act to amend...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz, do you want that one called? Or is that....Representative Macdonald's?"

Katz: "No, that's not my Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Macdonald. I did it again."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1208. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1208 is a companion Bill to House Bill...Senate Bill 1208 is a companion to House Bill 434 which passed out of this House and now has passed the Senate. Senate Bill 1208 provides, as did House Bill 434, that all of the people affected by a consolidation of districts be allowed to vote on the issue in a referendum. In addition to that,



Senate Bill 1208 requires that the Superintendent, Regional Superintendent or the State Superintendent if he denies a petition, has to submit a written report of his decision on the petition including findings and reasons to the committee of ten and the school boards affected in the district or the interested party. Further, it ties down the requirement that the effect of all districts be considered makes the State Superintendent's decision subject to Administrative Review Act. I ask for your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 149 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1234. Out of the record. 1281. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1281. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1281 was the subject of considerable debate last evening. The Digest still accurately explains the basic Bill in terms of making some nonsubstantive changes in the statute such as changing the references to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the State Superintendent of Education. And changing references to the Office of Public Instruction to the State Board of Education and the Illinois Office of Education. Last evening we adopted one Amendment proposed by Representative Jones which provided that aid which is given for Title I or aid which is earned by Title I students or Title I student count in the City of Chicago would be used specifically in attendance centers in direct proportion to the enrollment of students under... under Title I. So the Bill does those two things in its present... present form. Be glad to respond to any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye' and 10 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1322."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1322. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill...Senate Bill 1322, as amended, requires the Director to give written notice to the taxpayer that the request for information on his income tax return has requested by either the US Government, IRS Service or some other organization. This is a Bill to protect private people's invasion...and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill that we have had attempts made to amend to provide that 148 of the Income Tax shall go to park districts. A ridiculous Amendment if ever there was one. Now I call your attention to the fact...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Walsh doesn't need any education from me, you know that's not in this Bill, Mr. Walsh. This Bill is the original 1322. Your synopsis is correct whatever's in it but there's no Amendment adopted that has anything to do with the income tax."

Speaker Redmond: "Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, I'm aware of that, Mr. Speaker, I'm just reviewing a little bit. I didn't think the Gentleman would mind. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there's a chance...I understand this Bill was amended in the House...no, was not amended? All right, let me...let me speak...."

Speaker Redmond: "But it was amended."

Walsh: "Huh? It was amended...."

Speaker Redmond: "But if it had been amended...proceed. Proceed."

Walsh: "Was there...will the Gentleman respond to a question? Was there an Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "No. No."

Walsh: "In the House adopted?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Walsh: "Okay, to the Bill. Mr. Speaker, the Bill's no good in and of itself even if there's no opportunity to do anything else with it. The problem with it is simply this, that the Federal Government may for reasons



of their own be interested in the tax return of a crime syndicate figure, Tony Accardo for example. I hardly think it our duty to have our Director of Revenue inform Tony Accardo that the Federal Government is interested in his income tax for whatever reason. Now, I submit to you that the Federal Government uses income tax returns for the purpose of determining income in matter where there may not be legitimate services or apparent legitimate services for that income. I don't think that we should be in league with someone and put them on notice that they are being investigated when indeed they may be counter to the people that we are attempting to serve. And I...I submit to you that this is not a good Bill and it ought to be defeated. And furthermore has had a very checkered career."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Levin."

Levin: "A question to the Sponsor. I'm looking at the synopsis and it indicates this Bill passed on June 17th. Is the synopsis incorrect?"

Giorgi: "That's correct. When I was off the floor, Representative Darrow thought he'd pass the Bill for me and I had it reconsidered and put back on the Order of Third Reading. And then the abortive attempts to the Amendments was tried."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bowman: "Representative Giorgi, if this were to be defeated what would then the posture of the Illinois Department of Revenue be if they got inquiries from the Internal Revenue Service? What would they be able to do or not be able to do under circumstances?"

Giorgi: "My understanding of it, if you pose as a governmental agent or a governmental entity, your income tax facts are made available to people. Insurance companies have been known to pose as governmental agents and get...get access to your income tax records. This says, when there's a request for your income tax records, you are notified day in advance of that Director notifying the people of their interests. And you might want to go into court to prevent or to demand what their reason for searching your income tax. This is just giving a citizen a warning that someone is trying to get in on them for some reason or another."

Bowman: "So you're suggesting at the present time the Director of Revenue makes...."

Giorgi: "Is doing it freely."

Bowman: "Makes it freely available to anyone who comes and says they're a government agent."

Giorgi: "In my opinion, there are...and I'm going to name 'em, insurance companies posing as governmental entities, getting...gaining access to our income tax records."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as I might....to the Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bowman: "I hope that some Members of the House might feel just a little uncomfortable at the prospect of having their income tax records being made available to just anybody who walks in off the street and says that they are government agents. In fact, I plan to vote against this Bill not because I think the notice requirement is a bad idea but because I think we probably ought to tighten up the law in other respects in terms of restricting access to these records."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, there's one other problem with this Bill and I can't vouch for it but it was mentioned and the evidence was given in the Revenue Committee. There's a letter from the local District Director that states that if this Bill passes...."

Speaker Redmond: "Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, there was testimony and I...that if this Bill passes the Internal Revenue Service will not make available to them ...to us, the State of Illinois, its computer data information that the Revenue Department counts on in doing its job. Now, that letter was sort of dismissed out of hand. But I think it's something you should know about and that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I was going to say that when the legislation came up a week ago or so to require the Chicago police to go in and get a court order before they engaged in surveillance, I voted against that Bill because I didn't want to hamstring the Chicago police. I'm perfectly happy to have the police doing their job without requiring they go in and get a court order. Likewise, I'm going to vote against this Bill



and I urge many of you to vote against it. I don't think Uncle Sam, the United States Government, when they're moving in close on some hoodlum and usually we get organized criminals who...the only way you can catch them is on income tax evasion. Now all we need to do is pass a law like this to say that you have to send a letter to somebody to say that we're moving in and about to capture you. It's about as ridiculous as requiring the Chicago police to go in and get a court order before they start looking over people who are moving and possibly planning to put a bomb in city hall. I urge all of you to vote 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to be critical and I really am having difficulty finding out what's wrong with this Bill. I hear a lot of speakers who are speaking about it. I don't think there's anything wrong with governmental agencies exchanging information. I don't think that's a terrible thing. We exchange with the federal the federal exchanges with us. But somehow it's always .... a terrible thing to give notice to the taxpayer. I think the taxpayer may be interested to know that....that something is being....some governmental agency has asked for his records. I don't think that's an unreasonable thing for me as a taxpayer to know. Now we were talking about Tony Accardo. It might have been a blessing if they had told Albert Jenner that his...his returns were not in the file. I think...I think there's nothing wrong, frankly, with...with doing precisely that. I think this Bill makes sense. I don't think it hurts anybody who is...who is checking anybody out. If the figures are there the figures are there. These are returns. If...if they're doing an audit on somebody, the books that are behind that order must be available under a dozen other laws. And this Bill is a perfectly proper Bill. A perfectly proper concept. And I think it deserves our passage. We will not, as far as Representative Bowman's comments are concerned, we're...they're going to get those returns and...and we're not going to stop them from getting returns. Let's at least give the taxpayer knowledge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't know if the Sponsor





of this Bill is shooting from the hip or not but what he said a while ago terrifies me because there is a Confidential Records Law in Illinois now and if some....if he has hard evidence that some insurance company is going in and looking at those files then they're in violation of the law and so is the Director of Revenue and his employees. I suggest he turn it to over to the Legislative Investigating Committee and we'll prosecute the Director and all the people who are doing this. Now they're subject to prosecution right now. I have no objection IRS looking at my state return or the FBI or any agency like that but I sure don't want insurance companies and outsiders looking at it. But I'd like to join him and be sure that he knows what he's talking about. If he does, let's prosecute them. That's the way because we have a Confidential Records now and they have no right to give them out to anybody like that. So, Representative Giorgi, I challenge you to come forth with that evidence and we'll have some prosecutions around here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist. Sandquist. Over here, Sandquist. Over on the Republican side."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

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

Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a step in a series of steps to protect our privacy from computer invasion. And this Bill and future Bill will protect our privacy by requiring organizations for any transfers of our personal data. And what's so wrong about telling a taxpayer that the IRS, the FBI or the United States Government or some other state wants to look at your income tax records? Who's ashamed of that? And I accept Friedrich's challenge. Pass this law so I can give the people that gave me the information the ten's days notice that I'm going to turn the information over to the Department of Revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, explaining my vote, Mr. Friedrich is quite correct that we have in Illinois a very strong law prohibiting the disclosure



of state income tax returns. However, other states may not have a law like that and if Illinois makes available the return of a taxpayer in Illinois to another state and that state does not have such a law, then we would have the sanctity and the privacy of the individual invaded. That, I think, is a good reason why the taxpayer is entitled to know to whom his tax return is being given. And accordingly, I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 115 'aye' and 37 'no'. The Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar appears House Bill 1177....wherever it may be. Representative Lyn Martin. Lyn Martin on 1177. Out of the record. It's Senate Bill 1177. 1308, Representative Campbell."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1308. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1308 is designed to do the following. To establish a cost related reimbursement system of payment for group care services provided by the skilled and intermediate nursing care facilities, the public aid recipients, to be mandated as of January the 1st of 1978 by the Federal Government. It assures a method of payment on a reasonable cost related basis which is prospectively determined annually by the Department of Public Aid. It provides a payment rate which does not result in subsidization of the cost of care of public aid recipients by nonrecipient patient. It defines the elements for payment rates as to standard services, patient services and utilization capital and opportunity for a profit based on the ability to economically and efficiently deliver the type of services needed. It provides for a public review and comment on proposed rates and administrative appeal to final determination of rates. It also contains a fraud kickbacks sections, penalties if violations. And it did pass the Senate 54 to nothing. And I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to support this Bill and I'm going to urge everybody else to do so. And the remarks



I have to make certainly aren't directed at the Sponsor of this Bill. But I think it takes a lot of gall for the Department of Public Aid, even with the urging I know they're getting from the Federal Government, to come in here with a Bill of this kind which I think, although it's sorely needed, I think in consideration of their attitude in regard to the payment of medical cost of all kinds in this Session is absolutely an affront to the Legislature and to the people of this state. We first came to them with a Bill, if you'll recall 2339, which was... came here from the Economic and Fiscal Commission of this Legislature after a thorough study of all costs including the Public Aid costs, all third party medical costs that are...are paid by the State of Illinois and other third party providers. It included a system very, very similar to this one that is proposed herein for nursing homes, for hospitals, for health maintenance organization and the Department of Public Aid was opposed. The Bill was defeated in Human Resources. Then the Department, through the Governor's Office, came back here and said, 'Hey, we need that Bill but we can't have it for nursing homes, we don't want it for nursing homes. We can't have it for health maintenance organization but we'd like it limited to hospital rates. So we would like for you to come back and push that Bill'...And they went to the Human Resources Commission....the Committee and the Committee responded and the Committee brought that Bill out on the floor of this House. And the Committee worked hard on that Bill and so did any other Members of this Legislature and so did many other private citizens of this state. And then after weeks and days and days and days of work, and hard work I might tell you, in both the Senate and the House, we get a letter from the Director of the Department of Public Aid overnight after meeting all of the objections that he possibly had to the Bill, overnight, saying, 'We can't have this Bill. It's terrible. Senate Bill 1060 and House Bill 2339, they're just horrible. We can't have those Bills' for reasons I cannot explain. And then he has a Bill going through the House here for the nursing homes. And one of the objections, by the way if you'll recall on hospitals was, that it was covering only hospital costs after the...the Administration had asked for it not covering nursing homes. They had the gall to come in here and push a Bill just for nursing homes



alone, nothing for hospitals, nothing for HMO's and not covering all of the other third party medical costs throughout this state which are bearing upon all of the people and all of the patients, private alike, and have this kind of a thing come in at this time. It is good. This is one part of what we need and one part only. And I resent the actions however of the Director and the Department of Public Aid that they've taken towards the other Bills and then come in with this Bill alone. I urge you to vote for it. It is needed. But I think they need to know and we have an opportunity to tell them that they have an obligation in all other medical costs too. And it'll surprise me if those people who were so much against the hospital rate Bill and so much against House Bill 2339 as it first came from the Fiscal and Economic Commission covering all of these third party payments of...of medical costs in this state can possibly support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on this good Bill."

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

Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Campbell to close."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree wholeheartedly in some respects certainly with the previous speaker. However, I do want to say that all of you know that the problem that we've been having in the Medicaid system in the State of Illinois and the State has not been upholding its job in trying to provide services to the needy patients. And if we don't do something, we are going to not have any nursing homes to take care of these people. They will have to be in the hospital and cost us considerably more. So I just simply want to say without belaboring the point, I would appreciate your favorable support because this is a whole lot better than the system that we now have and there'll be more uniformity."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Jaffe to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, you know, I...I know that you didn't permit anybody to speak against this particular Bill although you notice that I had



my...my light on. And...and I really think that that's sort of a travesty but I don't want to get into that. This Bill is probably one of the worst Bills that we're going to pass out this Session. I might tell you that this is the Bill that really tells you where the Governor stands. This is the nursing home operator's ripoff Bill. This Bill through all my fiscal conservatives on the other side of aisle is cost fifty to eighty million dollars. And it's not for poor people. It's not for school kids. It's solely for nursing home operators. So if you want to lay down in bed with nursing home operators, with the Governor, you can all sleep there very well."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am going to vote for this Bill. But I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that we had an opportunity this morning to protect the interests of the taxpayer and this House voted 'no' on an Amendment which would do this. We had an opportunity this morning to vote for an Amendment to this Bill which would improve the quality of care for the patient. Our first job should be to look out for the taxpayer and to look out for the people that this state government should serve. I hope that in approving this Bill it will not turn out that the people whose interest we are serving are the interests of the nursing home owners."

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

Kempiners: "It's all right, you got the votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 138 'aye' and 11 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1378. Representative Marovitz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement. For those who may be interested, there will be a baseball game tomorrow morning between the press and the House of Representatives at 10 o'clock in the morning on Diamond 8 at...at Lincoln Park. Ten o'clock in the morning...providing that we get out, though, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect. 10 in the morning...Diamond 8 at Lincoln Park, Press versus the House. And furthermore with all due respect to my constituents, the Chicago Cubs who are in first place, I think we ought to



give equal time to the Chicago White Sox who also were in first place and won today."

Speaker Redmond: "1378, Representative Laurino. I understand the Calendar's in error and that's on Second Reading. Representative Laurino, we'll call 1378 on Second Reading. That evidently has been held there."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1378. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #2 was adopted...."

Speaker Redmond: "Where are we on 1378? Maybe we better take this out of the record? 1378, is there any motion filed with respect to Amendment #2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any motions...any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Kane. Amends House Bill 1378 on page 1, line 1 and 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1378 shortens the time between the filing of petitions for nomination in the primary from the present 99 days to 57 days. I've talked with a number of people on the floor of this House about that idea. There seems to be a great deal of support for it. What it would do is move the filing for nomination from December to some time around mid-January. There are a number of technical problems, however, with working out the...the timing at this time. I think that we're going to work on this problem during the summer, come back in the fall with it and because of that I would ask to table at this time, Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1378."

Speaker Redmond: "Have Amendments #3 and 4 been adopted?"

Kane: "I would withdraw them, Mr. Speaker, they haven't been adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved to withdraw Amendments #3 and 4. or he withdraws them rather. Any further Amendments? Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Johnson: "If the Sponsor intends to move this to Third Reading today, I'm going to object and require that a 107 votes be...be on the board before he does that."

Speaker Redmond: "This is one of those that was held on Second last night, Representative Johnson. It was read a second time, yes, it was."



Well, I don't know yet. Are there any further Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 is still laying on the Clerk's desk. Robinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson withdraws Amendment #1."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Yeah, we'll...call Third Reading. We call 1378 on the Order of Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1378. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Bill? Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1378 merely permits voters who move within 30 days of their respective precinct and statutorily are too late to vote in their present precinct to go back and vote by affidavit in their old precinct. And I move for a favorable....favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think we should probably pay careful attention to this Bill because of what the potential is. We've seen and heard a lot of talk in recent, in recent months by the Carter Administration about instant registration. Well, this isn't quite instant registration but it's just about as close as we're going to come without a complete flipflop to that particular posture. Senate Bill 1378 has as much potential for vote fraud as any provision that we could pass out of this General Assembly outside of a carte blanche day of registration voting affidavit type of system. It...it creates instability in the system. It opens the door the kind of potential for misuse that I think is unlimited. And I think in some areas where there is a great deal of transiency adds to that possibility even more. In addition to that, the registration records of election authorities would be substantially disrupted. There'd be uncertainty in the list for purposes of campaigning or otherwise. And I think to allow this and allow an individual simply by affidavit because he moved to...to vote on the day of the election and not comply with the thirty day rule that we have now is something that's a dramatic change in our system. And I think somebody regardless of their party or



regardless of their posture are to look carefully at to see what the ramifications are going to be for the State of Illinois and to the individual areas they live in. I would urge the Members of this General Assembly to look at this and to vote 'no' on SB 1378."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while I have mixed feelings about the necessity of this Bill I...I think the last speaker is a little confused because this is nowhere close to instant registration because it only applies to those who are already registered and who move within 30 days before an election. They must have been registered and then may, if this Bill becomes law, go back to their old place of registration, the old precinct, and vote in the election. But I'm not saying that's a good idea. There are people who have been disenfranchised because...I think of one incident the recent election where a woman had a suit for divorce filed and moved out of her house and out of the precinct a few days before election, she was not allowed to vote. It would take care of those instances. It may also open itself up to possible questionable means of voting. But it certainly is not instant registration by any means."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think the two prior speakers have very succinctly described the substance of Senate Bill 1378 and gave very valid reasons to every Member of this House to vote against the Bill. I might simply add that this Bill should it become law would simply be a bonanza for the vote fraud artists who operate in various parts of Cook County. I made a remark yesterday that Cook County is the vote fraud capitol of the world and this piece of legislation would only help it retain that title. And for that reason plus those stated by the prior speakers that I urge every Member to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1378."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "On many occasions I have agreed with Representative Telcser on election Bills. I don't this time. I think that this is a good Bill. As a matter of fact, under federal law right now, the people in Illinois and throughout the country have the right to do this, to vote this way, for President, for U. S. Senator, for Congressmen,





for all federal offices. If we don't pass this law there's the potential that people who do move can go back to their old precinct and will have to have a special ballot with only federal offices on it. This kind of...of...and that would be a paper ballot and I know that the Representative from Chicago wouldn't want to see that. I think that this Bill is a good Bill. It brings us in line with the federal law. It is not a Bill that will cause the problems that the previous speaker has said."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised at Representative Telcser talk about the Republican Party in Cook County like that but neither here nor there this Bill is very, very reasonable. Why disenfranchise a person just because he has to move from residence to another? Last election I had a friend who sold a home and because of the house closing he had to move and it was two weeks prior to the election. He couldn't go to the new place....election to say that he wanted to cast his vote nor he could he go back to his old residency which he lived there for fifteen years to cast his vote. This simply allows a person who is already a registered voter, registered in a precinct, so that he would not be disenfranchised in case he has to make a move during election time. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 1378."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Simms."

Simms: "The Sponsor...would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Representative Laurino, does this include the Amendment to the Bill that moves the filing date to January?"

Laurino: "No."

Simms: "There's no Amendment dealing with the changing of the dates for filing of the primaries?"

Laurino: "None."

Simms: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those..."

Representative Totten. I can't see...you have such a convention there."

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

I, too, would like to speak against this Bill for some of the reasons that Representative Telcser has indicated, I think the Bill could provide vehicles for considerable fraud. But secondly, it also



provides for people to come back into local communities and vote on referendums and other issues when they don't even live there anymore. And they could take advantage of situations where they could be encouraged to come back and...and...it's just like the opposition to having a lot of students voting in communities where they don't have permanent residences. In addition to the fraud, I think this is a serious mechanical difficulty and with the signing of an affidavit which I believe is a provision of the Bill, you could have many people voting from the same address which is something we've talked about as being fraudulent in the City of Chicago before and I think will happen throughout the State under the provisions of this Bill. I think it's a dangerous precedent. I don't think the Bill is well drafted at this time and it should not be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Laurino to close."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there's some misunderstanding on this Bill. There's no encouragement on vote fraud in this Bill. All it's doing is guaranteeing the people the citizens of the district and the precincts of the State of Illinois the right to vote because they may have for one reason or another been put into a precinct where they are not qualified to vote. And so by going back to their old precinct where they must have been registered by the thirtieth day to exercise that right. Right now by federal law you can vote by...for the President, Congress, United States Senator under this procedure. We're just trying to bring the Election Code of the State of Illinois under that jurisdiction. And I ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

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

Dyers: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak for this Bill, explaining my vote. In the areas of DuPage County that I live in this would be extremely helpful. There's a whole...hundreds of thousands of people in this country called corporate gypsies, junior executives who move and the date for buying homes frequently and selling homes is October 1st. It's a popular closing date. These people are disenfranchised because they miss, they move



this thirty days before the election in November. I think both parties would find that they benefit from this Bill because you enable these people to vote by affidavit. Think it's a good Bill.

It needs four more 'yes' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

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

I...I guess as a Democrat I'm supposed to support this Bill and...

I've supported all Bills to provide for registration. But I...I

can't support this. I noticed in my last election we had...the Great

Lakes Naval Training Center is part of North Chicago by annexation

so we can get motor fuel funds. We had people from Great Lakes Naval

Training Center voting in elections by affidavit. Somebody was trying

to affidavit that they lived in my city and I know...know they didn't.

And I can see what will happen in this when we pass something like

this. We'll get a lot of people in the Great Lakes Naval Training

Center voting in the North Chicago Municipal Election. And I can say

that that matter is right now under investigation. They've had a

couple of indictments about it. And all we will do is create problems

like that. I just think it's a bad idea. I've seen it happen in

municipal elections, two days before the election there's been regis-

tration flooding in, we don't know where they're coming from, and

you're going to do it by affidavit and you're just going to have more

fraud."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I have a notion that a sailor at the Great Lakes

Naval Station ought to be entitled to vote. I think that while Mr.

Matijevich is voting 'no' that his reason is what impelled me even

further to vote 'yes'. Now bear in mind that you can't just walk in

and get a ballot. You have to fill out an affidavit. If that affi-

davit is false you can be sentenced for perjury. That is a very serious

crime. I believe that sailors and other people who are transient

whether they are executives or in the Armed Services ought to be able

to vote. We ought to let them vote in Illinois for our officials

as well as the Federal Government letting them do so. And you have

to be registered on the 30th day in order to be able to participate."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Totten, you



spoke in debate. Now what are you going to do?"

Totten: "Well, if this reaches 89 votes I'm going to seek a verification.

I know there are some people voting who aren't here. Might as well pull them off or have another Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some of the opponents of this Bill have indicated that they think it will provide a means for fraudulent practice. On the other hand, I think that this gives people who have legitimately changed their place of residence within a very short time of the election the opportunity to vote without being fraudulent. I'm sure there are instances now where people really are disenfranchised. There are times when those people are reluctant to give up that vote and where they do indeed go back and vote in the precinct in which they had resided before their recent move. In those places, they are voting fraudulently. They now sign an affidavit saying that they are residents there and could be prosecuted for that. This gives the people who are in that circumstance a legitimate opportunity for going in, stating that they have changed their place of residence. That will then be on record so that they cannot use that excuse at a future time and they will then find the opportunity for becoming adequately registered before the next election. I think we are providing a means for people voting so that they will not have to do it fraudulently. And I would urge your support for this Bill."

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

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill and I think we only need a few more votes on...on the board. You know, it seems quite obvious to us as I hear all these election speeches going on back and forth that what we want is, we want participation and we want as many people to participate as possible. That being the case, I think we ought to let people vote and not disenfranchise them just because they have moved away thirty days during an election period. We ought to have those people voting. They're certainly entitled to vote. They're American citizens. And I...I would say to you that I would certainly urge an 'aye' vote on this. I think for Representative



Telcser who is a....really a very dear friend to talk about vote fraud is a little bit ludicrous. And I don't usually criticize Representative Telcser but I think, you know, in this particular case, Art, I think you really went a little bit overboard with your paranoia. And I think you ought to get your Republican friends to put a couple more votes on the board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there certainly is a big difference between voting for President of the United States, or perhaps even for Congressman, than it is to vote on a mayor when you don't even ....you probably don't even live in the town, you vote for precinct committeemen when you don't live in the precinct. And you vote for state representatives and you don't live in the legislative district. It's certainly reasonable to require that a person live at the place where he's going to be voting. So I don't know why we should do this. It's one thing for the federal level but it's an entirely different thing on the state level. You're going to have people, as Representative Totten pointed out, coming in and on a bond issue that he won't have to pay for. But I think it's a bad Bill, it's a bad idea and you ought to be voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, just to comment on the last speaker, I might note that this is not for people who are strangers to the community. This is not for people who know nothing about a given area. They've had to be registered there. They've had to live there. These people have ...have an intimate knowledge. Now they're...they're certainly recent residents. The bed is still warm where they were living and where they were sleeping. They were there for the last thirty days. I swear I think there's more paranoia than the average mental health center in this...in this room. And...and I hear about robots and apparently if you mention vote fraud there's sort of a Pavlovian thing to vote 'no'. There's no vote fraud in this. We have to comply with the Federal Voting Act. We should vote 'yes'."

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

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very,



very succinctly I'd like to indicate to the Members of this Body that this Bill does not try to indicate in any manner that anybody can walk into a polling place that they had lived in in a precinct where the polling place is and vote. They must have been registered there to vote on the 30th day. It's not for new people or for... people to just walk in and say, 'I'd like to vote because I live here'. They've had to have been registered in that precinct on the 30th day and have disenfranchised by moving into a new precinct and not having the constitutional requirements to vote there. That's all this does is ask that they have the right to vote in their old precinct."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85 'aye' and 67 'no'.....Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Would you poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you...."

Johnson: "Well, just to renew if...if....they get the 89 votes they need to renew a request for a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Tomico, Ewell, Friedland, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Madison, McAvoy, Meyer, Pierce, Pullen, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Stearney....."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Representative Laurino?"

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before I ask for this to be put on Postponed Consideration, all the people that were complaining about this being a vote fraud bill have indicated that they have....they have voted some people as voting 'no' and they're not even here. What could be worse than vote fraud? I'd like to ask that this be put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1196. Wait a minute. 0096."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 96. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is a final series of the sex revelation. Senate Bill 96 amends the Illinois...hey, it's appropriate, the Illinois Horse Racing Act. This Bill permits the Agriculture Premium



Fund to be used for the care and the general rehabilitation of the widowers of disabled veterans. This renders the Act neutral and males...for males as well as females can receive benefits. And I would urge your support of Senate Bill 96."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 130 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 103."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 103. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Here we go again. Senate Bill 103 is the same as House Bill 655 amending the Illinois Municipal Code. The word 'man' is deleted rendering this provision sex neutral in requiring that every inhabitant to assist their mayor in enforcing the laws if they are over 18 years old. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 103."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 131 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 104."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 104. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm just checking here. 104...."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Supplemental Calendar."

Terzich: "I'd like to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act.....Senate Bill 104. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Taylor. Amends Senate Bill 104 on page 1, line 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has this Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Has the Amendment been printed and distributed? They tell me it has."

Bowman: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, I believe we're in exercise in futility.

If this Amendment is adopted, this Bill can't be passed today and it dies."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll meet that when we come there. Representative Taylor, explain the Amendment."

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

This Amendment is very important. It raises the time for paying back debts to forty years. The Bill has already passed out of the House and is in the Senate now. And I feel that it is very important that we take this action because I don't know the action that the Senate is going to take and that is why I brought Amendment #1 to...to Senate Bill 104. And I solicit your support for Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 104."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm taken by surprise with this Amendment. It looks as though the Gentleman is attempting to extend the life of municipal bonds thereby stretching out the indebtedness to the city and perhaps jeopardizing the city's bond rating. I wish you would have come and talked to us about it. And if he doesn't want to take it out of the record and come and talk about it I would have to rise to oppose this Amendment. I think it has some very great import. It could have some far reaching effects on the city's financial status. I...I'm really sorry that it comes like this with such a surprise and so I'm going to rise to oppose the Amendment. I hope that the Members of the House look at this Amendment





very seriously and if in fact it is germane and I'm going to question its...the germaneness of the Amendment....defeat it. Mr. Speaker, I ask your ruling...Amendment's germaneness first of all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "Well, apparently he's asked for a germaneness ruling. I'll hold my remarks in support of the Amendment until such time as the...."

Speaker Redmond: "Where't the Parliamentarian? Where's the Parliamentarian? Been advised it is the same act and it is germane. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "I rise on a point of parliamentary inquiry. I see that this Senate Bill 104 in the Digest says, it simply changes reference concerning fireman's pension funds in cities of less than fifty thousand population for widows and surviving spouses. I understand the Amendment that they are trying to put on the Bill at the present time has nothing to do with changing widows to spouses. And the intent of the Bill is not germane and neither is the Amendment germane to the intent of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Ruling has been made. Representative Terzich, did you seek recognition?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding that just...so let them discuss this and I'd like to take this out of the record and we'll go through the other ones and come back if this would be all right....."

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

Terzich: "Expedite the proceedings of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Been called to my attention that I...went out of order here. 106."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 106. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 106 provides the same as House Bill 655 which was passed. It amends the Act to revise the law in relation to counties. The Bill changes the reference from 'man' to 'member' concerning merit commission for sheriff's deputies. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 106."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I was going to suggest that...it seems to me there's on the Calendar a number of these Bills that are all in a series that have not been amended and they all are very simple sex neutralization Bills. Is it possible for the Sponsor to consider having them on one Roll Call? I...hear a lot of 'noes'..."

Terzich: "We only have...we only have two more Roll Calls, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on 106? 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 133 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 110. 110."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 110. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes. Senate Bill 110 provides the same as House Bill 667, amending the Election Code language that discriminates based upon sex is deleted. And I understand that there has been an Amendment to this which is approved by the..both sides of the aisle and I urge adoption of Senate Bill 110."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "May I ask a question of the Sponsor? Mr. Terzich, does this have an Amendment on it, I saw distributed about the mini-convention selection?"

Terzich: "Yes, I just mentioned this. Yes."

Robinson: "Well, then that case I oppose Senate Bill 110. I don't remember this Amendment being...being put on. The Amendment that was put on this Bill makes a real change. This Bill is no longer changing 'male' to 'person'. This Bill now talks about how delegates to party mini-conventions will be selected. The Amendment...the Amendment says that it will be up to the party central committee to decide how those delegates to mini-conventions will be selected. What concerns me, at the last mini-convention they did it by districts. But if you leave it up to the party central committee without any decision by this Legislature, there's the possibility that delegates to the



mini-convention will be selected at-large statewide without downstate being represented. I solicit a 'no' vote."

Terzich: "...You're...you're wrong, Representative Robinson, my Parliamentarian's.....tells me right here. It says, line 14, it says, 'By the appropriate state central committee or a political party established pursuant to this Article which may include the procedures prescribed by this Section 7.14'...."

Robinson: "That doesn't answer my objections. It says 'Which may use that Section'. It doesn't say they have to use that Section. It leaves it up to the party central committees to use any selection procedure that they want. And I'm concerned that downstate will be left out as the party central committee may decide to do it at-large without any reference to districts. This...the...I think this is a dangerous precedent to set for delegate selection. And I again ask for a 'no' vote on House...on Senate Bill 110."

Terzich: "Well, from what I understand is that at the present time it's not allowed by the national party convention and it is within those limitations that this Amendment falls. It is presently not allowed by the national organization."

Robinson: "That still doesn't meet my objections. The party rules are written...right now in change. We don't know what those rules will provide for for the next mini-convention. And I think that the Legislature should not delegate this kind of tremendous power in selecting delegates to the party central committee. This is the responsibility of the Legislature."

Terzich: "Well, from what I understand, without this Bill there is no restrictions and this has to be done by the Legislature. Like I mentioned that I understand this Bill was approved by both the Leadership of both sides of the aisle. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 110."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Terzich, I'd like to ask you a question. If...if this...you or one of your brain trusts or whatever. If this Bill is not adopted, or this Amendment on this Bill, Senate Bill 110 is not adopted, would the posture be that there would be no laws governing the mini-convention? There would be no guidelines set up



and that...."

Terzich: "From what I understand that's correct."

Houlihan, D: "And then in that case as in the first time when we had the mini-convention in, I believe '74, there was...there was statute authorizing the people who'd be on the ballot and they went to a mini-caucus system, caucuses in wards or townships and then counties and then in Congressional districts?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Houlihan, D: "Now, does this then allow the Democratic State Central Committee or the political...well, does it allow it then to put these people on the ballots by districts?"

Terzich: "That's correct if they chose one of the methods in the statute."

Houlihan, D: "So in other words, this gives them additional powers to put people on the ballot rather than to be constricted to the caucus-type system where people would not be on the ballot?"

Terzich: "That's correct and that's the...something that they do not have now."

Houlihan, D: "Right. Now I have one final question. Representative Robinson raised the possibility that these people might be elected statewide or that the state central committee might chose...in...the language here is permissive and says 'May include the procedure prescribed'. Is there any protection that these delegates will be elected by district, by Congressional districts, so that we couldn't have an imbalance on a statewide representation to the convention?"

Terzich: "Well, that's the only method in Section 14.1, if they are elected on the ballot statewide....by...by districts, I'm sorry. By districts."

Houlihan, D: "That's the only procedure in Section 714-1 but it says it may include that, it may not include that."

Terzich: "I understand the only way to go on the ballot is pursuant to that Section 14....that's the only way to go on...."

Houlihan, D: "I see, so this would....would require if we were going to elect mini-convention delegates that they would have to be elected then by districts."

Terzich: "That's correct."

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



if I might address myself to this Bill. I...I share some of Representative Robinson's concerns but I think that they have been addressed by Representative Terzich. And I think this provides that we will have representatives or delegates to the mini-conventions elected by ballot which is, I think, a much more neat and probably allows for more participation on a district-wide level than in this practice which we adopted in 1974. I remember running as a delegate to the convention in 1974 and I was greeted with a number of buses that were brought to the polling place of people from our ward and I...hadn't been as resourceful as our opposing slate and then was not...was not consequently elected. And I was a little bit concerned over the election procedure that we had, a very small participation of members in the total process of electing delegates. And I think this would give the state central committee a much better vehicle to increase participation in the delegate's election process. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I find myself somewhat concerned because I recall what we've been going through for the past two or three years in regard to these Amendments at late date going on in regard to the Election Code in the selection of delegates of any kind in the Democratic Party. It bothers me considerably. Now this may be as...as innocuous as has just been discussed between Representative Terzich and Representative Houlihan. But I...it... it bothers me in view of the history we've had over the past couple of years. Now I know you've had...maybe this gives you some...some assurance within the City of Chicago but what we've seen in the Amendments that were run in at the end over this last couple of years, we found that we were invariably placing efforts to reduce the delegate strength of downstate districts in Illinois. We never know what's going to happen and I have very little confidence in...in the state central committee in that regard. I think it'd be a lot better if we spell everything out or if we would put it in a Bill at the beginning of the Session and have a chance to really argue it out instead of running it in as an Amendment at this late hour. And so consequently I am much too timorous to vote for this Bill with this



Amendment on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, you seeking recognition?  
Representative Terzich to close."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, from what I understand that this Amendment does not touch that section one bit. It's a good Amendment and it was adopted on the floor of the House and I would move for a.... 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 110."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I know it's too late to ask a question but maybe he...the Sponsor can indicate by nod of his head, does this still de-sex the Municipal Code like Senator Knuppel intended to do in the first place? Or did you lose...did you put the sex back in the Municipal Code?"

Terzich: "...Still got more sex in there."

Friedrich: "Well, does it take it out?"

Terzich: "No. No. This leaves it in there. This adds a little to it, that's all."

Friedrich: "I don't think it adds a little bit to it.... Okay."

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

Houlihan, D: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill. I think, as explained by Representative Terzich, the concern that some of the Members are covered in the provisions of the Bill. I think it is a good Bill both for the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. It establishes a definite procedure, one that we haven't had for selection of delegates to mini-conventions. If those in the City of Chicago will recall the last time the situation for delegate selection of the mini-convention was simply a mess trying to determine how these people would be selected. And there was no firm or formal procedure. Now that's what this Bill addresses itself to. It's a reasonable Bill. It deserves our support and I would urge the Membership's support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'aye' and 29 'no'. And the Bill having received the



Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 116."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 116. A Bill for an Act to substitute the word 'person' for 'man' in several acts and parts of acts named herein. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Senate Bill 116 provides the same as House Bill 655.

It amends the Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Authority Act. It substitutes the word 'person' for 'man' thus rendering the Act... sex neutral. The provisions deal with the appointment of the manager. I understand there's Amendment #2 and I would let the person who put on Amendment #2 explain Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Terzich: "Representative Chuck Campbell from Danville."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is practically the same thing that we voted on and out of this House a 103 to 3 on the BED Appropriation. This simply....I withdrew the original Amendment which abolished the Civic Center. This one simply places a referendum on...before the Danville Civic Center to sell the bonds. And it doesn't affect any other civic center and I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...any other questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 137 'aye' and 1 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 125."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 125. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create a division in the Office of Attorney General for the investigation and enforcement of law relating to civil and equal rights. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Senate Bill 125 provides the same as House Bill 669 and it amends the Act creating the Civil Rights Division of the Attorney General's Office. What this simply does, it expands under their present Civil Rights Department, adds sex and natural origin to the list of discriminatory acts, Civil Rights Division of the Attorney



General's Office to investigate and prosecute. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 125."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. This particular Bill, in my opinion, will create for the Office of Attorney General a much larger staff. It will increase his authority, I think, immeasurably and unnecessarily. I doubt very much that the regulation in this area should be in the Attorney General's Office. I think the votes are going up on the board here simply because we're in a cycle of what were relatively minor Bills. But this is not a minor Bill. This is a major Bill for the Republican Attorney General of this state. I think that the Democratic Party particularly should take a close look at what's involved in this Bill. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, we went over this before. At the present time, and I mentioned in the explanation of the Bill, that this is presently in the Attorney General's Office on handling of discrimination because of race, color, creed, et cetera. All this does is simply add onto it 'sex' and 'natural origin'. That's all it does. They can handle it under their present allotment of people over there. It's only if there's a complaint put on them...that Act. It doesn't expand the department one bit whatsoever."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Now, I...I don't understand why we have the Attorney General doing this. I thought we had a state FEPC that was supposed to investigate charges that were filed with regard to discrimination. We expanded FEPC to cover sex and race. And I don't see any reason why...how many agencies do we need of state government to investigate the same topic when we've already created a...an administrative agency to do precisely that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Sounds like a rhetorical question. Representative Chapman. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 101 'aye' and 15 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 205.





Representative Reilly."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 205. A Bill for an Act to amend... the Election Code...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I...I did ask, you know, so they could resolve their problems on Amendment ...on Senate Bill 104. And I would appreciate if we could handle 104 now."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. We'll return to 104, 205 be next."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 104. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, as I mentioned, Senate Bill 104 amends the Municipal Code. We did have the Amendment #1 which I believe now has been discussed with the Minority Leader over there and therefore I would... it should be on Second Reading if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove it from Third and bring it back to Second."

Terzich: "All right. And then we're on the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 104."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment changes Section 11-10-2 of Chapter XXIV to Sections 8-1-3 and 11-10-2. And actually it's as germane as a flea is in Alaska on the iceberg. This Amendment...that's right...this Amendment refers to an entirely different subject. The subject matter of Senate Bill 104 relates to changing the word 'widow' to 'spouses'. Now this Amendment relates to borrowing money by the corporate authorities. Now, if anything, it...I've never seen anything so absolutely preposterous in my life...."

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

Houlihan, D: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've already ruled that that... Amendment is germane...."

Geo-Karis: "Then I appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Houlihan, D: "Now, Mr. Speaker, we're beyond that now, we're back to...."

Geo-Karis: "No...we're not...no, Mr. Speaker,...."

Houlihan, D: "...That motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair is



obviously out of order."

Geo-Karis: "...Order. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Was pulled out of the record just as I was about to ask you and nobody did anything further. I'm appealing the ruling of the Chair. If you...the Speaker....."

Speaker Redmond: "The decision about the germaneness was about ten or fifteen minutes ago."

Geo-Karis: "Yes, but they pulled it out of the record...."

Speaker Redmond: "There was no....and there was no request for the.... appeal for ruling of the Chair."

Geo-Karis: "Mr....Mr....yes, there was. Mr. Speaker,....get a chance."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on the question, we're on the question of the adoption of the Amendment."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order. He pulled it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "I told you that the ruling on germaneness was made and there was no appeal from that ruling....now that's final."

Geo-Karis: "....He pulled it out of the record before you had a chance...."

Speaker Redmond: "That's final. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, the Lady is talking on your ruling which is perfectly legitimate. The....."

Speaker Redmond: "But it's too late."

Walsh: "Bill was taken out of the record. The Bill was taken out of the record at that point."

Speaker Redmond: "But it's too late."

Walsh: "...Well, it is not too late. She may want to appeal the ruling."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...the question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Representative Taylor, I believe, is the Sponsor...."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Taylor, can you tell me, I'm not familiar enough with this portion of the statute to know, does this apply to all corporate authorities or does it apply to those of certain sizes?"

Taylor: "Mrs. Satterthwaite, my Amendment amends the Municipal Code and



it provides that bonds that...issued by a corporate authority may have the maturity date of forty years from the date of issuance. Presently the maturity period is twenty years and...."

Satterthwaite: "Well, my question, Representative Taylor, was in regard to whether that includes all corporate authorities regardless of the size or does it apply to municipalities of a certain size?"

Taylor: "Well, it doesn't....Representative Satterthwaite, it doesn't say that in my Amendment. It applies to all...."

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

Houlihan, D: "Well, in speaking in favor of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this Amendment simply provides for nonhome rule units the same power that home rule units already have. All it simply allows is that it would be a maximum from twenty years and what the thing provided for here in the Amendment would be a total of forty years as far as the bonded indebtedness. And if you have a major project twenty years could well be too limited a period of time for the bond issue to...that would be involved to finance a project. That's all this Amendment does. And it is simply providing for nonhome rule municipalities the same power that home rule units already have. That's all that's involved. It's an extremely reasonable Amendment and I think it deserves our support. And I would urge that support."

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

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the last speaker was absolutely right. The present Constitution allows home rule municipalities to issue bonds or to incur indebtedness to be more correct, up to forty years, not to exceed forty years. Then the Constitution goes on to say that nonhome rule municipalities may issue or incur indebtedness up to forty years unless otherwise limited by statute. Presently the statute limits it to twenty years. This Amendment would attempt to allow nonhome rule municipalities to issue bonds and to incur indebtedness not to exceed forty years the same as home rule municipalities. I see nothing wrong with it. Maybe philosophically you're opposed but it seems to me to be quite fair to allow nonhome rule municipalities to issue bonds up to forty years."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, we are talking about forty years, that's two generations. I don't want my village to have that power. I think it's a terrible Amendment. What are we....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that maybe...there's one good reason why this Amendment should be defeated. That is because at this late hour, as tired as we are, people are now starting to tack on to what have become shell bills involuntarily very substantial, monumental kinds of questions without the benefit of Committee Hearings. We know what we're voting on. We're bypassing and we're insulting the Committee system and I think for that reason alone these kinds of Amendments, at this hour, at this time, ought to be soundly defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But this Bill, this Amendment has already passed out of this House, it's presently in the Senate on a Bill that the Senate has not taken action on and for fear that they will not take action, I felt that this would be one way that I can make certain that this becomes law. And I solicit a few more votes for this Bill...this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is not germane, it has nothing to do with the original...."

Speaker Redmond: "That already has been decided now for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "...I'll ask for a verification if the....goes the other way."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, another thing that makes me a bit suspicious with respect to this Amendment is the sponsorship and the strong support from Representative Houlihan who is a close associate of the Majority Leader. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there's a possibility that we may be involved here in pulling the fat from the fire for home rule units so that we.... they can issue bonds for forty years. Now it is true that the Constitution gives home rule units that authority. But it seems to me in the back of my mind there is a court suit pending, and I think we may



be given...giving statutory sanction with this Amendment to that Section of the Constitution which I think these people feel is necessary. So I would urge that you vote 'no'. Forty years is far too long."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Amendment. Can see nothing wrong with the forty years. You give it to all the municipalities under home rule and all thing ....all you're talking about is the difference in interest. You're going to twenty-five and thirty year mortgages, so what's the difference? I can see no problem with it whatsoever."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I just want to make a point of parliamentary inquiry for... inasmuch as this affects Chapter 24, Municipal Corporation, Municipal Government. There's a provision in this Amendment, there's a collection of a direct annual tax sufficient to pay the interest and the indebtedness off too. Now there's no referendum provision in that. Put that in your hat and smoke it."

Speaker Redmond: "That's a good point. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is a point but I'd like to also point out at...at this time that many small municipalities have been, let's say, addressing the questions of water supplies and sewers, et cetera. In a twenty year period, let's say with a municipality of two or three hundred people in a bond issue of about a million and a-half dollars they can't pay it off in twenty years is basically what we're talking about. Therefore, they need the expanded period of time to pay off a million or a two million dollar bond issue because they don't have the property values for it. It is a good piece of legislation allowing the downstate municipalities and counties to do what the home rule units are doing now. How can you expect villages of twelve or fourteen hundred or two thousand people to pay off a bond issue of a couple million dollars in twenty years? It can't be done. It's a good piece."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was voting with my friend here until Representative Bluthardt got up and reminded



me when he spoke that Leyden Township has some eighteen thousand population in the unincorporated area and Leyden Township is one of two townships in the State of Illinois that owns their water system and the way they were...to get...the only way they got was by issuing forty year bonds on it. And that's the reason why I changed my vote. Tim was questioning it, from my 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 69 'yes' and 79 'no'. Representative Taylor has requested."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to a verification?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, you are."

Taylor: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to show you the good sport that I am and I'm not going to get sore about losing this Amendment. I'm going to let it go. I would suggest some of the other people that takes up the time of the House, they should do likewise."

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

Leverenz: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "That's 70 to 79.. Gentleman's motion fails. Now we move that back to Third Reading. Read the Bill a third time. Representative Bluthardt, aren't all revenue bonds for forty years? Or can't they be revenue bonds by a municipality?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 104....."

Bluthardt: "Municipalities but not unincorporated areas."

Speaker Redmond: "Revenue bonds for municipality now may be forty years, isn't that correct? Okay. Just...I just was curious."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 104. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it just goes to show you you should never mix sex with money. Now we get back to our firefighters on Senate Bill 104. This is the same effect as 657. And Adeline if you want to become a firewoman this will help you out. Amends the Illinois Municipal Code, the Bill deletes all language regarding sex and inserts more sex, or sex neutral language, such as surviving spouses to replace the word 'widows'. This allows a person to receive firemen's pension fund benefits without regard to sex."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 146 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 205. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I...I think I have one more...143 but I might say that last one might help me out at the firehouse anyhow. I do...my last one on that sex liberation is 143. 143."

Speaker Redmond: "143. The Chair has been overruled. We'll take it out of sequence."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 143. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the exercise and right of eminent domain. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Senate Bill 143 does the same as House Bill 660 which amends the Eminent Domain Act. The Bill adds sex neutral language, the result is a woman's interest property can be....can be defended by her without requiring her husband to be a party to the suit."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion?"

Terzich: "I think I want an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Like to have the right to ask the...if he'll yield...a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Terzich: "Just remember, Adeline, a fireman is your friend."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, well, you're my friend but you're so interested in sex lately that I...that I..."

Speaker Redmond: "That should make him a better friend."

Geo-Karis: "...Beginning to worry about you. I realize the hour is late and you've been here quite a while but I won't go into the other details. However, I'd like to know, if I may going back to the point of order, you say that this Bill deletes requirements....would you.... I didn't quite get it."

Terzich: "Well, it says the Bill adds sex neutral language, the result is..."

Geo-Karis: "Your Bill deletes the requirement that if a married woman's

interest is involved, her husband must be made a party, is that right?"

Terzich: "It says the result is a woman's interest and the property can be defended by her without requiring her husband to be a party to the suit."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to against this Amendment because this Amendment is not necessary.

Under the present law this can be done, it's already in the statute...."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, she feels that way I table House Bill 143."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 143 is tabled. 205. Table House Bill 143. 205."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 205. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keilly at long last."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 205 is a Bill that we brought out of the Election Committee the other night by a vote of a 106 to 39 here in the House of Representatives. What the Bill does is amends the Campaign Finance Article of the Election Code to provide that state central committees and county central committees of any political party or a political committee within the meaning of the Act without regard to the amount of contributions accepted during the twelve month period. Now, it's perfectly obvious to anyone who read the Campaign Finance Act when it was passed that this was the intention of the authors of the Act. Perfectly obvious to everyone except the State Board of Elections which ruled for reasons that we can only guess at, that this was not so. And for that reason county central committees, even though they are extremely powerful political organizations, providing a great deal of money in influencing elections in a great many ways, much more powerfully than our own individual candidate committees do have not been required to file the Campaign Disclosure Report. Representative Stanley had this....has been the Sponsor of this Bill. He's not here. I am one of the Chief Sponsors of the Bill and he asked me to handle it for him. The Bill, as I said, was brought out of the House Election Committee by a vote 106 Members of the House. It passed the Senate





with 56 'yea' votes, no 'nays' votes. The Bill simply corrects an obvious mistake in interpretation of the previous law, makes it clear that the powerful Committees should file campaign disclosure reports so that we can know for the very same reasons that we require this disclosure of other Committees. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to clear up just one matter that Mr. Reilly mentioned. The 78th General Assembly is the one that passed that Act that he referred to and if the Members were present during the 78th General Assembly will remember, it was presented to our Body about twelve minutes to twelve one night by Representative Phil Collins and it was moved by Speaker Blair and no one had a chance to make any comments. Bud Krause and Ted Lechowicz were yelling and screaming to try to ask some questions to find out what the sixty-page Amendment did and we weren't to ask any questions. So the folly is really on the Republican Party. That's why these Committees were deleted."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 148 'aye' and 1 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed."



Speaker Redmond: "639, Representative Cunningham. You want this out of the record?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 639. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to make and executive agreements. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me start by saying that S.B. 639 is an administration Bill. It is sponsored here in the House by Representatives Brummer, O'Daniel and myself. They've been joined as hyphenated Cosponsors. One of these Gentlemen will close on the Bill. Their sponsorship doesn't constitute an endorsement of the administration but it certainly is an enthusiastic endorsement of the Bill itself. The Bill does three things. I want you to hear me very carefully. It authorizes the Department of Transportation to enter into an agreement with municipalities for the water supply. First... Second, it authorizes the Department of Transportation to protect the water supply from poachers. And third, it authorizes the Department of Transportation to enter into various agreements with other governmental agencies. That's all that it does. Now, it should have been on the Consent Calendar. I do not know why it was there, but I wish to slay the red herring or bury it before it's drawn out across the path of your reasoning in this matter. It does not create a twenty-seven thousand acre Louisville Lake, nor a twenty-seven hundred acre Louisville Lake. It might result in a few small reservoirs for water supply for four parched communities in the Little Wabash River Basin. Those communities are Clay City, Flora, Louisville and Fairfield. Many of you are familiar with the area involved. It's so dry down there often that you can't spit. The Speaker himself used to go to a very fine watering hole in the area called Passport that was closed down because of an inadequate water supply there. This Bill is desperately needed. It is not an anti-ecology or anti-conservation Bill in any stretch of the imagination. It doesn't cost the State of Illinois a dime. A financial, a fiscal statement has been filed in this matter. Perhaps next year, they'll need



to hire a guard to watch the water supply. I urge and implore you to vote 'aye' on a very good Bill that's needed for the 54th District and for the communities name."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hesitate to rise against this Bill, especially when it's sponsored by such a great man like Senator Terry Bruce, Representative Roscoe Cunningham, but I shall. The potential cost of this program is somewhere around eleven million dollars of state monies. Now, I don't know how the money's going to be spent. If it was Capital Development Board bond monies with forty year limit, I wouldn't mind it so much. But authorizing the Department of Transportation now to acquire and execute agreements, I know full well how that money's going to be taken or probably taken from the road fund. I stand here in opposition to a program of a water shed. If we're going to have water sheds, I think we really have to rely on the Department of Conservation and... the Soil and Water Conservation State District to develop those water sheds. I'm not against water sheds in particular, but I do think it ought to be a particular plan by the State of Illinois and not in pork-barrell legislation. I hesitate to rise against this Bill, but I see some drastic affects from us financially and in setting a precedent and I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

Johnson: "The Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Johnson: "Is this Senate Bill written, Representative Cunningham, so that the Illinois Department of Transportation could condemn land for a private company if the company agreed to repay the state?"

Cunningham: "No, there's no ballot of condemnation and I want to reply to that, the other uninformed comments. Not your uninformed, but his. There's not a dime's worth of expense involved."

Johnson: "Well, a couple of more questions. Could you tell us what the reimbursement clause contained in Senate Bill 69 provides? As I understand it, it's a very general and weak provision and



it doesn't specify the amount of reimbursement or require that any, either person, industry or city would demonstrate the ability to repay."

Cunningham: "The four cities that I named have indicated a desire to purchase water. It merely authorized the D.O.T. to act as the agent for the reimbursement of expenses incurred in furnishing the water they desire and need desperately."

Johnson: "Does this Bill... in all honesty, what's the relationship between this Bill and the Louisville project that's involved down in your area?"

Cunningham: "Peripheral. The Louisville project is entirely dependent upon the Louisville, Kentucky Corps of Engineers. They have indicated that there isn't any money to build the Louisville Reservoir and so it's, for all practical purposes, in deep storage. This does not revive it in any way. That's just a nonsensical conclusion that people have jumped to to the detriment of this Bill and the four communities that I've listed."

Johnson: "Why is it necessary to allow or to authorize the Department of Transportation to cooperate with anyone on any water supply or water storage project? Why the general language contained in the statutes? Doesn't that offer a carte blanche that could really be detrimental in the future?"

Cunningham: "I wondered myself why the D.O.T. heeded that authorization but the lawyers for the D.O.T. said it was necessary. That's why the Bill was introduced and why it was carried through the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Friedrich: "An inquiry if we're on Short Debate Calendar or not. If it is, I think they're both out of order. My Calendar shows that Bill is on Short Debate Calendar. We've been on it for ten minutes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, you'd better look at the Supplemental Calendar, page 2. It's on Senate Bills, Third Reading, page 2. It's not on Short Debate. Please continue, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I won't take anymore of the time... House... the time of the House except to say that I think it's a bad Bill and too general and ought to be defeated."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this important piece of legislation. It only allows agreements with these necessary water projects. From what Mr. Johnson is reading, it's obvious he's getting it from the same coalition that has opposed every water project in this state that I can remember, good, bad or indifferent. We've attempted in East Central Illinois to put together several water projects. Each and every one's been opposed, regardless of it's need, regardless of it's merit, regardless of the compromise, regardless of the alternatives. We need water over there. We don't need anymore crap from the University of Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in support of this project and one of the reasons why, if I can have a little attention, the little Giant from Lawrence County will have all of the county paved if we don't do this, so please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions if the Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "There has been very careful language written here so that you don't use the word reservoir, but I have a question in terms of what type of flood relief you'll get from this."

Cunningham: "Well, I think they call them catch basins, but I'm not sure about the terminology. Obviously, they'll have to be some small structures put somewhere along in this creek, but there will no... there'll not be the huge structure that was contemplated initially for which the Corps of Engineers has dampened enthusiasms."

Leverenz: "Has this been endorsed, Representative, by the Water Resources Commission?"

Cunningham: "Yes, it has and by the Governor."

Leverenz: "Would you call this Middle Fork South or Kentucky Lake North?"

Cunningham: "No, neither would be a misnomer. We can't dream that



high in our section of the state. We're just trying to live and not to scale the heights. That's your prerogative."

Leverenz: "This is a good piece of foot-in-the-door legislation. I wonder if you have any idea what the overall cost of this project might be."

Cunningham: "The D.O.T. filed a fiscal statement and they said that in subsequent years, they might have to hire one watchman at a cost of less than ten thousand dollars a year to keep poachers out of the water supply."

Leverenz: "What is the cost-benefit ratio then?"

Cunningham: "The water supply has said that it's better than a one to one, water resources."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker; I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed. The previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "No, either one of the Cosponsors please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's that?"

Cunningham: "Either Representative Brummer or Representative O'Daniel. They're Cosponsors. Appreciate your help, Ted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative O'Daniel. The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. O'Daniel."

O'Daniel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I hate to disagree with my colleague, Representative McClain, but I think he's been reading Mr. Marlin's editorials from over at Champaign. This won't cost the Federal government or the State of Illinois, this won't cost the State of Illinois one penny. The Federal government and the State of Illinois has to be in agreement on to who pays for the water from these reservoirs and the state will not go into agreement with the Federal government until they're assured from the local municipalities that they will be repaid from this water. And all this Bill does, it has nothing to do with building Louisville Reservoir. As far as benefit ratio is



concerned, it merely gives the Department of Transportation the authority to be the... designates the D.O.T. as the Department of state government that controls the supply of water and who uses it and who pays for it. It doesn't cost the State of Illinois one penny. And as for as the twenty-eight thousand acre Louisville Lake being prime agricultural land, the only way you could make it prime agricultural land would be to jack it up thirty feet and land plane it. Anytime you have an area where there's... that's suitable for a reservoir, it isn't prime agricultural land. And these projects are very badly needed down in our area and it's a very good Bill and I'd appreciate it if you would support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 639? All in favor, vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill very clearly gives the Department of Transportation carte blanche to enter into any kind of agreement with any public or private agency for the purpose of construction, operation, maintenance, replacement of any water supply and water storage facility. It does not define water storage in here at all to be limited to catch basins. I would furthermore call to your attention the Democratic staff analysis on this Bill where it describes the Little Wabash Water Shed project which was recommended by the Corps of Engineers, approved by Congress. The total cost of that project including Federal money would be fifty-five million dollars. The state will get socked for between one and a half and two million dollars for recreational development. The... granted, part of the state's share will be picked up by the local communities involved, but they're going to have to bear the brunt of \$5.7 million to be distributed among the towns of Louisville, Flora, Clay City and Fairfield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, to explain his vote. Okay, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Roscoe Cunningham has gotten his reward for being the Minority Spokesperson



on Appropriations. His ability to use the language never ceases to amaze me as drafting the synopsis obviously covers up the need to construct or prepare for the construction of another reservoir. Those of you who remember opposition to the Scenic Rivers Bill on the basis of the fact that it is taking away farmland from poor unsuspecting farmers who are going to be ripped from their possession of land by the State of Illinois ought to take a good look at this one because when the D.O.T. is done, you'll have twenty-eight thousand acres of property gone without anything but a hope that Roscoe will come downstate and try to talk them right out of their land. It's a miserable piece of legislation. The only skill that's left in here is language that was used to disguise the Bill for what it is - another reservoir...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones, to explain his vote."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Roscoe's project and he's always bugging me about working on projects for Springfield, but I think that this is one project, the Louisville Reservoir, that cannot be put into Springfield, so I'm supporting Roscoe on his project."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I'd like to make a couple comments. I'm in full support of this Bill. Number one, in reference to Representative Schneider's comments about the scenic rivers, the Little Wabash River wasn't even considered for the scenic rivers. It's not scenic. It's not suitable for agriculture. And it... there's a need in the area for a water supply for the municipalities. If you look at the Bill, this authorizes the state to enter into agreements with those municipalities so that those municipalities can pay for that water supply. And that's all the Bill does. It authorizes them to enter into those agreements with the municipalities can agree to pay for the water supply which they want. So they can do so jointly because it is a river of the state, it's necessary that the D.O.T. handle the thing rather than have one





municipality handle the thing and they can all jointly enter into cooperative agreements."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me point out to the Membership that there's been a request of a verification on this Roll Call by Mr. Mugalian and I would strongly recommend that the person if he is not here in the chamber and he is recorded, kindly record him as present or not voting. Seems there'll be a verification. The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have here again a situation where you have a few screaming idiots that are opposed to the concept that people come before blue darters and giant red horse suckers. I think probably these people need to spend their time productively and if they're not willing to join the 20th Century, then perhaps, they ought to close their mouths and go back to wax candles and making jelly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think there is something far more basic here to be considered than a particular project that this Bill seeks to address. The fact that this Bill gives very broad authority to the Department of Transportation for something that is proposed as a water supply project. I think we need to be asking ourselves a very basic question. Is the Department of Transportation the state department that ought to be dealing with local governments and their water supplies? What are we going to do with this water supply? How do we connect that with transportation? If all we want is better water for the municipalities, surely there is some other department that can better address these problems. I solicit your 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to explain his vote. Timer is on. Did you explain your vote? Have all voted who wished? May I point out to you that there's going to be a verification. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry. Tip, did you want to explain your vote?"



On this question there are 84 'ayes', 48 'nays', 22 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham. Kindly poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk, when you have an opportunity. Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, if this gets 89, if there are 89 green lights up there, I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm well aware of that, Sir. Thank you. Poll the absentees please."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Don Brummet, Caldwell, Collins, Domico, Ewell, Ewing, Hanahan, Hoffman, Hudson, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Madison, McAvoy, Meyer, Schisler, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Stearney, Winchester, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, would you kindly change my 'no' vote to 'aye'? Mr. Taylor, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Oh, I thought you were seeking recognition. Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. McPike as 'aye'. Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones, from Chicago."

E. Jones: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again we are helping the people downstate and the people downstate have been so good to me and especially my friend, Roscoe; so change my 'present' from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jones, Mr. Emil Jones 'aye'. Mr. Yourell 'aye'. Mr. Kosinski 'aye'. Mr. Dawson 'aye'. Mr. Deuster as 'aye'. On this question there are 91 'ayes'. Mr. Caldwell as 'aye'. 92 'ayes'. Caldwell, Louis Caldwell. On this question there are 92 'ayes', how many 'nays', Jack? 46 'nays', 22 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman persist in his verification, Mr. Mugalian? All right, Clerk will poll the absentees. Okay, proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Adams, Anderson, Janes Barnes, Bartulis, Birchler, Bluthardt, Bradley, Brandt, Rich Brummer, Caldwell, Campbell, Christensen, Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Corneal Davis, Dawson, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Edgar, Epton, Farley, Flinn, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Harris, Hart, Dan Houlihan, Hoxsey, Huff, Huskey, Jacobs,



Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Keats, Kempiners, Kent, Kosinski, Kucharski, Lauer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to do this as quickly as possible and it would really help if people would raise their hands if they're here. See, I don't want to take anymore time than is absolutely necessary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ladies and Gentlemen, would you kindly raise your hand when your name is called upon? That would be a big help. Thank you very much."

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino, Lechowicz, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mahar, Mautino, McAuliffe, McBroom, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Miller, Molloy, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Peters, Polk, Pouncey, Riley, Richmond, Ryan, Shumpert, Simms, Stanley, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, Van Duyn, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Wall, Wikoff, Williams, Younge, Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you. Would you change my 'no' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly record the Lady from 'no' to 'aye'?"

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is he recorded?"

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

Winchester: "Would you please vote me 'aye' and could I be verified as voting 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Can he be verified? Hearing no objections, fine. Mr. Beatty would like to be recorded from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Giorgi, from 'no' to 'aye'? Giorgi. Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "May I be verified 'aye', Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Mr. McBroom, hearing no objection, you're verified. Are there any other requests? What's our count, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Could I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Any objections? Hearing none, you're verified. Giglio, Frank Giglio. What's our count? On this question there are 96 'ayes' we're starting with. Mr. Hanahan wants to be recorded as 'aye'. That's 97. Mr. Mugalian, would you kindly proceed then with your verification?"

Mugalian: "Bartulis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bartulis is in the back."

Mugalian: "Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bradley. He's not in the chamber. Yes, he is. I'm sorry, he's standing, he's walking down the aisle."

Mugalian: "Campbell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Campbell is here."

Mugalian: "Daniels."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels, how's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Daniels in the chamber? I don't see him. Take him off the Roll Call. Mr. Daniels is here, I'm sorry. He just walked in. Leave him on the Roll Call."

Mugalian: "Where is he, where?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here."

Mugalian: "All right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Go ahead and believe me. I won't give you a short count. All right, fine. Please proceed."

Mugalian: "Edgar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Edgar. He's here."

Mugalian: "Epton."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Epton is here."

Mugalian: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who."

Mugalian: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Farley. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. Is the Gentleman in the chamber, Mr. Bruce Farley? Take him off the Roll Call. Take him off the Roll Call. Who else?"

Mugalian: "Hart."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hart. The Gentleman is not in his chair. The Gentleman in the chamber? I don't see him. Take him off the Roll Call. Mr. Speaker wants to be recorded as 'aye'. He's right here. I am recorded as 'aye'."

Mugalian: "Hoxsey."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hoxsey. She's here."

Mugalian: "Jacobs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jacobs. He's here."

Mugalian: "Stanley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stanley. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. The Gentleman in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off."

Mugalian: "E.G. Steele."

Speaker Lechowicz: "E.G. Steele. E.G. Steele. He's in the chamber."

Mugalian: "Totten."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Totten. Mr. Totten. I don't see him in his chair. The Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Totten. Janey, could you just move over for a second? He's not here. Would you kindly record Mr. Boucek from 'no' to 'aye'? Right there."

Mugalian: "Mahar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mahar. The Gentleman is here."

Mugalian: "Riley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Riley is... he's here. Could we have a little order in the chamber please? The Chair is having a difficult time hearing the names of the individuals that are being called."

Mugalian: "Ryan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ryan? Mr. Ryan. I'm sure he's very close by. Take him off temporarily, but he'll be here shortly I'm sure. Take him off temporarily. Mr. McCourt."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

McCourt: "Would you please record me as 'aye'."

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

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I call Kucharski. If not, I'd like to..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that?"

Mugalian: "Kucharski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Eddie Kucharski. I don't believe you have. Was the Gentleman verified, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, he hasn't been verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kucharski. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? I don't see him. Take him off the Roll Call."

Mugalian: "Peters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Peters is here."

Mugalian: "Sevcik."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Joe Sevcik. He's there."

Clerk O'Brien: "Voting 'present'."

Mugalian: "Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Garmisa's in his chair. Right here. Ben, you want to stand up? They don't believe me."

Mugalian: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Van Duyne's right here."

Mugalian: "McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McGrew. I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. McGrew. Take him off the record."

Mugalian: "Wikoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's here."

Mugalian: "Deavers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Deavers. Cissy, would you mind moving just a little bit? I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Mr. Deavers. Take him off the record."

Mugalian: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Doyle. He's here."

Mugalian: "Jack Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Williams. He's here."

Mugalian: "Huff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Huff. Mr. Huff. I can't see him back there. Bill O'Daniel, would you mind sitting down for a second? Mr. Huff. I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Doug Huff. Take him off the record."



Mugalian: "Vince Molloy here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he is. Are you concluded, Sir?"

Mugalian: "Is Representative Madigan here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Madigan. No, but his lovely wife and daughter are."

Mugalian: "I know."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sure that he'll be... you questioning  
Mr. Madigan?"

Mugalian: "Yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, I don't believe the Gentleman is in  
his chair, but I'm sure and I don't see the Gentleman in the  
chamber. Take him off the record."

Mugalian: "Taylor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Taylor. He's back in the center aisle."

Mugalian: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, what's the count? Would you take the count  
please? On this question there are 91 'ayes'..."

Mugalian: "McMaster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I thought you were concluded."

Mugalian: "No, I just wanted to know where we were so that we wouldn't  
take time if..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, you'd better start hurrying because it's  
about time. I'm sorry, what? Wait a minute."

Mugalian: "McMaster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Could we have a little order in the chamber please?  
Mr. McMaster. He's in the chamber. I said you're in the chamber."

Mugalian: "Gaines."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Mugalian: "Gaines."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Gaines is in the aisle. Are you concluded,  
Sir? On this question there are how many, Jack? 91 'ayes', 42  
'nos'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is  
hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate  
Bill 1148. We'll get back to the other ones on priority of call  
in a minute. Mr. Katz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1148."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill unanimously reported by Judiciary I



Committee. It was going through on the Consent Calendar but...if Senator Glass has a Bill, this is Senator Glass' Bill to permit individuals to contribute conservation rights. I had a similar Bill that's over in the Senate and we made a few changes in it. What I would like to do is to withdraw Amendments #1 and 2, and to move the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1148. It establishes the right of individuals to voluntarily give conservation rights to unique properties in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendments #1 and 2 ...hear...any objections? Hearing none, they're withdrawn. Gentleman, Amendment #3."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Amends House Bill.... this is the wrong Amendment.."

Speaker Lechowicz; "How about Senate Bill 1148?"

Katz: "Yes, it amends Senate Bill 1148."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Want to explain the Amendment and then we'll have the Clerk read it? We can't find the Amendment up here. Harold. Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Amendment #3 permits individuals to convey conservation rights to governmental units or to entities that are designed like the Nature Conservancy to conserve valuable property. This is a way that we can preserve Illinois' natural heritage and I would urge the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz:"Any discussion? Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Representative Katz, according to the Republican staff analysis, Amendment #1 which you withdrew was necessary for the Department of Conservation's support. And, as I understand it, Amendment #1 provided that the non-conveyance of a conservation rights would be ...would exist unless accepted by the state or the local unit of government, if it was that type. Does Amendment #3 contain that provision in it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yes, it requires the acceptance by the state before any conservation right can be granted to the state."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Katz: "I would move the adoption of Amendment #3, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman moves the





adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed..... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Mr. Bluthardt on the Amendment?"

Bluthardt: "Well, yes, on the parliamentary procedure. I didn't understand. You say that #1 and 2 were withdrawn. Were they adopted previously?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "They were not."

Bluthardt: "They were never...never....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We never do anything wrong up here, Eddie."

Bluthardt: "Well, sometimes you do, Teddy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bills Third Reading. Senate Bill 1068.  
Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1068....."

Katz: "Yes, I'd like to be on Third Reading now, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I already mentioned that. You are on Third Reading."

Katz: "Oh, he has the wrong number, Mr. Speaker, it's Senate Bill 1148."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now wait a minute. We just put on an Amendment, it's got to be held there for a while unless you have leave to consider it immediately. I don't believe you asked for leave immediately, we're on another order of business right now. If you want to go back to that Bill, and ask for a special reading, we'll consider it at that time. Senate Bill 1068."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1068. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to concerning conveyances. Third Reading of the Bill."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1068 was on the Consent Calendar but was removed because....the Democratic staff discovered as...the defects in the Bill. It's a very simple Bill. The Recorder's Association wants the Bill because it will enable them to keep better track record. It amends the Conveyances Act to provide that in a warranty deed, a quit claim deed or a mortgage that the name of the grantor be printed or typed underneath the signature. This is to enable the...the recorders to be able to decipher what may be illegible handwriting so that they can keep up the track record. It also



provides that the forms of these three types of deeds, mortgage, warranty deed and quit claim deed, to have a blank space, square space of three and a-half inches for the use of the Recorder for imprinting the time stamp and the date of the document. Neither of the provisions affect the validity of the deed or the mortgage so I urge the adoption of Senate Bill 1068."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Tipword: "Representative Leinenweber, I..I..have a question that popped into my mind that kind of bothers me a little. I wonder if after we put this on and in considering all of the other requirements we've been placing on the face of the deeds and like documents, is there going to be anyplace to put the deed and the description?"

Leinenweber: "Well, Representative Tipword, if you use the usual form deeds that you get from the legal printing supply firms you won't have any trouble. And if your secretary is like mine, they automatically type in the name anyway. So it certainly won't make any difference. All the present form of deeds of legal supply houses have an empty space for the purpose of Recorder. All this provides this, I suppose, for the so-called makeshift deeds, the people that do it yourselves, so there'd be some room for the Recorder to...some uniformity. And also so that the Recorder will be able to decipher the names on the deeds so that in keeping the tract book they will be accurate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Gaines: "Harry, suppose a guy goes to the corner drugstore and gets a four year old form next year? Will his deed still be valid without this thing on it?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, it will based upon Amendment #3, the deed will still be valid."

Gaines: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1068 pass? All



those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Bruce, ...me 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record: On this question there's 133 'aye's, no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Katz: "I would like leave, Mr. Speaker, to waive the appropriate rules so that we might consider on Third Reading, Senate Bill 1148 as amended."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave for the Attendance Roll Call to hear Senate Bill 10...what...1148. Hearing no objections the Attendance Roll Call will be used."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1148. A Bill for an Act relating to conservation rights and real property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Telcser: "I wanted to ask Representative Katz what the Bill was before ...what the problem is, why do we need leave?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we just amended it and maybe you were off the floor and in turn in order to bypass the amended stage, a day on the Calendar, he asked for leave. Do you have any objections?"

Telcser: "No, that's all right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you very much. Mr....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The House previously passed out House Bill 910 which was a Bill that would enable individual voluntarily to convey to units of government or to organizations that specialize in such things, unique property rights of great scenic and cultural value. Senate Bill 1148 is a similar Bill...with Amendment #3 the two Bills are in conformity. It will enable individuals voluntarily to convey to appropriate governmental units or private organizations land that has unique qualities, or parts of land that have unique qualities. It was on the Consent Calendar and previously unanimously passed this House as House Bill 910. I would move the adoption of Senate Bill 1148."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."



McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to clear up one matter.

Harold, there's no way that an individual or the Conservation Department could like give the property, like for instance, to the National Guard for monuments and then two or five or ten years later the National Guard could make it into another use. Once it is this use it has to stay this use?"

Katz: "Once the property rights is given to the State of Illinois, it must be accepted by the State of Illinois before it becomes State of Illinois property. Once it does that it is like any other property belonging to the State of Illinois."

McClain: "So in other words, if that property was ever to be changed, the use is going to be changed or the property would be sold, it would have to go through Legislative branch?"

Katz: "It would require the same authority in order to dispose of the property that we now require for the disposing of any other kind of property of the State of Illinois."

McClain: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Speaker yield?"

Katz: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, the Sponsor will though."

Waddell: "Let me pose a problem. Let's say, for example, that you have a farm that you want to will or deed, rather, to the University of Illinois. Under this Bill and under the wording where you say 'local government', do you say then that a county for example or a township who did not want to lose the taxes to the...to that local government could then stymie this gift that you wanted to give to the University?"

Katz: "I think there is in the first place, you can always convey total interest in property. What this Bill is concerned with is conveying of partial interest, unique qualities of properties that you cannot now convey. If you want to convey such...such unique qualities of that so that future generations may enjoy this particular unique right you may do it but when it is a governmental unit involved, they do have to accept. You cannot unload something on a governmental unit under this Act that they do not want to accept. One of the reasons



for that is that there may be upkeep involved, for example. It might be something that involves a historical monument. In that situation the State of Illinois could require that the individual before the state would acquire it must agree to pay a certain amount of money that would provide for upkeep otherwise the State of Illinois could refuse to accept it."

Waddell: "Fine. Now would you get back and answer my question? Under the wording of this, it says, 'Or unit of local government'. Would you answer the question? Can that be construed by the court to say that you could not deed that because the local government doesn't want you to have it and lose the taxes?"

Katz: "Well, anything that you want to convey, so the local government has to be accept it as I understand it under the Bill, by the local government. You cannot...."

Waddell: "You're not willing it to the local government. You're giving it to the University of Illinois but the local government objects, then what?"

Katz: "Oh, no, no, no. No, I'm sorry, I didn't understand you, Mr. Waddell. The answer is no. The only one that can object is the grantee, namely, the University of Illinois. But someone else can object. If somebody wants to give the property to the State of Illinois, for example, the State of Illinois has the right to decide whether it wants it or not but the county has no right to interpose. That is simply between, as in all other property rights, between the grantor of the property, the owner of the property, and the grantee, or the party that will be receiving the property rights."

Waddell: "Thank you."

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

Dunn, J.F: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Legislative intent has been accurately reflected by this debate so I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed.... Previous debate.... Move....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yes...believe this Bill will make it possible for individuals to convey unique properties and land before they are despoiled. This will therefore act to the benefit of ourselves and future generations



and I would urge the adoption of Senate Bill 1148."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1148 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Kelly. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 138 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We're back on the Supplemental...Senate Bill 1203. Mr. McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1203. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act authorizing municipalities to incorporate. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1203 was on the Consent Calendar until Democratic staff found some technically incorrect portions. We corrected that earlier this morning and now the Bill we believe is in correct shape. It allows fire protection districts to adopt national standards by reference. I know of no opposition to the Bill and urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1203 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar on page 6 is Consideration Postponed, House Bill 2410. Mr. Totten? The Gentleman in the chamber? For what purpose does Mr. Daniels seek recognition?"

Daniels: "May I have leave to have my vote on the last Bill changed from 'present' to 'aye'? I hit the wrong switch."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Mr. Daniels as 'aye' on the last Bill, 1203. Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Have we gone completely through the Calendar and has every Sponsor indicated that he has had his....or had his Bill called or does not want to call?"

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

Walsh: "I wondered if we had gone through the Calendar and if every Sponsor had been accommodated who wants his Bill called."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, my friend, ...all I can tell you is that I take



directions like everyone else."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the...the order of...the Order of Consideration Postponed, we have heard those Bills. They should be the very last priority and we should address ourselves to Bills that we have not heard. And I would suggest that you do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, before we go into that order of business then, is there anyone here that'd like to have his Bill called on Third Reading as having a Senate Bill? ...One other time now. Mr. McLendon, what Bill do you have?"

McLendon: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 1203...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record....does the Gentleman have leave? Kindly him as 'aye' on 1203. Elmer, for you anything. What do you need? What's the Bill number? Okay. On the Motion of Concurrence, Mr. Conti? Is that Concurrence? All right, what's the Bill number?"

Conti: "House Bill 2332, they amended it in the Senate right after the word 'commissioner'...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me just tell you this that that...that can wait for a little while. What about Senate Bills? Mr. McBroom, what Bill do you have?"

McBroom: "I have Senate Bill 1239, Mr. Speaker, if it's convenient for you now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "And where is that on the Calendar? 1259?"

McBroom: "Yeah. Yes, Mr. Ryan is the Senate Sponsor. It's on Short Debate...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, it's on Short Debate?"

McBroom: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Fine. That's located on page...page 4, Senate Bill 1259. Mr. McBroom will handle it for Mr. Ryan. Please proceed, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1259. A Bill for an Act relating to the commissioners and deputy commissioners of banks and trust companies. Third Reading of the Bill."

McBroom: "Yes...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, this provides for a very modest increase



for the commissioners, the first deputy commissioner and the deputy commissioner. It's a total cost to the State of Illinois of twenty-seven thousand dollars (\$27,000). The last time that they received a salary increase was 1971. And the way the statute's set up, as I understand it, Mr...Mr. Speaker, unless we act now these...these gentlemen will not be able to receive an increase until 1982. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any opposition? This is on Short Debate.

Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley. Oh, your light's on. You want to speak, Gerry? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1259 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I just wondered, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I see we've got a 118 votes. It seems to me that it might be illegal to cut a term and raise a salary at the same time. We've got the votes, it looks like you have the votes for it, that's what I was sitting here wondering about. Yeah, it might be a futile act to do what we're doing. If...I...I know who this is going to affect that...I just...."

McBroom: "Well, Representative Bradley, I...I...I would not second guess you on that, ever since I've been a Member of the Legislature I've never tried to practice law and I'm not going to do it tonight. I understand that it's...it's legal and this is a posture that we should take. And I...I certainly solicit your support."

Bradley: "Well, I'm going to have to vote 'present' I think on that... on the Bill...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'ayes', 9 'nays', 14 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Anything else on Short Debate? All right, let's go back to Consideration Postponed as I was asked to do. Mr. Brady, what do you have?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I have one that was on...that we were going through Priority of Call, they were listed as Second Reading but it is on Third now. It's on the bottom of the page, Senate Bill 293."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which Calendar on which page?"

Brady: "It's...it's on the Supplemental, it is on the Priority Call.."





It's the last Bill printed on that page."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Brady: "It says Senate Bill 293. I think it's even on the Calendar on page 5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes. Well,...."

Brady: "The Bill was amended this morning and I would...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take a look at page 1 of the Supplemental Calendar.

It's Senate Bill 293. Mr. Clerk, would you kindly reflect the board? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 293. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, what this is is an attempt to do is smooth out the state cash flow progress...problem, pardon me. There are an awful lot of people who say that the impact of taking school money at one moment of the month causes difficulty with the cash flow and therefore puts us in a position of looking like we have less money than we take in. The revenue doesn't come in one day and the outgo...the tremendous outgo on school funding going out in one day causes a problem. There were 37 days where revenue fell more than....below the twenty million mark last year. And over half of those were attributed to school payments. If we do this I think we can smooth the cash flow, probably make a lot more money available for schools too. Comptroller Bakalis supports this and I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we had some problems with this in debate if I remember correctly, Mr. Brady, and I think you'd agreed it wasn't one that you thought should happen at this time. With the cash flow, the problem was that the money is going to be going out at one time rather than spread over a whole period of time. And there was some concern, especially late in the year in...in May and June that it could cause a real deficit in the spending. And that's why that the Committee did not get the Bill out and I'm really not sure it's one we ought to consider at this time, Mr. Brady."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "If...if I might respond to Representative Polk? This Bill was amended. It's not based on entitlement now, it doesn't push it up, it's just spreading the existing existing way we pay school money. It's about as economically sound an idea as we could present in any kind of type class....cash flow we might want. It does not change its spending on entitlement."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the Sponsor is correct. This is the Amendment that was Representative Hoffman's Amendment which... as I understand, removes the entitlement and now we have two monthly payments for distribution of general aid money to the schools. This is consistent with what we have been doing over the last couple of years and that's just trying to straighten out the line on cash flow. And I support the Bill totally. And I solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. This was Amendment this afternoon and I can support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. The question is, shall Senate Bill 293 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', ..... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 148 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. DiPrima, do you want that Bill called?"

DiPrima: "I respectfully request that we temporarily hold it up. I'll get to it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we....got just a couple more minutes to go through. Who? He's got to check with the Veteran's Organization. Mr. Tuerk, what Bill are you interested in? Mr. Fred Tuerk from Peoria please."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a very important Bill on the Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah? What's that?"

Tuerk: "Of which I am the hyphenated sponsor and apparently the first name as Sponsor is not going to call the Bill so I would like to call it. It happens to be Senate Bill 600."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're not on that order of business."



Tuerk: "You asked if there were any Bills that were on the Calendar that ought to be called and I want to call Senate Bill 600 'cause there's a lot of people on this floor that wanted to be recorded on that Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Show me where it's on the Calendar. Thank you."

Tuerk: "It's on a high priority of call on Priority of Call of the Calendar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Show me on the Calendar, please."

Tuerk: "Page 3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Clerk, would you kindly tell these Gentlemen where the Bill's at?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill was moved to Interim Study Calendar."

Tuerk: "Who moved that to Interim Study Calendar?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Tuerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Sponsor of the Bill."

Tuerk: "When?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Today."

Tuerk: "I'd like to hear the Sponsor of the Bill respond to that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate Sponsor told me earlier that he would hope that the Bill would be kept alive and put in the Interim Study. And I made out the proper form and placed that Bill in Interim Study Committee as he requested."

Tuerk: "Mr. Bradley, can I ask you a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mautino on a point of order." Was that motion filed as a result of a little conversation we had down by the Clerk's desk?"

Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Tuerk: "Well, I think there was an understanding that I was going to proceed and call that Bill."

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

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman asked to have the Clerk announce what happened to that Bill. The Clerk announced it and I say we move to another order of business. He's responded to the Gentleman's question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. House Bills Second Reading,



2414. Mr. Ryan. God love you too, Jack. Mr. Walsh on a point of order."

Walsh: "Yeah, on the last item of business, Mr. Speaker, apparently I voted or agreed to send that Bill, Senate Bill 600, to Interim Study so...having...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe you're incorrect."

Walsh: "Voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which ....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're on 2414...."

Walsh: "It was sent to Interim Study."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Kindly adjust the board. There was no vote on that, Mr. Walsh." Check, you better check it out with your Parliamentarian. You're lost without him. Okay, let's go. House Bill 2414."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2414. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Transportation Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Relax, Gentlemen, it'll be a long night. Mr. Telcser for Mr. Ryan. Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Skinner. Amends House Bill 2414 on page 3, line 20 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, the tank's deep but not deep enough to hold the cross-town sellout. Amendment #1 specifies that seventy million dollars (\$75,000,000) which will be spent for suburban mass transportation purposes will indeed be spent in Lake, Kane, McHenry, DuPage....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for one second....."

Skinner: "Will, suburban Cook County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...Mr. Bradley...Mr. Bradley, what purpose do you ...recognition?",

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering what in the world we're doing on 2414, it's a House Bill. And I believe it's exempt and we're trying to meet a deadline at midnight tonight. There are Bills to be considered. There are even Postponed Consideration that I think are more important than this exempt Bill, is that...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it's the intent of the Chair to briefly go through this Bill as quickly as possible."



Bradley: "How many Amendments are on the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "From my memory....I think it was around thirty."

Bradley: "Well, I don't....well....Mr. Speaker, that's...I just can't imagine we would stay in this order of business."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, if Mr. Telcser wants to withdraw this Bill at this time....."

Skinner: "Oh, shucks, he does that every time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's ready to go."

Skinner: "And we've built enough water supplies to float any tank that we might have...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Please proceed with your Amendment as the timer is on."

Skinner: "I don't know why the timer would be on, I'm not going to spend ten on this. I've already explained the Amendment. This is an Amendment to draw the facts that the Governor sold us out on RTA, to the public's attention."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, to respond."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly arise to oppose Amendment #1 from a Gentleman for whom I have...do have the highest regard, understanding very well his deep sensitivity and feeling about the RTA issue."

Skinner: "Isn't he kind?"

Telcser: "However, I must say that House Bill 2414 is not the vehicle to which the Gentleman should address himself but rather a Bill, or to a Bill that deals specifically with the RTA. House Bill 2414 is a very complex Bill. It involves an awful lot of work, an awful lot of money and I would hope that the Members of the Assembly would defeat the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #1...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Open up the board. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Well, Speaker, see, you're being somewhat autocratic."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's 33 Amendments on this Bill, it's...."

Skinner: "But certainly, but Representative Holewinski is grasping for the air."



Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll give him some recognition in a minute.

You want to explain your vote or not? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I just wish you'd proceed according to the House rules which...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We do."

Skinner: "...Difficult this evening."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to explain his vote. Jim."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, I think the chair acted out of character in both going to this Bill, keeping us here when we have matters before us on a deadline. You're only being a tool of the Majority Leader. That's not your posture usually, Representative. I think that this is untimely. Representative Telcser...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to explain your vote?"

Houlihan, J: "Is part of this hidden deal arrangement and it's a disgrace to the Legislature...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly confine your remarks to Amendment #1?"

Houlihan, J: "All right. Now Amendment #1 which is before us clearly should not be before us because, Representative Lechowicz, you're again abusing your rights as a leader and as a chair. And I would ask for a verification if this Amendment is defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski, to explain his vote."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more. We had questions that we wanted to ask. I don't even know what this Amendment does nor do most Members on this floor right now. I would agree that if we're going to proceed like this, we will ask for a verification on every single Amendment before us."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's your choice. Mr. Bradley to explain his vote."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really intended to get up and ask some questions of the Amendment... of the Sponsor of the Amendment and we were cut off and denied that right. I regret that it happened but it appears to me that this Amendment in the form that it's in right now, looks to me like there are a few errors that we could correct before we vote on it. But I'm going to support the Amendment and if it does...does fail I think that we ought to have a verification and get to the....really get to the



guts of the issue. And I hope that the Sponsor of the Amendment could reply in some way to just giving some assurance that...that the Amendment's in good shape. I regret very much that we're in this posture, Mr. Speaker, when those of us....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone else want to be recognized? Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'yes' for this Amendment. Now, it may not be a very good Amendment, I don't really think it probably is. But it appears to me that we can do something very good with this Amendment if we just all vote 'aye'. I think we would get out of here pretty soon and wouldn't...do this silly considering of these Amendments until some other time. It doesn't appear to me that it's an exempt Bill, it has to be done right now. And if we put this one on and if that doesn't convince, we put the next one on, I'll venture to say that there would be a delay."

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

Matijevich: "No, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move to defer action on this Bill, the motion is order until tomorrow at five o'clock. And that...and that motion is in order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Sir, you can't do it in the middle of a Roll Call."

Matijevich: "Yes, I can."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Parliamentarian, you can't. Is there anyone else that want to explain their vote? Let me point out to you that kindly vote your own switch. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2414, as everyone knows is Representative Ryan's Bill. He has been off...he is off the floor and he asked me to handle it. Frankly, I had no idea that this would raise so many problems and concerns for the Members. The last thing I want to do is deny the privilege for Members. They have questions about a Bill, I thought it'd be a good time to call it tonight. Mr. Speaker called it. And in deference to some of the Members who seem to have an exceptional amount of interest in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that it is exempt, I would ask you



to take it out of the record and we'll call it tomorrow at a time when the Members are more rested and perhaps in better attendance. And give them a chance when we do adjourn tonight to go home and carefully read every Amendment so that when they're here tomorrow they'll be very well prepared and could perhaps limit the questions and the amount of time that it will take to hear these Bills which is quite complex and has a...a large number of Amendments. And so I do want to give every courtesy possible to those Members who have risen to express concern that the Bill wouldn't be fully considered."





Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there consent to dump this Roll Call and take this Bill out? Hearing no objection, dump the Roll Call. The Bill is taken out of the record, and it's to remain on Second Reading. Okay, let's go back to the original order of call like the Speaker wanted. Consideration Postponed, which is located on page 6. House Bill 2410, Mr. Totten. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 23, Mr. Jones."

Jones, E.: "Oh, boy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 23..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute, Emil, let him read the rest of the Bill. Did you read it? Okay, fine. Please proceed."

Jones, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the controversy has been cleared up regarding Senate Bill 23. There was a rumor going around that the Senate Sponsor didn't want the Bill; but when we heard this Bill in Financial Institutions, the Governor's Office testified in favor of it. There has been no Amendments placed on this Bill in the House; and I ask for your favorable vote on Senate Bill 23."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I point out to you that on Consideration Postponed, it's been a known policy of one proponent and one opponent. Then you have the opportunity of explaining your votes. Are there any opponents? Any opponents to Senate Bill 23? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Mann: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I've sat here, and I've watched and I've listened. You've got seniority over some Members, I've got seniority over you, don't abuse the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't try to, Bob. Let me tell, all I can tell you is that as far as...and I'm trying to do a job, that's the way I was told. And I'm on the Order of Consideration Postponed. Now..."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, there has been no rule or regulation or customs saying that there was one proponent and one opponent with regard to Bills on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...I was just told that. We suspended the rule the



other night, and I was reminded by...that fact by the Parliamentarian."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill affecting an industry. There is an Amendment on it. The Sponsor has not explained it to us, except to say that the Senate Sponsor is for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mann, we adopted a rule the other night on items Consideration Postponed that...be short debate, and there be one proponent, one opponent, and you can explain your vote. Now..."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, if you...if you adopted such a rule..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...I didn't, the House..."

Mann: "...you ought to un-adopt it because all you have to do is lose a Bill, then put it on Postponed Consideration and jam it right through the House."

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

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 23, there has...this Bill has not been amended. It is one of a series of Bills that concerns the currency exchange industry. I, among others, initiated a ...a drive to regulate this industry. When Governor Thompson was elected, he joined. And these Bills are Cosponsored by Republicans and Democrats. The same Bills that were drafted by the Governor's staff with our consent were started in the Senate and started in the House. The Bills that came from the Senate were sponsored by ...this one by Representative Jones, others by others. Our intention was to have all of the Bills passed; and the House, and the Senate have been most cooperative. When Representative Jones intro...got up to pass this Bill last week, Representative Collins indicated that this Bill shouldn't pass. As one who perhaps took most of the heat during the past three years on this series, I'm interested in getting all of the Bills to the Governor's desk so that he can find the ones that will give the best service to the general public. And I heartily recommend that we pass Senate Bill 23, which is the last in this series, and get on with the business."

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

Mann: "Yes, will the Sponsor, please, explain the Bill in their present form?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jones."



Jones, E.: "Yes, yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only change in this Bill that was made in the Senate, which was a Senate Amendment, is that it gave the Director the power to set lower fees for cashing public aid checks, Bob Mann, that you've always concerned yourself about. If he can set a lower fee for cashing public aid checks, he will do so if it is within the...within the Constitution. Also, it gives the Director the power to fine or suspend a licensee for any violation of the rules and regulations as set forth. These are the two major changes made by the Senate Amendment. But as I foresaid, there were no Amendments in the House. The Governor's Office testified for the Bill before our House Committee; and I ask for a favorable vote."

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

Taylor: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', those opposed by ...'no'; the previous question has been moved. The question is, shall Senate Bill 23 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am voting against this Bill for one reason only. I've read the letter from our former Majority Leader that was sitting on my desk--I don't know why it was here, but it was--saying what a good Bill this was and it reforms the currency exchange laws. Since I have become a Legislator, I have tried to find someone who will tell me, who will help my constituents who want to buy food stamps from currency exchanges. I tried to get the Attorney General to help me, I tried to get the Walker administration to help me. Nobody has given me the answer why a currency exchange must belong at \$30 a month to the Currency Exchange Association in order to be able to handle food stamps. I think this is a disgrace. It's something that's not addressed in this Bill, and I'm not going to do one darn thing for the currency exchanges until I get an answer to the questions I've been asking for two years."



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

Bowman: "Yes, Speaker, I also refer to the letter on...that was put on our desks by, apparently, by Gerald W. Shea and Associates. I think that was a breach of the rules which we should not tolerate. And I plan to vote against any Bill which is lobbied in this fashion. I think it's a disgrace."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As one of the Sponsors of Bills that were tabled in order that these Bills might survive, because we had a multiplicity of Bills on the same subject, I'm calling upon you to support this measure because even if this...ever if this does not address itself to all the problems, it does eliminate some of the problems that persist in the City of Chicago. Therefore, I'm asking you to vote for this Bill; and at a later date we will do something to help alleviate the other problems, which I recognize as well as you do. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. I happen to live in the black community. I know something about the black community. I don't understand many of these people who're always talking about they're willing to help that community, when they have money in those doggone banks and won't bring them into our area. The currency exchanges are the only one that's doing anything in our area. And I suggest that you vote for this Bill if you want to do something for the area that you say you want to do something for."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones, to explain his vote."

Jones, E.: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to Representative Willer's question, the currency exchange industry does sell food stamps. But for your information the people in your community who might happen to need food stamps, they pay more for the food



stamps at the post office than the people in the City of Chicago pay at the currency exchange. I want...that's for your edification. But as far as the Bill itself is concerned, even as far as the letter that was distributed by our former Majority Member, who served quite eloquently in this House, and whom I hold the highest respect for, I asked that that letter be circulated to help clear up some of the facts; but I resent the fact that his name was used to such a degree that he happened to have a letter passed in this Body which he served with honor. But this is a very good Bill. As I stated earlier, the Governor's Office supported this piece of legislation. We worked for many months holding hearings in the City of Chicago as well as here in Springfield in an attempt to get some regulation within the currency exchange industries. And I solicit some more green votes for this piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 84 'ayes', and 21 'nays' and 23 recorded as 'present'...oh, I'm sorry, Deacon, the lights must have just went out. I'm sorry, I didn't see it. Excuse me for one second. Well, the board is closed, what we'll do is...well...yeah, we'll dump the Roll Call and start with a new one. Dump the Roll Call. The question is, shall Senate Bill 23 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'; the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Corneal Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis, C.: "Now, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to mention one aspect that I don't think has been mentioned. There are a lot of currency exchanges out in our neighborhood, and I think they work very diligently on it. To help this industry straighten itself out and to give reasonable charges, make reasonable charges for cashing checks. But one thing I want to make clear to you and that is this that there are a lot of people working in those currency exchanges, especially young black women. Now what do you want to do? Do you want to fire them? Where are they going? Where are they going for a job



with all of the unemployment out here? I want you to take that into consideration. You're going to do nothing if you close them down but put them on relief. And there are a lot of people out there that the banks won't take their checks. The only place they can go to cash them is the currency exchanges. And I would say to you that the best thing you can do if you want to help us out there is to vote 'aye' on this because a real effort has been made to clean up this industry. And I don't think we ought to use these personal attacks on anyone."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will please take the roll. On this question there's 79 'ayes', 17 'nays', 27 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman asks leave to poll the absentees. Is that correct, Mr. Jones?"

Jones, E.: "Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone has expressed themselves on this issue and I would not waste the time of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Poll the absentees. Mr. Jack Davis wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Yourell and Davis, Jack Davis. Mr. Matejek as 'aye'. Did you get those three, Jack?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I got Matejek and Jack Davis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And Mr. Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Bartulis, Bradley, Brandt, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Collins..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Caldwell? Kindly record him as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Conti, Cunningham, Deavers, Deuster, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Ewell, Ewing, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Hanahan, Hoffman, Holewinski..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Holewinski as 'aye', please. Mr. J. David Jones as 'aye', please."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Huskey, Jaffe, Kelly, Kempiners, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Leinenweber, Madison..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Anderson? Kindly record him as 'aye'."



Clerk O'Brien: "...Lynn Martin, McAuliffe, McAvoy, Meyer, Miller, Peters, Pierce, Ryan, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Stanley, Stearney, Totten, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall and Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "'Aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. McBroom as 'aye'. Mr. Hanahan as 'aye'. Mr. Deuster as 'aye'. Mrs. Hoxsey as 'aye'. Deuster. Mr. McCourt as 'aye'. Mr. Miller as 'aye'. Mr. Waddell as 'aye'. Mr. Keats as 'aye'. Mr. Jaffe as 'aye'. Mr. Deavers as 'aye'. No, he won't. Mrs. Geo-Karis as 'aye'. Mr. Levin as 'aye'. Mr. Pechous as 'aye'. Mr. Simms as 'no'. Mr. Skinner as 'present'. Anyone else? Clerk, will you kindly tally the Roll Call, please? 99 'ayes'...will you kindly record Mr. Telcser as 'present'. I don't know how he's recorded...99 'ayes', 18 'nos'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Senate Bill 161, Mr. Deuster...Consideration Postponed."



Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 161 is a very important Bill for all of us who are interested in special education. Unfortunately, this was called last Friday just before the Anita Bryant Resolution when the Membership was down. What this does is that some ten years ago, we gave our local school districts permissive authority to impose a two cent tax for special education building purposes. That had an eight year limit on it. It had eight year limit...Senate Bill 161 extends that so this existing authority will continue. It also broadens it so it may be used for other special education purposes. I think this is a very good Bill. It had been discussed. It does not cost the State of Illinois any money. It...it doesn't hurt anybody. It allows our local schools to continue their ability to help the needs of special education children. Out in my area we have used this authority and raised local money. It's local effort. Our taxpayers have been willing to utilize this authority to help the special education children. I urge your support for this Bill. It's very, very important and is supported by everyone I know interested in the special education of our children."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there an opponent? Mr. Schneider...DuPage."

Schneider: "Just to...thank you, Mr. Speaker, and just be certain that you're aware of what 161 does. 161 is converted from the provisions of the previous law which was that you could levy the taxes without referendum for a special building fund for special education. That is to say that the outlying, outside of Chicago districts levied that tax, Chicago did not. Now what is more important, however, is now you're expanding that authority to include a nonreferendum tax for special education, tax rates of four cents per unit district, two cents for elementary and two cents for the high school districts. I think it's not a bad Bill if we could finally levy all these taxes to the point where it would reduce the cost to the State of Illinois. Unfortunately this Bill does not accomplish anything except to expand the authorities to increase taxes; to expand the program. And I think more time has to be done in consideration of the Bill. And I would ask a 'no' vote on this proposal."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill #161 pass? All in





favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this goes well beyond what the Act does presently now. It's really opening it up to a taxation for all of special education on a local basis beyond the building fund and beyond the eight year max as was written into the law. I think that this will create a tax situation on local bodies and I don't think this is a good legislation at this time."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the people who need the special education are less fortunate than we are and we cannot just close our eyes to their needs. This is a very important Bill and I certainly urge your favorable consideration because those ...you know, we could have been in their shoes. So let's see if we can't them, they're less fortunate than we are. It's an important Bill, let's get some more 'aye' votes on there."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I reluctantly agree with the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Education that this really is a bad Bill. And not only does it extend a tax that was placed without referendum but it expands the purpose for which that tax may be used. The levy was for the purpose of retiring bonds for the building of special education buildings. And is now, can be used for any other purpose that the special education units may decide that it can be used for. As was discussed when this Bill first came up, perhaps the...this...this can be used but I think the people ought to have an opportunity - and we ought to have an opportunity - to really examine. If we, if we were to do this for everything for which we permit a...a limited term and a limited pur....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, your time is up, Sir. The Gentleman...the Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ...I think we have a good piece of legislation here because all we're



doing here is extending something that has been on, as the Sponsor said, for the last eight years. And there's many areas of our state that's going to be really hurt on special education if we do not carry on and pass this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote. He's not here. The Gentleman from...have all voted who wish? Have all voted...."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote briefly. We have used this levy to build buildings. This is extremely important. It was mentioned that this broadens the authority, yes, the buildings can be maintained and that if there's anything we believe in, it's allowing the local people to help out the children. I want to emphasize three parts of this Bill. It doesn't cost the state a penny. It doesn't hurt Chicago. And it allows our local people to ...to carry the freight if they want to. If they don't like what their local school boards are doing they can throw them out. But if there's anything people's legislation and children's legislation, it's this Bill. And I hope that we'll have more votes on there and at the appropriate time I hope it's close enough, I would like to request a poll of the ....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Reed, to explain her vote."

Reed: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm reminded of one special ed district in Lake County that has an eighty-eight thousand dollar (\$88,000) deficit from last year and is at the top of their levy. Now where on earth is that district to go to? If they are given the leeway of being able to transfer their funds within their special ed district they perhaps can cope with something that under no circumstances can they handle otherwise. This is good legislation. It's desperately needed by the special education districts all over the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman...the Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I believe this, too, is a good piece of legislation and with all the mandates that the state continues to hand down to the local school districts, I believe the time is now



to turn around and help them in some small way. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I believe there's a misunderstanding about this Bill.

It does not raise the amount of money it just simply gives the local districts, the districts the privilege of using the money anyway that they desire including contracts even with private agencies for service that the public schools cannot handle. This is an important Bill and greatly needed. Look at your synopsis and reconsider your vote, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 83 'ayes', 49 'nays'. Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Boucek, Byers, Collins, Cunningham, DiPrima, Lonico, Ewell, Ewing, Friedland, Frisdrich, Getty, Giglio, Hoffman, Klosak, Kornovicz, Kozubowski, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Madison, Lyn Martin, Peggy Smith Martin, McAvoy, McPike, Meyer, Nardulli, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Stanley, Stearney, Totten, Von-Boeckman, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does anyone want to be recorded? For or against? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 83 'ayes', 49 'nays'. This Bill having not received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 207, Mr. Terzich? I believe he requested that item go on the Interim Study. Senate Bill 312, Mr. Yourell. Is the Gentleman on the floor? 312. Senate Bill 312. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 312. This Bill's been read a third time previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 312 gives counties the authority to levy a .015% tax to cover the cost of publication of county notices. The counties do not presently have the power to levy a special tax for purpose ...for this purpose. Now you know that early in this Session we raised the publication cost for these counties but we did not give them the opportunity to levy a tax for the increased cost. Now



Senate Bill 312 also contains a provision which exempts the publication tax from the scope of the county tax. This exception provision is necessary to make this tax a separate tax in accordance with Illinois case law and to...and to avoid having to enact ultra vires provision. Now this tax in addition to any other applicable statutory limitation on taxes. And I know that the counties desperately need the money when we mandate a program to counties or any other units of local government by increasing the rates by which publications can be published, then it follows that we should allow the counties to enact a tax to cover the increased cost of fulfilling a legislative mandate. This is up to the county board. If the county board does not want to do this they don't have to. The...the act is in their power to enact or not to make law. And they're the ones that have to answer to the voters. If they want to do this they can. And I would suggest that you help your counties out and allow them to have this privilege of enacting this new tax by giving us a favorable response to Senate Bill 312. This does not apply to Cook County only to counties of a million population, with less than a million."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who wants to speak in opposition? Mr. Skinner?  
Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you, Speaker 'C'. Correct me if I'm wrong but I believe that this is the second two and a-half cent increase in county taxes without a referendum that we will have passed today if this Bill passes. Now some of you may want to be held responsible for that. Those of you in Cook County could care less but those of us in down-state may not want to be held responsible for it. And those who don't might want to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 312 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, want to explain your vote?"

Yourell: "Well, thank you. I don't know what happened. All those 82 votes who were up there before, I urge...there was...there was going to be some work done on this Bill but obviously it wasn't done."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 59 'aye's', 47 'nays', 3 recorded as



'present'. This Bill having failed to receive Constitutional Majority hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 359. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer. Gentleman.....Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as 'no' on the...last Bill please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On 312?"

Harris: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection? Kindly record the Gentleman as 'no' on 312. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, on 359. Clerk...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 359. This Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 359 was explained at length on Monday when I put it on Postponed Consideration. Since then, Representative Leinenweber introduced an Amendment which we accepted to tighten up that portion of the Bill that dealt with the right of the minor to look at his records or counsel for the minor. It deals specifically with three things in the change of records that they keep on minors. And I would explain it briefly and hope for a favorable vote. It does three things....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'am."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, may I have some order please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Could we have a little order in the chamber please? Kindly give the Lady your attention. Please proceed, Ma'am."

Willer: "Yes. This Bill amends the Juvenile Court Act to provide that no law enforcement officer or other person or agency may transmit records of persons who have been arrested or taken into custody or any fingerprints, photographs or individually identifiable information relating to a minor who has been investigated for the commission of an offense, arrested or taken into custody before his 17th birthday unless a court should authorize the same. The second thing it does, the Act also provides that police records pertaining to minors shall, upon written request, be open to inspection by the minor. This is a section that Representative Leinenweber amended. We accepted the Amendment so that any police contact and we could take a MEG agent



I guess as an example, would not be uncovered and so a minor may look at his records unless the law enforcement officials say that for reasons of exposing a contact and they get a court order forbidding him to look at it. The third part of the Bill deals with the discretion of a court to give upon its own...a motion of interested parties to destroy, or the minor to destroy or expunge the law enforcement records pertaining to that case. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there an opponent or discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this bad Bill. Representative Leinenweber, my running mate's suggestions to it indeed made it a little bit better but it is still a bad Bill. I think all of those in this chamber that are committed to course of law and order of the 80th General Assembly has been and would recognize the onerous provision or possibility of removing and expunging a juvenile record so as not to be available at a later date in the event of repeat felonies when the juvenile reaches his majority is doing a vast disservice to the community and to the credibility of the jurisprudence system in disposing of a future case. We...all aware....we are all aware that many, many heinous crimes are now committed by those under the age of 19 and even those under the age of 17. Those records should not be expunged. They should be available. They should be readily available for future action in the event of repeat felonies and...and...and recidivism posture of a repeat felon juvenile when he reaches his majority. I strongly urge you to defeat this bad Bill once again."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 369 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote. No? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Lee. Lee. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, wants to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Well, I'm afraid this isn't going to make it. I...I think the...Mr. Davis is...is unduly concerned. There is after all, a provision here for the expunging only after a court hearing. This



is to bring the statutes into compliance with the laws as is presently interpreted by the Illinois Supreme Court. So I...I think the...there have been some scare tactics here. But I'm afraid it's not going to make it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, I would simply like a poll of the absentees at the proper time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Lady's entitled to that. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to explain her vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, all that this Bill calls for is...is a part of what a commission on juvenile delinquency has been promising us they were going to do with this file for the last four or five years ever since the juvenile file was placed in... in...under their custody and under their control. They also promise to expunge a lot more than just this. But they have not done so. And this is really only now requiring them by statute, finally, to do those things which they have promised of which the court has told them they should and must do. And I would urge the Members of this body to become a part of that movement and see that they do their...the law as pronounced by our courts has required them to do and what they promised to do for about four years."

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

Johnson: "I just want to give an example of how this would apply. If a 21 year old accused murderer brought into court before the judge, the judge...if this law were enacted into law here tonight, would have no knowledge nor would the State Attorney of what previous record that individual might have had. He might have been convicted in the juvenile system of fifty offenses before that and yet in setting bond or otherwise, nobody would have any knowledge of this. I think it's a definitely anti law and order Bill and ought to be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone else? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 55 'ayes', 53 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 382. Mr.



McMaster."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 382. This Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think a few folks will remember the conversation of...discussion...debate between Representative Greiman and myself the other day or other night. We went into this quite extensively. I don't want...to take a great deal of your time. And really all it does is continue with what is going on presently and which most of the township supervisors of general assistance keep their books. They are audited by the township board of auditors on a periodic basis. But I think that when it's necessary to pay bills for those people who are on township welfare, township general assistance, I think would be very difficult for the supervisor to run all over going to the town clerk and so forth to get orders signed so that he might pay those bills. I would urge your support in this good piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, in opposition."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if you recall the debate on this yesterday, this is a debate on a township Bill that pertains to only one township in the entire state and that happens to be the township that I live in,...Niles Township. It really is a fight between...between the Democrats and Republicans in Niles Township. The court has already adjudicated this matter and this particular Bill flies in the face really of the court's decision and I must say it's really just a grudge Bill filed by the Republican Senator in my particular district. I'm sort of surprised at my good friend from Knox County. I've never gotten involved in a county political fight. I don't know why he should get involved in a Niles Township political fight. It's a bad Bill. It only pertains to my township and I think we should tube this Bill and give it a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 382 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Greiman: "No, that's...that's okay, if it gets up there I'll do it otherwise...."





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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular Bill, Representative Jaffe brought up a point, it is an internal matter. It's interesting that a judge ruled there is only one township in this entire state for the person in charge of public assistance is not allowed to keep their own records. One township in the whole rotten state. Have...we haven't heard of judges legislating, that's the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard of. One judge decides he knows better than the Legislature, the elected officials, you name it, that judges knows more and he makes a decision that is unrelated to the rest of the world. How many times have we turned around the floor of the House and said 'What the devil are these judges doing to us?' Here's an example. A judge makes a decision that affects one township and makes that one township different from every other township and every other county in the entire State of Illinois. I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Yes, it does only involve Skokie but the Bill definitely intends to clear who maintains the custody of the records. The Cities, Villages and Township Act should spell that out. And if a judge has made a wrong decision on it then we should spell it out for him. This Bill merely intends to let the clerk know that he is the custodian of the records and he should not become involved in the General Assistance to begin with."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to be brief and read to you a letter dated June 17th.

'The Township Clerk's Association of Cook County unanimously recommends a 'no' vote on Third Reading on Senate Bill 382'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for being a blabbermouth



tonight but the truth of the matter is I can assure you that the Township Officials Organization downstate and those Township Supervisors and Clerks in Will County, my county, are for this Bill. And we can't really help it, we're...we're a backbone township downstate county and we want this Bill and we think it's a very good Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, to explain his vote."

McMaster; "Well, Mr. Speaker, since I didn't get a chance to explain my vote...or to close, I will explain my vote. In reply to Representative Yourell who read the letter from the Cook County Township Clerk's Association, let me say that the Cook County Township Officials Association have conveyed word to me that they as a whole are in support of this legislation. I would urge more green votes, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, to explain her vote. Miss Pullen, I'm sorry."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I find it very strange that this is supposed to be a political situation when you consider that in a township in question all the township officials are of one political party. This is not a political situation. It is justice. I should think that Niles Township and I'm sure the residents there would resist the fact, I certainly do as a Representative of Niles Township, would resent the fact that they have been made a special case by a court in Illinois. This court has legislated instead of judging and I think we should tell them what we want the law to be. It simply clarifies the Township Act so that Niles Township would be in the same condition as the other townships in Illinois. It's a good Bill. It's a fair Bill. And I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote."

Greiman: "Well, my only comment is really that we have had over the years a...problems with accounting on general assistance. This is serious...serious matter to me. How funds are spent on general assistance in Niles Township, in every township, is a...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed, that was my mistake."

Greiman: "That's important I think that we continue, I don't know how you feel but in my township even though...even though my party



is now in power, I like the idea of their being a certification of those general assistance payments. There's a precondition of the issuance of those checks. I think that makes sense. We do it in the State of Illinois, we should do it in Niles Township too."

Speaker Lechowicz, "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.

Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Will you poll the absentees please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, I will." At the appropriate time would you kindly poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, let me say that as I look over the floor, I can see many buttons that are green that are not on the here...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Jaffe: "And if it gets 89 I would certainly ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Let you override. Clerk will poll the absentees please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Bowman, Breslin, Byers, Collins, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Friedland, Friedrich, Hart, Hoffman, Huskey, Emil Jones,...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jones, 'aye', please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Klosak, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Lucco, Madison, Lyn Martin, McAvoy, McClain, Meyer, Murphy, Nardulli, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Sharp, Steurney, E. G. Steele, Willer, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change my 'no' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Taylor as 'aye'. Mr. Taylor Pouncey as 'aye'. Mrs. Willer?"

Willer: "Vote me 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record her as 'no'. Mr. Caldwell as 'aye'. Kindly record...Mr. Michael McClain as 'aye'. On this question there are 87 'ayes' and 53 'noes'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 467, Mr. Giorgi. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Representative Kane, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kane: "For purpose of a motion. It's now quarter past ten, Mr. Speaker,



and I would move that we suspend the appropriate rule and dispense of explanation of votes from now until midnight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, may I just...may I just point out to you though we're on Consideration Postponed. And in turn there was a rule adopted that according to the Parliamentarian that it's a Short Debate Calendar and it's really...I would hope that you would hold that motion because it's the only opportunity individuals have to explain their positions in a minute. And I think that it's working...maybe not as well as some people would like, but you still have an opportunity to debate and asks questions in questions and answer period on explaining your vote. Please hold that. Please. I think you'd just bring this place into a turmoil."

Kane: "I think we could...if we could just put that to a quick vote, up or down, I'd be willing to take that. I think that all of these Bills have been debated once fully and I think...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's just hold it for a while, okay, please? Senate Bill 467."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 467. This Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave of the House to move this Bill from the Order of Third Reading to the Order of Second for the purpose of an Amendment? This is on the Circuit Clerk's salary schedule and I would amend Cook County down to....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does...the Gentleman is asking leave to bring this Bill from Third on Postponed Consideration to Second for an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 467 and so forth."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 goes into Cook County, the section of the Bill dealing with Cook County, and amends the salary of the Circuit Clerk of Cook County from fifty thousand down to forty-two thousand five hundred which is his present salary. And I urge the adoption of the Amendment. That is his present salary. The Amendment is on everyone's desk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman...is there any opposition? Or any



discussion on the Amendment? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Telcser: "Representative, as I understand your Amendment, you are taking the Cook County Clerk out of this pay raise altogether?"

Giorgi: "No...I'm moving...."

Telcser: "In effect you are."

Giorgi: "Taking him out completely."

Telcser: "Did you answer yes, Representative?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Telcser: "Or the Cook County Clerk will now be out of the Bill with this Amendment? That's fine. Thank you. I support the Amendment."

Giorgi: "I have the salaries of every Circuit Clerk...in Illinois if anyone's interested. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment, please. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, on the...on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Now...now with regard to counties with a population of one million or less, does it still have mandated pay scales in it or have you...are you placing in it a range within the board can select....."

Giorgi: "From...from three hundred thousand (300,000) to one million (1,000,000) population. The range is twenty-nine thousand (29,000). No range, just twenty-nine thousand (29,000)."

Tipsword: "So they're mandated salaries below that. And it doesn't say not more than twenty-nine, it just says twenty-nine, is that right?"

Giorgi: "That's correct." Twenty-seven in the counties from two hundred to three hundred thousand. Twenty-three thousand to counties a hundred to two hundred thousand. Fifty thousand to a hundred thousand is twenty thousand and fifteen thousand to fifty thousand, eighteen thousand."

Tipsword: "So those boards will have no discretion in those counties."

Giorgi: "That's true."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Further discussion on the Amendment? The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor signify by



saying 'aye', all those opposed....? Amendment #1 is adopted.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to Third Reading Consideration Postponed.

I'm sorry. Mr. Giorgi, what?"

Giorgi: "You want to call it up immediately or do you want to hold for a while?"

Speaker Lechowicz: ".....IF we have leave, I.... Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I object to it be called at all....it's been on Second Reading, Amendment was adopted and it cannot be called today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Objections have been raised and in turn your point is well taken. Unless you want to move, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "This takes 89 votes? I move that we suspend the appropriate rule for the immediate consideration of Senate Bill 467."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms. It only takes 89 votes."

Simms: "If...if I could ask a question. Zeke, will...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, 89...."

Simms: "Will this pay raise take effect immediately or 1980 when the new Circuit Clerks are elected? Are they now appointed in.... officers of the court as the Attorney General has indicated?"

Giorgi: "After the next election."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Zeke. Pardon me. Mr. Giorgi, there have been objections to it and it takes a 107 votes. I think you just better leave it where it's at. Well, it was amended today. According to the Parliamentarian it takes 107. I thought it took 89, too. Mr. Matijevich, point of clarification whether it takes 89 or a 107."

Matijevich: "Yeah, well, I thought when the...when you don't get leave of the House, the Sponsor may by motions with 89 suspend that rule. I...I can...pretty quick here, I believe. It's under Section on Amendments wherever the hell that's at. It's getting late to do anything."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, I know, John. According to the Parliamentarian you better take a look at 35-C and it takes a 107."

Matijevich: "If unanimous consent is denied, leave of the House may



be granted by a vote of 89 Members. 35-D, that's what I'm looking at. 35-D. Take a look at that, Dave. 'If unanimous consent is denied under this rule, leave of the House may be granted by vote of 89 Members'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Parliamentarian wasn't here when the motion was stated. The motion, correct me if I'm wrong, was to...for immediate consideration after the Bill was amended. It was put back on Consideration Postponed Third Reading and the Gentleman asked leave to have the Bill called on Third Reading after it was amended today. Mr. Giorgi, leave it where it's at."

Giorgi: "I'll proceed with the motion because if I can't proceed with the motion the Bill will be dead anyway. I might as well take a chance on the vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed with the motion. The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule 35-C for the immediate consideration of Senate Bill 467 as amended. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. According to the Parliamentarian it takes a 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? We'll verify when we get to a 177. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan, D: "Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Membership to give Representative Giorgi the necessary number of votes so that he may have his Bill considered. This is the last day for consideration of this Bill and to meet the concern as expressed by many Members of this House, he has amended the Bill to remove any salary increase for the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County. This has no applicability therefore to Cook County. But I think in fairness to the Sponsor of the Bill and because of the salary increase that it proposes for other circuits other than Cook County, I think he's entitled to a Roll Call on the Bill. And in order to do that we need a 107 votes. I think it would be the courteous and the fairest thing to do and I would ask you to support this motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, I would disagree with the distinguished Gentleman that just spoke. In the first place, we're told by the Sponsor that the



effect of these raises does not take place until these people are elected again. And that will be in 1980, as I understand it, so there's no particular rush. I submit that a 107 is more difficult to get and so we ought to deny the 107 just in case they should be able to get 89 on the question. Now I submit also that the raises requested, especially the raise requested for the Circuit Court Clerk of Cook County, to fifty-one thousand dollars (\$51,000) is absolutely ridiculous. And just because it was introduced that way the Bill should not be considered."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi, on the question I believe the...."

Giorgi. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. ...This question there's 101 'ayes', 22 'nays', I recorded as 'present'. Gentleman asks leave to poll the absentees. Pardon me? No, they haven't. Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "If I could move to have this placed on Interim Study, or leave to have to it on Interim Study...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave to put this Bill on Interim Study, 467?"

Unknown: "You didn't try very hard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave is granted. Senate Bill 478, Mr. Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 478. This Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mugalian: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Mugalian: "We were told that once there was a Roll Call on any matter involving Postponed Consideration that you were thereafter completely barred from getting it on Interim Study. Now is there one rule for one Sponsor and another rule for another?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, Sir. That was a Roll Call to suspend the rule."

Mugalian: "I heard first hand that that was the Speaker's order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now, now, wait. Sir, that was a Roll Call to suspend the rule to hear that Bill on Third Reading. It was not a motion... it was not a motion on passage of the Bill. Senate Bill 478, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 478,





there was an objection by Mr. Schlickman when the Bill was first heard regarding what the loss of revenue might be to the State of Illinois and Representative Conti showed some concern about that also. It dealt...or deals with mutual funds investing in municipal bonds. And Mr. Conti was concerned as what the loss of revenue might be to the State of Illinois and the Department of Revenue indicated to the best of their ability they could not determine what that loss might be in the double taxation that we presently have, the taxes...the mutual fund being taxed and then upon distribution of the...the interest due to those people who have invested in mutual funds from the municipal bond, they again, would be taxed and double taxation would exist. Now since that...that time we have amended the Bill and we have provided for the state to enrich the coffers of the State Treasury by taxing those people who have earned income in the State of Illinois but live outside of the State of Illinois and consequently are not liable and are not paying income tax to the State of Illinois on those dollars earned in the State of Illinois. It's a different concept than we had when 478 was before us initially. I think both sides of the aisle and especially the other side should probably show...show quite a bit of interest in here because we're going to have income that the Governor had not anticipated prior to 478. And I urge that we get 89 votes for Senate Bill 478."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any...."

Bradley: "Incidentally, the Department is supporting the...the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any opponent? The question is, shall Senate Bill 478 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote." Mr. Walsh, do you want to explain your vote? Okay. All right. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, to explain his vote."

Bradley: "If that's within the rules, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is to explain my vote and I see we're getting the votes. But it's a good piece of legislation in its present form and it will enrich the coffers of the state. The good Lord knows we need...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish?"

Bradley: "Thank you, Sir."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 109...I'm sorry, a 111 'ayes', 9 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the...Mr. Giorgi requested that the Bill he sponsored be put in the Interim Study Calendar. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that cannot be done under the rules from the floor. House Resolution 232 provided that House Bills could be placed on the Interim Study Calendar. The purpose of that Resolution was to get us through the crunch for House Bills on the last day at the deadline point. House Resolution 232, however, had a self-destruct or a repealer in it and is repealed as of May 23, 1977. So I submit to you that Mr. Giorgi's Bill could not be put in the Interim Study Calendar nor could Mr. Bradley's Senate Bill 600...Mr. Bradley and Mr. Tuerk, Senate Bill 600, be put in the Interim Study Calendar. Those Bills are still on the Calendar, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, I'm sorry, you're wrong. We readopted the Resolution."

Walsh: "Mr...Mr...Mr...Speaker would you please point out how I am wrong? If you will refer to House Resolution 232, it repeals itself on May 23, 1977."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I just told you it was readopted. When was it readopted, Jack? We'll get back to you. It was readopted. Senate Bill 693...I'm sorry, Senate Bill 668, Representative Terzich put that Bill on Interim Study. Senate Bill 693. Let's update the board. Let's go. 693. Mr. Darrow."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman on the floor? You can handle the Bill for him? Okay, Mr. Polk. 693, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 693 is a Senate Bill by Senator Soper and Representative Darrow is handling it. He's been called off the floor temporarily and he asked if I would help him. It's designed to save this nonhome rule municipality's money when financing the water, sewer, electric and gas projects. There was one objection to it. The Bill has been amended since then, we now have a frontdoor referendum. There should be no objections. I'd appreciate



a do pass."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any opposition? The question is, shall Senate Bill 693 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Glen. Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 124 'ayes', 3 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received.... would you kindly record Mr. Tuerk as 'aye'....it's a 125 'ayes'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Tipword 'aye'. Anyone else? Does the Gentleman have leave? Mrs. Summer as 'aye'. Lady have leave? Hearing no objections, so recorded. Senate Bill 710. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Summer. 710, Ma'am. Oh, I'm sorry. That's Sommer in the Senate. Mr. Von Boeckman. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Mr. Von Boeckman? Read....Senate Bill 732. Mr. Christensen. One moment, please. Mr. McMaster, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, in regards to Senate Bill 710 of Von Boeckman's in regard to county zoning, I believe that he and Mr. Schlickman arranged an Amendment to that that met my satisfaction. If there's any way that it can be heard and voted on tonight, I'm willing to go with it if...but....if Jimmy's Here. You want me to...well, I don't know whether the Amendment's out or anything else."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to handle that Bill, is that your request, Sir?"

McMaster: "I will if somebody has a copy of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We can give you the file in one second, we'll get back to it immediately after we get through with Mr. Christensen's Bill then."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 732, this Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen on Senate Bill 732."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to call 732 and 733, at the same time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman requests leave to call 732 and 733, is there any objections? Hearing none the Clerk will kindly read 733."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 733, this Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen on 732 and 733."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 732 is a Bill to create the Kankakee River Commission. It will be a ten member Commission to study the problems caused by the Kankakee River due to the large amount of water that is sent to us from Indiana. This has caused flooding, this caused million of dollars worth of damage plus it's filling with filth and the duty of the Commission will be to send back reports to recommend less legislation that would correct this. The appropriation is for twenty thousand dollars to cover the expenses for the Commission, this Commission is for one year only and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson wants to seek recognition, I got a note."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for several questions?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "This is short debate, Sir."

Johnson: "Short debate? Oh, I'm sorry, I will address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any opponents?"

Johnson: "Yes, I'm an opponent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Then address yourself to both Bills."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Bill that in my opinion is possibly one of the most unnecessary pork barrel Bills that will come before this General Assembly this year or any other year. The purported purpose of this Commission which creates a new bureaucracy consisting of ten members and costing the taxpayer twenty thousand dollars, it's to study the condition of the Kankakee River. As I understand it, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Division of Waterways the Illinois Water Survey and the Water Resources Commission are all charged in some way or another with that same responsibility. There has been studies done at this same river and the same condition over the course of the last twenty to twenty-five years and it's simply a situation where we're creating another government bureaucracy..... absolutely nothing new and nothing that's not already being done by other agencies of the state. And, if each one of us and I'm sure that everybody in this House has a river in their district... wants to create a special river, the Vermillion River Study Commission or the Kaskaskia River Commission, when there are already agencies charged with that same responsibility. Number one, the budget would go out of control and number two, any semblance of responsibility or control by the agencies of the state would have no rhyme or reason and I urge a 'no' on this very bad piece of legislation and waste of the taxpayers money."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 732 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay' The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword to explain his



vote."

Tipsword: "No, Sir. I have a question of the Chair, you might be able to enlighten me while we're doing this.... Can you tell me where food century three is?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, would you open the board please. I'm sorry, what?"

Tipsword: "Can you tell me where food for century three is on the Calendar?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Food for century three is in CDB's budget."

Tipsword: "Thank you, it's not up yet?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's see. I think the Amendments have been adopted but it hasn't been voted on."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers to explain his vote."

Deavers: "Now, I've been very nice to you once this evening and Representative Christensen got by without a verification but this time if you don't knock them off, the ones that are gone then we're going to grind her to a halt."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this particular piece of... two pieces of legislation. It seems unless that unless the pork barrel projects in this state are in a particular county they are no good but, it seems to me that this happens to be a good project and it ought to get an 'aye' vote from both sides and I concur with Representative Tipsword, when he requests some consideration of where food for century three may be."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, to explain his vote."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this Bill the last time it was up and it hasn't gotten any better. If there is a silt problem, I think anybody who knows anything about the Triple K River knows it comes from Indiana because they



dredge it and the silt pours over the Illinois side, you don't just spend twenty thousand dollars to find that out. I don't see any reason to spend this... I've got a copy of the last report which came out the first year I came in the General Assembly, I showed a nice hard back covered book... if the Gentleman, the Sponsor of this Bill would like to have a copy, I'll give you my copy. I think there is a number of people as has been previously pointed out.. are voted on this Bill who aren't here and if we want to stay here all night, I guess we can go through a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Luft, to explain his vote."

Luft: "I just have a question of the Chair, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Luft: "Where is the Capital Development Board budget?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "What?"

Luft: "Where is the Capital Development Board budget?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, I haven't had an opportunity to look at the Calendar but that's where the food for century three is at, my friend."

Luft: "How many Amendments are on that budget?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "About thirty-four."

Luft: "When will it be called?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It is exempt from the Bill."

Luft: "But it will be called."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, it will."

Luft: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent, to explain her vote."

Kent: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just do not understand why all the talk of century... food for century three... has nothing to with the Kankakee River, it will not be located there, the Kankakee River floods or whatever it is, does not have anything to do with it so I would hope that they would just ask their questions at another time. This Bill is very



unnecessary because our water resources can already take care of this. I would urge you to vote 'no' and those that are not here pull their votes off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll tell you why this Bill is unnecessary, it's the do-nothing Republican Legislators from Kankakee County aren't involved in this project. That's the only reason, the do-nothing Kankakee Legislators of the Republican Party are opposed to this, they would rather spend the two hundred thousand dollars for Ryan's boondoggle for Public Aid. It is totally out of the question, it's a bad idea to take up the time of the House with your verification and it's foolishness. Representative Telcser, you should be ashamed of your Leadership."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, on a point of personal privilege."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to know how that Gentleman feels about his leader."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Superb. His name wasn't mentioned in debate. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, looking around at all the empty chairs here and I know all the Legislators here were elected on their honesty and integrity and I just wonder how we got so many ghost voters up on the board. I think you ought to dump this call and do it over."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Speak for yourself. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. Mr. Yourell, please."

Yourell: "Let's check those ghost red voters up there, I see six... want me to name them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Naaaa. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers. I thought you explained your vote."

Deavers: "Excuse me, I wanted to talk to Mr. Houlihan, but I'll walk over and visit with him. I was wondering when he was





going to break into a tirade but he finally did."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill was up on Third...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Matijeovich: "When this Bill was up on Third Reading there was a lot of talk about the Senate's Sponsor that that was the reason why it was defeated and I don't think that's the real reason and I think that after all the Minority Leader isn't here right now and I recall on the Roll Call, both he and the other Representative from Kankakee were on that Roll Call voting 'aye'. Now, they're not here right now and I know damn well if they were here they would urge all the Republicans on their side of the aisle to vote 'aye' because it means so much to them, they wouldn't have voted 'aye' if it didn't mean a lot to them and their district. So, I would urge all of you to vote 'aye' over there otherwise I'll be a little suspicious of why you would want to kill it, wouldn't I."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, to explain his vote."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker in explaining my vote, I could not let the remarks of the last Gentleman pass without standing to acknowledge that we on this side of the aisle are independent thinkers and we know that the Gentleman from Kankakee has occasionally been known to be wrong. I realize that the people on the other side of the aisle don't believe their leaders could be wrong but we over here do know that they are viable. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangmon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, when this Bill is disposed of I would like to renew my motion to dispose of the explanation of vote until midnight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll address yourself at that time. The



Gentleman from.... Mr. Christensen, do you want to explain your vote?"

Christensen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say one thing... this is only twenty thousand dollars and the only thing that bothers me is that this is for Kankakee County and I just can't believe that my two colleagues are not on this Roll Call vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 28 'nays', 13 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 963. Who did? Mr. Deavers.... Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "I asked for a verification long before the Roll was taken, I told you you got by with it once tonight. One time shame on me, but no more... let's go."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Deavers, you are correct, you've put it in those terms but the Chair not understanding those terms proceeded to announce the Roll. But, every Gentleman is entitled to a verification and the Gentleman has ask for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Caldwell... excuse me, that's Campbell, not Caldwell. Collins, Jack Davis, Deuster, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Epton, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Geo-Karis, Hoffman, Huskey, Dave Jones, Kempiners, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Leinenweber, Madison, Mahar, Lynn Martin, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McBroom, Meyer, Molloy, Peters, Reed, Sandquist, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Stanley, Stearney, E.G. Steele, Telcser, Totten, Wall, Wikoff and Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone of the absentees want to vote? May I just make a clarification that it's not any Gentlemanly request of clarification, any Member may request a verification. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Reed, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Oh, I'm sorry, you were pointing to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

you're eyes... you were confused temporarily. Kindly record the Lady as 'no'. Mr. Williams, for what purpose do you seek recognition"

Williams: "Please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye', please. Mr. Houlihan, you're light is flashing... for what purpose?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned in debate just a while ago and I rose to a point of personal privilege. I'll wait until after verification if you want. Mr. Luft is also joining in asking for the verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Deavers, did you hear that? Mr. Deavers, did you hear that?"

Deavers: "I wasn't paying attention, would you reiterate it please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Luft is joining in the request for verification. I would imagine to knock off some people that are on your side that are voting for us on the district."

Deavers: "Whatever is fair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Want to persist."

Deavers: "Absolutely. Different strokes for different folks."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Be careful."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, is it now proper to give views. on our Leadership?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, what? No, it's not. Please proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Walsh, in the chamber? I've got a copy of the Resolution for you, you want to come up? Please proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Caldwell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Doyle, John Dunn..."



Speaker Deavers: "Excuse me, Mr. Dan Houlihan wants to be verified, does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, you are verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kosinski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Pullen, Richmond, Robinson, Ryan, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Simms, Steczo, Stuffie, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any question of the Affirmative votes, Mr. Deavers? Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Yes, plenty of questions, Mr. Speaker. Breslin."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Breslin, how is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Lady in the chamber? Mrs. Breslin. Kindly take her off the roll."

Deavers: "Brummet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Brummet... somebody is sitting in his chair back there. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber, Mr. Brummet? Take him off the roll."

Deavers: "Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli... how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Deavers: "Byers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Mr. Byers... Mr. Byers, I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Byers is voting 'present'. Do you want



to take him off?"

Deavers: "No, I'm proud of him. Probably the best vote he's made all Session: Chapman, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman... she's here."

Deavers: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson, is here."

Deavers: "Domico."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Domico... how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can't take him of the Roll Call if he's not voting. You want to put him on?"

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, did you take Capparelli off?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Caparelli... I think we did. Take him off Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Are they finished, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't know."

Deavers: "No, we're still going."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Deavers: "Ewell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewell... Mr. Ewell... how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Ewell... take him off the record."

Deavers: "John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Dunn... he was just here. John Dunn."

Deavers: "He went to Decatur, he told me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see the Gentleman in the chair.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. John Dunn. Take him off the record."

Deavers: "How about Representative Farley?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bruce Farley. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Farley. Take him off the record."

Deavers: "Garmisa."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Garmisa in the chamber? Garmisa.  
He's here."

Deavers: "Garmisa is here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, right over here."

Deavers: "Very good. Getty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Getty. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see the Gentleman in the chair.  
Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take him off."

Deavers: "Giglio."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Giglio. Mr. Giglio. I don't see the  
Gentleman in the chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?  
Take him off the Roll Call. Anyone else?"

Deavers: "Yes, Representative Hart."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hart. I don't see him in his chair. Is  
the Gentleman in the chamber? Take him off the Roll Call."

Deavers: "Huff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Huff. He's there."

Deavers: "How about my good friend Aaron Jaffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Aaron Jaffe, he's always around. Where is  
he? Aaron. Aaron Jaffe. He must be in the men's room.  
Take him off temporarily."

Deavers: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Emil Jones. Is the Gentleman in the  
chamber? Take him off the Roll Call."

Deavers: "Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you seek  
recognition?"

Ryan: "I would like to have leave to be verified now, if I  
may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified.  
Hearing no objection, he is verified."

Ryan: "Thank you."



Deavers: "Did we take Representative Katz, off?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Deavers: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I didn't know that you questioned Mr. Katz. Mr. Katz... I don't see him in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Katz. Take him off. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to take him off?"

Deavers: "Kozubowski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is he recorded?"

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

Deavers: "Getting bad reports here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's your Leadership."

Deavers: "Lucco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lucco. Coach, Coach is training the team for tomorrow, we've got a big ball game tomorrow, you know at two o'clock coach. We're playing the press. Oh, is it ten o'clock, you changed the hour, I'm sorry. Mr. Lucco, is the Gentleman... I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Joe Lucco. Take him off the Roll Call."

Deavers: "Jesse Madison."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jesse... oh..."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Maybe we should vote him."

Deavers: "Robert Mann."

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

Deavers: "Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Billy Marovitz. How long do you want to go.... Billy Marovitz. The Gentleman is not in his chair but I'm sure he's around here. We'll have to take him off temporarily."

Deavers: "McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McGrew. Gale, could you just move over a



little bit, I want to see if Sam's there. No, he's not in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber....Mr. McGrew. McGrew...or Ed McBroom."

Deavers: "McBroom did not vote , so....."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, McBroom wants to be voted 'aye'."

Deavers: "Very good. I will verify him, he can do what he would like. Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty. I don't see the Gentleman in his chamber. Take him off the Roll Call. Oh, here's Beatty, put him back on."

Deavers: "Nardulli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave him that way."

Deavers: "Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge. The Lady is back there."

Deavers: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Von Boeckman. I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Von Boeckman. Von Boeckman. Take him off the Roll Call."

Deavers: "Darrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Darrow. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave him that way."

Deavers: "Could I have a count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "I would like to have the Bill tabled."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have Senate Bill 732 and 733 tabled? Hearing no objections they are tabled. Dump the Roll Call."





Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 963, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House for round 7."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Greiman. Mr. Kane has a motion that he wants to renew. At this time, Mr. Kane, on the motion."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my motion. I think we've played around enough tonight. I move that we adjourn until 4:00 tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well wait. We'll hold that for a while."

Kane: "No I...I persist in that motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're not recognized for that purpose. Senate Bill 963. Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have talked about the Bill that would insure voting by absentee in suburban Cook County. Now I used to think that Republican... Now I got to tell you. I'll share this confidence with you. I always thought the Republicans were very smart and that maybe my party wasn't so smart. Houlihan, sit down, you're in my way. I have to see the panorama of the Republicans, all right. You people don't know where the suburban Cook County is. You don't know that it's in Barrington, that it's in Schaumburg, that it's in Elk Grove Village, that it's in all those other hard, ribrock Republican areas. You think it's Niles Township where we vote Democratic and Evanston, where we're building a Democratic party and New Trier where we're building a Democratic party and the other parts of suburban Cook County. And the truth of the matter is...the truth of the matter is that of the 5,000 people that were disenfranchised in 1976 most of those were Republican votes. Or if they weren't Republican they sure as hell weren't organization Democratic votes. They were split like crazy. So what you're doing here when you vote against this Bill, you're saying to the people, to your own people, to Republicans you're saying, 'We're so afraid. We're so paranoid somehow, we're willing to say Republicans don't vote.' Now this Bill,



963, insures that everybody is going to vote...vote is going to be counted. The people have gone to a lot of trouble that they're vote is going to be counted. I think that the Democrats, I think maybe my Leadership had some people walk off the other day, because I think they caught on and they said, 'Hey, why are we doing that?'. My Congressman was elected by 200 votes, that's why I'm fighting it and also because I believe...I believe every vote should be counted. But you fellas, you people, you've decided... you see, you've decided that we're so paranoid about Stanley Kusper, Stanley T. Kusper, that we don't even want Republicans to vote by absentee ballots. Vote for 963, this is the last time we get this thing. It's the only show in town left. It's the only time we're going to make sure that every person who casts an absentee ballot gets counted, even Republicans."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 963 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Glenn... Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan to explain his vote. Jimmy."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, yes, I'd like to explain my vote but I'd also like to be recognized on a point of order to explain how I feel about the Leadership. When it's appropriate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. We'll get back to you. Have all voted who wished? Oh, I'm sorry. Please proceed."

Houlihan: "Representative Greiman has very clearly indicated the need for this legislation. This legislation would...this legislation would make sure that every vote is counted. I can't believe that there would be Members on the other side of the aisle that for partisan reasons would not want to have votes counted. It seems to me that it is totally irresponsible. It seems to me that Representative Porter is going to be very upset with all of you when he comes back here as a lobbyist and in fact no longer has a job because he could not have votes counted. Now I don't often



get up on the floor and rise to defend Representative Porter because usually he can do a job for himself. But clearly this is a full employment Bill for that poor white haired Gentleman and I believe that all of you Republicans on that side of the aisle who vote against him are just showing the crassness that you again exhibited on the Christensen Bill where you voted against..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record.

On this question there's 79 'aye' and 37 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 978."



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

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 978 is a similar Bill that we had heard earlier in this Session of the General Assembly, it was Senate Bill, or House Bill 1431. It's the rate increase for the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. The original rate increase as proposed was a thirteen cent (13c) rate increase graduated over a three year period generating some twenty-six million dollars (\$26,000,000) in needed revenue for the operations and ongoing expenses of the Metropolitan Sanitary District. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this Bill pulled back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Agreed Amendment that Representative Art Telcser has on the other side. Wait a minute, Art. May I have leave to have this Bill brought back to Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser. Gentleman has asked leave ...the question...that's all right. Objections have been raised."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, is there some mistakes? Is it Representative Abramson? Can I have leave for Representative Abramson to bring the Bill back to Second Reading so Representative Abramson can put on ...Agreed Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "They're...they're having problems in front of you. You're not having problems across the aisle. Objections have been raised by Representative Matijevich and Houlihan."

O'Brien: "All right, then I'll move to bring it back. According to Rule 37-D it only takes 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

O'Brien: "Well, this Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm going to give every Member a chance to have Bills on Consideration Postponed called tonight. I think that's only fair to your colleagues to give them all the same courtesy that you'd expect from yourself....for yourself. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I know there were some Senate Bills that never got called on Third Reading. Are you going to do that tonight? Or are they exempt or something or...."

Speaker Redmond: "We're taking Consideration Postponed. We'll bid the devil good morning when we meet him."

Deuster: "I didn't hear that, I'm sorry."



Speaker Redmond: "We're...we're on this order of business, 978. Now, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "I yield to Representative Telcser."

Speaker Redmond: "Objections have been raised to bring it back to the Order of Second Reading."

O'Brien: "Well, then, I'll move that we bring it back to the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to bring it to the Order of Second Reading. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I hesitate to do this to Dan O'Brien but I might point out that this same kind of thing, although it's one step further, was done to Zeke Giorgi and they wouldn't give him the votes in order to hear the Bill on Third Reading. I think we ought to just take it one more step and not even let them take it back to Second."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's...62 'aye' and 28 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. You want to call it on Third....Consideration Postponed for passage? Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "We'll go with the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Did he say he was going with the Bill?"

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, since we can't bring the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Agreed Amendment, then we'll just have to go with the Bill. And as I said before, Senate Bill 978 exactly the same Bill that we voted out of this Body with over 99 votes and that was House Bill 1431. It's a rate increase for the Metropolitan Sanitary District. It's an increase that is needed because of the rising energy courses.....costs. Now every Member of this Body thoroughly discussed this issue earlier and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm very...I'm really



sorry we're in this bind. I'm still going to have to oppose the Bill in this form. But let me simply say to the Members that this Bill deals with a tax rate increase for the Metropolitan Sanitary District. The Amendment which I wanted to offer, had the Bill come back to Second, was to reduce the tax levy which a sanitary district had come in to seek. They had to ask for increases for 1978, 79 and 1980. And I had worked out with them a lower tax rate than they requested for 1978 and 1979...."

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

Houlihan, J: "Representative Telcser for the fourth time is out of order tonight. He's speaking to an Amendment which is not before this Body. He's giving us additional information which is not germane and he should confine his remarks to the Bill and explain why the deal broke up."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, confine your remarks to the Bill."

Telcser: "And in addition, Mr. Speaker, there'd be no increase for 1980. And I'm sorry that the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle wants his taxpayers to pay more money than is necessary. I have attempted to reduce taxes, to reduce the tax levy for the people who live within the confines of the Metropolitan Sanitary District which are both his constituents and mine. I'm really sorry that we're wound up in some kind of a problem from the other side of the aisle from Representative...the Gentleman who just spoke. And I don't know if he's for higher taxes or less accountability, I'm not quite sure. But I am not going to support Senate Bill 978 with the higher tax rate increase. And I hope we do have a chance at some point in time to bring the Bill back and lower the rate as I have done so in the Amendment which unfortunately was not able to be offered."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote perhaps I can give you the distinction between the Agreed Amendment and the original Amendment that was proposed on this side of the aisle and voted by 99 Members of this House. The first Amendment, or the original Bill



as I have stated was a rate increase of thirteen cents (13¢) graduated over a three year period generating some twenty-six million dollars (\$26,000,000). The Agreed Amendment that we were not able to bring the Bill back to Second Reading to put on which probably would have made this a lot easier was a rate increase in the first year of three cents (3¢) and in the second year of six cents (6¢). And that took place for the years 1978 and 79 and was a nine cent (9¢) rate increase generating eighteen million dollars (\$18,000,000). So actually instead of giving them a three year rate increase of thirteen cents (13¢) graduated over a three year period, Mr. Speaker, we're giving them less and it's based on a two year period. It's an Amendment for...."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close."

O'Brien: "1978 and 1979, three cents (3¢) the first year and six cents (6¢) the second year generating nine cents (9¢) or eighteen million dollars (\$18,000,000). And we can come back in the next Session of the General Assembly and at that time deal with the...the other two cents (2¢). So there's only two cents (2¢) that separates us. And if we don't want to give them the extra two cents (2¢) that they needed in their budget, we can turn around and pass this that year. I urge everybody to give it an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 65 'ayes', 62 'nay', this Bill failed to receive the Constitutional Majority and is hereby declared lost. 1296, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. Representative Leverenz, are you going to handle 1296?"

Leverenz: "No Sir, I... just a question as to where 1097 is... Senate Bill which is on postponed also."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on 1296, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. That is known as death with dignity. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that 1296... 1296, is a Bill that limits the introduction of Bills from every Member to fifteen Bills excluding the Appropriation Bills and excluding Resolutions, House Joint Resolutions, Senate Joint Resolutions, Committee Bills and the ever present and future shape of this House... it should be proposals. Now if you feel like you want to vote for this Bill vote for it; if you don't, we'll see what happens."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 81 'aye' and 41 'no' and the Bill having failed to receive Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 1301, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that we had earlier this week. There is a great deal of confusion as appeared with regard to the safety involved. This is the Moped Bill. One person is described as a premiere item of the Session. I don't think it is that important but it is very important item to me. It has been described as the end of the the search of the energy alternatives at the American gas pumps and the consumer pocket book. The





carpooling is reported on the increase as well as renewed interest in mass transit after decades of neglect. More and more Americans are mounting their bicycles, substituting pedaling for costly oil energy. The newest of all transportational alternatives is the motorized bicycle. It's a simple, short-haul vehicle that takes the push out of pedaling. This item has received the...complies with the national standards of the Department...the National Department of Transportation. Anyone who can ride a bicycle can ride this vehicle. The objections with regard to this matter has been as results of the lack of a requirement that the drivers have a motorcycle classification driver's license. Of the 31 states in which this is legalized, including all the major states, New York, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusettes, to give you a few of them - there are 31 - not a single one of those states require other than a simple driver's license to drive this vehicle. In fact, eight of them require no license at all. Now on a personal note, we have an AMF factory in our district. They hope to produce these vehicles in the AMF plant in the district that is personally important. It will mean jobs to the district. I earnestly solicit your 'aye' vote on this matter."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the Members of this House, that the Secretary of State is still opposed to the Bill in this form and unless it is...which it was not amended to require that a motorcycle operator's license be required of those who operate these Mopeds, we would like to see this Bill defeated."

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

Levin: "Mr. Chairman, in explaining my 'aye' vote. I'm voting for this measure because since it was voted on initially, Representative Brummer has worked so hard on this measure. He has talked to so many Representatives that I think he...just for perseverance deserves an 'aye' vote."

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

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye' and



30 'no'. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Wanted to explain my vote, but....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I'd respectfully ask for a verification unless you want to take another Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Dump the Roll Call. On this question...the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, this vehicle gets between a 150 and 200 hundred miles to the gallon. With regard to the motorcycle classification of license, I will again like to explain of the 31 states that I have mentioned, none, not one of them, require a motorcycle classification. Eight of them require nothing other than no driver's license at all. Of those, 28 have a separate classification for motorcycles. They do distinguish with regard to motorcycles. They do not with regards to Mopeds, they do not require a driver's license. In an examination of the safety features and the handling capabilities, it appears to be unnecessary to require a motorcycle driver's license with regard to this. This is automatic transmission. There is no clutching, there is no shifting, it is the lightweight vehicle which anyone who can ride a bicycle can ride. I earnestly solicit additional green lights on chat board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis. Jack Davis."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'yes' vote, Representative Brummer pointed out that this is going to bring jobs into the State of Illinois and in his district. It's a district Bill, it's a State of Illinois work Bill. It's a jobs Bill. I don't know what the Secretary of State's objections are but it seems to me anything we can do to encourage business in the State of Illinois we can work out with the proper amendatory legislation after we get this Bill passed and AMF starting to produce the darn thing. I recommend an 'aye' vote. Let's give that district some jobs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this has been called a Vehicle Bill but I think, really, the best feature of the Bill is that it hasn't been a vehicle for anything. Ellis



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Levin doesn't have any public utilities stuff on it. Cal Skinner doesn't have any RTA stuff on it. I...don't even have a police spy amendment on it. You know, I think this, this Bill is just clean as a whistle and we ought to just vote this one right out of here."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative O'Daniel."

O'Daniel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would appreciate some more green votes up in...on this board. We have an AMF plant in our district and this can mean as much as 600 jobs in our district. And as a time of high unemployment it...this would be quite a boost to the economy in our district. And I see no fault with these little vehicles. And I'd appreciate some more green votes."

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

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye'....

Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Could I have a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman...."

Brummer: "This is very important to the district and I would...I hate to take the time but it is very important."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "There are at least ten people up there with green lights that aren't here and I would persist in a...."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, poll the absentees. This the Secretary of ... State's opposition?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Bennett, Breslin, Byers, Campbell, Corneal Davis, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Hart, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Huff, Huskey, Johnson, Katz, Kempiners, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lucco, Madison, McAvoy, McPike, Meyer, Nardulli, Sandquist, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Stanely, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Taylor, Telcser, Tipsword, Totten, Wall and Wikoff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Johnson: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote him 'aye'. Representative Hanahan. Record



Hanahan as 'aye'. What's the count now?"

Clerk O'Brien: "90 'ayes', 28 'nays'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative McPike, 'aye'. What's the count?"

91 'ayes' and 28 'no'. Representative Kane has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Okay, give us some names, Mr. Kane. Clerk suggested that maybe you could call some off without reading them all."

Kane: "Brummet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Don Brummet. Brummet here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Kane: "Birchler."

Speaker Redmond: "Birchler is here."

Kane: "Cunningham."

Speaker Redmond: "Cunningham? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Kane: "Deuster."

Speaker Redmond: "Deuster is here."

Kane: "Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Daniels? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, 'aye'."

Kane: "John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Take Daniels off. Who was that one?"

Kane: "John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "John Dunn? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Kane: "Giglio."

Speaker Redmond: "Giglio? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Kane: "Dave Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Kane: "Jones."



Speaker Redmond: "Dave Jones is here."

Kane: "Lauer."

Speaker Redmond: "Lauer? Lauer here? He's here, yeah."

Kane: "Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Mahar recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Wait a minute. Mahar is in the back.

Leave him on."

Kane: "Bob Mann."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Kane: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Griesheimer. Take him off."

Kane: "Mudd."

Speaker Redmond: "Mudd here? Take him off."

Kane: "Katz. Oh, he's not voting. Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off. Jones, 'aye'."

Kane: "Satterthwaite."

Speaker Redmond: "Satterthwaite's in her seat."

Kane: "Schuneman."

Speaker Redmond: "Schuneman? Schuneman there? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Kane: "Van Duyn."

Speaker Redmond: "Van Duyn? There he is."

Kane: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Von Boeckman here? Von Boeckman here? Take him off."

Kane: "Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Winchester's here."

Kane: "Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Kane: "Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "Rigney...."

Kane: "Dawson. Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Rigney here?"



Kane: "Did you take Rigney off?"

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Kane: "Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Dawson here? Dawson here? Take him off."

Kane: "Any further...what's the count now?"

Clerk O'Brien: "81 'ayes', 28 'noes'."

Speaker Redmond: "We left...we didn't take Lauer off. How much?"

Clerk O'Brien: "81 'ayes'...."

Speaker Redmond: "81 'ayes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "28 'noes'."

Speaker Redmond: "28 'no'. Representative Rigney is back, did we put him on?"

Kane: "Want to take Lyn Martin off?"

Speaker Redmond: "Lyn Martin back there? She's there. Kelly is here, put him back. Representative Walsh."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. What's the count now?"

Clerk O'Brien: "84 'ayes', 28 'nays'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. 85. Representative Telcser, 'aye'. Ebbesen, 'aye'. Reilly, 'aye'. Hudson, 'aye'. Sumner, 'aye'. What's the count now? What's the count? This question there's 90 'aye' and 28 'noes'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1097, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Senate Bill 1097 I think we've worked the budget out that we had earlier today. At the first, simply the Bill eliminates the alphabetically class designations on second division vehicles over 16,000 pounds. These are the same trucks we're eliminating a classification on the...go through the weigh station where 99% of the ticket violations for overweight trucks are found. And second, the Bill contains my House Bill 501 which passed this House a 118 'aye' votes to 15 'no' votes which is the single rear license plate which will reduce the cost of license plates purchased by the State of Illinois leaving four million dollars (\$4,000,000) in the Road Fund. And that's on passenger cars only. Trucks, just



for a point of explanation, only have one plate anyway. I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 73 'ayes', 32 'nay'. And the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority hereby declared lost. Representative Willer, what purpose do you rise?"

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous leave to take Senate Bill 983 from the table and send it to Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. It will be taken from the table...what was the number again? 983. 1378, Representative Laurino. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was off the floor at the time and I would like leave to be recorded as voting 'no' on Senate Bill 23. This...I am very sorry I wasn't here because this is a Bill that was passed as a result of the circulation of a letter on the floor of this House, a letter that was replete with falsehood and lies. And there's nothing I can do now but I would like leave to be recorded 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to be recorded as 'no'? Representative McClain. Objection has been raised. 1378, Representative Laurino. Laurino, 1378. Representative McMasters for what purpose do you rise?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, when you were on Consideration Postponed, you passed over Senate Bill 710 of Mr. Von Boeckman's because he was not here and I offered to take it for him and previous speaker said he would come back to that, I believe...Lechowicz. I do want to make one inquiry though before we take the time. There would be two Amendments to be put on, they were agreed to by me. If we could hear the Bill again and vote on it, I will take the time to do it. If we can't do it, then forget it, it's a waste of time."

Speaker Redmond: "Objections have been raised."

McMaster: "I tried."

Speaker Redmond: "Schneider. 1378. 1378, Representative Laurino."



McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1378 has been discussed prior and I believe it...now that people are in a little better mood maybe they'll find it in their hearts to have the citizens of Illinois go back to their respective polling places when they've been disenfranchised and able to vote in their old voting places when they are registered voters. I move for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "I just want to explain my vote. Before when this Bill was called, I was off...at my office across the street and I heard Representative Matijevich talking about...he was worrying about some of those sailors at Great Lakes voting in North Chicago and I mentioned to him that the criteria for determining whether or not they had residency was, do they keep meat in the freezer at Great Lakes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think there are many people that I've encountered in my campaign who have been disenfranchised because they've moved from the precinct during that period of time. I think it's oftentimes a case where in a very mobile society you need to have Amendments and legislation like this so that nobody is disenfranchised. We have defeated time and time again those Bills to lock people out of the process. And I would think we ought to give Representative Laurino and his good legislation a few more votes so that we could make sure that everybody would be allowed to vote in the electoral process. It's one of the ...I think major goals that we should have in this Session after defeating some of the bad election Bills, we ought to pass these good election Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, this may not be the worst Bill of the Session but it rates with it so I hope that they wouldn't get 89 because of the numerous people who...who are not here who probably wouldn't...would like to vote on the Bill but unfortunately are being voted by other people. So maybe if they had their switches put over





to 'present' they wouldn't have to be...wouldn't have to have a verification. I would ask for one in the event...."

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

On this question there's 85 'ayes' and 46 'no'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority hereby declared lost.

305. McClain."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 305...."

McClain: "Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 305 is a Bill that came from Senator John Knuppel. It's a Bill that was given to Senator Knuppel from the Farm Bureau and...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 305. A Bill for an Act concerning inheritance tax. Second Reading of the Bill...."

McClain: "From the Farm Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce. The...the current law is that land, when there's a death in the family, land is assessed for inheritance tax purposes at the...the best use. What this would do is change that to be clear market value. The Governor's Office and Bureau of the Budget and Sam Vincent had some problems with it...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, we're on Second Reading. This was read a second time but there's a motion to table Amendment #1. Has there been any action on that?"

McClain: "Yes, Representative Houlihan is going to withdraw that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan...you withdraw the motion? Houlihan, you can nod."

Houlihan, D: "He is correct, I move to withdraw the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan withdraws the motion. Third Reading. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Third Reading. Proceed, Representative McClain."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 305. A Bill for an Act concerning inheritance tax. Third Reading of the Bill."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the present law for inheritance tax purposes is for the land to be valued at the best use. This causes a great incumbrance on farmers and small businessmen wherein they many times have to sell part of their property. So the



Farm Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce asked Senator Knuppel to put this piece of legislation in which would say that at the death of that person the best property should be valued at clear market value. However, it...although it passed the Senate 54 to nothing, when it came over to the House, Sam Vincent, Bureau of the Budget and the Governor's Office had some concerns because they did not know what the fiscal impact would be. So they offered an Amendment to me which I accepted which would say that the Amendment would change the payment of inheritance taxes from fifteen months after death to ten months. I had no objection to it, Farm Bureau, Chamber of the Commerce and the Senate Sponsor had no problems with it so we accepted the Amendment and it...the Bill passed out of Revenue Committee 19 to nothing. And I move for its favorable passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Are we allowed to ask questions or...."

Speaker Redmond: "If you do it fast."

Mugalian: "Oh, I'll try. This means that the value of farm property would be treated...does...I'm asking you a question. This means the value of farm property could be treated at about one-half its actual cash market value? According to our bill analysis that's what indicated."

McClain: "No, Representative Mugalian, what...what they said was that in valuating the property, the inheritance tax division occasionally says the best use of the property could be as great as twice the clear market value. And that's the import of the sentence you're reading, what...and that's what the best use is and that's one of the hassles with small businessmen and family farmers. So making it the clear market value is in line with the Internal Revenue Code's recent changes two years ago. And all this does, this Bill now... the main part of the Bill places Illinois in conformance with the Internal Revenue Code."

Mugalian: "Just one comment. I...I'm not sure that this Bill doesn't do something more than that. I really think it gives farm...people that die on farm property an advantage that nobody else gets including suburban, urban and other people. And I don't know why we have to treat property differently upon...in connection with transfers on death. I think we've done enough for the farmers. I think the Farm Adjustment



Bill is probably unconstitutional. And if it isn't it's comparative rip-off to all other people in the State. And I'm going to vote 'no' on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tipsword: "If I read this correctly, Representative McClain, does... does this just put the valuation of...of farmland and small business property in a line with the last September's Internal Revenue change for Federal Estate Taxes so that you only have to have one appraisal for both?"

McClain: "Yeah. Yeah, I was incorrect when I said two years ago, it was last September's and...and the present law would read that we have to have about two appraisals and this would mean only one appraisal."

Tipsword: "If we don't change it, you've got to have an appraisal under the terms of the Federal Estate Tax Law, then you've got to have a separate appraisal at an additional cost under the...the State Inheritance Tax Law whereas heretofore until last September we used exactly the same rates on both taxes. Are the board...the same appraisals, I mean not rates. And this puts them back where you use the same appraisal as is required by the Federal Estate Tax. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Porter."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Porter: "Representative McClain, did...did you tell us what the fiscal impact was? I didn't...I didn't hear it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget could not determine the exact fiscal impact so they suggested the Amendment which would mean that attorneys, since we're the ones that are dilatory, would have to pay off the estate taxes or there'd be a penalty within ten months instead of the present case of fifteen months. So Sam Vincent, the Bureau of the Budget's contention that that would take care of the federal impact."

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



it seems to me that there's really only two questions to address here. One is the fiscal impact and if that's taken care of, a ten month change. The other one is, whether the ten month change makes good sense. It seems to me that it does. The Federal Estate Tax is payable within nine months after the date of death. The return for the Illinois Inheritance Tax is now due ten months after and the tax payable fifteen. You might just as well pay it at the time you file it. Makes good sense to me. I think the Bill is an equitable one in regards to state tax valuation. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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 a 113 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1312. Representative DiPrima."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1312. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Illinois' Department of Veteran's Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1312 is the equalizer. I fought tooth and nail to see that the veterans in the state colleges get amply rewarded for the services they gave their country. But we neglected to take care of these veterans in private institutions such as Sangamon University here, Milliken and Roosevelt College in Chicago, all the private colleges..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? 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 99 'aye' and 9 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 1124."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1124. A Bill for an Act in relation to government productivity. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is Senate Bill 1124, titled the State Productivity Act. And what it tries to do is it tries to measure the productivity of state...of state employees, state government and the



use of our tax dollars. Everyone talks about waste in state government. This Bill is designed to do something about it. And we've got a half dozen states that we've studied and find that this can be done. I think the biggest concern of local government, cities, counties and townships is the productivity of their various entities. We're all concerned about employee wages. We're all concerned about pensions, fringe benefits and the saturation and the end of the tax dollars. And we're going to have to increase our productivity and this Bill is designed to do it. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is...Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I ought to quickly rise and oppose Senate Bill 1124. It's going to create another unbelievable bureaucracy. It'll raise the cost of state government. It'll create untold paper shufflers, people that fill out forms which will probably never be read. I don't know...I respect Representative Giorgi's intent with this piece of legislation. It's certainly not going to accomplish what it seems to say that it will accomplish. It's only going to cost us more money and have more forms and another piece of bureaucracy. And I sincerely hope we defeat Senate Bill 1124."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Giorgi, would it be accurate to say that anyone who opposes this Bill would be for lazy and unproductive workers?"

Giorgi: "And inefficiency and maybe their...the...they're ashamed of their efforts and might not be able to measure up to what the people expect of them."

Houlihan, J: "Do you think that people who would prefer not to do a full day's work for a full day's pay would be those kind of people who would oppose this kind of legislation?"

Giorgi: "Especially if you give them immunity."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? The question is..."

Houlihan, J: "I rise in support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye',



opposed vote 'no'. Representative Peters to explain his vote."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't sure whether this was to establish the State Productivity Council but I see in the Digest that it is. And I just wanted to indicate that Representative Giorgi that in estimation this council couldn't track a bleeding elephant through the snow."

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

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I would solicit a 'no' vote. Just that we need a bureaucrat telling bureaucrat telling how to be productive. A bureaucrat could get lost picking his nose. He probably couldn't find a road map on the way out. I think if we were smart what we would do is get rid of this thing so we don't have bureaucrats talking about productivity. That's the most frightening thought I've ever heard of. If the bureaucrats talk about productivity it would decrease productivity."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 'aye' and 57 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority hereby declared lost. 29."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 29. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Giglio and I are the hyphenated cosponsors of this Bill. I believe it's an agreed Bill. It's one we discussed on Second Reading that relates to the...the effort to try and have more uniform - the day that which voter registration cuts off. Essentially it's twenty-eight days except in...when they have precinct registration days in Chicago and suburban Cook County, it's thirty-five. It's an improvement, moving from forty-five to thirty-five days for registration. I think it's a good Bill. I believe it...I know of no opposition. I'd urge your support for it."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill having received the



Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk desires any time, he doesn't, I move that we adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that we adjourn until three tomorrow afternoon. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. We now stand adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.			
1	9:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
1		Speaker Redmond )	Atten R.C. Senate Bills 2nd R
1		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 96-2nd R-no C.A. Fl Amen
1		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
1		Clerk O'Brien	
1		Deuster	
1		Speaker Redmond	
2		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 103-No Am/CA-2nd R
2		Speaker Redmond )	3rd Reading
2		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 104-2nd R-No C.A./Fl
2		Speaker Redmond )	3rd Reading
2		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 106-2nd R-No C.A./Fl
2		Speaker Redmond )	3rd Reading
2		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 110-2nd R-No C.A./Fl
2		Speaker Redmond )	3rd Reading
2		Darrow )	
2		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 116-Amendment #1
2		Speaker Redmond)	
3		Clerk O'Brien	
3		Campbell	Withdraw Amendment #1
3		Speaker Redmond	Amendment withdrawn
3		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Ryan	Objects to Bills with Amendments
3		Speaker Redmond	Out of record





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
2.			
3		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 125-2nd-No C.A.
		)	
3		Speaker Redmond )	3rd Reading
3		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 143-2nd-No C.A.
		)	
3		Speaker Redmond)	3rd Reading
3		Clerk O'Brien	SB 159
4		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
4		Clerk O'Brien	SB 205
4		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
4		Clerk O'Brien	SB 862-2nd-No C.A.
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Ryan )	Fiscal note
		)	
4		Speaker Redmond)	Out of record
4		Darrow )	
		)	
4		Speaker Redmond)	
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Leinenweber	
5		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 1177-2nd-No C.A. or Floor
		)	
5		Speaker Redmond)	3rd Reading
5		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1203-3rd
5		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
5		Campbell )	
		)	
5		Speaker Redmond)	
5		Clerk O'Brien	2nd Reading or C.A.
5		Speaker Redmond	Floor Amendment?
5		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
5		Campbell	Withdraws #1
5		Speaker Redmond	



3.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Campbell	Objects
6		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
6		Bradley )	
		)	
6		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
6		Chapman )	
		)	
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		Campbell	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Campbell	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7	9:21	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1378-2nd R-No C.A.
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Friedrich	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Bowman	Withdraws Amendment
7		Speaker Redmond	
8		Clerk O'Brien	SB 639-2nd R
8		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
8		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2-SB 1378
8		Speaker Redmond	
8		Darrow	
8		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
4.			
8		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #3
8		Speaker Redmond	
8		Darrow	
8		Speaker Redmond	
8		Totten )	
		)	
9		Darrow )	
9		Speaker Redmond	
9		Ryan )	
		)	
9		Darrow )	
9		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
9		Clerk O'Brien	SB 116-2nd-No C.A.
9		Speaker Redmond	
9		Clerk O'Brien	Fl Am #1 withdrawn, Am #2
9		Speaker Redmond	
10		Campbell	
10		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
10		Clerk O'Brien	SB 159
10		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
10		Clerk O'Brien	SB 205-2nd-No C.A.
10		Speaker Redmond	Floor?
10		Clerk O'Brien )	Amendment #1
		)	
10		Speaker Redmond)	Out of record
10		Clerk O'Brien	SB 293-2nd
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Hoffman	Table Amendment #1
11		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
11		Darrow )	
		Hoffman)	



5.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
11		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 adopted-3rd Reading
11	9:30	Clerk O'Brien	SB 205-2nd R
11		Speaker Redmond	
11		Lechowicz	
12		Speaker Redmond	
12		Bowman )	
12		Speaker Redmond)	
12		Lechowicz	
12		Speaker Redmond	
12		Bowman	Wish to proceed with Bill
12		Speaker Redmond	
12		Bradley	
13		Speaker Redmond	
13		Ryan	
13		Speaker Redmond	
13		Ebbesen	
13		Speaker Redmond	
13		Clerk O'Brien	SB 205-Amendment #1
13		Speaker Redmond	
13		Lechowicz )	Amendment #1
13		Speaker Redmond)	
13		Stanley	
14		Speaker Redmond	Amendment lost
14		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2
14		Lechowicz	Amendment #2
14		Speaker Redmond	
14	9:38	Telcser	



6.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Mugalian	
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Keats	Moves previous question
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Giorgi	
	16		Speaker Redmond	Previous question motion lost
	16		Stuffle	Yield
	16		Lechowicz	
	16		Speaker Redmond	Amendment lost
	16		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #3
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Lechowicz	
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Mugalian	
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	17		Giorgi	
	17		Speaker Redmond	Amendment lost
	17		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	17		Reilly	
	17		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
	17	9:45	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1203-2nd R-No C.A.
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	17		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	17		McPike	



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

 STATE OF ILLINOIS  
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
7.			
18		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
18		Clerk O'Brien	No further Amendments
18		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
18		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1308-2nd Reading
18		Speaker Redmond	
18		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2-1308
18		Speaker Redmond	
18		Madison	
18		Speaker Redmond	
18		Campbell	Oppose
19		Speaker Redmond	
19		Friedrich	
19		Speaker Redmond	
19		Friedrich )	
		)	
20		Madison )	
20		Speaker Redmond	
21	9:52	Madison )	
		)	
21		Speaker Redmond)	
21		Chapman	
22		Speaker Redmond	
22		Madison	To close
23		Speaker Redmond	
23		Epton	
23		Speaker Redmond	
23		McClain	
23		Speaker Redmond	Amendmetn #2 fails
23		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3



8.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	23		Speaker Redmond	
	23		Mugalian	
	23		Campbell	
	23		Speaker Redmond	
	23		McClain	
	23		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
	23		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4
	24		Speaker Redmond	
	24		Campbell	
	25		Speaker Redmond	
	25		McClain )	
	25		)	
	25		Campbell)	
	26		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
	26		Levin	Amendment #5
	26		Speaker Redmond	
	26		Clerk O'Brien	
	26	10:05	Levin	
	26		Speaker Redmond	
	26		Campbell	No objections
	26		Speaker Redmond	
	26		McClain )	
	26		)	
	27		Levin )	
	28		Speaker Redmond	
	28		Chapman	
	28		Speaker Redmond	
	28		Levin	To close
	28		Speaker Redmond	Amendment lost-3rd Reading



9. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
28		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1068-2nd R-No C.A.
28		Leinenweber	
28		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
29		Leinenweber	Withdraws #1
29		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
29		Leinenweber	
29		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
29		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
29		Speaker Redmond	
29		Leinenweber	Move to reconsider Amen #2
29		Speaker Redmond	
29		Leinenweber	Withdraws #2. Amendment #3
29	10:15	Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
30		Clerk O'Brien	
30		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
30		Clerk O'Brien	SB 39-3rd Reading
30		Speaker Redmond	
30		Mautino	
30		Speaker Redmond	
31		Leinenweber	
31		Speaker Redmond	
31		Hart	
31		Speaker Redmond	
31		McMasters	
32		Speaker Redmond	
32		Steele, E. G.	
32		Speaker Redmond	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
10.			
32		Geo-Karis	
33		Speaker Redmond	
33		Leverenz	
33		Speaker Redmond	
33		Stiehl, C. M.	
33		Speaker Redmond	
34		Friedrich	
34		Speaker Redmond	
34		Kane	
34		Bowman	
35	1:30	Speaker Redmond	
35		Ebbesen	
35		Speaker Redmond	
35		Pierce	
36		Speaker Redmond	
36		Dunn, R.	
36		Speaker Redmond	
36		Mautino	
37		Speaker Redmond	
37		Macdonald	
37		Speaker Redmond	
37		Stuffle	
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Greisheimer	
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Bartulis	Votes 'no'
38		Speaker Redmond	SB 39 passed



11. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
39		Clerk O'Brien	SB 466-3rd Reading
39		Speaker Redmond	
39		Daniels	
39		Speaker Redmond	Passed
39		Clerk O'Brien	SB 348-3rd Reading
39		Speaker Redmond	
39	10:40	Deavers	SB 348
39		Speaker Redmond	
39		Jaffe	
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Deavers	Explains vote
40		Speaker Redmond	Passed
40		Ewing	
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Catania	Objects to Bill on 3rd Reading
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Ewing	
40		Speaker Redmond	SB 687-2nd Reading
40		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Catania	
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		Ewing	Oppose
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		Houlihan, D.	
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		Johnson	



12. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
42		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
42		Catania )	
		)	
42		Speaker Redmond)	
		)	
42		Bradley )	
		)	
42		Speaker Redmond	
42		Ewing	
42		Speaker Redmond	
42		Pullen	
43		Speaker Redmond	
43		Ebbesen	
43		Speaker Redmond	
43		Catania	
43		Speaker Redmond	
43		Ewing	
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Skinner	
44		Speaker Redmond	
44	10:54	Dyer	
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Catania	
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Davis, C.	
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Matijevich	
45		Speaker Redmond	
45		Catania	
45		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
13.			
45		Friedrich	
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Catania	Poll absentees
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Madison	Explains vote
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Greisheimer	Votes 'no'
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Birchler	Change to 'aye'
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Dunn, J.	'Aye'
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Mulcahey	'Aye'
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Tipsword	'Aye'
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Clerk O'Brien	Continues Poll of Absentees
47	10:57	Speaker Redmond	
47		Martin, L.	'No'
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Anderson	'No'
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Mugalian	'Yes'
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Catania	Requests Verification No Vote



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

14.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	47		Speaker Redmond	
	47		Ewing	Request verification Affirm Vote
	47		Speaker Redmond	
	48		McBroom	Leave to be verified
	48		Speaker Redmond	
	48		Edgar	Change to 'no'
	48		Speaker Redmond	
	48		Harris	Change to 'no'
	48		Deuster	'No'
	48		Speaker Redmond	
	48	11:02	Clerk O'Brien	Negative Roll Call
	48		Speaker Redmond	
	48		Catania	Questions Negative Roll
	48		Speaker Redmond	
	48		Ewing	Asks count
	48		Speaker Redmond	76-87
	49		Catania )	Questions
			)	
	50, 51		Speaker Redmond)	
	51		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
	51		Ewing	Not distributed-move to 3rd
	51		Martin, P.	Objects
	51		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
	51		Martin, P.	
	51		Ewing	
	52		Speaker Redmond	
	52		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1025-3rd Reading
	52		Speaker Redmond	



15. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
52		Brady	Leave to return to 2nd
52		Speaker Redmond	
52	11:16	Daniels	Explain Amendment
52		Speaker Redmond	
52		Katz	Responds
52		Speaker Redmond	
52		Lechowicz	
52		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1 adopted
53		Speaker Redmond	Katz withdraws #2
53		Daniels	
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Katz	Out of record
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1039-3rd Reading
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Garmisa	Leave to return to 2nd
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Schuneman )	Explain Amendment?
		)	
53		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
53		Von Boeckman )	
54		Speaker Redmond	
54		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3-floor
54		Speaker Redmond	
54		Von Boeckman	Leave to table Amendment #3
54		Speaker Redmond	
54		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4-SB 1039
54		Speaker Redmond	



16. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
54		Von Boeckman	
54		Walsh )	
54		Speaker Redmond )	
54		Speaker Redmond	
55		Johnson )	
55		Von Boeckman )	
55		Speaker Redmond	
55		Leverenz	
55		Speaker Redmond	
56		Leverenz )	
56		Von Boeckman )	
56		Speaker Redmond	
56	11:30	Kosinski	Support
56		Speaker Redmond	
56		Totten	Oppose
57		Speaker Redmond	
57		Neff	Support
57		Speaker Redmond	
57		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
57		Speaker Redmond	
57		Von Boeckman	To close
57		Speaker Redmond	Amendment fails-3rd Reading
57		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1039-3rd Reading
57		Speaker Redmond	
57		Garmisa	
58		Speaker Redmond	
58		Schuneman	



17. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
58		Speaker Redmond	
58		Totten	Oppose
59		Speaker Redmond	
59		Friedrich	Explains Bill
59		Speaker Redmond	
59		Dunn, J.	
60		Speaker Redmond	
60	11:37	Neff	
60		Speaker Redmond	
60		Von Boeckman	
60		Speaker Redmond	SB 1039 passed
60		Ebbesen	
60		Speaker Redmond	
61		Katz	SB 1025-Amendment #3
61		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
61		Clerk O'Brien	SB 687-3rd Reading
61		Speaker Redmond	
61		Daniels	
61		Speaker Redmond	
61		Ewing	
61		Speaker Redmond	
61		Martin, P.	Speaks against
62		Speaker Redmond	
62		Friedrich	
62		Speaker Redmond	Passed
63		Clerk O'Brien	SB-1259-
63		Speaker Redmond	Out of record



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



18.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	63		Daniels	
	63		Speaker Redmond	SB 1025
	63		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1025
	63		Speaker Redmond	
	63		Brady	Explains 1025
	63		Speaker Redmond	
	63		McMaster	
	64		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	64		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1
	64		Sevcik	Explains SB 1
	64	11:47	Speaker Redmond	
	64		Byers	
	64		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	65		Matijevich	
	65		Speaker Redmond	
	65		Lechowicz	
	65		Speaker Redmond )	
	65		Houlihan, J. )	
	65		Speaker Redmond	HB 2414 exempt
	66		Simms	
	66		Speaker Redmond	
	66		Boucek	
	66		Speaker Redmond	
	66		Clerk O'Brien	SB 29
	66		Giglio	Table Amendments 1,2,3,4
	66		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
	66		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5



19.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	67		Deuster	
	67		Speaker Redmond	
	68		Skinner )	
	68		Deuster )	
	68		Speaker Redmond	
	68		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
	69	11:55	Clerk Hall	SB 36 97 - 3rd Reading
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69		Terzich	
	69		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	69		Clerk O'Brien	SB 123-3rd Reading
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69		Terzich	
	69		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	69		Clerk O'Brien	SB 128-3rd Reading
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69		Terzich	
	70		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	70		Clerk O'Brien	SB 131-3rd Reading
	70		Speaker Redmond	
	70		Terzich	
	70		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	70		Clerk O'Brien	SB 168-3rd Reading
	70		Speaker Redmond	
	71,72,73		Totten	
	73		Speaker Redmond	
	73		Willer	



20.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	74		Speaker Redmond	
	74		C. M. Stiehl	
	74		Speaker Redmond	
	74		Holewinski	
	75		Speaker Redmond )	
	75		Geo-Karis )	
	75		Totten	
	75		Geo-Karis	
	76		Houlihan, J. )	
	76		Totten )	
	76		Speaker Redmond	
	77		Houlihan, J. )	
	77		Speaker Redmond )	
	77		Houlihan, J.	
	77		Speaker Redmond )	
	77		Bluthardt )	
	78		Speaker Redmond	
	78		Darrow	Moves previous question
	78		Speaker Redmond	
	78		Totten	To close
	79		Speaker Redmond	
	79		Robinson	Explains vote
	79		Speaker Redmond	
	79		Johnson	
	80		Speaker Redmond	30 'yes' 110 'no' fails
	80		Epton	
	80		Speaker Redmond	HB 689



<u>21.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
80		J. D. Jones	
80		Speaker Redmond	
80		Mahar	
81		Speaker Redmond )	
81		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 689-3rd Reading
81		Speaker Redmond	
81		Brady	
81		Speaker Redmond	
81		Peters	
81		Speaker Redmond	
81		Jaffe	
82		Speaker Redmond	
82		Hoffman	
82		Speaker Redmond	
82,83		Barnes	
84		Speaker Redmond	
84		Brady	
85		Speaker Redmond	
85		Flinn	
85		Speaker Redmond	
85		Meyer	
85		Speaker Redmond	Passed
86		Speaker Redmond	HB 2422
86		McGrew	
86		Speaker Redmond	
86		Matijeovich	
86		Speaker Redmond	



<u>22.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
86		Farley	
86		Speaker Redmond	
86		Dawson	
86		Speaker Redmond	Moved to 3rd Reading-HB 244
86		Clerk O'Brien	
86		Speaker Redmond	
86		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2422 Third REading
86		Speaker Redmond	
86		Collins	
87		Speaker Redmond	
87		Collins	
87		Speaker Redmond	2422 passed
87		Dawson	
87		Speaker Redmond	
87		Speaker Redmond	
87		Skinner	
87		Speaker Redmond	
87		Satterthwaite	
87		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
87		Abramson )	
88		Speaker Redmond	
88		Friedrich	HB 2424 to 3rd Reading
88		Speaker Redmond	
88		Clerk Hall	HB 2424-3rd Reading
88		Speaker Redmond	
88		Friedrich	
88		Speaker Redmond	Passed



<u>23.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
89		Clerk Hall	HB 862-2nd Reading-NO C.A.
89		Speaker Redmond	
89		Clerk Hall	No Floor Amendments
89		Speaker Redmond	3rd Reading
89		Clerk Hall	SB 862-3rd Reading
89		Speaker Redmond	
89		Brady	
89		Bradley in the Chair	
90		Hoffman )	
		)	
90		Brady )	
90		Speaker Bradley	
90		Jones, J. D.	
90		Speaker Bradley	
90		Jones, E.	Question
90		Speaker Bradley	
90		Lauer	Support
91		Speaker Bradley	
91		Brady	To close
91	12:52	Speaker Bradley	Passed
91		Jones, E. )	
		)	
92		Speaker Bradley)	
92		Clerk O'Brien	SB 830-2nd Reading
92		Speaker Bradley	
92		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
93		Speaker Bradley )	
		)	
93		McGrew )	
93		Speaker Bradley	



24.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	93		Brady	Oppose
	94		Speaker Bradley	
	94		Peters	Oppose
	94		Speaker Bradley	
	94		Stuffle	
	94		Speaker Bradley	
	94		Brummer	
	94		Speaker Bradley	
	94,95		McGrew	To close
	95		Speaker Bradley	Amendment fails
	95		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4
	95		Speaker Bradley	
	96		Houlihan, J.	
	96		Peters	Point of order
	97		Speaker Bradley	
	97		Houlihan, J	eave to amend on its face
	97		Speaker Bradley	
	97		Peters	
	97		Speaker Bradley )	
	97	1:08	Houlihan, J. )	
	97		Speaker Bradley	
	98		Stuffle )	
	98		Houlihan, J.)	
	98		Speaker Bradley	
	98		McGrew	
	99		Speaker Bradley	
	99		Peters	



25.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	99		Speaker Bradley	
	99		Skinner	Question
	100		Houlihan, J.	
	100		Speaker Bradley	Amendment withdrawn
	100		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4
	100		Speaker Bradley	
	100		Mann	
	101		Speaker Bradley	
	101		Brady	Support
	101		Speaker Bradley	
	101		Peters	Support
	101		Speaker Bradley	
	101	1:20	Houlihan, J.	
	101		Speaker Bradley	
	101		McGrew	
	102		Speaker Bradley	
	102		McClain	
	102		Speaker Bradley	
	102		Mann	
	103		Speaker Bradley	
	103		Barnes, E. M.	Explains vote
	103		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted
	103		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6
	103		Speaker Bradley	
	103		McGrew	
	104		Speaker Bradley	
	104		Satterthwaite	





26.			
<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
104		Speaker Bradley	
104		Peters	
105		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted
105		Bowman	'No'
105		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #7
105		McGrew	
106		Speaker Bradley	
106		Stuffle	
106		Speaker Bradley	
106	1:32	Brauy	
107		Speaker Bradley	
107		Skinner )	
		)	
107		McGrew )	
107		Speaker Bradley	
107		Tipsword	
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		Keats	Moves previous question
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		McGrew	
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		Walsh	
108		Speaker Bradley	Motion fails
108		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #8
108		Speaker Bradley	
109		Brady	Table #8
109		Speaker Bradley	Tabled
109		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #9



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
27.			
109		Speaker Bradley	
109		Brady	
109		Speaker Bradley	
109		McGrew	Oppose
109		Speaker Bradley	
110	1:40	Peters	Oppose
110		Speaker Bradley	
110		Stuffle	Oppose
110		Speaker Bradley	
110		Brummer	
111		Speaker Bradley	
111		Brady	To close
111		Speaker Bradley	Amendment fails
111		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #10
111		Speaker Bradley	
111		Brady	
112		Speaker Bradley	
112		Darrow	Leave-Ben Polk, etc.
112		Cunningham	
112		Speaker Bradley	
112		Brady	Leave to hear SB 830
112		Speaker Bradley	
112		Peters	
112		Speaker Bradley	
112		Clerk O'Brien	SB 830-3rd Reading
112		Brady	
112		Speaker Bradley	



28.			
<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
112		Skinner	Question
113		Brady	Responds
113		Boucek	
113		Speaker Bradley	
113	1:48	Brady	To close
113		Speaker Bradley	SB 830 passed
113		Clerk O'Brien	SB 968-3rd Reading
114		Speaker Bradley	
114		Getty	
114		Speaker Bradley	
114		Willer )	
		)	
114		Getty )	
		)	
114		Speaker Bradley	
115		Greiman )	
		)	
115		Getty )	
		)	
115		Speaker Bradley	
115		Geo-Karis	
115		Speaker Bradley )	
		)	
115		Madison )	
		)	
		)	
116		Getty )	
		)	
116		Speaker Bradley	Passed
116		Daniels	Leave to vote 'no' on SB 830
116		Speaker Bradley	
116		Clerk O'Brien	SB 203-3rd Reading
116		Speaker Bradley	
117	1:56	Redmond (Speaker)	SB 203
117		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
29.			
117		Flinn	
117		Speaker Bradley	Passed
118		Clerk O'Brien )	SB 321-3rd Reading
118		Speaker Bradley )	
118		Ryan )	
118		Madigan	
118		Speaker Bradley	Out of record
118		Ryan	
118		Speaker Bradley	321 - Out of record
118		Clerk O'Brien	SB 345-3rd Reading
118		Speaker Bradley	
118		Ebbesen	
118		Speaker Bradley	
119		Clerk O'Brien	SB 433-3rd Reading
119		Speaker Bradley	
119		Brady	
119	2:03	Mann	Urges 'no' vote
119		Speaker Bradley	
119		Chapman	
120		Speaker Bradley	
120		Kempiners )	
121		Brady )	
121		Speaker Bradley	
121		Hoxsey )	
122		Brady )	
122		Lechowicz	Moves previous question
122		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
30.			
122		Brady	To close
122		Speaker Bradley	
122		Pierce	Explains vote
123		Speaker Bradley	
123		Simms	Explains 'no' vote
123		Speaker Bradley	SB 433 lost
123		Madigan )	Moves recess till 3:30
		)	
123		Speaker Bradley)	House recess till 3:30
123, 124		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
RECESS.			
125		Doorkeeper	
125		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
125		Daniels )	Introduction
125		Meyer )	
		)	
125		Speaker Redmond)	
125		Wolf	
125		Speaker Redmond	
125		Geo-Karis )	
		)	
126		Speaker Redmond)	
126		Hoffman )	
		)	
126		Speaker Redmond)	
126		Geo-Karis	
126		Speaker Redmond	
126		Keats	
126		Speaker Redmond	
126		Geo-Karis	
127		Speaker Redmond	



<u>31.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
127		Daniels	
127		Speaker Redmond	
127		Hoffman	
127		Speaker Redmond	
127		Geo-Karis	
127		Conti	
127		Geo-Karis	
127		Speaker Redmond)	
127		Martin, P. )	
128		Speaker Redmond )	
128		Daniels )	
128		Brummet	
128		Speaker Redmond	
128		Bowman )	
129		Speaker Redmond)	
129		Geo-Karis	
129		Speaker Redmond )	
129		Tipsword )	
129		Speaker Redmond)	
129		Mulcahey )	
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Stanley	
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Matijevich	
130		Speaker Redmond	
130		Mulcahey	
130		Speaker Redmond	



32.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	130		Mulcahey	
	130		Speaker Redmond	
	130		Lucco	
	130		Speaker Redmond	
	AT EASE			
	130		Matijeovich	Senate adjourned
	130		Speaker Redmond	House will come to order
	130		Jaffe	
	130		Speaker Redmond )	
	131		Jaffe )	
	131		Giorgi	HR 158
	131		Friedrich	
	131		Speaker Redmond	
	131		Simms	
	132	4:25	Speaker Redmond	
	132		Kempiners )	
	133		Giorgi )	
	133		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
	133		Clerk O'Brien	SB 596-3rd Reading SB 495
	133		Speaker Redmond	
	133		Houlihan, D.	
	133		Speaker Redmond	SB 596 passed
	133		Clerk O'Brien	SB 597-3rd Reading
	133		Speaker Redmond	
	133		Johnson	
	133		Speaker Redmond	
	134		Jaffe )	
	134		Johnson)	



33. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
134		Speaker Redmond	
134		Yourell	
135		Speaker Redmond	
135		Leverenz )	
		)	
135		Johnson )	
135		Yourell	
135		Kosinski	
136	4:35	Yourell	
136		Speaker Redmond	
136		Peters	Responds
136		Speaker Redmond	
136		Dunn, J.	Moves previous question
136		Speaker Redmond	
136		Johnson	To close
137		Speaker Redmond	SB 597 passed
137		Clerk O'Brien	SB 621-3rd Reading
137		Speaker Redmond	
137		Neff	
137		Speaker Redmond	
137		Stanley	'No' on 597
137		Speaker Redmond	
137		Neff	SB 621
138		Speaker Redmond	
138		Jaffe )	
		)	
138		Neff )	
		)	
138		Speaker Redmond	
138		Katz	





34.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	139		Speaker Redmond	
	139		Keats	
	140		Levin	
	141		Speaker Redmond	
	141	4:47	Barnes )	
	141		Neff )	
	142		Speaker Redmond	
	142		Holewinski	Moves previous question
	142		Speaker Redmond	
	142		Neff	To close
	143		Speaker Redmond	Explanation of vote
	143		Robinson	Support
	143		Speaker Redmond	
	143		Steele	Support
	143		Speaker Redmond	SB 621 lost
	143		Clerk Hall	SB 622 - 3rd Reading
	143		Speaker Redmond	
	144		Davis, J.	
	144		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	144		Clerk O'Brien	SB 689-3rd Reading
	144		Speaker Redmond	
	145		Sumner	
	145		Speaker Redmond	
	145		Johnson	
	145		Sumner	Discussion
	145		Speaker Redmond	
	145		Bowman	



<u>35.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
145		Speaker Redmond	
145		Holewinski )	
		)	
146		Sumner )	
146		Speaker Redmond	
146		Huskey	Previous question
146		Speaker Redmond	
146		Sumner	To close
146		Speaker Redmond	Passed
146		Daniels	
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Clerk Hall	SB 767
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Christensen	Sponsor
147		Speaker Redmond	
147		Deavers )	
		)	
147		Christensen)	
147		Speaker Redmond	
148		Christensen	To close
148		Speaker Redmond	Passed
148		Deavers	Verification
148		Speaker Redmond	
148		Simms	
148		Speaker Redmond	
148		Houlihan, J.	
148		Speaker Redmond	
148		Clerk Hall	SB 886
148		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
36.			
148		Lechowicz	Sponsor
149		Speaker Redmond	
149		Bowman )	
149		Lechowicz)	
150		Speaker Redmond	
150		Matijevec	
150		Speaker Redmond	
150	5:11	Lechowicz	To close
151		Speaker Redmond	
151		Skinner	
151		Speaker Redmond	
151		Lauer	Speaks against
152		Speaker Redmond	
152		Katz	Supports
152		Speaker Redmond	
152		Ewing	Supports
152		Speaker Redmond	
153		Peters	Against
153		Speaker Redmond	Passed
153		Vitek	Point of personal privilege
154		Speaker Redmond	
154		Clerk Hall	SB 917-3rd Reading
154		Skinner	
155		Speaker Redmond	
155		Conti	Oppose
156		Speaker Redmond	
156		Caldwell	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
37.			
157		Speaker Redmond )	
158		Levin )	
159		Keats	Against
159		Taylor	Moves previous question
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Skinner	
159		Speaker Redmond	
159,160		Holewinski )	
160	5:35	Speaker Redmond)	
160		Tipsword	
160		Speaker Redmond	
160		Skinner	To close
161		Speaker Redmond	SB 917 - lost
161		Clerk Hall	SB 961 - 3rd Reading
161		Speaker Redmond	
161		Taylor	
161		Speaker Redmond	
161		Dunn, J. )	
161		Taylor )	
161		Speaker Redmond	
162		Bowman )	
162		Taylor )	
162		Speaker Redmond	
162		Wolf )	
162		Taylor )	
162		Speaker Redmond	SB 961
162		Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
38.			
163		Speaker Redmond	
163	5:41	Sandquist	Explain vote
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Robinson	
163		Speaker Redmond	
163		Houlihan, D.	
163		Speaker Redmond	Passed
164		Friedrich	Leave to vote 'aye'
164		Speaker Redmond)	
164		Geo-Karis )	
164		Speaker Redmond	
164	5:49	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1097-3rd Reading
164		Speaker Redmond	
164		Leverenz	
164		Ebbesen	
165		Speaker Redmond	
165		Leverenz )	
165		Ebbesen )	
165		Speaker Redmond	
165		Waddell )	
166		Leverenz)	
166		Speaker Redmond	
166		Schuneman )	
167		Leverenz )	
167		Speaker Redmond	
167		Rigney )	
168		Leverenz)	



39.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	168		Speaker Redmond )	
			)	
	168		Kane )	
			)	
	168		Leverenz )	
			)	
	168		Kane )	
			)	
	169		Speaker Redmond)	
			)	
	169		Kane )	
			)	
	169		Speaker Redmond	
	169		McAuliffe	
	169		Speaker Redmond	
	169		Van Duyne	Moves previous question
	169		Speaker Redmond	
	169		Leverenz	To close
	170		Speaker Redmond	
	170		Greisheimer	Explains vote
	171		Speaker Redmond	
	171		Mautino	
	171		Speaker Redmond	
	171		Leverenz	Postponed Consideration
	171		Speaker Redmond	Consideration postponed granted
	171		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1142-3rd Reading
	171, 172		Lucco	
	172		Speaker Redmond	
	173		Houlihan, D. )	
			)	
	173		Lucco )	
			)	
	173		Speaker Redmond	
	173		Friedrich )	
			)	
	173		Lucco )	
			)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
40.			
173		Speaker Redmond	
173		Waddell )	
		)	
174,175		Lucco )	
175		Speaker Redmond	
175		Hudson )	
		)	
175		Lucco )	
175		Speaker Redmond	
175		Houlihan, J.)	
		)	
175		Hudson )	
		)	
175		Lucco )	
176		Speaker Redmond	
176		Houlihan, J.	
176		Speaker Redmond	
176		Edgar	
177		Speaker Redmond	
177		Madison	Moves previous question
177		Speaker Redmond	Moved
177		Lucco	To close
177		Speaker Redmond	SB 1142 passed
177		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1143-3rd Reading
178		Speaker Redmond	
178		Daniels	
178		Speaker Redmond	
178		Conti	Can't hear
178		Speaker Redmond	
178		Daniels	
178		Speaker Redmond	



<u>41.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
178		Kosinski )	
		)	
179		Daniels )	
179		Speaker Redmond	
179		Geo-Karis	
179		Speaker Redmond	SB 1143 passed
179		Clerk O'Brien	
179		Speaker Redmond	
179		Katz	
179		Speaker Redmond	
179		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1208-3rd Reading
179		Speaker Redmond	
179		Macdonald	
180		Speaker Redmond	SB 1208 passed
180		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1281-3rd Reading
180		Speaker Redmond	
180		Hoffman	
180		Speaker Redmond	SB 1281-Passed
181		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1322-3rd Reading
181		Speaker Redmond	
181		Giorgi	
181		Speaker Redmond	
181		Walsh	
181		Speaker Redmond	
181		Giorgi	
181		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
181		Walsh )	
182		Speaker Redmond	





Page	Time	Speaker	Information
42.			
182		Levin	
182		Giorgi	
182		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
182		Bowman )	
182,183		Giorgi	
183		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
183		Mugalian )	
183		Speaker Redmond	
183		Deuster	
184		Speaker Redmond	
184		Greiman	
184		Speaker Redmond	
184		Friedrich	
185		Speaker Redmond	
185		Sandquist	Moves previous question
185		Speaker Redmond	
185		Giorgi	To close
185		Speaker Redmond	
185		Katz	Explains vote
186		Speaker Redmond	Passed
186		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1308-3rd Reading
186		Speaker Redmond	
186		Campbell	
186		Speaker Redmond	
186.187		Tipsword	
188		Speaker Redmond	
188		Terzich	Moves previous question



43. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
188		Speaker Redmond	
188		Campbell	
188		Speaker Redmond	
188		Jaffe	
189		Speaker Redmond	
189		Chapman	
189		Speaker Redmond	
189		Kempiners	Moves previous question
189		Speaker Redmond	Passed
189		Marovitz	
190		Speaker Redmond	
190	6:50	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1378-2nd Reading
190		Speaker Redmond	
190		Kane	Am #3 & 4 withdraw
190		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
190		Johnson	
190		Speaker Redmond	
191		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1378-3rd
191		Speaker Redmond	
191		Laurino	
191		Speaker Redmond	
191		Johnson	
192		Speaker Redmond	
192		Bluthardt	
192		Speaker Redmond	
192		Telcser	
192		Speaker Redmond	



44.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
192		Robinson	
193		Speaker Redmond	
193		Terzich	
193		Speaker Redmond	
193		Simms )	
193		)	
193		Laurino)	
193	7:02	Totten	Speaks against the Bill
194		Speaker Redmond	
194		Laurino	To close
194		Speaker Redmond	
194		Dyer	
195		Speaker Redmond	
195		Matijeovich	Against
195		Speaker Redmond	
195		Katz	
195		Speaker Redmond	
196		Totten	Possible verification
196		Speaker Redmond	
196		Satterthwaite	Support
196		Speaker Redmond	
196		Jaffe	Support
197		Speaker Redmond	
197		Leinenweber	Against
197		Speaker Redmond	
197		Greiman	Support
197		Speaker Redmond	
197		Laurino	Explains vote



<u>45.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
198		Speaker Redmond	
198		Laurino	Poll absentees
198		Speaker Redmond	
198		Johnson	Possible verification
198		Speaker Redmond	
198	7:15	Laurino	Postponed consideration
198		Speaker Redmond	
198		Clerk O'Brien	SB 96-3rd Reading
198		Speaker Redmond	
198		Terzich	
199		Speaker Redmond	Passed
199		Clerk O'Brien	SB 103-3rd Reading
199		Speaker Redmond	
199		Terzich	
199		Speaker Redmond	Passed
199		Clerk O'Brien	SB 104-3rd Reading
199		Speaker Redmond	
199		Terzich	Leave to return to 2nd
199		Speaker Redmond	
200		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Bill. Amendment #1
200		Speaker Redmond	
200		Taylor	
200		Speaker Redmond	
200		Bowman	Been distributed?
200		Speaker Redmond	
200		Houlihan, J.	
200		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
46.			
200	7:20	Taylor	Explains Amendment #1
200		Speaker Redmond	
200		Telcser	Oppose
201		Speaker Redmond	
201		Houlihan, D. L.	
201		Speaker Redmond	
201		Geo-Karis	Point of inquiry
201		Speaker Redmond	
201		Terzich	Out of record
201		Speaker Redmond	
201		Clerk O'Brien	SB 106-3rd Reading
201		Speaker Redmond	
201		Terzich	
202		Speaker Redmond	
202		Deuster	
202		Speaker Redmond	Passed
202		Clerk O'Brien	SB 110-3rd Reading
202		Speaker Redmond	
202		Terzich	
202		Speaker Redmond	
203		Robinson )	
203	7:26	)	
203		Terzich )	
203		Speaker Redmond	
203		Houlihan )	
204		)	
204		Terzich )	
205		Speaker Redmond	
205		Tipsword	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
47.			
206		Speaker Redmond	
206		Terzich	To close
206		Speaker Redmond	
206		Friedrich	
206		Terzich	
206		Speaker Redmond	
206		Houlihan, D.	
206		Speaker Redmond	Passed
207		Clerk O'Brien	SB 116-3rd Reading
207		Speaker Redmond	
207		Terzich	
207		Speaker Redmond	
207		Campbell	
207		Speaker Redmond	Passed
207		Clerk O'Brien	SB 125-3rd Reading
207		Speaker Redmond	
207		Terzich	
208	7:40	Speaker Redmond	
208		Houlihan, D.	Oppose
208		Speaker Redmond	
208		Terzich	
208		Speaker Redmond	
208		Katz	
208		Speaker Redmond	
208		Chapman	
208		Speaker Redmond	SB 125 passed
209		Clerk O'Brien	SB-205-3rd-Reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
48.			
209		Speaker Redmond	
209		Terzich	Wants SB 104 handled
209		Speaker Redmond	
209		Clerk O'Brien	SB 104-3rd Reading
209		Speaker Redmond	
209		Terzich	
209		Speaker Redmond	
209		Geo-Karis )	Against
		)	
209		Speaker Redmond )	
		)	
209		Houlihan, D. )	
210		Speaker Redmond	
210		Geo-Karis	Point of order
210		Speaker Redmond	
210		Walsh	
210		Speaker Redmond	
210		Satterthwaite )	
		)	
211		Taylor )	
211		Speaker Redmond	
211		Houlihan, D.	
211		Speaker Redmond	
211		Bluthardt	
212		Speaker Redmond	
212		Willer	'No'
212		Speaker Redmond	
212		Mugalian	
212		Taylor	
212		Geo-Karis	Verification



Page	Time	Speaker	Information
49.			
212		Speaker Redmond	
212		Walsh	Urge 'no'
213		Speaker Redmond	
213		Deavers	Support
213		Speaker Redmond	
213		Geo-Karis	Point of parliamentary inquiry
213		Speaker Redmond	
213		Mautino	
213		Speaker Redmond	
213		Conti	
214		Speaker Redmond	
214		Taylor	
214		Taylor	
214		Speaker Redmond	69 'aye' 79 'no'
214		Taylor	
214		Speaker Redmond	
214		Leverenz	
214		Speaker Redmond	
214		Bluthardt	
214		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 fails
214		Clerk O'Brien	SB 104-3rd Reading
214	7:58	Speaker Redmond	
214		Terzich	
215		Speaker Redmond	Passed
215		Terzich	
215		Clerk O'Brien	SB 143-3rd Reading
215		Speaker Redmond	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
50.			
215		Geo-Karis )	
216		Terzich )	Table SB 143
216		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
216		Clerk O'Brien	SB 205-3rd Reading
216		Speaker Redmond	
216		Reilly	
217		Speaker Redmond	
217		McClain	
217		Speaker Redmond	Passed
218		Clerk O'Brien	SB 639-3rd Reading
218		Speaker Redmond	
218		Cunningham	
219	8:05	Lechowicz in the Chair	
219	8:06	McClain	Against
219		Speaker Lechowicz	
219		Johnson )	
220		Cunningham,	
220		Speaker Lechowicz	
220		Friedrich	Out of order
220		Speaker Lechowicz	
220		Johnson	
221		Speaker Lechowicz	
221		Stuffle	
221		Speaker Lechowicz	
221		Campbell	
221		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>51.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
222		Leverenz )	
222		) Cunningham)	
222		Speaker Lechowicz	
222		Dunn, J.	Moves previous question
222		Speaker Lechowicz	
222		Cunningham	
222		Speaker Lechowicz	
222		O'Daniel	
223		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 639
223		Bowman	
223		Speaker Lechowicz	
223		Schneider	Explains vote
224		Speaker Lechowicz	
224		Jones	
224		Speaker Lechowicz	
224		Bowman	
225		Speaker Lechowicz	
225		Lauer	Explains vote
225		Speaker Lechowicz	
225		Satterthwaite	
225		Speaker Lechowicz	
226		Mugalian	Verification
226		Speaker Lechowicz	
226		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
226		Speaker Lechowicz	Change to 'aye'
226		McPike	'aye'
226		Speaker Lechowicz	



52.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	226		Jones, E.	'aye'
	226		Speaker Lechowicz	
	226		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds with verification
	227		Speaker Lechowicz	
	227		Mugalian	Raise hands?
	227		Speaker Lechowicz	
	227		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
	227		Speaker Lechowicz	
	227		Sumner	
	227		Speaker Lechowicz	
	227		Winchester	Verified as 'aye'
	227		Speaker Lechowicz	
	227		McBroom	Leave to be verified
	227		Speaker Lechowicz	
	227		Giglio	Verified?
	228		Speaker Lechowicz	
	228		Mugalian )	Questions Affirmative Roll Call
	228	8:30	Speaker Lechowicz )	
	228		McCourt	Record 'aye'
	228,229		Mugalian )	
	230		Speaker Lechowicz )	
	231		Clerk O'Brien )	
	231		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 639 passed
	231		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1148
	231		Katz	Leave to withdraw #1 & 2
	232		Speaker Lechowicz	



53. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
232		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
232		Katz	
232		Speaker Lechowicz	
232		Leinenweber	
232		Speaker Lechowicz )	
232		Katz )	
232		Speaker Lechowicz )	3rd Reading
233		Bluthardt )	
233		Speaker Lechowicz	
233		Katz	
233		Speaker Lechowicz	
233		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1068-3rd Reading
233		Leinenweber	
234		Speaker Lechowicz	
234		Tipsword )	
234		Leinenweber )	
234		Speaker Lechowicz	
234		Gaines	
234		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1068 passed
235		Katz	Leave to waive rule consider SB 1148
235		Speaker Lechowicz	
235		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1148
235		Telcser	Question
235		Speaker Lechowicz	
235		Katz	
235		Speaker Lechowicz	



54.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
236		McClain	
236		Speaker Lechowicz	
236		Waddell )	
		)	
237		Katz )	
237		Dunn, J.	
237		Speaker Lechowicz	
237		Katz	To close
238	8:56	Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
238		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1203-3rd Reading
238		Speaker Lechowicz	
238		McPike	
238	8:58	Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
238		Daniels	
238		Speaker Lechowicz)	
		)	
239		Walsh )	
239		Speaker Lechowicz	
239		McLendon	Vote on HB 1203
239		Speaker Lechowicz	
239		Conti	
239		Speaker Lechowicz	
239		McBroom	SB 1259
239		Speaker Lechowicz	
239		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1259-3rd Reading
239		Speaker Lechowicz	
239		McBroom	
240		Speaker Lechowicz	



55. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
240		Bradley)	
240		) McBroom)	
240		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
241		Brady	SB 293
241		Speaker Lechowicz	
241		Clerk O'Brien	SB 293-3rd Reading
241		Speaker Lechowicz	
241		Clerk O'Brien	
241		Speaker Lechowicz	
241	9:06	Polk	
242		Speaker Lechowicz	
242		Brady	Responds to Polk
242		Speaker Lechowicz	
242		Schneider	
242		Speaker Lechowicz	
242		Polk	Stand corrected
242		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
242		DiPrima	
242		Speaker Lechowicz )	
243		) Tuerk )	Wants to call SB 600
243		) Clerk O'Brien )	Moved to Interim Study
243		Bradley	
243		Tuerk	
243		Speaker Lechowicz	
243		Mautino	Point of order
243		Speaker Lechowicz	
244		Walsh	Point of order



<u>56.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
244		Speaker Lechowicz	
244		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2414-2nd R-No C.A.
244		Speaker Lechowicz	
244		Skinner	Amendment #1
244		Speaker Lechowicz	
245	9:10	Bradley	Question
245		Speaker Lechowicz )	
		)	
245		Skinner )	
		)	
245		Speaker Lechowicz	
245		Telcser	Oppose Amendment #1
245		Speaker Lechowicz	
246		Skinner )	
		)	
246		Speaker Lechowicz)	
246		Houlihan, J.	
246		Speaker Lechowicz	
246		Holewinski	Verification on every Amendment
246		Speaker Lechowicz	
246		Bradley	
247		Speaker Lechowicz	
247		Tipsword	
247		Speaker Lechowicz	
247		Matijevich	Motion to defer action
247		Speaker Lechowicz	
247,248		Telcser	Out of record
249		Speaker Lechowicz	Dump Roll-Out of record-remain on 2nd
249		Jones, E.	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
57.			
249		Speaker Lechowicz	
250		Mann )	
		)	
250		Speaker Lechowicz)	
250		Caldwell	
250		Speaker Lechowicz	
250		Mann	Asks for explanation of Bill
251	9:26	Jones, E.	
251		Speaker Lechowicz	
251		Taylor	Moves previous question
251		Speaker Lechowicz	
251		Willer	Explains vote
252		Speaker Lechowicz	
252		Bowman	Breach of rules
252		Speaker Lechowicz	
252		Gaines	Explains vote
252		Speaker Lechowicz	
252		Taylor	
252		Speaker Lechowicz	
252		Jones, E.	
253		Speaker Lechowicz	Dump Roll
253		Davis, C.	
254		Speaker Lechowicz	
254		Jones, E.	
254		Speaker Lechowicz	Poll absentees
255		Clerk O'Brien	
255		Speaker Lechowicz	99 'ayes' SB 23 passed
256	9:38	Deuster	SB 161-3rd Reading



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
58.			
256		Speaker Lechowicz	
256		Schneider	
256		Speaker Lechowicz	
257		Brady	
257		Speaker Lechowicz	
257		Geo-Karis	
257		Speaker Lechowicz	
257		Walsh	
257		Speaker Lechowicz	
257		Neff	
258		Speaker Lechowicz	
258		Deuster	Explains vote
258		Speaker Lechowicz	
258		Reed	"
258		Speaker Lechowicz	
258		Summer	"
259		Speaker Lechowicz	
259		Dyer	"
259		Speaker Lechowicz	Poll absentees
259		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
259		Speaker Lechowicz	Bill lost
259		Clerk O'Brien	SB 312-3rd Reading
259		Speaker Lechowicz	
259	9:48	Yourell	
260		Speaker Lechowicz	
260		Skinner	
260		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 312



59. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
260		Yourell	
260		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
261		Harris	'no' on SB 312
261		Speaker Lechowicz	
261		Clerk O'Brien	SB 359-3rd Reading
261		Speaker Lechowicz	
261		Willer	
262		Speaker Lechowicz	
262		Davis, J.	Oppose
262		Speaker Lechowicz	
262		Bowman	Explains vote
263		Speaker Lechowicz	
263		Willer	Poll absentees
263		Speaker Lechowicz	
263		Tipsword	
263		Speaker Lechowicz	
263		Johnson	
263		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
264		Clerk O'Brien	SB 382-3rd
264	10:00	Speaker Lechowicz	
264		McMaster	
264		Speaker Lechowicz	
264		Jaffe	
265		Speaker Lechowicz	
265		Keats	'aye' vote
265		Speaker Lechowicz	
265		Conti	



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
<del>Speaker</del>	
<del>Speaker</del>	
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	Lost
<del>Speaker</del>	'no' on SB 312
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del> O'Brien	SB 359-3rd Reading
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del> J.	Oppose
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	Explains vote
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	Poll absentees
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	Lost
<del>Speaker</del> O'Brien	SB 382-3rd
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	'aye' vote
<del>Speaker</del> Lechowicz	
<del>Speaker</del>	

186/11/77

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
60.			
265		Speaker Lechowicz	
265		Yourell	
265		Speaker Lechowicz	
265		Davis, J.	
266		Speaker Lechowicz	
266		Pullen	
266		Speaker Lechowicz	
266		Greiman	Explain vote
267		Speaker Lechowicz	
267		McMaster	Poll absentees
267		Speaker Lechowicz	
267		Jaffe	Possible verification
267		Speaker Lechowicz	
267		Clerk O'Brien	
267		Speaker Lechowicz	
267		Taylor	
267		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
267		Kane	Move suspend rules-expl of vote
268		Speaker Lechowicz	
268		Clerk O'Brien	SB 467
268		Speaker Lechowicz	
268		Giorgi	Leave from 3rd to 2nd for Amend
268		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave granted
268		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
268		Giorgi	
269		Speaker Lechowicz )	
269		)	
269		Telcser )	



61. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
269		Giorgi	
269		Speaker Lechowicz	
269		Tipsword	
269		Giorgi	
270		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #1 adopted-3rd
270		Giorgi	
270		Speaker Lechowicz	
270		Walsh	Object
270	10:31	Speaker Lechowicz	
270		Simms	Question
270		Speaker Lechowicz )	
270		Matijeovich )	
271		Speaker Lechowicz	
271		Giorgi	Proceed with Amendment
271		Speaker Lechowicz	Takes 107 votes
271		Houlihan, D.	Explains vote
271		Speaker Lechowicz	
271		Walsh	Explains vote
272		Speaker Lechowicz	
272		Giorgi	Leave for Interim Study
272		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave granted
272		Clerk O'Brien	SB 478
272		Speaker Lechowicz	
272		Mugalian	Parliamentary Inquiry
272		Speaker Lechowicz	
272		Bradley	SB 478



62.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
273		Speaker Lechowicz )	
		)	
273		Bradley )	
		)	
274		Speaker Lechowicz)	Passed
		)	
274		Walsh )	
		)	
274		Speaker Lechowicz	
274		Polk	SB 693
275		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
276		McMaster	
276		Clerk O'Brien	SB 732
276		Speaker Lechowicz	
276		Christensen	Leave to call 732 & 733 together
276		Speaker Lechowicz	
276		Clerk O'Brien	SB 733
276		Speaker Lechowicz	
276		Christensen	
276		Speaker Lechowicz	
277		Johnson	Questions
277		Speaker Lechowicz	Short Debate
277		Johnson	Opponent.
278		Speaker Lechowicz	
278		Johnson	
278		Speaker Lechowicz	Explains vote
278		Tipsword	
278		Speaker Lechowicz	
278		Deavers	
278		Speaker Lechowicz	



63. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
278		Stuffle	Support
278		Speaker Lechowicz	
279		Wolf	Explain vote
279		Speaker Lechowicz	
279		Luft	Question of Chair
279		Speaker Lechowicz	Explains vote
280		Kent	
280		Speaker Lechowicz	
280		Houlihan	
280		Speaker Lechowicz	
280		Telcser	
280		Speaker Lechowicz	
280		Boucek	
280		Speaker Lechowicz	
280		Yourell	
280		Speaker Lechowicz	
281		Deavers	
281		Speaker Lechowicz	
281		Matijeovich	
281		Speaker Lechowicz	
281		Lauer	
281		Speaker Lechowicz	
281		Kane	
282		Speaker Lechowicz	
282		Christensen	
282		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
282		Deavers	Asks for verification



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

64. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
282		Speaker Lechowicz	Poll absentees
282		Clerk O'Brien	
283		Speaker Lechowicz	
283		Williams	Change to 'aye'
283		Speaker Lechowicz	
283		Houlihan	
283		Speaker Lechowicz	
283		Deavers	
283		Speaker Lechowicz	Proceed with verification
283		Clerk O'Brien	
283		Speaker Lechowicz	Proceed
284		Clerk O'Brien	
284		Speaker Lechowicz	
284		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
284		Speaker Lechowicz	Questions of Affirmative Roll
284		Deavers	Plenty
284	10:32	Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll
285		Speaker Lechowicz	
285		Deavers	Questions
285, 286		Speaker Lechowicz	
286		Ryan	Leave to be verified
287,288		Speaker Lechowicz	
288		Christensen	Bills tabled
289		Speaker Lechowicz	
289		Greiman	
289		Speaker Lechowicz	
289		Kane	Move to adjourn





65.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
289		Speaker Lechowicz	Not recognized for that reason
289		Greiman	HB 963
290		Speaker Lechowicz	
290		Houlihan, J.	
291		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
292		Clerk O'Brien )	Leave to return SB 978 to 2nd
292		Speaker Lechowicz)	
292		Deuster )	Objections raised
293		Speaker Lechowicz)	
293		Clerk O'Brien	Move to bring SB 978 back
293		Speaker Lechowicz	
293		McClain	
293		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion fails
293		O'Brien	
293		Speaker Lechowicz	
293		Telcser	
293	11:08	O'Brien	Go with SB 978
293		Speaker Lechowicz	
293		Telcser	Oppose SB 978
294		Speaker Lechowicz	
294		Houlihan, J.	He's out of order
294		Speaker Lechowicz	
294		Telcser	
295		Speaker Lechowicz)	
295		O'Brien )	
296		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
296		Leverenz	Where's 1097?



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
66.			
296		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1296
296		Giorgi	
296		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
296		Brummer	SB 1301-3rd Reading
297		Speaker Lechowicz	
297		Wolf	
297		Speaker Lechowicz	
297		Levin	
297		Speaker Lechowicz	
298		Brummer	
298		Speaker Lechowicz	
298		Kane	
298		Speaker Lechowicz	
298	11:18	Brummer	
298		Speaker Lechowicz	
298		Davis, J.	
298		Speaker Lechowicz	
298		Bowman	
299		Speaker Lechowicz	
299		O'Daniel	
299		Speaker Lechowicz	
299		Kane	
299		Speaker Lechowicz	
299		Clerk O'Brien	Polis absentees
299		Speaker Lechowicz	
299		Johnson	Votes 'aye'
299		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
67.			
300		Clerk O'Brien	90 'ayes' 28 'nays'
301		Speaker Lechowicz )	Kane requests verification
		)	
301		Clerk O'Brien )	
		)	
301		Kane )	questions
302		Walsh	HB 1301
302		Speaker Lechowicz	90 'ayes' 28 'noes' Passed
302		Leverenz	SB 1097
303		Speaker Lechowicz	
303	11:32	Willer	Leave to take SB 983 from table to Interim Study
303		Speaker Lechowicz	
303		Collins	Leave to vote 'no' on 793
303		Speaker Lechowicz	Objections raised
303		McMaster	
303		Speaker Lechowicz	
304		Laurino	SB 1378
304		Speaker Lechowicz	
304		Wolf	
304		Speaker Lechowicz	
304		Houlihan, J.	
304		Speaker Lechowicz	
304		Leinenweber	
305		Speaker Lechowicz	Lost
305		Clerk O'Brien)	SB 305
		)	
305		McClain )	
305		Speaker Lechowicz	
305		Houlihan, D.	Withdraws Amendment #1



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
68.			
305		Speaker Lechowicz	
305		Clerk O'Brien	
305		Speaker Lechowicz	3rd Reading
305		Clerk O'Brien	SB 305-3rd Reading
305		McClain	Explains
306		Speaker Lechowicz	
306		Mugalian )	
		)	
306		McClain )	
307		Speaker Lechowicz )	
		)	
307		Tipsword )	
307		McClain	
307		Tipsword	
307		Speaker Lechowicz )	
		)	
307		Porter )	
307		McClain	
307		Porter	
308		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
308		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1312-3rd Reading
308		Speaker Lechowicz	
308		DiPrima	
308		Speaker Lechowicz	1312 passed
308		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1124-3rd Reading
308		Speaker Lechowicz	
308		Giorgi	
309		Speaker Lechowicz	
309		Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
69.			
309		Speaker Lechowicz )	
309		Houlihan, J. )	
309		Giorgi	
309		Houlihan, J.	
309		Giorgi	
309		Speaker Lechowicz	
309		Houlihan, J.	
309		Speaker Lechowicz	
310		Peters	
310		Speaker Lechowicz	
310		Keats	
310		Speaker Lechowicz	Bill lost
310		Clerk O'Brien	SB 29-3rd Reading
310		Speaker Lechowicz	
310		Deuster	
310		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
311		Madigan	Move to adjourn
311		Speaker Lechowicz	Adjourned

