

Doorkeeper Koehler: "All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Led in prayer by Reverend Robert McDonald."

Rev. McDonald: "Let's stand together and bow our heads. Almighty and most holy God, our Father, surely Thou art high and lifted up. Your thoughts are far above our thoughts, for we are but men and women and You are God. Lord, we lift these men and women representing the people of the great State of Illinois to You for guidance and blessing. If they go the second and third mile, meeting for extra hours and days, grant unto them the ability to reach decisions for the good of all, compromising where they must, living with one another, working on the principle of love and brotherhood. Bless them with patience, Father, patience and understanding and endurance as they work to meet a deadline for the sake of the people of Illinois. In the name of the Lord, Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. On the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 2549, Representative DiPrima. DiPrima, do you want to go with the Concurrence on 2549? 2549. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2549. All it does is..."

Speaker Redmond: "Hawaii Five-0 wants to know what it does."

DiPrima: "Correcting some of the language. It's deleting 'armed forces' and inserting in lieu thereof 'armed forces, Department of Defense' and on page 1 by deleting line 16 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'killed or such servicemen or servicewomen as have been declared by the U.S. Department of Defense or the U.S. Veteran's Administration to be permanently disabled with ninety to one hundred percent disability.' It takes out the State Scholarship Commission and inserts in lieu thereof 'Department of Veteran's Affairs', leaving nothing."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

DiPrima: "I move for the adoption of..."

Speaker Redmond: "So what's new?"

DiPrima: "...Senate Amendment #1."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2549. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90, 100 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2549. Representative Tipword on 2790? Out of the record. Representative Epton on 2808. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to nonconcur with this Amendment, Senate Amendment #1. It adds one simple sentence to the Bill. However, I'm not sure to what the necessity for it is. I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss it with the Senate Sponsor. Hopefully, we can resolve it and I would recommend at this time that we nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2808. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The motion carried and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1. Monroe Flinn, you ready on 2842? 2842."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on House... on House Bill 2842, the Senate Amendment made a correction. There was an objection on the floor of the House when the Bill passed the House and I agreed to have the Senate amend the thing. And what it amounts to, it permits churches to have a liquor license but not interfere with the one hundred feet law. And so we left it one hundred feet law like it is and I would move for the concurrence of Senate Amendment to House Bill 2842."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Gentleman would hold this Bill till I have an opportunity..."

Flinn: "I agree to hold it."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this one out of the record. Representative Wikoff on the floor? Polk. Is he here? Representative Matejek. How about Representative Flinn on 2928?"

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on 2928, this is the Bill that would permit the municipalities to maintain the septic tanks in those areas where



they couldn't sewer them. And there was a problem with the Taxpayer's Federation that we had a seventy-five percent of the voters who would have to object to anything they did that way and they wanted to make it fifty-one percent and I agreed with their fifty-one percent and that's what this Amendment does. I would move for the concurrence of Senate Amendment 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2928. 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 100 'aye' and 1 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2928. Looks like we've done the simple ones so we'll stand at ease till the call of the Chair. My guess would be about a half hour. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Before we go at ease, Mr. Speaker, would the record indicate Representative Kornowicz being excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, the record will so show. The Order of Concurrence, we're going to take things that are noncontroversial. Representative Conti, you have one on Conference... Concurrence. 2983. Is that controversial? Appropriation for the Commissioner of Banks and Trusts. Want to go with that one? 2083."

Conti: "It's just a couple of line items, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a couple of line item expenses that have been changed in the Senate. And the Hynes Amendment is not more than fifty percent of the appropriation for personal services, travel, telecommunications and operations of auto equipment. It's noncontroversial. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2983. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109 'aye' and 1 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2983. 2999, Representative Tipword. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate put an Amendment on that had been



requested of the Secretary of State by the Space Needs Commission who have constructed the new parking garage and at the time we voted for the construction of the parking garage, it was indicated that it was...would pay for its own operation. And the Secretary of State has discovered through his council that he has no authority to charge rent upon any of the state buildings and this is an Amendment put on authorizing him to make a charge of twenty dollars per space for rent of spaces in the new state parking facility."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2999. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Will the Gentleman inform us what the rate for Legislators is?"

Tipsword: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I wasn't quite sure whether the House Sponsor had stated what I thought I heard him say. Did he say that the Secretary of State was asking authority to impose a fee on all people who parked in the state parking garage. Is that correct?"

Tipsword: "No, the... this authorizes it. He had been requested by the Space Needs Commission or been authorized to direct it, to charge for the parking spaces in the parking facility. He had his council do research on it and he found no authority that he could do so. This is in compliance with the Space Needs Commission's request that the parking facility should pay for its own operation and this authorizes him to charge twenty dollars a space."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "The Sponsor has answered Representative Griesheimer that is the reason for this. Space Needs had requested him to do this and he found out that he couldn't. But in response to Representative Bowman, Legislators pay the same price as everybody else and that's the way it ought to be."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's



110 'aye' and 6 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2999. Representative McAuliffe here? How about 2869? Representative Lucco, can you handle that one?"

2869."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2869, we're asking for concurrence. The Senate made a minor change. All they did was strike out the word 'services'; put in 'industrial related services'. This is a Bill which permits the state to buy products made in our state prisons. And I would recommend concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2869. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and no 'nay'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2869. Representative Jane Barnes, 2775, is that controversial? Out of the record. Representative Dan O'Brien here? Any Member got a noncontroversial item on the Order of Concurrence they want called? How about Environmental Energy, is that your Commission? 3151. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3151 amended the Nature Preserve Act and to provide that cave... caverns would be, you know, nature... appropriate items for nature preserves. But the Senate added an Amendment that was inadvertently deleted from the Park District Code in the last Session and it's... was inadvertent deletion in the Senate Bill and it really... I've been informed by the staff that has a very, no significant impact and it really puts the Park District Code back into the form it was in the previous Session with respect to exchange of land between private and public interests and I move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, this is the Bill that we heard in the Environment Committee."



Bowman: "That's right."

Geo-Karis: "Would you tell us in...I couldn't quite understand from your explanation just what the difference was between the way we heard the Bill in the Environment Committee and the Senate Amendment."

Bowman: "Oh, the Senate Amendment actually, simply clarifies something that's in the same part of the code but really was not... it doesn't address itself to the same problem as the Bill in its original form addressed itself to. Basically what the Amendment does is this. It provides that private parties and park districts can exchange land of equal value."

Geo-Karis: "What about Senate Amendment 2? Is that Senate Amendment 1 you're talking about?"

Bowman: "I'm sorry, could you speak up?"

Geo-Karis: "There were two Amendments, you know. Senate Amendment... looks like it's..."

Bowman: "Yeah, I'm sorry. Senate Amendment 1 is totally technical, just changes... corrected a misspelling."

Geo-Karis: "All right, fine. And Senate Amendment 2 is the one relative to exchange of land?"

Bowman: "That's right, exchange of land... comparable value."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment... Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mahar: "Representative Bowman, I'd like to ask a question about the principle of conveying property to the nongovernmental entity in exchange for similar suitable property. Don't we have the statutes that require public bidding on this type of thing? In other words, what we're doing here is allowing the park boards to enter into an agreement with a private entity without the authority or without the opportunity for the public at large to be involved?"

Bowman: "Representative, in response to your question, I believe you'll notice in the Amendment it says requires that any exchanges



be of substantially the same value so that there would be no necessity for seeking, you know, the lowest value for the acquisition of a specific parcel. In other words, the basic purpose of the Amendment as I understand from the Senate Sponsor is to simply provide park districts flexibility in filling out the, you know, around the boundaries, their territory, to achieve a configuration of land that is more useful for their purposes.

I think if they were going to be acquiring land de novo, then they would probably want to, you know, to take bids or... but what they're doing is exchanging comparable value."

Mahar: "Yes, I can understand. There's an example given here which is probably a very good and valid thing and the most expeditious way to handle it would be to handle it probably in this manner. But you know, we can't look at these things in terms of just this particular situation. We have to look in terms of appraisal. You said similar value. It has to be an appraisal set, number one."

Bowman: "That's right."

Mahar: "It has public... there should be public notices so that other people who might be interested might have the opportunity. Beyond this, probably nobody but the private enterprise and the park are all that's concerned. When you put in the statutes, then you're opening the thing up to some other transaction elsewhere which would be a totally different thing and I'm just wondering what safeguards we had. Now in a couple recent situations, one for Representative Schneider, the language was so worded it was almost impossible for anybody else to be involved in this type of thing. And the cities and villages situation for Representative Brummet, the same applied. I'm wondering what safeguards we have here so that this thing can't become a normal routine for park districts to engage in... in transactions with private enterprise with no checks and balances."

Bowman: "Well, two things. First of all, I believe that there would have to be an appraisal. Otherwise, there would be no means of establishing comparability of values. Okay, that's my first response. My second response is that the exchange of land in order to be of value to the parties would necessarily, seems to me, have



to be in some kind of contiguous... in almost all cases, it would be contiguous parcels and that would automatically limit the field right away so that even if they, you know, open it up to anybody who's interested, I doubt that in ninety-nine percent of the cases anyone else would be interested."

Mahar: "I don't... we don't talk about contiguous aspects here. I don't see contiguous in here. Now I'm... I'm not totally familiar with the initial piece of legislation."

Bowman: "My understanding, Representative Mahar, and I mentioned this in my opening remarks and perhaps you missed it, this is precisely the way the statute used to read. Up until the Spring Session of this General Assembly, the statute was... worded in precisely that way. And a Bill that was passed by both Houses, sponsored by Senator Wooten in the Senate who sponsored this Amendment, changed the Park District Code and inadvertently deleted that particular language. That language is being requested to be put back into the statutes. I'm not aware of any abuses which had existed in the past when the language was in that form and so that's why I agreed with the Senate Sponsor to simply, you know, to..."

Mahar: "You're saying then that this was in the Code before and..."

Bowman: "That's my understanding. I asked the staff of the Environment Committee in the House to check into that for me and that was two days ago. I have not received a negative response."

Mahar: "Would you be willing to hold this?"

Bowman: "I would."

Mahar: "And look at it?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Mahar: "Thank you very much."

Bowman: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, could we take this out of the record?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. How about 3006? Representative Getty, is that yours? Judiciary II. Representative Getty."

Getty: "At the request of one of the Members who isn't here, I'd like to hold it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll take that one out. Cissy Stiehl, is she here? Senate Bills, Second Reading. 1456."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1456. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Tipsword."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword, doesn't look like Representative McClain is here. Have you discussed your motion with him?"

Tipsword: "No, I haven't and I was wondering if we even have a quorum."

Speaker Redmond: "We'd better take this one out. 1469. Out of the record. Wait a minute. Are there any motions on 1469 with respect to Amendment 1? Yes. By whom? Representative Tipsword, same thing with that one I assume? Out of the record. 1535."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1535. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to Higher Education Institutions and Agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1558."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1558. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1562. Seven Amendments on this one so we'd better take that out of the record. Representative Martin."

L. Martin: "Speaker, if you recall we just were waiting for one of the Amendments to be distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

L. Martin: "They want... most of the Amendments that they're talking about are to be withdrawn. There's only one, I think, that has



to be voted on."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is the Sponsor of the Amendment that's in earnest? Representative Tuerk. Let's call 1562."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1562... Senate Bill 1562. A Bill for an Act to amend the title in Section 1 of an Act to provide for the enforcement by the Department of Public Health certain state and local food handling and health regulations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 4... Amendments #1 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments 1 and 4?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #4 by Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin."

L. Martin: "Just a correction. 1 was adopted in Committee. 4 was a Floor Amendment and it's about to be withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Was 4 adopted in Committee?"

L. Martin: "It was not."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there a motion with respect to Amendment 1?"

L. Martin: "No. That stays with the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "The records show that Amendment is a Floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 4 was a Floor Amendment adopted and subsequently tabled. The motion to table Amendment 4 prevailed."

Speaker Redmond: "Then the Calendar's in error. It should not show 4 on... Calendar as having been a Committee Amendment, is that correct?"

Clerk O'Brien: "You're correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5 was ruled not germane. Amendment, Floor Amendment #6, Tuerk, was withdrawn previously. Amendment #7, Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 1562 on page 1 by deleting line 1 through 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of this Amendment? Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #7 was brought



to my attention by the State's Attorneys office in Peoria where we have a Peoria City-County Health Department which is a combination and it currently licenses and regulates food service establishments throughout the county by way of an intergovernmental agreement with the state Department of Health. But what the agreement fails to authorize the county to issue licenses and collect a fee. And the Attorney General's office is presently reviewing at the present time requests to some other county and what county that is is subject to local licensing of food establishments and what this Amendment does is enable the county board, and it's permissive, having a population of less than five hundred thousand which makes it consistent with the present statute of those counties over five hundred thousand, the opportunity to regulate in the food service establishments in the county and establish a license fee of not less than twenty-five dollars, no more than a hundred annually which is the same language as in the statutes today. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think this is a very important Amendment that everyone should pay very close attention to. This establishes another bureaucracy at the local level and allows government to regulate and charge fees on small business establishments. We already have a state inspection for these establishments. I think everyone can agree that in the county level and in the local municipality levels that we've got in some cases federal inspectors, state inspectors, and local inspectors going in these places. I think now that every third customer in one of these small restaurants is an inspector instead of a paying patron, so I urge everyone to vote 'no' on this Amendment. I think it establishes another layer of bureaucracy. I think it's a terrible Amendment. It's got a good Sponsor, but that's the only thing I can say for it. I think it's a bad Amendment and everyone should vote against it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Tuerk to close."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Usually my colleague



from Peoria and I agree on most things except this one we violently disagree. It doesn't establish another layer of bureaucracy. If the Gentleman from Peoria is not interested in protecting his constituents to the point that I'm consistent with my beliefs that I want to protect those constituents back there and make sure that all people that are using the food establishments within the county are protected, then that's one thing. But to say that it creates another level of bureaucracy I think is a hundred and eight degrees in the opposite direction of my thinking because what is happening today is, Peoria County is now doing it with an intergovernmental agreement with the state agency and what's going to happen if the Attorney General rules against this sort of thing, then we're going to have some real problems back in the county. Now my friend from Peoria has some problems with this based on some real deep feelings and I can understand what his feelings are. I don't particularly plan to bring those to the floor of the House, but I see nothing wrong with this. It's being done right now and it's just an extension of what is being done and makes it legal and some of the counties with the higher population are able to do this at the present time. And I just want to make sure that our constituents back home and throughout the state are protected with the proper licensing and regulation and inspection that should take place and the state is not in the position to provide the manpower to do it at the present time. I think it's a good Amendment and should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #7. Representative Geo-Karis, I called on Representative Tuerk to close."

Geo-Karis: "I'm sorry. Could you just give me the essence of that Amendment because I can't find it here?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis is requesting the essence of Amendment."

Tuerk: "The essence of the Amendment is to give counties of five hundred thousand or less the opportunity to do what some of the counties are doing today and that is inspecting and regulating and licensing food establishments throughout their counties."



This is a permissive Amendment. It gives the county board in those counties of five hundred thousand or less the opportunity to do this if they care to do this."

Geo-Karis: "And if they do that then the state doesn't have to do it, is that right?"

Tuerk: "That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "I speak in favor of this Amendment. I think it's a very good Amendment, a helpful one because I know in my county we do have a County Health Department and they do it anyway so I speak in favor of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #7. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "In explaining my vote, I think that all of those in the downstate counties that are smaller counties had better take a good long look at this Amendment. I can see the value of it if it was, let us say, a hundred thousand population and up. I happen to come from a county that's thirty-eight thousand, five hundred. Our Health Department includes a doctor and a nurse at the county level. I do not want to see this type of a situation occur in the small counties. They don't have the manpower to do it now. It would cause problems for those counties that are very small. For example, Peoria being a hundred thousand population I could see probably the need for it, but the way this legislation is drafted, I think can have a problem with it in the downstate areas."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, it appears to me, I may be wrong but it seems to me that some people have a misconception about what the Amendment does. I think absolutely Representative Mudd is correct in his assumption that this is a duplication of efforts and an unnecessary burden on small business, an unnecessary burden particularly on the small restaurants in many of our downstate districts. The position taken by Representative Mudd is absolutely correct. It just adds another layer of unneeded inspection, unneeded bureaucracy, and it seems we're going to have as many inspectors and customers in some of these small places



if we don't watch what we're doing and we ought to defeat the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin."

L. Martin: "I think some of the worries about the Amendment are accurate. Nonetheless, I'm going to vote 'yes' on the Amendment. This Bill is headed for a Conference Committee. Representative Tuerk has indicated, I think quite rightly, that within that Conference Committee we will change that Amendment to block so it will only be the large urban counties that have City-County Health Departments where if we don't have something like this in the act, they'll be able to work only within the city limits even though they have a contract within the county. So I think you can vote for the Amendment, you'll see the Bill again. I guarantee you there will be a lower limit so the downward counties or the smaller counties will not have to be concerned and that only those counties which already have the City-County Health Department will be involved."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there shouldn't be any downstate Representatives that comes from any rural area with small restaurants and coffee shops, taverns, serving food business and what have you that would be voting for this Bill. One more harrassment of these small business people in the rural areas, that's the last thing we need to do is discourage small business in Illinois and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, Representative Martin is absolutely correct. If this is a problem, far be it for me to hurt small business. I think most of the people in this chamber know that from my voting record and for my articulation on this floor relative to my relationship with small, medium or large business. I don't think that's the real issue here. I think the issue is the people that are using these facilities and where we have the City and the County Health Department doing the job now, I want to make sure that that is continued. Now, Representative Martin has indicated my... my consent to take care



of this problem for the smaller counties and I would certainly do that. You have my word that it will be done. It will be amended somewhere in the vicinity of a hundred and seventy-five or a hundred and fifty thousand population. I have no problem with that whatsoever. I would urge you to support the Amendment and we'll take care of it a little later on. You have my word of that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, it's too late to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, but my... it was my understanding that this was instead of and instead of addition to. Can you answer you that?"

Tuerk: "The county department would be doing it instead of, instead of addition to the state department."

Friedrich: "Right. There won't be two inspections?"

Tuerk: "No."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I'd rather take a chance in some of these counties of letting a local health inspector inspect a restaurant where they understand the local conditions and I would... some fellow that's reading a book and came in and doesn't understand some of these little country towns a farmer may walk in with a little sod on his shoes and then the health inspector declare it unfit. This has happened in my area because some of these little elevator towns have a restaurant where the fellows come in with their boots on and the state health inspector just plain doesn't understand that. And I think a county health inspector would."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, is this Bill on Second Reading right now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Anderson: "Well, my suggestion to the Sponsor is just take it out of the record and amend it right now to get that lower limit in for the smaller counties. I'll vote 'no' until he does that."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm the Sponsor of the Amendment. I'm not Sponsor of the Bill. I have no way of



taking this Bill out of the record. All I'm indicating to the Membership is that it will be taken care of and you have my word and you have the Sponsor of the Bill's word. I don't know what else word you need other than that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin."

L. Martin: "I... if the Amendment loses, as I say, the Amendment truly doesn't mean a great deal to me one way or the other. I want the Bill moving on."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 51 'aye' and 76 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails, the Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Cissy Stiehl here? Let's try 1575."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1575. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Office of Lieutenant Governor. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor isn't here and an Amendment is being prepared for this appropriation. I would appreciate it if it could be taken out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1576. Representative Ryan, are you... there's an Amendment, I guess, that had been filed. Is he aware of that? 1577."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1577. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Judges' Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1583."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1583. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, the request of the Minority



Leader. On 1587 are you aware there's an Amendment filed on that one, Representative Telcser? Out of the record. 1592. Representative Sumner on 1592. Out of the record. 1595, Representative Wikoff. There's an Amendment filed on that one. Are you aware of that? Out of the record? There's a lot of Amendments that have been filed on 1601 that evidently haven't been printed. 1611."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1611. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of the Auditor General. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1617. Out of the record. 1672. Out of the record? Out of the record the request of the Sponsor. 1704."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1704. A Bill for an Act to amend the Higher Education Corporation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 failed in Committee. Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew... the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 2, Brady."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew on the floor? Out of the record. 1710. The Gentleman from McHenry is here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1710. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1725. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Levin is not here and a Co-sponsor of this Amendment, he's asked me to present it. I don't believe he's here. He may be. If he is, let him go ahead with it. But in the last year there was a Bill that was sponsored by



myself, Representative Walsh, Representative Meyer... Mahar, I mean, stated that..."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, wasn't there a motion filed on a Committee Amendment on this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're not... we haven't gone along that far."

Madigan: "I believe it was Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Mr. Clerk, is there a motion filed with respect to Amendment 1? There is a motion. Who's the Sponsor of that motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Cunningham, Brummer and R.V. Walsh."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that's a highly controversial Amendment to a highly controversial Bill and in all fairness to the Members that we ought to hold that Bill until tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll take it out of the record. 1760. Representative Epton."

Epton: "I respect the... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I respect the opinion of the Majority Leader and I certainly won't quarrel with it but I think that the record should show that this is the fourth time I've been ready to go and there are Gentlemen here who are prepared to argue against it. I certainly will acquiesce with it but I would hate to be caught in the switches and find that this department Bill doesn't get out."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll call it. 1760. Out of the record. 1783. Representative Madigan. 1783, you want that one? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, there are several controversial Amendments offered to this Bill and in all fairness to the Sponsors of the Amendments and to the full Membership, we ought to hold the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1841. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I thought the Democrats wanted property tax relief. This is the only vehicle available. If we want to cut property taxes, we have to consider the Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you addressing 1841?"



Skinner: "No, I'm addressing 1783, the Bill that's up there on the...
oopsy daisy, the board has changed. As if by magic."

Speaker Redmond: "Jack be nimble, Jack be quick."

Skinner: "Well not much for candlesticks."

Speaker Redmond: "1841."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1841. A Bill for an Act making appro-
priation to the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the
Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading." 1859. Is this controversial?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1859. A Bill for an Act relating to
the release of highway easements. Second Reading of the Bill.
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Amendment... there's a Floor Amendment... okay. First Floor
Amendment we thought was adopted in Committee. You want to go
to that, Jack?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there Amendment from the floor here, Represen-
tative... Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Edgar-Campbell. Amends Senate Bill
1859 on page 1, line 22 and so forth."

Edgar: "This is just a technical Amendment we thought had been
adopted in Committee. It changed a misspelled word and another
typographical error in the Bill. I'd move its adoption."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, C.M. Stiehl. Amends Senate Bill
1859 on page 2 immediately after line 8 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "C.M. Stiehl on the floor? Representative Edgar,
what's your pleasure?"

Edgar: "This is a transfer, land transfer in her district that they
forgot to get in and they're putting it on in this Bill. I don't
think there's any controversy surrounding it."



Speaker Redmond: "You willing to accept the Amendment?"

Edgar: "Yes."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1861."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1861. A Bill for an Act to transfer certain powers and duties related to energy of the Department of Business and Economic Development and the Division of Energy in the Department of Business and Economic Development to the Illinois Institute of Energy and Environmental Resources. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Please take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you the Sponsor of this?"

Kane: "Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "So's Geo-Karis."

Kane: "No. Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "1861, I... What was that, Representative Totten? Out of the record. 1864."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1864. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense to the Bureau of the Budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Out of the record please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You want this out of the record? Out of the record. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit: House Bills #1333, 2767, 3009, 3010, 3049, 3054, 3260, 3349, 3350 and 3388. Passed by the Senate June 24, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker..."



Speaker Redmond: "God bless."

Clerk O'Brien: "I'm directed to inform..."

Speaker Redmond: "God bless."

Clerk O'Brien: "...the House of Representatives the House... has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles, to wit: House Bills #2707, 2754, 2554, 2344, 2541, 2490, 32, 1803, 2219, 2256, 3231, 3225, 16, 3270, 15, 3283, 2578, 2995, 3220, and 3227 together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended June 24, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second Reading. 2706."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2706. A Bill for an Act to make the day designated by federal law Memorial Day in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, DiPrima-Katz-Dyer. Amends House Bill 2706 on page 1 by deleting line..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima. DiPrima on the floor? Who else is the Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "DiPrima, Katz and Dyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Dyer. Representative Dyer, can you handle this Amendment?"

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this one... the primary Sponsor of this Amendment is Representative Larry DiPrima. I guess he isn't on the floor and Representative Katz and myself. You remember yesterday, we adopted the Amendment cosponsored by Representative DiPrima and Representative Hoffman which straightened out Memorial Day in regard to school holidays. This Amendment amends the Promisary Note Act which straightens out the confusion for bankings and savings and loans, financial institutions. I think it's a very helpful Amendment cause it completes the job we started yesterday. I hope it'll get the same hundred and two votes that we got on the other one. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I... this is probably futile, but I must agree with the Sponsor of the Amendment. This does complete



the wrecking job that was done in 'desecrating a holiday which we in Illinois and throughout the nation should hold in great reverence. Especially in Illinois because there's been said in here so many times the Memorial Day holiday did start in Illinois down in Carbondale at the order of General Logan who was on the... Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I deplore what happened yesterday. I deplore the shabbiness with which this... the Bill was... the Memorial Day Bill was dismissed from Committee yesterday and I would just urge the Members to reconsider what they did yesterday and not continue along this path. I think it's a terrible thing when we would so dishonor our dead, our fallen heroes of our various wars that we would wreck... complete the wrecking job on this holiday. I asked some of the Members yesterday how long it's been since anyone heard this holiday referred to as Decoration Day and you just don't hear it anymore. And so I think it should be... everyone should be reminded that this is the day that we historically went to the cemeteries and decorated the graves of our fallen war heroes. Many of us in this Body served in the armed forces. There was... we are talking about those who weren't as fortunate as we were... in coming back from the various wars in which we served. I think this is a deplorable act and I would ask you to reconsider and to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the former speaker and I would request a mechanical Roll Call on this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Amendment because I firmly believe that in the interest of the people of the State of Illinois, that we must adopt it. And well I... as I said yesterday, I regret the fact that the day was ever changed by the Federal Congress. I still think that we should use every effort that we can to get Congress to take this particular day back to May 30th and until such time as those efforts are successful in Congress, I think



it's in our best interest to support this Amendment. Now there, the question of veterans and the question of who's loyal and who isn't and that sort of thing, I think is something that we can't totally consider in view of the fact that every family here... every Member here has a family member who were either in the service or whatever, we all want to see some sort of sanity restored in regard to this matter and I was firmly convinced this last Memorial Day when my own V.F.W. and American Legion Post held their parades on Monday and they told me personally that something has to be done. In spite of the fact that they personally felt very badly about the thing, they recognize that we have to do something in Illinois and I urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've had a lot of conversation about this. I think if we are really representative of our people, there's no question that we have to conform on this matter. And I've taken part in Memorial Day services and I'm sorry that there aren't more people with the patriotic atmosphere. But I can tell you that you'll find just as many out there on Monday who believe in the spirit of this holiday as you will if we keep it on the 30th. Let's do what the people want. Let's be representative and let's pass this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, would the Sponsor please remind us why she is offering this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I'll be glad to and my only regret is that Representative... oh, Representative DiPrima may want to speak to this because what we're doing, yesterday we did half the job. We made the change for the school holidays. But adopting this Amendment, we're amending the Promisary Note Act so that the banks and savings institutions and the businesses can straighten out their complex confusion. Many people yesterday were reluctant to vote for that Amendment because they thought it didn't do the whole job. This is just the second step in straightening out the confusion and I defer to Representative DiPrima."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

Skinner: "Wait a minute, hey, I thought I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "A question of the Sponser, I don't care which Sponsor it is, but I would like to know the motivation for this Amendment. You know, just basically what you said yesterday if anyone remembers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer or DiPrima. Which one? Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Is this the Amendment that makes it a commemorative holiday? Well, what's the Amendment on? I wasn't here?"

Dyer: "This is Amendment #1 to House Bill 2706. We're trying to finish the job we started yesterday by amending both the School Code and the Promisory Note Act and it would conform the Illinois holiday to the federal holiday."

DiPrima: "Well, I wanted another Amendment. I told Katz I wanted an Amendment to make it a commemorative holiday. Is that Amendment up?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, there are two Amendments and you're correct."

DiPrima: "Oh, okay."

Dyer: "One of them makes it a commemorative holiday and the other one..."

DiPrima: "All right, go ahead."

Speaker Redmond: "Been answered, Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "No. The question is, why are we changing it? I mean if there's no reason to change it, there's no reason to vote for the Amendment. And so far the proponents have been..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Skinner: "...lacking in any motivation."

Dyer: "All right, if we want a repeat of yesterday's debate, we'll go into it. We talked many, many times about the... improving the business climate in Illinois. Everyone here has deplored the loss of jobs and the loss of businesses in Illinois. We have made many steps to try to stem the flow of jobs out of the State of Illinois. One of the things that has cost businesses, banks, and school districts millions of dollars in the last few years has been the confusion caused by the Memorial Day holiday. This year



was the worst of all. Really, millions of dollars literally were lost because national companies couldn't coordinate their banking, their mailing and so on with Illinois different holiday. School districts... all of us are trying to get a good school aid formula and school districts lost thousands of dollars because of the confusion in the holidays. That is just one... that's one of the reasons. The second reason that was brought out yesterday in the debate is that families were split up because of the different days the parades were held. Children couldn't see their father's parade and the fathers couldn't see the children's parade. If you're looking for a really dedicated, solemn commemoration of the war dead as we all are, we are not getting it under the present system."

Skinner: "So there are two basic reasons?"

Dyer: "Yes."

Skinner: "Number one is so that business won't, won't be harmed; in order to help business. And number two is to keep the family together."

Dyer: "That's correct."

Skinner: "All right..."

Dyer: "That's for starters."

Skinner: "How does this differ from President's Day in February where the Federal Government celebrates one day and Illinois celebrates Lincoln's Birthday which is not the same day? How is business less disrupted in February than it is in May?"

Dyer: "Well, I think I can best answer that question by asking you a question. Have you had as many letters or phone calls from your constituents about the President's Day as you have about Memorial Day?"

Skinner: "I can truthfully answer 'yes', I've had none about either."

Dyer: "Well, I think you're alone in that."

Skinner: "Well, the point that is... has been made here today, I think, ought to be underlined and emphasized whether you vote for this or against this. And that is we are caving in to business interests. When we have a federal holiday that does not coincide with a state holiday, the State of Illinois does not disappear. Everything does



not go up for grabs. The trains still run amazingly enough. The C.T.A. still runs. Gasoline stations still sell their products so that one may travel to work or to vacation as the case may be. This is basically a cave-in to the business community. And as long as the proponents realize that, I don't see anything wrong with the Amendment. And if they'll hold the Bill on Second Reading long enough, I'll give them a second chance to do that - to accomplish the second goal and that is family togetherness. I have an Amendment being prepared to change Thanksgiving to Monday or Friday if you prefer that so that there may be three day weekends. No one sets Thanksgiving for any reason whatsoever except to pick a day out of the air. And why it's to be Thursday? A Thursday Thanksgiving is merely caving in to big business again so people can take off work on Friday and make it the biggest shopping day of the year. But if you're really in favor of family togetherness instead of big business, we certainly ought to change Thanksgiving to either Monday or Friday so that we can have another three-day weekend."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dyer, you said a couple of times that your Amendment amends the Act... the Promisory Note Act and the School Code."

Dyer: "That's correct."

Schuneman: "But the synopsis of the Bill says that the Bill does that. Now, does your Amendment do something else like naming this day as the commemorative holiday? I'm not sure that I understand what the Amendment does."

Dyer: "Thank you... Representative Schuneman. You're absolutely correct. I've brought out a copy of the Bill and you're right. House Bill 2706 amends both the Promisory Note Act and the School Code. So in its total it finishes the job we started yesterday. Amendment #1 which I think you're all going to want 'yes' for it is as Representative DiPrima said, simply saying that May 30 in Illinois since it's a traditional date, will be a commemorative holiday."

Schuneman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman. Representative Hudson."



Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor, Representative DiPrima in this case, be willing to answer a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Ray, yes, I was... I have approved this Amendment, but as Skinner said..."

Hudson: "Larry, I haven't asked the question yet. I wonder if..."

DiPrima: "All right, Ray, what was your question?"

Hudson: "The question would be this. Yesterday, you indicated that Representative McClory, I think, was the one that you mentioned, Congressman McClory, was it, that was trying to effect some changes at the federal level."

DiPrima: "He's the guy that created the mess. Are you kidding?"

Hudson: "Yesterday I understood you to indicate that... let's make it Congressman Railsback, correction. Okay? Now, do you feel that if we go this route and make this change at the state level that that will help or will it hurt as far as any change at the federal level is concerned? In other words, if we change at the state level, won't the Feds. really, in effect, feel that they've won the battle?"

DiPrima: "Well, I don't know. They seem to be getting away from all patriotic holidays. I don't know. I'm suggested what Skinner said to the press on many occasions. Let's...changing Thanksgiving Day because then you don't have that break in between there. You know, this way it'd be Friday, Saturday and Sunday or if he desires it, Saturday, Sunday and Monday cause that's a time when the families all get together for a Thanksgiving dinner and what have you, you know. But I've always maintained that the Memorial Day is a day of reverence, a day to honor the war dead, and members of your own family for that matter. But Congress hasn't moved any way. There's Bills been introduced, George O'Brien when we left the House here, that was one of the first Bills he introduced when he went to Congress. It never got anywheres. Henry Hyde tells me that you have to have two hundred and eighteen Co-sponsors on a Bill down there to get it moving. And so far they haven't done anything. And so that's why I think we might as well go ahead with this and see what happens if in the event that



Congress should ever come to their senses and change it back, we can change it in a hurry, you know. So I say let's just go along and adopt this Amendment. But then I want... I don't like the way this is worded here. It says..."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion?"

DiPrima: "So I move for the adoption of this Amendment, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2706."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. DiPrima moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Is there any discussion? There being... Mr. Jones on the Amendment."

E. Jones: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know exactly what does the Amendment do."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "It stops the blacks from shopping on May 30th. Doesn't do anything, just vote for the Bill. What are you asking stupid questions for?"

E. Jones: "Well, you know, in the State of Illinois, the blacks spend the most money so I'm quite sure the merchants don't want them to stop, you know. But I see... I really want to know what the Amendment does because people in my community are very concerned..."

DiPrima: "It puts everything in conformance with the federal holiday. It takes it out of my original Bill which I had passed four years ago and puts it all in one package, in this package along with that Amendment we added to Hoffman's Bill yesterday. All right?"

E. Jones: "All right, Larry."

DiPrima: "Okay, Webster."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Waddell on the Amendment."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for a mechanical Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 125 'ayes', 18 'noes', 2 voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. And Mrs. Martin, Peggy Martin wishes to inform the electricians that her switch is not working."



Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Katz. Amends House Bill 2606(sic) on page 3, line 15 and so forth."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Katz. Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "I'll take it for Katz. All this says, it allows the school boards may make such changes in its calendar for the school term as may be required by any changes in the legal school holidays prescribed in Section 24-2. You check up on that 24-2."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, we should have a Roll Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 19 'noes', 1 voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2973. Mr. Abramson. Out of the record. House Bill 2978, Mrs. Catania."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2978. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense..."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Representative Houlihan has an Amendment for this and he's not here right now so... James Houlihan."

Speaker Madigan: "Out of the record?"

Catania: "So let's take it out of the record."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. House Bill 3288. Mr. Kempiners. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3288. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Public Aid. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3316. Is there any Member from the Committee on Government Reorganization present? Mrs. Stiehl on House Bill 3316."

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, would you take that out of the record please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Out of the record. House Bill 3383. Mr. Matijevich. Mr. Matijevich in the chamber? On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading there appears House Bill 2739. Mr. Ryan. For what purpose does Mr. Epton arise?"

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You will recall earlier one of the Senate Bills on Second Reading was taken out because one of the Sponsors of the motion was not present. I spoke to the Speaker and he indicated that when the Sponsor of the Amendment did appear he would come back to the order of business. I wonder if you'd be good enough to do so."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine, Mr. Epton. Be more than willing to accommodate your request. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading there appears Senate Bill 1725. Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Amendment is... there's one Committee Amendment and then there's one, several Floor Amendments. Senate Bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer, for your information, when this Bill was called earlier on the Order of Second Reading I requested that the Bill be taken out of the record because of your absence from the chamber. And that's why we have now returned to this order. And you wish to be recognized, Mr. Brummer?"

Brummer: "Yes, I... was my understanding from talking to Representative Cunningham who has filed the motion with myself concerning this, this is going to be held until later today until Representative Cunningham could be here. If the Sponsor wants to proceed at this time, I suppose that's okay. I don't see Representative Cunningham in the chamber though."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be the last one to take advantage of any colleague. But as I indicated earlier, there are..."



this is the fourth time that this Bill has been continued. I did not indicate to Mr. Cunningham that I would hold it. As a matter of fact, I indicated just the opposite. I said when it was called, I would get up and speak in favor or against. I don't know whether the Amendment will pass or not. I know that Mr.... I think your point was valid. Mr. Brummer is here, he's a competent advocate of the Amendment and some of the people who would vote with me are not here as well as those who would... might vote against me. And I would just as soon proceed at this time. I most assuredly did not promise to hold this Bill up."

Brummer: "Okay, let's proceed then."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. Mr. Clerk, are there any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill... Senate Bill 1725. A Bill for an Act relating to the Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "By whom?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Cunningham, Brummer and R.V. Walsh."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I think it's important that we briefly review the history of this Bill. It was introduced in the Senate obviously originally. As introduced originally in the Senate it provided that one hundred percent of the operation of the Department of Insurance would be assessed against the domestic Illinois insurance companies only. I think it..."

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

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, point of order."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

McPike: "The speaker is speaking to the Bill and the motion is to table. If he would address himself to the motion only."

Speaker Madigan: "Your point is well taken. Proceed, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Okay, the... the... thanks, Representative McPike. The Bill as originally introduced was to provide for a hundred percent assessment against the domestic companies only of the operation of the Department of Insurance. It was amended in the Senate by



Senate Amendment #1 which called for an assessment against the domestic companies for increased costs of financial examiners.

It came over to the House in that form..."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. McPike seek recognition?"

McPike: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The speaker is again addressing himself to the Bill - explain the Bill and explain the Amendment. Now the motion is to table. He's gonna' address himself to the motion to table only."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman's point is well taken. And, Mr. Brummer, there are others seeking recognition. For what purpose does Mr. Tipsword arise?"

Tipsword: "I'd just like to inquire of the Chair how you... how you can possibly explain a motion to table unless you can explain the Amendment you're tabling, explain what it does?"

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. I think your point is well taken also. And, Mr. Brummer, proceed."

Brummer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's fair to advise the Members of this House what occurs if this motion to table is successful. If this motion to table is successful, the Bill will be in the same posture that it was when it came over to the Senate. And I think most of the Members here who would want to know what that is and I don't know how I can so inform the Members here what that posture would be unless we can discuss the condition and the shape that the Bill was in when it came over from the Senate. Okay. When it came over from the Senate, the Senate had amended the Bill deleting the changes in the life insurance valuation fees and it provided that domestic companies shall pay the expenses of examinations by assessments rather than through direct payment. And the purpose of the assessment, the purpose of the assessments was to be to pay for the cost of the examination of the financial condition of the domestic insurers. There were several other provisions but that was the important item. When it came to the Illinois House Insurance Committee, the Amendment #1, House Amendment #1 was adopted which, in effect, deleted Senate Amendment #1 and put it back in the original posture. There's a very important concept involved here



and that is whether the domestic insurance companies of the State of Illinois shall pay one hundred percent of the cost of the operation of the Department of Insurance. I would point out to you that doing business in Illinois are four hundred and sixty-five domestic insurance companies and nine hundred and seventy-seven foreign insurance companies. The Director of the Department of Insurance in Committee indicated that the Department last year handled fifteen thousand consumer complaints. He indicated that probably over sixty percent of those consumer complaints were as a result of the activities of foreign insurance companies. He also indicated the Department that handles fourteen thousand consumer inquiries; approximately sixty percent of those were as a result of the activities of foreign insurance companies. There were forty thousand forms filed to approval with the Department. There are eighty thousand agent brokers in Illinois. All of those or many of those do sell both domestic insurance and insurance for foreign insurance companies. I think it is inherently unfair that the Department of Insurance should attempt to assess one hundred percent of the entire cost of the operation against the domestic insurance companies only. I think it is ironic that we have just been doing a number of things to try to improve the business climate in the State of Illinois such as removing sales tax from manufacturing equipment and a number of other items to try to improve the business climate and here the Department of Insurance comes up with an assessment program to assess completely against the domestic insurance companies, the companies that have their home offices located here, the entire cost of operation to the Department of Insurance. Now the, in 1973, there was legislation requested and I'm sure some of you here recall that, that required a certified public accountant audit to be performed with regard to each domestic insurance company and that be furnished to the Department. The rationale for that was that the Department indicated that would decrease the need for financial examiners. Now the Department says they need additional financial examiners to insure the financial solvency and stability of the domestic companies. The domestic company's response is,



fine, we will pay for additional financial examiners. We will be glad to have an additional assessment assessed against us for that purpose, but do not tag us with the entire cost of operation of the Department of Insurance. I would be glad to respond to any questions regarding this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich on the Amendment."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Brummer has certainly stated his case well. Failure to support his position in this matter will mean an exodus of several domestic companies in Illinois. We certainly do not need that. We need more business in Illinois and not less. I know of one in particular that's going to immediately leave if this is put into effect. The insurance industry certainly brings in a lot more money to Illinois than it costs to operate the Department. It is... the money goes now to general revenue but this is a direct assessment on Illinois companies and Representative Brummer should be supported in his position."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tipsword on the Amendment."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Amendment and I think in support of the Amendment a word should be said about generally how insurance companies throughout this country are taxed. Generally, not in every state, but generally it is the foreign based company that is taxed in each state. And the domestic companies generally are not taxed by the various states. Consequently, if we are to move to this kind of a new tax situation in which we impose the tax for the cost of the operation of the Department upon our domestic companies, it puts our domestic companies generally at a disadvantage to domestic companies located in most of the other states of this Union because they pay no tax as a domestic insurance corporation in that state. There are a few states that have this kind of a plan, New York significantly being one of those states that does. And as a result of the New York tax in the years that it has been imposed, a significant number of domestic companies moved out. It is worthwhile for a company to move even though it has business in Illinois upon which it would then pay a foreign tax if they can



move into a state where they have a substantial volume of business so that they become a domestic company and no longer pay a foreign tax in that state. So consequently, we cannot afford, I do not believe, to lose those companies that we could lose by virtue of the imposition of this tax upon domestic companies in the State of Illinois, this state being one of the states surprisingly where a great, great numbers of domestic companies are located and they have a lot of people employed throughout the State of Illinois in our large cities and scattered in offices throughout many of our very small communities throughout this state - communities that they come into and can employ a class of people that can otherwise generally not find employment in those communities. You'll find a lot of women in a lot of these offices that are scattered around and clerical positions and filing positions and in communities where there is no industrial locations very much throughout the state. I think that this Amendment is very good and if we do not adopt it, it can be a disastrous thing for the insurance business in Illinois." His motion is good."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jack Davis on the Amendment."

J. Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

J. Davis: "Representative Brummer, what is the Department of Insurance's budget this year? Are you aware of that figure?"

Brummer: "About 6.3, 6.1 million."

J. Davis: "Contained in the Amendment that you're trying to table at this point, is there a lid on the tax that would be assessed to the domestic companies as far as relates to the budget of the Department of Insurance?"

Brummer: "There is a lid on there of eight million dollars."

J. Davis: "So it can never rise above eight million unless succeeding General Assemblies raise it above eight million?"

Brummer: "Well, there will be succeeding General Assemblies I'm sure. Whether they will raise it above eight million, the Amendment as it's currently written which I am moving to table does have a cap in of eight million dollars."

J. Davis: "Of eight million. Thank you."



Brummer: "Of course that is much higher than the Bill as it came over from the Senate originally."

J. Davis: "I understand that. Can you then tell me life companies now currently pay a valuation tax in the State of Illinois. Will this Amendment affect carriers writing life insurance or only those writing casualty?"

Brummer: "The Amendment would affect both."

J. Davis: "I understand that, but I recall in testimony on the Amendment in the Insurance Committee that two of the life companies who testified indicated that the valuation tax as opposed to the tax now being proposed in Amendment #1 that you're trying to table would be virtually equal, maybe a small increase of a few thousand dollars, nothing to really write home about. So this Amendment really, basically is aimed at casualty companies, is that not correct?"

Brummer: "Well, it depends on... most of the companies write both life and casualty companies or many of the companies do. As I indicated in my opening remarks, it would be a removal of the life insurance premium tax and there would be an assessment of a hundred percent of the entire cost of the operation against all the companies doing business in the State of Illinois."

J. Davis: "Yes, I do understand that as well. I think the New York experience is that there is no lid on the particular valu... or the particular tax that we're talking about at this point. May I address the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Davis."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is a rather novel concept to come before us that the taxpayers of Illinois would be very grateful for and particularly for those of you who have spoken in strong opposition from the other side of the aisle to casualty companies. This Bill would provide what amounts to a user tax on the insurance industry so that the general revenue tax or the general revenue coffers of the State of Illinois would not go any longer to support the Department of Insurance, rather that the insurance companies who are writing insurance in this state would now pay the ordinary and



contingent expenses of the Department of Insurance to regulate that particular industry. I think it's a good concept and one that needs some real hard looking at and I would certainly support it at this point. It was brought out in testimony that the life companies particularly would have really virtually no affect upon this particular process if we adopted it. Now the process can be changed. The statement was made that New York has run away taxation along these lines and the companies are leaving. That may or may not be true in New York. This Bill or this Amendment that Representative Brummer's seeking to table does have a lid on it and I don't really believe at this point in time that the casualty writers or the life writers in Illinois are going to defect from the State of Illinois in any great way, shape or form. So I would urge you to vote 'no' on Representative Brummer's motion to table. I think it's a good concept and one that needs to be left in the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McPike on the motion."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to correct some of the misconceptions that have been stated so far in this discussion. There are nine hundred and seventy-seven foreign companies doing business in the State of Illinois and these companies are taxed. They pay a two percent premium tax, two percent of the gross premiums written. That amounts to seventy-nine million dollars every year. The domestic companies, four hundred and sixty-five, about half in number, do not pay the premium tax. We are one of very few states in the United States that allows our domestic companies to escape the premium tax. I believe that there are six or seven - Arkansas, Florida, Minnesota, North Dakota, Oklahoma and Illinois. We are the only states that allow the foreign, the domestic companies to escape this tax. A few companies have claimed that because of this increase allot... increased assessment on them that they're going to leave the state. One in particular from southern Illinois claims that they will leave the state. Point in fact is that it will cost them twenty thousand dollars if they remain in this state and if they leave and move to Indiana as they claim they will, it will cost them



two hundred and fifty thousand dollars because they will then be a foreign company operating in Illinois and will have to pay the premium tax. What the Department is trying to do is to regulate insurance companies in Illinois. And I would like to tell you what the Department says on this. They're saying that the insurance industry should finance not only financial examinations, but also the consumer protection division of the Department of Insurance. Both financial integrity and market performance are prime public concern. Now what the insurance companies say is just the opposite. They come in Committee and say that we're all in favor of more financial regulations. We're all in favor of tighter controls, but we believe that the Department of Insurance should compete with the Department of Public Health, should compete with Education, should compete with everything else in state government for public funds. What, in effect, they're saying is that we recognize because all those other things have higher priorities that the Department of Insurance is never going to receive the money that they need to properly fund the regulation of insurance industries... industry in Illinois. The Department of Insurance's budget has gone up approximately 1.8 percent a year from 19... from fiscal year '72 to the present. It simply cannot compete for state monies. The Department has come up with a... not a novel approach because we do the same thing with banks. They are saying that the Department... that the insurance companies, the insurance industry who benefits most from this should pay for it. That's simply what it comes down to. We do have fifteen thousand complaints. I don't know where most of your complaints came from in the last year, but the majority of mine were on insurance companies, on redlining, on numerous problems caused by insurance companies. We have eighty thousand agents in this state and we simply do not have the people in the Department of Insurance to regulate these agents. This gives us that vehicle. It allows us to tax an additional one million dollars on domestic companies. One million dollars which will mean that the domestic companies who have the lion's share of the business will be paying approximately twelve million dollars into state funds and that foreign



companies who have the minority share of the business will be paying eighty million dollars into state coffers. We are not putting domestic companies at a disadvantage. This gives us a chance to realistically regulate insurance industry and also investigate claims. I think that the motion to table should be defeated. I think this is a novel, innovative approach that the Department of Insurance has come up with and I suggest that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman on the motion."

Schuneman: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Schuneman: "Representative Brummer, your motion is to table House Amendment #1."

Brummer: "That's correct."

Schuneman: "Now do I understand that that will then put this Bill in the posture in which it was when it came out of the Senate?"

Brummer: "That is correct."

Schuneman: "And... very well. Mr. Speaker, could I speak to the Bill please? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of this motion. The Department of Insurance needs more money to conduct financial examinations of insurance companies. I agree with the Department in that position. They introduced this Bill as a means of getting that money and I don't quarrel with their announced intention. But when the Senate put on an Amendment which said that they could assess only to the extent that they did conduct these examinations, then the Department didn't want the Senate Amendment. Now I suggest to you that the Senate was correct. That we should give the Department the authority to assess domestic companies, but not to support the entire Department. One of the problems that this creates is in the levying of the taxes among the various insurance companies that do business here in Illinois. For example, some of the giants in the business who have... who are domestic here in Illinois, companies like State Farm, Allstate, the Country Companies, Continental National, these companies are all in support of the Bill with the House Amendment on it. But I suggest to you that there is a very self-serving reason that



they suggest that they support that Amendment. The self-serving reason is that whatever this new system would cost them, they're going to get credited through the elimination of the life insurance valuation tax and that new taxes will fall on some of the property and casualty companies in this state who are not, in fact, in the life insurance business. So this will be the effect of leaving this House Amendment on the Bill. There is one other point that I would like to make to you and that is that the fair share funding concept is used by only one other state in the United States and that is the State of New York. The argument will be from now on if we adopt this idea, the argument in the Appropriations Committee will be from now on, give us the money to operate the Department. It isn't going to cost the taxpayer anything anyway, we're just going to pass it on to the insurance industry and I suggest to you that to that extent we may be giving up some of our appropriation controls that we have here in the House and in the Senate and I stand in support of Representative Brummer's motion."

Speaker Madigan: "On the motion, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in favor of Amendment #1 and in opposition to the motion to table. The... one of the major functions that the Department of Insurance has begun to undertake in the last few years are consumer related functions. If you go back two or three years ago, there are lot of things that the Department was doing, was not doing that they're doing now. We've had the problem of insurance redlining, we've passed some new laws with respect to it. Unfortunately, we don't have any regulations yet. We've had a problem with Blue Cross. We passed a new law last year with respect to that. Unfortunately, we don't have regulations yet. There are a number of areas in which, just in the last couple of years there's been significant activity on the part of the consumer concern the insurance area. I support Amendment #1 because I think it would treat the consumer fairly. Amendment #1 would provide for fair share funding not only for the supervision on insurance companies but also for those functions which benefit our... consumer related functions. I get



an awful lot of inquiries in my district related to insurance and one of the problems we find is the Department right now lacks the adequate resources to take care of all of these problems. I think that Amendment #1 would help to provide the kind of funding which would benefit those consumer related functions. Therefore, I urge the defeat of the motion to table that Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "On the motion, Mr. Schoeberlein. Mr. Schoeberlein moves..."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "...the previous question."

Schoeberlein: "I would move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall the main question now be put? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and Mr. Brummer is recognized to close the debate."

Brummer: "There are several things I think that should be made, comments that should be made in closing. First of all, the insurance industry generally pays some eighty-nine million dollars currently in various types of assessments, privilege taxes and things of this nature. The cost of the budget of the Department this year is 6.1 million. That means there is a profit to the State of Illinois of some eighty million dollars. So I think it's unfair to state that the industry is not paying its own way. What this really is is a fight between domestic insurance companies and foreign insurance companies. Now the comment was made that the foreign insurance companies pay a privilege tax for doing business in the State of Illinois. That is absolutely correct. However, there are a couple comments that I think in fairness need to be made regarding that. Number one, the Illinois domestic companies that do business in other states pay that same type of privilege tax. Secondly, with regard to the privilege tax that foreign insurance companies pay in the State of Illinois they receive as a credit against that a one hundred percent credit for all income tax liabilities. That means that the foreign insurance companies never pay any Illinois income tax unless their



income tax is higher than their privilege tax. And, in effect, it is not. Obviously, the domestic companies here do not receive that type of credit and do pay the income tax, but foreign insurance companies receive a complete credit and, therefore, never pay any Illinois income tax as a result of the activities in the State of Illinois unless their income tax liability exceeds that of their... of the privilege tax. Very simply, it seems to me a question of whether or not we should assess the domestics the entire burden, the cost of operation of the Department of Insurance. One comment was made that is absolutely incorrect, at least according to the testimony that the Director of the Department of Insurance gave in Committee. The comment was made that the domestic companies do the bulk, the lion's share of business in the State of Illinois. The Director of the Department of Insurance indicated that the, that the domestic companies do approximately forty to forty-five percent of the business in the State of Illinois and some fifty-five to sixty percent of the business in the State of Illinois is done by out-of-state insurance companies. I do not think that we should assess, therefore, the entire cost of operation of the Department of Insurance against those domestic companies who represent some forty to forty-five percent of the business in the State of Illinois. I think we ought to put this Bill back in the same shape, in the same posture as it was when it came over from the Senate. In order to do that, I request an 'aye' vote on the motion to table House Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to table House Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Epton to explain his vote."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to prolong this. You've heard a lot of information. It's unfortunate that so many well-meaning people have misinterpreted this Bill. Let me assure you that this is a Bill that was initiated by the Department of Insurance. It first came up in the Senate Committee at which time this Amendment was offered



and defeated. In the floor of the Senate they got a little bit careless and it's true, it did pass. Then it came over to the House Committee and again by a vote of 13 to 3 it was defeated in Committee. Now let me just simply make one point about New York. In 1972, this state which is allegedly comparable to ours although I can't figure in what respect, their budget for the Department of Insurance was fourteen thousand, fourteen million, three hundred, thirty-five thousand. Under this system, 1979, they went to sixteen million - a total increase of less than seven million dollars. This certainly is not a runaway budget. Let me just point out to you this one simple factor behind this Bill. Today when the Department of Insurance goes into an insurance company, an insurance agency, a broker, they assess a hundred dollars per man per day. An agency's entire profit can be gone in a month's time by Departments' examination. This is the purpose of this Bill - to eliminate that individual assessment against companies that can ill afford it. As a matter of fact, the company that will pay the brunt of this is Blue Cross, Blue Shield which today pays to the State of Illinois in regulatory taxes five dollars. It will add approximately one penny to each policy they issue. I would appreciate your voting 'no'."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that the Sponsor of the motion to table has... through his motion to table simply wants to protect our domestic companies all the more. Just a few months ago, some of our Legislators in Lake County and I was one of them, met with some of the agents that we had and they were very concerned about the fair share plan because they felt it was planned in New York and it works in New York and it was not very feasible. I do feel we have a duty to protect our domestic companies first, ahead of the foreign companies and that's why I vote 'aye'."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think looking at the board that the House is making a very grave error. What is going to happen if you adopt this plan that is in



existence only in the State of New York where it costs about twice as much to administer their Department as it does, for example, in California and where they have pure domestic companies. What you're going to have is a cutting away from the appropriation process where we in the General Assembly have control over the expenditures of the Department and oversight over its operations and the cost of doing what the Department should be doing will go out of sight without any control. Now we have, we're very fortunate to have Rich Mathias who is extremely able as head of this Department and he's right in almost every case, but I think not in this one. I think we have to protect the appropriation process and I think that we have to be very careful not to allow it to get away from us. That's exactly what happened in New York and I think that this ought to be an 'aye' vote for every Member."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this is a very good concept and one that we should endorse. I think we should be voting against this motion to table. Now a lot has been made about the possibility of runaway costs under the fair share plan, but as Representative Davis pointed out, there is a cap built into this over which a fee cannot be charged. And I might add, that fee is something in the neighborhood of one-tenth of one percent. Beyond that, there is a self-destruct clause in this plan where... whereby it will, the sunset provision will apply within five years. So we do have control over it and we're not losing any appropriation control. Now I do think the one thing that's being overlooked and Representative McPike pointed it out graphically, foreign corporations in this state do pay a two percent premium tax. Our domestic companies do not pay that. So we have a competitive advantage for our domestic corporations right away. Now if we should impose this other tax upon all corporations, it would be simple for other states to impose retaliatory taxes on our companies. So I really think that it's a specious point. To suggest that an Illinois corporation would move out of Illinois because of the



fair share plan is ludicrous. The one company and again Representative McPike alluded to it, the one company that has threatened to move out would pay approximately twenty thousand dollars in fee under the fair share plan. If they should move out of the state and continue operations as a foreign corporation, it would cost them in premium taxes about a quarter of a million dollars a year. So I think, I think again that we are overlooking the point here that instead of examination fees being paid by the individual companies, we are spreading the fees among the various companies and upon those that are best able to pay. Blue Cross, one of the largest insurers in this state, currently pays no taxes to the State of Illinois. They would pay a proportionate portion of the fair share plan, but again it would be no more than one cent per policy. Certainly a realistic cost of doing business and the main point, I think, to... should not be overlooked is... two points I think. Number one, we were bothered in the past by insolvency in the insurance industry. I think under the fair share plan the Department will be better able to insure that smaller and maybe weaker companies will be closely scrutinized and will be saved from insolvencies before it may come about. And beyond that, it's not only financial stability of the industry but the Department is attempting to address itself here, it is to consumer protection and in the long, I think that's the major thing that we're all concerned with - that the consumer, the policy holder be protected from insolvencies and be protected from fly-by-night companies. This, I think, is a very sound concept, one that merits our support and I urge everyone to vote against this motion to table."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's a saying that executives raise to their level of incompetence and you can also say that executive agencies will spend every dime you give them. The reason I'm voting to support this motion is that I know what it's going to do to a ballooning budget and I don't like the excuse that the taxpayers aren't going to pay for it. I hear that now more and more every day that that's going



to be the next excuse that we're going to have users pay the cost of operating government and I don't think that's going to solve anything. All that's going to do is add to the inflationary costs of government. Somebody mentioned the California experience as opposed to the New York experience with this concept. In New York the budget for the Insurance Department is fifteen million, four hundred and twenty-four dollars. In California which administers more companies, three hundred more insurance companies than New York, their budget is seven million, nine hundred and seventy-nine thousand. That's really what we're going to have and those of you who believe that we should start putting a halt to the high cost of government, we aren't going to get any more help to the consumers. All we're going to do is add costs and balloon the appropriations of the executive agencies and that's why I'm supporting Representative Brummer's motion."

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

E.G. Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to urge more 'yes' votes on this motion. If we vote 'no', we're providing some help and we're providing some relief for life insurance companies and they're doing quite well, thank you, we don't need to give any more help to the life insurance companies. If we vote 'yes' on this motion before us, we're going to be helping the consumer because we're going to be preventing some additional costs that are only going to be passed on in the premium rates for auto, premium rates for car insurance and that's where the great problem is and that's where we need to help those costs down. One of the most frequent complaints that I get in my legislative office is the rising costs of auto insurance, property insurance, fire insurance and if we vote 'yes' here, we're going to prevent some additional costs being passed on to the fire insurance buyer, the property insurance buyer, the car insurance buyer. Those rates are going to be going up, they've been going up too much now. Let's not create that problem, increase the problem. Let's provide some relief and some relaxation from those consumer rates going up higher and I urge more 'yes' votes to help prevent that from happening."

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



Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you've been listening to the debate closely, I think there are two people who made quite a bit of sense on this issue. The first was Representative McPike who went into quite a bit of detail and the second was Representative Collins. I'd just like to point out that if this Bill passed in the form it's in now, of the six million dollar appropriation for the Department of Insurance, four million would come from these assessments and two million would come from fees. The budget would continue to go through the appropriations process which means that each and every one of us would have an opportunity to vote on it. There's an eight million dollar cap on this so it won't go over that and again, I'd like to reiterate as others have said that no company's going to be forced out of the state if this Bill passes because they'll wind up paying a higher two percent assessment on foreign corporations that would be levying on domestic corporations under this Act. I'd just like to point out that I'm voting 'no'. I think that every insurance company that's come to me and talked to me about this Bill has said we need more regulation but the question is, is it going to be paid through this method? And I'd like to point out that nobody has claimed that this will not be passed on to the consumer. I don't know any person who talked against this motion has said that. But the question is, is it going to be paid by the company doing business in the state as a tax on the premiums or is it going to come out of the General Revenue Fund? Well, that's the question that we're voting on and I'm voting 'no' and that's the way I feel it ought to be."

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

W. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have two reservations about the Amendment that has been adopted. And they are the reason that I am voting 'yes' to table the Amendment. The first is that the Department of Insurance has increased its budget this year from four million to six million dollars. That's a fifty percent increase. Now this Amendment would permit them very readily to increase that to eight million dollars or a hundred percent increase over just one year ago and I suggest



to you that that may be a bit exhorbitant. Now it also seems to me to be open-ended in that their future needs certainly will be based upon their desire and their ability to assess to the amount that they need for their budget and the assessment unfortunately falls on a single class of policy holders. It seems to me that those people who have life insurance are better able to pay a little bit of additional premium so that the... for tax purposes than those people who have casualty - automobile, fire, home owners and so forth. There are a lot of people who have... have to have that type of insurance who have not a speck of life insurance. The impact of this it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is to pass from the life companies to the casualty companies the cost of what, let's face it, is a tax increase. Unfortunately, it is passing to those people who are least able to pay the cost of a tax increase. The open-endedness, the fact that the Department of Insurance can assess to the amount of their budget and that we in the Legislature are in effect going to be a rubber stamp because it's going to be easy for us to give them the money since it doesn't come directly from the taxpayers' pocket. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Miller: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to speak on behalf of the Amendment or the motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1725. There are those of you here that attempted to portray that foreign insurance companies are being taken over the coals by paying seventy-nine million dollars in premium tax. I think we ought to consider for a moment what our domestic companies are contributing to the budget of the State of Illinois. It's my understanding that our domestic companies provide in the area of one hundred million dollars by payment of the valuation fee and Illinois income tax. Further, when we endeavor to compare New York to Illinois, the New York with a sixteen million dollar budget, let me point out to you that they regulate about one-half of the companies that we regulate in the State of Illinois and I don't think we ought to point to New York as a good example to follow in this case. Number three, I think we



would be setting a bad precedent here by beginning to fund all of our departments via revenue who those departments serve. Let me point out to you, for example, in other departments, Registration and Regulation and so forth, we provide General Revenue Funds for the state to operate those departments. I think we're going to begin a very bad precedent in our state if we go to the concept of departments being funded by those that they regulate. And I would ask good judgment on your part and ask for an 'aye' vote on the motion to table."

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

Brummer: "Yes, I think there's some confusion regarding this because of the original Bill that was introduced, the Senate Amendment that went on and then the House Amendment that went on and now the motion to table. As it originally went in and that is the condition that it is now, it is the... the original proposition of the Department of Insurance. The... a national publication of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners called this a new taxing authority that was being sought by the Director of the Department of Insurance in Illinois. I think it's rather interesting that this is a new tax that is being sought by the Department at a time when everyone is talking about we are not going to have any tax increases of any sort. But I think what is particularly important about this is the fact that this is a new tax only on domestic companies. Those companies that locate their home offices here, those companies that provide jobs for the people in our district here and the people of the State of Illinois in your districts and my districts. Those are the companies that the Department of Insurance is attempting to levy a new tax upon. We have heard much about the privilege tax that is paid by the foreign insurers. Let me point out once again that those foreign insurers receive a hundred percent income tax credit against their privilege tax. Now that means they pay no Illinois income tax. Obviously the Illinois domestic companies are paying large amounts of dollars in Illinois income tax as well as personal property tax, real estate taxes in Illinois. The Illinois domestic companies are in favor of stronger financial examinations.



That is exactly what the Bill did as it came over from the Senate. It provided an additional one million dollars for additional financial examinations. They and they spread that cost in the same manner that the Department's Bill did. In other words, it is not a heavier load on the small insurance companies, it is assessed in accordance with the number of premium dollars written. So the assessment is the same. The method of assessment is the same. The question is, shall the entire cost of the operation of the Department of Insurance be assessed against the domestics only or shall the cost of financial examinations be assessed against the domestic? I think it is inherently unfair to assess those companies who we appreciate for doing business in the State of Illinois the entire cost of the operation of the Department of Insurance when some sixty percent of that Department's activities are related to the activities of foreign insurers. I would request more green votes on this."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 68 'ayes', 76 'noes', 4 voting 'present' and for what purpose does Mr. Brummer arise?"

Brummer: "I would request a poll of the absentees and if that does not get the necessary green votes, I would request a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Byers, Capparelli, Darrow, Deuster, Ewell, Garmisa, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Hart, Hoffman, J.M. Houlihan, Kornowicz, Kożubowski, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Matejek, Meyer, Pierce, Schlickman, Sharp, Simms, Stearney, Terzich, Van Duyne, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "There has been a request of the Negative Roll Call. The Clerk shall proceed to a reading of the negative votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Antonovych, Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Bianco, Bluthardt, Boucek, Bowman, Brady, Brandt, Caldwell, Campbell, Chapman, Collins, Conti, Daniels, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deavers, DiPrima, Domico, Edgar, Epton, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Greiman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Huskey, Jacobs, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kempiners, Lechowicz,



Leinenweber, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Macdonald, Mahar, Margalus, Lynn Martin, Peggy Smith-Martin, Matula, McBroom, McClain, McLendon, McPike, Molloy, Mugalian, Nardulli, O'Brien, Peters, Polk, Pouncey, Ryan, Satterthwaite, Schneider, Skinner, Steczo, C.M. Stiehl, Taylor, Telcser, Tuerk, Vinson, Waddell, Wikoff, Willer, Wolf, and Yourell."

Speaker Madigan: "I wish to announce at this time, Mr. Brummer and Mr. Tipsword, for your information that I personally know that the following Representatives are in a meeting in the Speaker's office - Brady, Michael Brady and Schneider and Kane, McClain and Bradley. Other room. Are there any questions of the negative count?"

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Adams."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Adams is in the chamber."

Brummer: "What is the count before we start, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "What is the count, Mr. Clerk? The same as shown on the board."

Brummer: "Well, there are some individuals that the Clerk read that are not recorded on the board for some reason. Mr. Adams was one of them."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Adams is recorded as 'no'. His light is burned out but Mr. Mr. Adams is in the chamber."

Brummer: "Representative Bartulis."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bartulis is in his chair."

Brummer: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bianco is in the rear of the chamber."

Brummer: "Representative Corneal Davis."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis. Is Mr. Davis in the chamber? Remove Mr. Davis from the Roll Call."

Brummer: "Representative Edgar."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Edgar is in the chamber."

Brummer: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley is in the chamber."

Brummer: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn is in his chair."

Brummer: "Representative Jaffe."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe is in the chamber. Over there."

Brummer: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Katz. Remove Mr. Katz from the Roll Call."

Brummer: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leverenz is in the well."

Brummer: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mahar is in his chair."

Brummer: "Did you indicate Representative McClain was in a meeting?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Brummer: "Representative Molloy."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Molloy is in his chair."

Brummer: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Brien is here at the podium."

Brummer: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tuerk. Mr. Tuerk. Remove Mr. Tuerk from the
Roll Call."

Brummer: "Representative Wolf."

Speaker Madigan: "William Walsh?"

Brummer: "Wolf."

Speaker Madigan: "Wolf, is Mr. Wolf... Is Mr. Wolf in the chamber?
Remove Mr. Wolf from the Roll Call."

Brummer: "Representative Peters."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Peters is in the well, right down here."

Brummer: "Did we call Representative Edgar?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, he's been verified. Mr. Wolf has returned
to the chamber. Restore Mr. Wolf to the Negative Roll Call."

Brummer: "Representative Jane Barnes."

Speaker Madigan: "Jane Barnes is on the Republican side."

Brummer: "Representative Gene Barnes."

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Barnes recorded?"

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

Brummer: "Would you take him off then?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tuerk has returned to the chamber. Restore
Mr. Tuerk to the Negative Roll Call."

Brummer: "Representative Skinner."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner. Is Mr. Skinner in the chamber?"



Mr. Skinner is in the rear of the chamber. For what purpose does Mr. Laurino arise?"

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, will you change my vote from 'aye' to 'no' please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Change Mr. Laurino from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Flinn. Mr. Flinn."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Change Mr. Flinn from 'no' to 'aye'. Are there any further questions?"

Brummer: "No, I have no further questions."

Speaker Madigan: "No further questions. On this question there are 68 'aye', 74 'noes'. For what purpose does Mr. Jacobs seek recognition? There are 68 'ayes', 74 'noes' and the Amendment... or the motion to table the Amendment fails. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, D.L. Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 1725 on page 12, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan."

D.L. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is a corrective Amendment which would provide that a violation of Section 408 of the Act is also subject to the penalty provision set forth in the Act. Section 408 refers to the fees and charges required under the Act. What the Amendment would be to make a violation of that Section of the Act subject to existing penalty provisions set forth in the Act. It is not a controversial Amendment and I move its adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Levin. Amends Senate Bill 1725 on page 1, line 1 and 19 so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year this Body passed House



Bill 1191, which was sponsored by Representative Huskey, R.V. Walsh, and Mahar, to establish minimum standards for supplemental medicare insurance coverage. Of course since then, there's been a number of scandals that have developed with respect to supplemental medicare insurance coverage making the implementation of this new law particularly important. It went into effect January 1. Unfortunately, when a senior citizen newspaper in Chicago inquired of the Department as to how many companies were in compliance with the new law and how many were not, they were told that we don't keep our records that way. We assume that when there's a new law, the companies will comply. Subsequently the Department has provided me with a list of those companies that have filed but they don't know which companies should have filed that have not. What Amendment #3 simply does is to require annually for the next three years the Department of Insurance to report to the Legislature and to the Governor as to how many companies have indeed complied, how many have not and what remedial action, if any, has been taken. I know of no opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner on the Amendment. Mr. Skinner does not seek recognition. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment... is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Mudd. Amends Senate Bill 1725 on page 1, line 1 and 19 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment... Members of the House, gives the insurance industry the same protection as other regulated occupations in the state but no more. In 1974, we passed a series of Bills limiting the power of home rule units to regulate a wide variety of professions and occupations. The Illinois Supreme Court has twice upheld these Bills and I accept their judgment. But in a case of insurance we went further. We eliminated the taxing power of home rule units over insurance. The Illinois Supreme Court said that this meant that even a broad-based



tax not specifically on insurance companies was preempted. I don't think that's what we intended to do and that with all due respect, the Supreme Court is in error. In any event, this Amendment leaves entirely intact the preemption of regulating insurance industry. It only makes uniform the preemption which we enacted four years ago. And it puts back and allows local communities with home rules to have the taxing power but not the regulatory power of insurance companies in the State of Illinois which would be uniform to all other industries operating within the state. I ask for a favorable vote." Corrective legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, could the Gentleman give us an idea of a generalized tax that he envisions could be applied to the insurance industry or an insurance company?"

Mudd: "I'm sorry, Cal. I never heard the question."

Skinner: "Could you give us an example of a type of tax you think would qualify if your Amendment passed?"

Mudd: "Well, it would apply to any type of tax. It applies to a present industry within home rule powers, would apply also to insurance industry. Insurance would be in the same category as any industry, any business operating within those home rule municipalities or counties."

Skinner: "Well, for an example, are insurance industries in Chicago now exempt from a head tax because of that Supreme Court decision?"

Mudd: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you, Cal."

Skinner: "Are insurance companies still... are insurance companies now exempt from the head tax in Chicago because of that Supreme Court decision?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir. They would be, they'd be exempt from any tax that a home rule power could exempt on any industry. They are exempt. They're the only industry in the state that we exempt from home rule powers."

Skinner: "Okay, but they would not be... they're not exempt from property taxes."

Mudd: "No, only home rule powers. Property tax is regulated not only locally, but it's mandated by the state. But you have to...



in other words, the insurance companies are not, have no... home rule powers have no regulation authority over insurance companies. They're the only ones that are exempt and this would just bring them in accordance with other industries in the State of Illinois as they apply to the home rule."

Skinner: "You realize that this will probably accelerate the removal from Chicago of insurance companies like Kemper."

Mudd: "Yes, they'll probably come to Peoria since we have a growing community down there. We look for a couple of them to come into the Peoria community and move in there because we don't have a head tax there."

Skinner: "Thank you very much. It's certainly not my rule to stand here and defend the City of Chicago's economic base. If they want to go to the suburbs, that's okay with me."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Schuneman: "Representative Mudd, are you seeking to make it possible for home rule units to tax the insurance companies?"

Mudd: "No, Sir. What I'm doing is taking the exemption, an unfair exemption for insurance companies and put them in the same posture as any other industry in the State of Illinois as they're applied to by home rule."

Schuneman: "Are you seeking to give home rule units the right to tax insurance agents and brokers?"

Mudd: "I'm giving them the right to tax the insurance companies as they would any other industry in the state or business in the State of Illinois under the home rule powers."

Schuneman: "Well, I don't think you answered my question. Are you seeking to give home rule units the right to tax insurance agents and brokers?"

Mudd: "Oh, I think you missed my first point. This Amendment gives the insurance industry the same protection as other regulated occupations but no more."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Amendment. The very good Sponsor of this Amendment is seeking, I don't know



whether he's seeking to do it, but what he's doing is giving home rule units ~~the right to~~ license and tax insurance agents and brokers. Now there was a very important Supreme Court decision in the State of Illinois that resulted a few years ago from the attempt on the part of the City of Chicago to license and tax insurance agents and brokers and real estate brokers. Those groups took this matter to the Illinois Supreme Court and perhaps even of the United States. I'm not sure whether its ruling came down, but the ruling went against the City of Chicago. Now we have an Amendment which would seek to overturn that court decision. And Representative Mudd, I really have to indicate to you my shock and chagrin that you would be supporting something like this immediately after criticizing Representative Tuerk for adding to the bureaucracy of your own home county and it seems to me that this is precisely what this Amendment does and that it would give new taxing authority to your home rule unit and to the home rule unit in the City of Chicago. And, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you're going to hear from an awful lot of small, independent insurance agents and brokers and if you carry this to the final extreme, the real estate brokers and a lot of other small business people that are now going to be taxed and licensed not only by the State of Illinois by also by the City of Chicago and I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this bad Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Representative Schuneman took the words right out of my mouth actually. About an hour ago my colleague from my home district was appalled, you might say, about me attempting to hurt the small businessman and yet what this Amendment purports to do is to tax without the power to regulate. I'm not only chagrined, I'm disappointed, disillusioned. I think this Amendment should be defeated soundly."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Mudd on the Amendment. All that this Amendment would do would be to eliminate what is, in my opinion, an unreasonable exemption as far as the



authority of a home rule unit to impose the tax that Representative Mudd has referred to. I think it's long overdue. I think it's meritorious and it only brings into... this industry into the same situation as all other industries in the state and I would urge your support of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Kempiners: "If this Amendment were added to the Bill, how many votes would it take to pass seeing it involves a home rule question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Do you persist in a response prior to Roll Call?"

Kempiners: "Well, I don't think it would affect the Roll Call because it's just an Amendment, but I think it would affect the entire Bill so I won't persist before the Roll Call. Give you time to get the Parliamentarian there."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. There being no further discussion... and on the... on the Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1725, Mr. Collins, is recognized."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment and I recall just some years ago we passed an entire body of legislation preempting home rule units from licensing various professions and occupations for very good reasons. It certainly is ludicrous if you would require any occupation to hold a license in any municipality that may be a home rule unit. Now this came about in Cook County some years ago when real estate agents were under attack and wound up in the position where they had to have not only a state license, but had to have a license in Chicago and in any other home rule unit within the County of Cook in addition to anyplace else that they might do business. So I submit that this is a great way of driving people out of the business. If you had to have a license not only from the State of Illinois, but the City of Chicago and the Village of South Holland and the Village of Lansing and the City of Calumet City and all the other home rule units in the Cook County area and any home rule unit outside of Cook County and then I don't know, but Cook County being a home rule unit county you could probably let them



license, too. It seems to me Representative Mudd is trying to do just exactly what he chastised Representative Tuerk for attempting to do a short time ago. Now I voted with Representative Tuerk in that instance and I just can't imagine him trying to sabotage this good Bill by such a horrible Amendment. This would be a way of imposing real burden on the... on the insurance industry. It would be a great way of driving people out, especially small insurance agents - those that would be least able to impose or to shoulder these fees and taxes would be the ones who would be driven out of the business. If you really want to mount an attack on the small businessman, vote for this Amendment. If you want to help protect one segment of the small businessman in our business economy, vote 'no'. This is a horrible Amendment. I just can't imagine one being any worse."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to renew Mr. Kempiners inquiry as to whether or not it takes 107 votes on the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian has informed me that in the event that that question were put at the time of final passage that he would rule..."

Friedrich: "What about the Amendment, Sir?"

Speaker Madigan: "Well..."

Friedrich: "In my opinion it takes it on the Amendment also."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, let me finish my statement. The Parliamentarian indicated that he would rule that the Bill would require 89 votes to pass. And my own personal comment to your inquiry regarding the Amendment is that it would... it's like any other Amendment. It would require more 'aye' votes than 'no' votes. And Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this... just said something that was funny. But I want to re... I want to call the attention of the Members of this House that there was just a ruling handed down by the Supreme Court that real estate brokers or anybody registered by the State of Illinois cannot be registered by a local municipality even if it's a home rule unit. And I was advised I should tell Mr. Mudd to stick this in the mud."



Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a..."

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

Sumner: "I need some clarification on this. Does this mean then that in Peoria, for instance, it would give them the power to tax and to license insurance companies?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mudd. Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "It would give... Representative Sumner, it would give home rule powers the same power that they have over every other industry. Let's take, for example, the one thing... if nothing else, this Amendment might serve to bring before the House's attention... supposing that a municipality collects a head tax or any other tax imposed collectively on all industry within its boundaries. The other... and they do this trying to accumulate a certain amount of money for a particular purpose. They don't just tax a broad tax until they have a purpose or a study on how much revenue they're trying to derive from business. If they put a head tax, for example, on a municipality on all industry in a municipality, the other industries within that municipality have to absorb the tax that the insurance industry would be exempt from and I think that the Amendment in that case points out that it's elective taxing, that during the Constitution that there were some industries because of their strong, broad lobbying powers that were exempt and other industries within that municipality had to absorb that portion of those taxes."

Sumner: "Then you are saying 'yes', they will be taxed? Does this then mean that the state will also tax so they're going to have a tax for the state and also a tax by the local area if they so desire to do it or is it mandatory that they will do it?"

Mudd: "Well I think, Representative, that this... what this does is bring in home rule and take out the exemptions for individual businesses. It doesn't single out any insurance company or any particular industry. It makes it uniform throughout the municipality on those types of taxes it would apply to all."

Sumner: "Well just because we made a couple of wrongs before doesn't make this right to go ahead and do it, I wouldn't think. I don't



think I can support the Amendment. Next you'll go after all the other different individual people that are in the districts. I can think of other areas and I don't believe this is necessarily quite the right way to go. It's really a tax increase in a hidden manner."

Mudd: "No, it's not a hidden manner. It would apply to all those industries within that taxing authority. There just wouldn't be any exemptions. These people were exempted by the Constitution from being in compliance with all the other industries within that municipality. So what we're doing is taxing other industries to pay for their share. We're putting a tax on other industries at a higher level to absorb the exemption shared by just a few."

Sumner: "Well I wasn't here when you did that. I still don't think that makes this right. I'm sorry. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves that the main question now be put.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

The motion carried and Mr. Mudd is recognized to close the debate."

Mudd: "I think there's been enough discussion on it. Go ahead and take the Roll."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mrs. Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of you who were here about three or four years ago will remember there was another attempt to make it possible to license every insurance broker and real estate broker in anyplace that was a home rule area. Now if that's the case, just think what we're doing. We're giving unlimited powers to the home rule municipalities and governments. I don't think we should have anymore and I'm glad it's beat."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 20 'ayes', 87 'noes', 7 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading there appears Senate Bill 1760. Mr. Levin. Mr. Levin on Senate Bill 1760. For what purpose does Mr. Ryan arise?"

Ryan: "For the purpose of a motion, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 10(b) I move to change the order of business."

Speaker Madigan: "You were not recognized for that purpose, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "That's always in order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "No, it's not, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Yes, it always is."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin on Senate Bill 1760."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1760. A Bill for an Act..."

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

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would appeal your ruling and if you don't want to go with my motion, I would certainly think after your pledge of fairness to me from you and the real Speaker yesterday that you'd allow me that opportunity. You know, the rules are here for all of us, Mr. Speaker, and we would like to move to the order of business on Second Reading for Constitutional Amendments. We've been trying to do that for some time and pursuant to Rule 10(b), I would like to make that motion now."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, the order of business is Senate Bill, Second Reading, Senate Bill 1760 and Mr. Levin is recognized for that purpose."

Ryan: "I'm aware of that, Mr. Speaker, and my motion is always in order, Mr. Speaker. And it's in order now and I would... I renew my motion."

Speaker Madigan: "The order of business is Senate Bills on Second Reading. Mr. Levin is recognized. Mr. Levin. Mr. Levin."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1760. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Comprehensive County Hospital Governing Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin. Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Any Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Yourell. Amends Senate Bill 1760 on page 1, line 1 and 7 and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell on Amendment #3."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1760 is the same as Amendment #2 and I move to withdraw Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1760."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to withdraw Amendment #3. Is there leave? Leave being... there's objections to the motion. Therefore, the question is, shall the... shall the Gentleman withdraw Amendment #3? All those in favor of that motion will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ryan, to explain his vote."

Ryan: "No, that isn't what I wanted to do at all, Mr. Speaker. I would, if this happens to get more greens than red, I'm going to verify it and I'm going to renew my motion now, Mr. Speaker, that we move to Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading. If you want to be responsible for killing any kind of a property tax relief program in the State of Illinois, you're sure doing a good job at it, Mr. Speaker. And you're totally violating the rules of the House. And I renew my motion, Mr. Speaker, to go to the Order of Second Reading, Constitutional Amendments. And I have five Members, Mr. Speaker, that will go with me on that motion."

Speaker Madigan: "You're not recognized for that purpose, Mr. Ryan. The... have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes', 69 'noes', no voting 'present'. Mr. Yourell requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Capparelli, Darrow, Deuster, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Friedland, Garmisa, Giorgi, Harris, Hart, Hoffman, J.M. Houlihan, Katz, Kempiners, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Matejek, McAuliffe, Meyer, Peters, Pierce, Richmond, Schisler, Schlickman, Simms, Stearney, Terzich, Van Duyne, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Kempiners seek recognition?"

Kempiners: "Please record me as voting 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Kempiners as voting 'no'. What's the... Mr. Abramson, for what purpose do you arise? Record Mr. Abramson as 'no'. Mr. Brummet as 'aye'. Count now is 71-71. And therefore, the motion... Mr. Madison. Mr. Schisler. Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Schisler as voting 'aye'. Mr. Laurino. Record Mr. Laurino as 'aye'. Mr. Brummer. Record Mr. Brummer as 'aye'. For what purpose does Mr. Telcser arise? What's the count now, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, is this vote on a motion to withdraw?"

Speaker Madigan: "It's a motion to withdraw an Amendment. The Sponsor of the Amendment wishes to withdraw his Amendment."

Madison: "And that is under our rules, that is not an absolute right?"

Speaker Madigan: "I'm told by the Parliamentarian he needs leave to withdraw an Amendment."

Madison: "If he does not have leave to withdraw, can he then table the Amendment?"

Speaker Madigan: "He can move to table the Amendment."

Madison: "That's not an absolute right? But that doesn't require unanimous consent?"

Speaker Madigan: "Takes a simple majority just like this motion."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 74 'ayes', 71 'noes'. And there has been a request for a verification of the 'aye' vote and the Clerk will proceed to read the 'aye' votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Dyer, Caldwell, Chapman, Christensen, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Farley, Flinn, Getty, Giglio, Greiman, Hanahan, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Kelly, Kosinski."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich requests leave to be verified as 'aye'. He shall be so verified."



Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Peggy Smith Martin, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Pouncey, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Tipword, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Williams, Younge, and Yourell."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "What's the... has the count changed any, Mr. Speaker? Is it still 74-71?"

Speaker Madigan: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 74-71."

Ryan: "I have questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Ryan: "Representative Brady."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady is in the rear. Would you come out, Mr. Brady. And in the meantime, he shall be removed from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "I wish you'd reserve your comments from the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris wishes to be recorded as 'aye' and Mr. Richmond wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. And Mr. Brady has returned to the chamber."

Ryan: "Mr. Brady has followed orders and returned to the chamber."

Speaker Madigan: "He wishes to be extended the courtesy of being restored to the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Certainly, certainly. Anybody that follows orders that good can be on. Representative Breslin."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Breslin shall be removed from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Corneal Davis."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis shall be removed from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Madigan: "John Dunn. He's in the balcony."

Ryan: "I see him. Representative Farley."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley is in his chair. And would you verify Mr. Dawson right at the well?"

Ryan: "Verify him at the well?"



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dawson's right here."

Ryan: "I've heard he's been at the trough; I didn't know he was at the well. Representative Giglio."

Speaker Madigan: "What was the question, Mr..."

Ryan: "Giglio."

Speaker Madigan: "Giglio shall be removed from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Getty."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Getty's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kane is in the rear of the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Luft."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Luft is in the rear of the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Mudd."

Speaker Madigan: "What was the name, Mr..."

Ryan: "Mudd, Mudd."

Speaker Madigan: "Mudd?"

Ryan: "Mudd, that's right. Representative Mudd."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mudd. He's in the aisle."

Ryan: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Madigan: "He's in the center aisle."

Ryan: "Representative Pouncey."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pouncey's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sharp shall be removed from the Roll Call."

Ryan: "How about Representative Kelly?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kelly is in the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Shumpert back there, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Shumpert is in his chair."

Ryan: "And I assume that Representative Taylor is there."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor's in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Von Boeckman shall be removed from the Roll Call. Mr. Von Boeckman has returned."

Ryan: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schneider is in the aisle."

Ryan: "Representative Dan Houlihan."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan is in the chamber."

Ryan: "Is Representative Schisler back there, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "What was the name?"

Ryan: "Schisler, yeah."

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

Ryan: "Representative Hart."

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Ryan: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk?" On this question there are 72 'ayes', 71 'noes' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. And the Amendment shall be withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Telcser wanted to be recognized."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Levin. Amends Senate Bill 1760 as amended by deleting the title and so forth."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Madigan: "On Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1760, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for some time now a Member from our side of the aisle has pursuant to the rules which we have adopted sought recognition in order to make a legitimate motion to get this House to move to a certain order of business. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, all of us have seen the procedures and the rules of this House bent, twisted and perverted for the last few months so as to benefit a chosen few who happen to occupy a position of great power in this chamber. I would like you to know, Mr. Speaker and Members, that I do not make these remarks as a Republican to a Democrat or from one partisan to another. I speak to you simply as an elected Member of the great Illinois House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I say to you that because a few people have decided that they do not wish to hear an issue, they have disregarded the will of a Member of this Body. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the Gentleman who has risen to his feet time and time again to have his motion put has support from both sides of the aisle. He has support from every part of this great state. And let me say at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I don't know in my own mind whether or not I shall support the Gentleman when and if we ever get to the substance of the question itself. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think everyone should know that it is wrong, it is wrong for a few people from the City of Chicago to be able to dictate what this House will or will not debate. The Majority Leader of this House has piously and self-righteously told us about tax relief for the citizens of Illinois. And yet the very question which he will not let this Body hear is a question on sincere tax relief for everyone in this state. I might to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, you are going to have to share the burden of the decisions made by only a few people in your party because your side of the aisle controls this chamber. It is your side of the aisle which has the gavel and which is thwarting a few Members



from hearing an issue which is now being talked about from one end of this country to the other end. I say to you, Members of the House, you ought to rise up now. You ought to assert your rights. Every now and then if we let this continue, you may be on the other end of the gavel. This question goes deep in this state and there are sincere people who wish to have it heard. Now the machine in Chicago doesn't want to have it heard. And the Gentleman who has the gavel has taken it upon himself to get our elected, duly elected Speaker off of the podium. He won't let the Speaker preside when this question is put. He has taken it upon himself to stop this House from hearing this question. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House..."

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

Bradley: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman's making a very, very fine political speech. The TV cameras aren't here and the whole State of Illinois is missing it and I think you should rule him out of order and let's get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman rose on a point of personal privilege and I'm sure that as he has always done in his long career in the Legislature that he will remain on the point of personal privilege and, of course, observe all the rules of decency in conduct in the House. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman knows I really do not care about television cameras or the press. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I remind you what I said earlier in my remarks. There are Members on your side of the aisle who will support this issue, who want to support the issue and who are also deeply concerned with the question of taxes in Illinois. But they are going to have to bear the burden which you placed upon them because you, Mr. Speaker, you alone, you alone are preventing this issue from being heard. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, each one of us should have equal rights. We have all been elected as Members to this great Body. We are following the rules. We are simply asking for equity and fairness. The Gentleman from Cook has risen to his feet, he has



followed the rules, he has asked that his question be heard. And yet one Member of this House, one single Member is preventing this great question from being heard in this chamber this week. I say to you, my friends, it is unfair. The voters of this state are going to know who was thwarting our will and thereby their will. It is one man. It is the Majority Leader from Chicago and I know how sincere, I know how sincere and concerned many of you are and perhaps the majority of Members from both sides of the aisle feel about this question. And yet, my friends, you sit there in silence. I ask you to join us. If the Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, will ever let this question be put, I know there'll be Democratic votes for the question. But I'm asking for your help in helping the Gentleman from Cook to have his question heard. Why won't you join with us to see to it that we can get to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading and hear the Gentleman's Amendment? I don't believe, I sincerely can't imagine that you will willingly let one person, your Majority Leader, prevent you from hearing a question of such great importance. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask some Member now to rise and pursuant to Rule 10(b) or (d) or whatever it may be, to put the motion, to put the motion and let's get on to Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading and let's see what the will of this House really is."

Speaker Madigan: "The order of business is Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1760. And on that Amendment, Mr. Levin, is recognized. For what purpose does Mr. Ryan arise?"

Ryan: "For the purpose of a motion, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule 10(b). I move to change the order of business."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, the order of business..."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, this is going to go on and on and on. You know it and I know it. Now why don't you be fair about it and give the Gentleman a chance to have the motion heard? What are you afraid of? What are you afraid of, Mr. Speaker? Can you answer that? What is it you're afraid of?"

Speaker Madigan: "Have you concluded your remarks?"

Ryan: "No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Ryan: "I would renew my motion that we move to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading. And I have four, five Members that join with me, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the rules of this House. Would you call my motion, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Have you concluded your remarks?"

Ryan: "If you'll call my motion, I'll conclude my remarks."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Ryan, please proceed to the conclusion of your remarks. You've been informed as to the order of business and I'm sure all the Members of the House would be happy to listen to you but they would also appreciate it if you would conclude your remarks."

Ryan: "I know and they'd also appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if you'd give us a fair chance over here on this side of the aisle. Check with your Parliamentarian and ask him if we're in order like you do on everything else."

Speaker Madigan: "Have you finished, Mr. Ryan?"

Ryan: "Are you going to call my motion, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, you're fully aware of our posture. We wish to extend all personal courtesy to the Minority Leader. Could you please tell us if you've completed your remarks? Would you turn on Mr. Ryan?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the fairness that you've given me, but I really can't say that I see where you've been too fair. And if you really want to be fair, you can call my motion, Mr. Speaker. That's what this is about."

Speaker Madigan: "The order of business is Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1760. And Mr. Levin is recognized. Mr. Levin."

Levin: "I've a feeling this is a bad time to bring this up. Okay. I didn't realize there was so much interest in this Amendment. Yes."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Amendment read in full. Mr. Levin's Amendment read in full."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall proceed to a reading of the Amendment in full."



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Amends Senate Bill 1760 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following. 'An Act to amend Section 4, 10 and 13 of' and to add Section 13.1 to..."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Conti seek recognition?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I asked Mr. Levin to read the Amendment in full."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Conti, we certainly wish to accede to all reasonable requests and a request that an Amendment be read, I think, is reasonable."

Conti: "I didn't think we knew what unreasonable meant."

Speaker Madigan: "But I wish to point out to you, Mr. Conti, that the... that function is normally performed by the Clerk."

Conti: "Yes, I understand it is."

Speaker Madigan: "Reading the Amendments."

Conti: "But the function of calling Bills at certain orders are also decided by the Speaker of the House and we've been ignored for the last three or four weeks. I've been hearing something about Proposition 13 and saw a lot of crocodile tears about the poor taxpayers in the City of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, but here we're trying to give people tax relief and all you keep coming up with circuit breakers and all other kind of breakers to give tax relief and we will not be able to hear the Constitutional Amendment #4 that Don Totten's been trying to propose. I'd like to have the Amendment read in full and every Amendment to every Bill read in full."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Kane seek recognition?"

Kane: "I would suggest that that is dilatory, Mr. Speaker. I think we ought to continue with the program of the House."

Speaker Madigan: "I believe your point is well taken, but the Clerk shall read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "An Act to amend Section 4, 10 and 13 of and to add Section 13.1 to an Act in relation to a Comprehensive County Hospital Governing Commission. Approved April 25, 1969 and to amend, and by deleting everything after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following: Section 1. Section 4,



10 and 13 of an Act in relation to the Comprehensive County Hospital Governing Commission.. Approved April 25, 1969 as amended, are amended and Section 13.1 is added thereto and amended and added Sections to read as follows: Section 4. In making appointments to the Commission the selection committee shall give due consideration to a fair representation throughout such county. No more than five members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party at the time of their appointment. No person shall be appointed to the selection committee or Commission who is a member of the governing body or an officer or full time employee of a municipality, of the federal or state government or of any other public agency, except that membership on any selection committee or Commission shall not preclude a person's appointment to the committee or appointment. Section 10. The Commission, as agent to the county in which the Commission exists and without further authorization from that county or the Board of Commissioners thereof, shall have and exercise on behalf of that county, the following powers: to organize, operate, maintain and manage insofar as developing and enforcing county policies, the various hospitals and hospital facility owned by such county, and the hospital..."

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

Greiman: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. In looking at Rule 34, dealing with Amendments, it speaks of offering an Amendment and submitting in writing Amendment to the Clerk and the printing and placing of a copy on each of it, but not the actual reading of the Amendment itself, Mr. Speaker. And nowhere in Rule 34, dealing with Amendments, is there a reference to the actual reading of the Amendments in full. I wonder if you could do this, if you could advise me whether we have to hear this or whether perhaps we could have somebody on the staff read them to Mr. Conti as they come across his desk. That might be another way to handle it. Could we get a staff member to read it to Mr. Conti maybe? Mr. Speaker, what about that? Perhaps Adeline could sing the Amendments to Mr. Conti quietly."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."



Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, what about my inquiry?"

Speaker Madigan: "What was your inquiry?"

Greiman: "You have to listen, Mr. Speaker. In Rule 34, I don't see anything that requires the reading of the Amendment in full. It tells about what we are to do with an Amendment when it comes in but doesn't refer to the reading of the Amendment in full. They're to be placed on our desks; they have been placed on our desks and I'm trying to... while I love Jack O'Brien's voice, it's not the whole world."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman, the rules do not require that, but we are extending this courtesy to Mr. Conti. Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "So that we also have courtesy for the other hundred and seventy-six of us, isn't it possible that we could get someone who would read them to Mr. Conti in a quieter way off in the corner perhaps? This is really a courtesy and not a rule that we would have to have. There are a hundred and seventy-six of us that perhaps would like to read it ourselves. Maybe an Assistant Clerk could handle it?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "And the hospital, medical, nursing, health and allied medical research and educational programs related to such hospitals and hospital facilities; to give its views, judgments or appraisals and/or to lend its good offices to official state and local comprehensive health planning agencies, now existing or in the future created, with regard to..."

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

Ryan: "To request a Republican Conference immediately, Mr. Speaker. Immediately."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, I'd like to consult with the Speaker."

Ryan: "Well, where is he? Why isn't he here?"

Speaker Madigan: "Well, we'll consult with the Speaker."

Ryan: "How long is that going to take?"

Speaker Madigan: "Pardon me?"

Ryan: "How long will that take?"

Speaker Madigan: "A few moments. And the Clerk will proceed to read the Amendment."



Clerk O'Brien: "For the implementation of comprehensive health care for all residents of the county; to form agreements for the provision of needed health services with public or private non-profit hospitals or health care facilities within the county, provided that such hospitals or health care facilities remain functionally autonomous but subject to the Commission's policies; to establish and enforce policies regarding the use, operation and management of hospitals and health facilities under its authority; to affiliate with one or more accredited medical or nursing schools. For the purposes of this Act, affiliation is defined as an agreement between a hospital or health facility and a medical or nursing school or schools, whereby the school or schools provide professional staff for the hospital or health facility, and the hospital or health facility provides an auxiliary teaching program for the school or schools, and such agreement conforms with the policies of the Commission; to make and enter into contracts to accomplish any or all of its purposes; to establish rules and regulations for the use, operation and management thereof; to fix, charge and collect reasonable fees and comprehension... compensation for the use or occupancy of the various hospitals and facilities responsible to the Commission, or any part thereof, and for hospital, medical and nursing care, medicine or other hospital or allied medical research for educational services furnished by any such hospital or facility; to establish bank accounts; to administer and expend all funds collected; and to borrow against and to pledge accounts receivable for purposes set forth in this Act. The Commission shall further have the power to accept, retain and administer any funds provided from any source for research and educational purposes related to services and programs administered by the Commission. The Commission shall have the power to sue and be sued, complain and defend its own name, as agent of the county, and to purchase, receive by gift, or otherwise acquire intangible and tangible personal property for its purposes. Judgments rendered against the Commission as agent for the county shall be payable solely from funds available to the Commission under Section 13 of this Act. As agent for the county, the



Commission shall fix all salaries, wages or other compensation, or benefits and working conditions of all employees, including physicians, or other persons performing services for the Commission. Section 13. On or before the 1st day of December of each year the Commission shall submit to the Board of Commissioners of such county a consolidated budget covering all comprehensive income, expenses and capital outlays of any such hospital, hospital facility and the hospital, medical, nursing, health and allied medical programs related thereto, of any comprehensive health plans and services provided in accordance with such plans, and of any agreement or contracts with public or private nonprofit hospitals or health care facilities, which budget shall show the net amount for which it requests an appropriation. The net amount for which the Commission may request an appropriation from the Board of Commissioners of the county shall be the difference between the anticipated expenses and capital outlays in the consolidated budget and the anticipated income submitted in the consolidated budget. The Board of Commissioners shall appropriate to offset such net amount a sufficient sum of money as the Board deems necessary for the Commission to meet the expenses and to carry out the provisions of this Act and such appropriation shall be in the form of one lump sum amount and shall be transferred to the Commission ~~in monthly lump sum installments concerned~~ (the words 'in monthly lump sum installments concerned' struck through) upon receipt by the count of said funds. (And the following paragraph is underlined.) If tax anticipation notes are issued by the Board..."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, as much as I enjoy hearing the Clerk read this, there's no provision in the... either the rules or the Constitution any longer for to that ask that a Bill or an Amendment be read in full. I think it should be there because... but I think this is an abuse of the Clerk."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "If tax anticipation notes are issued by the Board of Commissioners of the county in anticipation of the collection



of taxes levied under this Act, the proceeds of such notes shall be paid to the Commission upon receipt after paying the principal and interest of such notes from such taxes the county shall pay the balance of such taxes to the Commission monthly as received. (end of underlined paragraph) For the purposes of this Act, the Board of Commissioners of the county is authorized to levy a tax on the taxable property of the county to be extended at a rate not to exceed twenty-five percent of values. Such tax shall not be included in any statutory tax rate limitations..."

Speaker Madigan: "Now, Mr. Clerk, Mr. Clerk, Mr. Ryan has moved pursuant to Rule 10(b) to change the order of business to Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading. And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. And Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Well, a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. How many times can this motion be renewed on the same subject during a Session?"

Speaker Madigan: "Parliamentarian informs me that for sure it can only be renewed once today. It can only be put once today and not a second time. And he apparently is unwilling to comment further. The motion requires 89 votes. And to explain his vote, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you can see I listened very closely to what the Membership of the other side of the aisle stated and I just want the record to show quite vividly that the Democratic Party per se has provided some tax relief for the home owners of this state. We provided it in the Bakalis program which was adopted and is in the Senate. We provided it by Senate Bills that came into this House and, yes, two of them are now at the stage of the Governor either deciding to amendatory veto or sign them into law. I believe that as far as any criticism from the other side of the aisle of the Democratic Party has not supplied the measure of tax relief to the home owners of this state are a fallacy. And I, for one, strongly object to the Membership or a Member on that side of the aisle criticising the City of Chicago and its membership in trying to provide tax relief for the home owners of this state. That is an absolute lie. All you got to



do is check the record, my friend, and you'll see that the Membership on this side of the aisle did provide Bills, did provide the support, and yes did provide the necessary leadership in order to accomplish that fact. I don't believe that the issue is closed though. I don't believe that we have every possible recourse available to us. That's why I'm working with Representative Totten and that's why I'm supporting this measure. I believe that Proposition 13, it was passed by unanimous vote, sixty-five percent of the vote in California, brings about the facts. And, yes, it's a serious question. And let me point out to you that L.A. County was the first county in this United States that went to a fair market value system on real estate. And, yes, I know that you're well aware... well aware of the fact that in 1972 Cook County went into the same system. And at that time, I mentioned by reservations to my party and at that time, I mentioned my reservations to the people of my community and, yes, when I also ran for Assessor of Cook County, trying to be the Democratic candidate, I came in with a platform stating the fact of what's transpiring not only in Cook County but in the other large counties... in the other large county in the United States that went to that system. But for anybody to come out and state that, yes, we did not provide some measure of tax relief, it's an error because we have. But I'm also cognizant of the fact of the frustrations of the Membership of this House not only on this issue but on others. And, yes, I do believe in fairness. I do believe in fairness, not only on this question but on any other question that comes before this Body. May I also point out in all fairness we've been trying to get to this issue for some time? May I also point out that the political honesty coalition had a meeting last week and they're proposing... in the process of getting passed out petitions to address the tax freeze question. They had two hundred and twenty Members there last week. They took petitions and they're in the process of getting them circulated and signed. In conjunction with that petition, they were given a petition... they were giving a petition for the..."

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



Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't rise to interrupt Mr.

Lechowicz but I certainly do object, a Member from the other side of the aisle coming over here, he's over here now, he's pushing lights of Members who are not on the floor of the House in violation of the rules. It's a most flagrant violation that I've seen on the floor of this House since I've been here. Now I think he at least ought to be Gentleman enough to get on the other side of the aisle and quit voting those switches of the Democratic Members. I wish you'd get him over there. I might say when I have the mike also, Mr. Speaker, that there are Members on that side who are being voted green who are not here today and I would wish that they would vote them 'present'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And let me just point out to you and to this Membership that this issue is not going to go away. I think that the feeling of the people, I know in my community who were just reassessed, are quite anxious to see exactly what type of relief we're going to be providing and, yes, we did provide it in 1784 and 85. And hopefully if we get to 1783, without the Amendment, Senate Bill 1783, it would provide an adequate amount of relief on a temporary basis. So Representative Totten has studied the question, we've discussed this for some time. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I've been reviewing this since December of last year. I knew that in my area we're going to go through the reassessment procedure for Jefferson Township and I knew that the unfortunate tax bills which are going to be coming out July 1 in our area, the second installment, may you please, will be escalated by at least a twenty to twenty-two percent. And when those tax bills hit, unfortunately we will not be in Session to be considering a tax relief before the November election. And I, for one, from a Democratic Party standpoint believe, believe that House Joint Constitutional Amendment #44 should be discussed. I won't be taken into implementation until 1980 and for that reason, and for that reason, I am voting 'aye' and I would hope that the question could be brought to the House floor and it could be adequately discussed. I can go through and



pinpoint every pro...proponent of that measure and I can also show you some of my reservations.. And I'll do so, but I think that in all fairness, it should be an item that should be addressed in this General Assembly and it should be addressed before the November election. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm voting 'present' upon this issue and I'd like to explain my vote. We already have three articles to be amended on our ballot next fall. If we pass this, the Constitutional Amendment would come after we would pass this motion and if we pass it, it can't go on the ballot before 1980 I understand. That means there's going to be another General Assembly elected between now and then. I'm not a candidate for the General Assembly next time and I think the General Assembly that's elected next November should be making that decision after having talked with all of the people and if they've campaigned across their district and found out the views of all of the people throughout this State of Illinois as to how they should vote on this particular issue, when it's coming up. I have some feelings that I might want to vote for this. I'd like to see it on the ballot, but nevertheless, I think it is improper for me and anyone that's not coming back here to bind the hand of the General Assembly that will be in Session to consider Constitutional Amendments before the 1980 general election. This can't go on in 1978 and this is, therefore, just the improper time to consider this. It should be considered by the electorate when we put ourselves up or when others put themselves up as candidates for the next general election."

Speaker Madigan: "Point of parliamentary inquiry by Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the question, of course, that Representative Tipsword raises as to the fact that we've already passed Constitutional Amendments, there is... has the Speaker at this time ruled that additional Constitutional Amendments may be passed by the same Session? We theoretically impact Constitutional Amendments for the next umpteen elections without having an intervening General Assembly have an opportunity to vote at all



on Amendments. Are they in order at this point?"

Speaker Madigan: "Speaker has not ruled at this time, Mr. Greiman, on that question."

Greiman: "Well, I think that that applies to this particular motion and I would ask the Speaker to rule on that. I think this motion is out of order."

Speaker Madigan: "The Speaker intends to rule on that question when and if this matter is presented on Third Reading. But the Parliamentarian wishes to point out that whatever the ruling, it would be litigable in the courts. Mr. Matijevich to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, first of all the motion really wasn't in order. I didn't raise the.. I didn't raise the issue but it really wasn't in order because under Rule 61, if you look under Rule 61 when a question's under debate and we had Amendment #4 to the, whatever Bill that Levin was up on, that was under debate and under Rule 61, no other motion is in order except the following. And there's no motion under that to change the order of business, so the motion really is out of order, Mr. Speaker and it better not get 89 because I'm going to ask for that ruling when we get there. But here's why... I agree entirely with Representative Tipword. I voted for the Constitutional Amendment when it could have been placed on this ballot. I supported that and I think as Representative Lechowicz said, most of us did over here. But we went beyond that time limit. We cannot put any more on the ballot. Now to me it makes more sense for us to look at California, look at their experience before we do anything else with regards to Constitutional Amendments. We may find the experience in California may be too drastic. We don't know that, but California is a proving ground. It's a testing ground for us to look at that and then act not in haste and not act so quickly over Proposition 13 but to look at the experience there. But further than that, there is this political situation, too, Mr. Speaker. And that is this..."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This Speaker and others before him are addressing themselves to the Constitutional



Amendment and not to the motion before us which is to change the order of business. The question before us is whether a Member of this House has been treated fairly or if his rights have been impeded by the Chair of this House. And I think that that is the issue before us whether we have the right to change the order of business by motion under Rule 10(b) or not. All this extraenous debate about California and about the Constitutional Amendment itself is premature to say the least and I think we should confine ourselves to the motion before us."

Speaker Madigan: "Continue, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very difficult not to speak about changing the order without getting into these other matters. And really what the... what the taxpayers want more than anything, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, they want tax relief now. They can wait for this type of proposition, they want it now. All we do if we put this proposition on the ballot is we hoodwink the taxpayers because we're telling them we're not giving them tax relief now. We're going to get the Republicans off the hook, we're going to get Governor Thompson off the hook, we're not going to give an expansion of the circuit breaker tax relief so they can get it now. Their tax bills are high now. Now that's the issue. Do you want to hoodwink the taxpayers and say we're going to give you this in the future and something to think about in 1980? They won't buy it. You won't fool them. We'll go all over the State of Illinois and tell them that you will not support a measure that will give them immediate tax relief. That's the issue here. Let's not fool anybody. That's all you're trying to do."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that really is the issue right now, the question of tax relief. Previous speakers have taken a great deal of liberty in accusing the Republican Party of not meeting its responsibility. But, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's examine for a second some of these great Bills that have been touted as immediate relief. Senate Bill 1783 in its form is unamended.



What does that do? That gives relief to your taxpayers, not immediately but only after each county or assessment district during the first quadrennial assessment of each county or district following the effective date of that Act. So that doesn't give you immediate relief and those of you that have already being reassessed on a quadrent in Cook County aren't going to get the relief until you're reassessed again. So let's not kid each other, we have a lot of Amendments on that Bill that we're going to deal with. The only time you're going to get immediate tax relief is if you freeze the extension of taxes, if you lower the level of assessment and if you retard the growth of the local units from increasing their tax levy. Now that's what it's all about. It's a bunch of phoniness what you're telling us on the other side of the aisle that you're granting immediate relief and you know it is. You don't have any program for property tax relief, you never have had one and you don't have one right now. You want to vote for tax relief and you'll vote for relief in 1783 that are contained in some of the Amendments. Now we don't want to get up and make the issue partisan. You're the ones that are telling that you're doing a job. Now by voting against hearing an Amendment on the Constitution that Representative Totten and Lechowicz have put forth, you're once again telling the people of Illinois that you're not interested in immediate tax relief, that you're not interested in addressing the most important problem of this General Assembly. I, for one, think that's the overriding problem that we're facing right now and failing to meet that head on and directly and dealing with the real issue that the people of this state care about, relief in property taxes, you're not meeting your responsibility. You could talk about workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, business climate, you could talk about all other kinds of legislation. But when you talk about property tax relief, that's what the people want and that's what they care about. And as a Republican Member of this House that's concerned with property tax relief, I for one don't think that there's anything else that we should do here until we give our citizens some relief in that area. And if you don't back that effort up by



putting a green vote up here right now, then you're just going with a bunch of baloney when you're telling your people back home that you're for tax relief and this is a Roll Call on it and you have a chance right now to stand up and be counted and you'll have the chance again when we talk about some real relief in 1783."

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

Totten: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the opportunity even though the time of calling it for going to this order of business. First of all I'd like to make it clear that there have been many Members on the other side of the aisle who have joined me in this issue and in urging it be heard. There are Members from downstate as well as there are many Members from the City of Chicago who feel this issue is important and I thank them for their support. They have joined me and many others in their support despite many pressures that have been put on them and I thank them for it. But it seems rather odd, Mr. Speaker, that when we have had before us twice a Constitutional Amendment that we could have acted on all the way up until March of next year, that you have found it unnecessary and unneeded to call this Amendment. This is not a partisan proposition. This is one that has support from all sides of the aisle, from liberal, conservative, black and white, Democrat and Republican. It's one that should have been heard ten days ago when I first put my light on to seek recognition and you have sought to ignore me. Yet you have seen fit to run through Constitutional Amendment #54, I believe it was, where we could have waited until March of next year to hear that rather than hear this. But let me say to the Members of this side of the aisle and to the Members on the other side of the aisle who feel possibly that this may not be timely that the issue is timely. The issue is a complex one. The issue is one that's being addressed in Amendments like this all over the country for it was only Friday night that Governor Jerry Brown, the Democratic Governor of California proposed a Constitutional tax limitation Amendment in the State of California similar to the one that we're seeking to have heard here in this state tonight. It is a nonpartisan issue. It's one that should be heard. It's one



that's complex. It's one that should be passed out of this General Assembly immediately so that the impacts of it can be addressed by this Legislature and by the state and local governments that may be impacted by it in the two year period before it's on the ballot. We should have that much time to address an issue as important as this. I appreciate those who are supporting me in this motion to get it heard and those of you on both sides of the aisle who have helped to make this issue possible, I'd ask for your support to give me that 89 votes so that we can hear it now. Thank you."

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

Yourell: "Not to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, but rather to correct some statements that were made by a prior speaker from DuPage County who mentioned in his explanation of vote a Senate Bill, Senate Bill 1783, and the Amendments that are going to come to that Bill, House Amendments, that are going to spell out tax relief for the citizens of Illinois. I would suggest to you that he's referring to my House Bill 3410 which places a freeze on all real estate taxes in the State of Illinois and bases that freeze on the '78 assessment for the years 1980 and 1981. So for that Gentleman to take credit as a Republican measure for tax relief, House Bill 3410, he's absolutely incorrect. That is my Bill, sponsored by Yourell, Lechowicz, Matejek and fifty-three other Cosponsors, some of whom, of course, are Republicans. He's referring to Senate... House Amendment #19 to Senate Bill 1783 that takes my complete House Bill 3410 and places it on that Senate Bill. That is a Democratic proposal, Mr... Representative from DuPage County. Don't forget it. And you're asking for my support on that Amendment and remember that it started out and it still is a Democratic proposal from this side of the aisle to really give meaningful tax relief to the citizens of Illinois and to freeze those tax rates at the '78 level."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think we should care who is sponsoring what as long as we get some meaningful tax relief for our taxpayers of Illinois. If you think



they can wait till 1980 and... for the next Legislature to make up its mind what to do, you're badly mistaken. But at least if this Amendment is allowed to be acted upon, it won't be voted upon until 1980. If there are other major changes that take place in the meantime that gives some meaningful tax relief, well that's very well. But I think we're fooling ourselves by saying that people can wait. They cannot wait. The Jarvis Amendment in California did not go far enough. This Amendment does because this one would even... even prohibit local government from increasing existing taxes without voter approval and your property taxes could go up no faster than the rate of inflation. I think it's high time we faced reality. This is one of the most important issues to face any Legislature and Governor Jerry Brown finally realized that in California and now it's coming around a hundred and eighty degree turn and saying fine, we're going to do something about it in California. So let's vote for it. For heaven's sake, we owe it to our taxpayers and forget about whether it's Democrat or Republican."

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

Skinner: "If this motion doesn't pass, it's obviously going to be the Democratic Party that's going to have to take the blame. I can only see five Democrats up there whose names begin with B, H, L, S and W, not to use their name of course. If you vote 'no' or 'present', I would contend that that is an absolute copout. There have been some arguments on this floor that are just beyond reason. One Gentleman suggested that we amended three Articles. Well I only remember two Amendments and they're both the Revenue Article. And besides, this debate should have nothing to do with this year's referendum Amendments. As to 1980's referendum, certainly one of the Articles to be amended ought to be the Revenue Article. You can... we can put as many Amendments to that Article as we wish on the ballot, I believe and if the next General Assembly does not agree with us, we can always rescind, that is those of us who are reelected, can always rescind this Constitutional Amendment. I see no reason to be afraid to put it on and I suspect... I suspect this will be a good Roll Call if all us



Republicans who want to bump off marginal Democrats."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jack Davis to explain his vote."

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

I think I ought to point out first that this motion is to bring us to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading and not Third Reading. The Amendment will have to be read on three successive days if it passes. There will be other Amendments offered to the Amendment. It's time that this Legislature went on record as limiting through constitutional processes the tax reform measures that we all seek in the State of Illinois. Now a bipartisan effort should be mounted this year by statute to offer the kind of tax relief that we're seeking and I'm sure in the next ensuing day that we're going to do that. There's been a lot of talk here of Senate Bill 1783, 1785, 1786, but, Ladies and Gentlemen, the people of Illinois and across the country are interested in the kind of tax relief that was presented in 1776, two hundred and two years ago. That's what the Revolution was all about and that's the one that's facing us. You'd better hear this Amendment and you'd better go back to your districts and tell them you heard this Amendment and that you're willing to lock into our Constitution the kind of limitation that these... that the proposed 44 seeks."

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

L. Martin: "First of all, Mr. Speaker, and you may start with me.

Would you put the timers on?" I think one minutes to explain the vote is enough for all of us. And as I say, you may start with me. Some of the speakers are taking an extraordinarily long time. May I remind the other side of the aisle that one of what you are calling your tax reform Bills passed out of this House with 89 votes. One of those votes was mine. The reason for that is simple. The people in my district don't care who the Sponsor of a Bill is. They want tax reform. And if it's a Democratic Bill for a potential Democratic Governor and it is tax reform, I'll vote for it. And if it is a Republican sponsored Bill that will give relief to the taxpayers of Illinois, I will vote for it. Now you over there it seems to me are making a mistake, a mistake you



evidently are making willingly. But a 'present' vote is not going to be enough and I'm looking at some of you who are my friends and this is a mistake. Let's hear it."

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

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have here an article that was published June 19th in Collinsville Herald called 'Tax Protests'. A young man attended public school, rode the free school bus, participated in the subsidized lunch program. He entered the army and then upon discharge, retained his national service insurance from the G.I. Bill. Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse and bought a farm with an F.H.A. loan and obtained an R.F.C. loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. Later he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments helped pay for his farm and ranch. His father and mother lived on the ranch on their social security. R.E.A. financed lines supplied electricity. The government helped clear his land. The county agent showed him how to terrace it and then the government built him a fish pond and stocked it with fish. Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked his money and a government agent insured it. His children attended public schools, rode free school buses, played in the public parks and swam in the public pools. He was a leader in obtaining the new federal building and went into Washington with a group to ask the government to build a great dam. He petitioned the government to give the local air base to the county. Then one day after hearing that Carter's five hundred billion dollar budget for 1978 added up to two thousand dollars for every man, woman and child, he wrote to his Congressman. 'I wish to protest these excessive governmental expenditures and attendant high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people should stand on their own two feet without expecting handouts. I'm opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand the return to the principles of our Constitution and of state rights.' Ladies and Gentleman, I think if we determine that some of these governmental services that people have been enjoying are no longer necessary, I will be happy to cut the taxes so that we no longer have



to fund those programs. But it does not make any sense for us to cut the taxes first and then deny the services. It's foolish for us to even be considering this matter at this time because we cannot get this issue on the ballot this fall. If we could, it would be a way of having the public express their opinions about tax decrease. But even if we act on it now it is not going to go on the ballot. We are going to be fooling the people into thinking that we have taken action in their behalf. I suggest that we need to get on with the business of the House so that we can fund state services for next year and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. For what purpose does Mr. Boucek arise?"

Boucek: "Change my vote to 'yes' please."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson, did you seek recognition? Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, I just wanted to announce that I have a horrendous conflict of interest in voting on that proposition. Despite that, I voted for it and it's because I have a horrendously high real estate tax bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recognized, too, because I think there's something very important here that a lot of the people in the House are forgetting. We've got about several Constitutional Amendment Bills in the Subcommittee on Executive that deal with real estate property tax relief. I think that it's unfortunate that they couldn't all have been debated because I think that we all agree that we need property tax relief, but we're not agreed on how we should give it or what formula this should take. I think Representative Skinner's got a good Bill for property tax relief. I think several other people have got good Bills. I just wish that we could debate them all, but I'm going to change my vote to 'aye', Mr. Speaker, to give an opportunity to at least one Sponsor to see it."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question there are now 89 votes. And Mr. Bradley has questions. Mr. Boucek was recorded as 'aye'."



Did Mudd record himself as 'aye'? There are 90 'ayes' and Mr. Bradley has questions of the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, to save the time of the House I'm not going to ask him to call the green ones. I'll just call some names and if they're not here, I wish that... Is Gene Hoffman over there? He's voting green."

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Hoffman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Bradley: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Record him from the Roll... remove him from the Roll Call."

Bradley: "Mr. Friedland."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Ryan seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, if we're going to have a verification, I think you ought to do it in the proper manner. I think that the Sponsor of the motion is entitled to have the absentees polled."

Bradley: "I don't think it's timely."

Ryan: "Well if we're going to have a verification, it ought to be done in the proper manner, Mr. Speaker, follow the way you're supposed to do it. But I'd appreciate it if you'd do it."

Bradley: "I was trying to save the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, and just to point out, we had 90 votes on there and there's a half a dozen that are on there that I definitely know are not here and we can save the time of the House by knocking them off."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Once in awhile, Mr. Speaker, I try and take a chapter from your book and I may need time to get some Members in here so I wish you'd follow the procedure that you're supposed to follow."

Speaker Madigan: "Clerk shall poll the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Capparelli, Darrow, Ebbesen, Ewell, Garmisa, Hart, Hoffman, J.M. Houlihan, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kozobowski, Mann, Marovitz, Matejek, McGrew, Meyer, Pierce, Schlickman, Terzich,



and Van Duynes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just... I think we removed Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Ebbesen. That correct?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, we have."

Bradley: "Mr. Friedland then."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedland in the chamber? Remove Mr. Friedland."

Bradley: "Mr. Cunningham."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cunningham. Remove Mr. Cunningham."

Bradley: "Mr. Stearney."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stearney. Remove Mr. Stearney."

Bradley: "Mr. Kucharski."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kucharski. Remove Mr. Kucharski."

Bradley: "Mr. Meyer."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer. Remove Mr. Meyer."

Bradley: "Mr. Griesheimer."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Ryan seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you still haven't followed the proper procedure. I believe the Clerk is supposed to call the 'aye' votes."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requesting the verification has waived that right. And Mr. Griesheimer shall be removed from the Roll Call. Mr. Griesheimer shall be removed."

Bradley: "I can't... Mr. Speaker, the last one I think I have is Mr. McAuliffe."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe is in his chair."

Bradley: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "How many, Mr. Clerk?"

Bradley: "Is Mr. Byers on the..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Byers is here. How many, Mr. Clerk? There are 81 'ayes', 40 'noes', 30 voting 'present'. The motion fails. Let's now return to the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading. Mr. Levin on Senate Bill 1760. The Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading there appears Senate Bill 1760. Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is an Amendment to House Bill 1760 which deals with the fiscal..."

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



Bradley: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, very briefly."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed as soon as we got done with that Roll that we had members of the press leaving the floor to go write their articles. I'd like to impress upon them the fact that that vote that we just had was not a vote on the issue, the vote was on the motion. And there were very many Members on this side of the aisle who would like to be in favor of the issue, but they are more interested in proceeding tonight with the business of this House. I hope the news media remembers that when they're writing their stories."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 deals with Senate Bill 1760 which attempts to deal with the very serious fiscal problem of Cook County hospitals. The Amendment contains two major provisions. The first provision deals with the use of revenues, proceeds from taxes and from tax anticipation notes and has been worked out jointly between the Governing Commission and the... County Board and the Democratic Leadership. And it would permit the Cook County Hospital Governing Commission to take immediately the proceeds of tax anticipation notes. Right now under the existing law they have to run up a debt and unfortunately they're not allowed to take more than one-twelfth of the proceeds of the tax anticipation notes or any revenue that comes in. The result is that we have a situation where these proceeds are sitting in the First National Bank, the same bank to which Cook County Hospital owes a debt of up to thirteen million dollars and this money cannot be used for purposes of paying off this debt. There are a couple of technical changes that are made. The second major provision in Amendment #4 reverses an Appellate Court decision which held that where a detainee, not somebody who has been convicted or plead guilty of a crime, but somebody who's a detainee is in need of medical care, a third party provider is not liable for that care if the detainee had had insurance or his public aid. I urge a favorable vote on Amendment #4."

Speaker Madigan: "Any discussion? Mr. McMaster."



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

Levin: "Certainly will."

McMaster: "Ellis, I'd like to have you refresh my memory somewhat.

Did you have in Counties and Townships Committee House Bill 3206?"

Levin: "Yes."

McMaster: "And it failed in Counties and Townships, is that not right?"

Levin: "That's correct."

McMaster: "Is this Bill, Amendment essentially the same as House
Bill 3206?"

Levin: "No, Amendment #4..."

McMaster: "Amendment #4 is essentially..."

Levin: "It's two part. There are two parts to it."

McMaster: "Part of it is essentially the same?"

Levin: "Part of it is essentially that, that is correct."

McMaster: "All right."

Levin: "I would point out..."

McMaster: "Ellis, as you recall, we discussed several things at
that Committee meeting. One of them was that I did not think we
had any objections to clarifying the law so that anyone who held
hospital insurance and let's say Blue Cross or whatever, should be
eligible to collect from that insurance in case they are incar-
cerated in the Cook County or in the county jail and sent to the
county hospital. The other part of your Bill would provide for
public aid paying for someone in jail and going to the hospital.
Is that not correct?"

Levin: "That is correct."

McMaster: "All right now, Ellis, will you tell me please what do you
estimate that this could cost the Illinois Department of Public
Aid should this legislation pass and become law?"

Levin: "Okay, the estimate that I have is that the amount will be
very minimal. And let me tell you why and let me give you a figure.
The general population of Cook County... of the jail, Cook County
jail is made up not of heads of household, the kinds of people
who would normally be eligible for public aid and who have a green
card. The vast majority of the persons who are detainees are
males between the age of eighteen to twenty-four. They are not



the head of households. They are... have not been previously certified for public aid. They do not have green cards and, therefore, they would not be eligible for public aid before they were arrested. And therefore, they would... there would not be any liability for reimbursements. The estimate I have is that this would cost between a hundred, approximately a hundred thousand dollars. Let me add while we're discussing reimbursement that it is very clear that if a person is convicted or pleads guilty under the federal Acts, we cannot be reimbursed. We have checked the issue out with respect to detainees and found that that is not necessarily the case that the Federal Government may very well reimburse the detainee. And I would point out that that part of Amendment #4 deals solely with detainees. It does not deal with individuals who have been convicted of a crime or individuals who have pled guilty. These are only people who are presumed to be innocent, who are awaiting trial and who were not able to come up bail."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I think he's taking a very long time to answer my questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Will all unauthorized people leave the floor?"

McMaster: "May I continue with my questioning, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Ellis, I think that you are out of line in estimate of the cost to the Illinois Department of Public Aid and you realize, I'm sure, as well as I that the Department of Public Aid spends a great deal of money in care of people in your counties. I really think... is the Department of Public Aid in support of this Amendment, Ellis?"

Levin: "Now this particular Amendment was not worked out with them. The other Amendment..."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, if I can go on then and address the Amendment itself. If I can address the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is basically the same as a Bill that we defeated in Counties and Townships Committee. As you know, your Committees are controlled by the people on your



side of the aisle. Nevertheless, it was defeated. It had a fair hearing. I think Mr. Yourell will agree with me that we were completely fair and have been. I think this is a very bad Amendment. I do not feel that we can afford this type of thing to be thrust upon the Department of Public Aid when some of us in this General Assembly are trying to save money for the people of the State of Illinois. And I would certainly oppose this Amendment very, very strongly."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "First a question of the Sponsor. This is a direct subsidy, is it not, from the State of Illinois to Cook County. What if we had a jail in Winnebago County in Rockford or Champaign County at Urbana and they maintained these similar health facilities? Would there be authorization now under the statutes for the State Department of Public Aid to reimburse Champaign County similarly as we do in this Act?"

Levin: "If I may respond to your question..."

Johnson: "Just a direct answer - yes or no."

Levin: "Senate Bill 1761 which passed the Senate and unfortunately did not get out of House Rules..."

Johnson: "The question is, does the statutes authorize reimbursing downstate areas for health care facilities in relation to... in relation to incarcerated individuals? Yes or no."

Levin: "May I answer the question in my, you know, the way I'm trying to please? Senate Bill 1761... you know, contained the provision to reimburse not only Cook County but the balance of the state. This was the suggestion of Representative McMaster. Unfortunately, that particular Bill did not get out of House Rules. This particular provision does not."

Johnson: "So..."

Levin: "I would certainly support something that would expand it."

Johnson: "Well the existing statutes and even with the passage of this Senate Bill, the only areas that would be affected by the reimbursement would be outside Cook County. So I would ask and pay attention... I would ask the Members of this General Assembly..."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Membership, Mr. Johnson. Would the



Membership please give their attention to Mr. Johnson and Mr. Levin. Thank you."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Members of this General Assembly and particularly those that serve Legislative Districts 31 through 59 to look carefully at what we're going to do. We're going to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of state money to reimburse Cook County when we don't have the benefit of the same benefit... statutory authorization in Champaign County, in Winnebago County, in Macon County, in all the other counties around the state who are being treated as second class citizens by the existing statutes or at least by the passage of this statute. This discriminates against downstate. It's a blatant special interest piece of legislation that's going to cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars and I would ask the Members of this General Assembly to vote strongly 'no' on Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1760."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion the question is, shall the Amendment #4 be adopted. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Houlihan to explain his vote."

D. Houlihan: "I think an explanation would be futile, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 47 'ayes', 83 'noes', 1 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Levin. Amends Senate Bill 1760 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, acceding to the will of the House, let me pull the Bill out at this point so we can redraft the Amendment so... I think remove the objectionable features."

Speaker Madigan: "What is your pleasure, Mr. Levin?"

Levin: "Take it out of the record. Leave it on Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Take this Bill out of the record. For what purpose does Mr. Ryan seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of welcoming the President of the Senate there. Since you didn't want to introduce



him, I thought I would. Nice to have you with us, Senator Hynes."

Speaker Madigan: "Senator Hynes wishes to thank you for all your current and past personal courtesies. On the Order of Concurrence on the Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears House Bill 3227. Mrs. Stiehl."

C.M. Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 and #3 to House Bill 3227. Senate Amendment #1 provides that the license renewal fees may be used by the Department of Registration and Education in the exercise of its licensing duties only after the consideration of with... in conjunction with the full consideration of the Medical Examining Committee. This Amendment is agreed by the Director of the Department of Education and the Illinois State Medical Society. The... and I would ask for approval of... that we concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendment #2 and 3. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is... would the Clerk correct the board? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 3227? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', no 'noes', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 3227. On page 8 of the Regular Calendar under the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 3151. Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3151. We brought it up at the beginning of Session and there was some question, Representative Mahar raised a question and we took it out of the record and we confirmed that the language that is being amended into this Bill is very similar to language which was inadvertently deleted from a statute in a previous Bill and we would like to move concurrence now."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3151. Is there any discussion?"



Mr. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Is the motion for Concurrence on Senate Amendments 1 and 2?"

Bowman: "Yes, please."

D. Houlihan: "Could you briefly explain what Senate Amendment #2 does?"

Bowman: "Yes. Senate Amendment #2 simply authorizes park districts to exchange land. In the original Act, the exchange of land was authorized but it wasn't, there was not specifications as to whether they could exchange land of comparable value with only governmental, other governmental entities or not. It was simply left open and so under the previous statute which was amended last spring, it was held that park districts could exchange land of comparable size and value with nongovernmental entities. Well when we passed the Bill that last spring, the language was changed to, restricted only to governmental entities along with some other modifications and completely removing the possibility that an exchange of land between the park district and a private entity could be consummated. And this Amendment simply, you know, restores what previously park districts have been able to do."

D. Houlihan: "But the... as I understand it though the exchange with the nongovernmental entity is limited to an exchange which is for the property which is being exchanged is for a park purpose. Is that correct?"

Bowman: "That's right."

D. Houlihan: "All right."

Bowman: "Yes, park purposes, comparable size, comparable value."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In following up on what... the question that Representative Houlihan asked, in checking the statutes it is apparent that Senator Wooten's Bill took some language out but that language I don't think referred to the exchange of nongovernmental entities. So I think the language that is put in Amendment #2 is slightly different than the language that we had prior to it being removed in 1977. However, I understand that this is the



type of thing that will take care of very small problems and I would hope that the park, elected park district would be doing the proper thing when they make the decision to exchange properties rather than having to go to a referendum for which the Act called for. So I remove my objection."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3151. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes', 8 'noes', 9 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3151. On the Order of the Second Supplemental... excuse me. On the Order of the First Supplemental Calendar there appears House Bill 3225. Mrs. Macdonald. Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Take that tomorrow?"

Speaker Madigan: "You said you'd rather take that tomorrow, Mrs. Macdonald?"

Macdonald: "Yes, if we could please."

Speaker Madigan: "If you so wish, we'll take it out of the record."

Macdonald: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Flinn wave his hands in the air?"

Flinn: "I was waving my hand to get your attention."

Speaker Madigan: "You've got it."

Flinn: "I'd like for you to vote 'aye' on 2256 as DiPrima would say."

Speaker Madigan: "Where is that at, Mr. Flinn?"

Flinn: "It's on the same Supplemental Calendar."

Speaker Madigan: "It's on the first Supplemental Calendar, Mr. Flinn?"

Flinn: "Yes, it is."

Speaker Madigan: "And the number?"

Flinn: "2256."

Speaker Madigan: "And what is your motion?"

Flinn: "I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 and I'd like to explain it briefly."



Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Flinn: "What it does is put an effective date in there and when we talked about the minimum salaries, we had 1404 and 1606 on there as minimum salaries for some of the county officers and all we did was remove the four dollars and the six dollars to make it an even dollar."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mrs. Pullen."

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

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

Pullen: "Is this one of the Bills that raises the minimum salaries for certain county officers?"

Flinn: "The Amendment cuts it four dollars and six dollars."

Pullen: "Does the Bill raise the minimum salaries for certain county officers?"

Flinn: "The Bill does, but we're talking about the Senate Amendment right now."

Pullen: "But we are on final passage. Thank you."

Flinn: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Can somebody tell me what the Senate Amendment did to the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn, would you explain the Senate Amendment?"

Flinn: "Sure, I'd be glad to explain it."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Membership please give their attention to Mr. Flinn?"

Flinn: "I'd be happy to explain it again. What it does is put in an effective date. It had no effective date; had a wrong effective date rather and we put an effective date in immediately when the Governor signs it. All right, the second thing it does in one of the minimum salaries in the certain number of counties, population of county, we had fourteen hundred... fourteen thousand and four dollars. We changed that to fourteen thousand. On another one we had sixteen thousand and six dollars and we changed that to sixteen thousand dollars. We cut those minimums by four and six dollars respectively."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Is there any



further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2256? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 104 'ayes', 27 'noes', 7 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2256. Mr. Dan Houlihan, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Page 3 of the Calendar, Mr. Speaker, House Bills, Third Reading, House Bill 3405."

Speaker Madigan: "And for what purpose does Mr. Leinenweber seek recognition?"

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, my seatmate, I won't say which one, inadvertently pushed the wrong switch. Could I be recorded as 'no' on that last Bill please? It won't change the outcome."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to change his vote and leave is granted. And on the, page 3 of the Calendar under the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, House Bill 3405, Mr. Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3405. A Bill for an Act to transfer funds in the Supreme Court Appropriations Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3405 as introduced was a supplemental appropriation to the Supreme Court for fiscal '78 in the amount of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The reason for this request was because of the very substantial additional transcription fees which have been incurred by court reporters paid through the court incurred as a result of the House Bill 1500 legislation passed last year or in last Session, the so-called Class X crime package. Amendment #1 to the Bill that was placed in Committee provided that this could be accomplished by a transfer of lapsed funds under the Supreme Court appropriation of fiscal '78, so in consequence what this is not a supplemental appropriation but rather a transfer of what would be lapsed funds in the budget. I know



of no opposition to the request and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House pass House Bill 3405. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the House pass House Bill 3405? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Is Mr. Leinenweber voted correctly? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 8 'noes', 9 voting 'present' and House Bill 3405 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, Regular Calendar, page 7 there appears House Bill 157. Mr.... who seeks recognition on that Bill, Mr. Flinn or Mrs. Stiehl? Mrs. Stiehl."

C.M. Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do concur with Amendment #1 to Senate Bill... to House Bill 157. This is the Mine Subsidence Study Act and the Amendment has been agreed by all parties. It simply provides that the Illinois Institute of Environmental Study would conduct the study rather than the Department of Mines and Minerals. We're doing this because they have the facilities by which to conduct the study. I would ask approval."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 157. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 129 'ayes', no 'noes', 7 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 157. On the same order of business, House Bill 158. Mrs. Stiehl. Mrs. Stiehl."

C.M. Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 158. These are agreed Amendments and they were worked out in the Insurance Subcommittee of the Senate. Amendment #1 simply extends the effective



date for one year from October 1, '78 to October 1, '79. Amendment #2 were technical corrections and Amendment #3 simply provides that the program will not go into effect until there are sufficient funds. I would ask that the House do concur in these Amendments. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 3 'noes', 3 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 158. On the same order of business, page 8 of the Calendar, House Bill 2842, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this came up a little earlier and the Minority Leader pointed out a problem we had with it and I would move that we do not concur with Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 2842."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that we do not concur in Senate Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it; the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2842. Back to the Supplemental Calendar, House Bill 3225, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have now straightened out a misunderstanding here and I recommend that we do concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3225. Senate Amendment #1 creates a one year Study Commission to study hazardous waste disposal, transportation and containment as well as low-level radioactive wastes. The Commission self-destructs July 1 in 1979. Senate Amendment #2, the standards implemented by the Bill shall be stayed where stayed by or consistent with decision of federal courts upon judicial review. It also allows administrative review of permit denials or permit conditions required pursuant to standards implemented by the Bill. The effect of Senate Amendment #3 would require board variances to be consistent



with the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act thus incorporating House Bill 3224 into this Bill. I recommend concurrence."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Question of the Sponsor. Amendment #2 with respect to conformity to federal decisions, what's the reason for the adoption of that Amendment in the Senate?"

Macdonald: "I wasn't given any specific reasoning for that so... but it is in agreement with the E.P.A. and they are, they feel..."

Johnson: "Like, I guess my question is, could we possibly be in the same posture, at least an analogous posture, that we were last year with respect to federal guidelines for air pollution although I realize this is a different Bill that by binding ourselves in advance to federal decisions we could be really, in effect, letting down our safeguards with respect to environmental protection? Isn't that possible under Amendment #2?"

Macdonald: "Well, not as I understand it, Representative Johnson. I don't believe so."

Johnson: "Well..."

Macdonald: "I think that's the reason for the Amendment to protect this n'that."

Johnson: "Well..."

Macdonald: "I think it provides additional safeguards."

Johnson: "Would you object to taking the Bill out of the record until we can ascertain whether that's the case or not?"

Macdonald: "Well..."

Johnson: "If you object, go ahead and vote on it. I..."

Macdonald: "Well..."

Johnson: "I guess there was a very controversial dialogue as you remember last year with respect to Representative Hart's Bill in a similar posture and I think that there's a number of Members in the General Assembly, maybe not enough to defeat the Concurrence, who might be concerned if by adopting or concurring with Amendment #2 we might be letting down our environmental protection safeguards."

Macdonald: "Well, I would as soon go ahead with it. We have much work to do and if you... if you don't concur, then we can go back



with it and see what we can do in the Senate. I would prefer to get this Bill either to a Conference Committee or else pass it if that's possible."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Question of the Sponsor."

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

Schuneman: "Representative, you mentioned in your explanation the Senate Amendment doing something about providing jurisdiction for the E.P.A. in the area of radioactive waste disposal. Would, could you repeat what you said about that?"

Macdonald: "They would only be participating in a study. That's all and they would make the report and the Study Commission would then destruct in one year."

Schuneman: "What's the interest of the E.P.A. in radioactive waste disposal since they have no, presently have no authority in that area at all?"

Macdonald: "Well, I don't think this was their Amendment. As a matter of fact, they were very reluctant... but the basic Bill is important enough to them so that they were willing to accept that responsibility."

Schuneman: "Well, I was hoping you'd take this out of the record so that we could because I wanted to talk to you about that, too because the Radioactive Waste Disposal Act enacted by the State of Illinois in 1963 gives entire jurisdiction over radioactive waste disposal to the Illinois Department of Public Health. And the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency has absolutely nothing to do with radioactive waste disposal and I'm curious as to why they should be given to the responsibility for conducting studies since they can't do anything about it anyway. Would you mind taking this out and talking about it?"

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, let's take this out of the record temporarily."

Speaker Madigan: "Take this Bill out of the record. It's the intent of the Chair to adjourn at this time unless there are some Members who feel they have emergency matters to be moved at this time. Absent any such matters, Mr. Giorgi."



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn till ten o'clock tomorrow morning, Monday."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning and his motion provides a few minutes for the Clerk to perform some perfunctory duties. On that motion all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. We are adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has receded from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, House Bill 2648. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, House Bill 3351; further to request it... inform the House of Representatives the Senate requests a Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to Bills of the following title, to wit: Senate Bills #1546, 1598, 1790, 1792 and 1798. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate's concurred with the House in passing a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bills #384, 3135, 3386, 1068, 2885, 2988, 3027, 3077, 2979, 3197, 3368, 2870, 2851, 2857, 2843, and 2981 together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended June 25, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	3:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend McDonald	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call	
		DiPrima	HB 2549, SA #1	
2		Speaker Redmond	House concurs	
		Epton	HB 2808, SA #1	
		Speaker Redmond	House nonconcurr	
		Flinn	HB 2842, SA #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan	Hold it	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Flinn	HB 2928, SA #2	
3		Speaker Redmond	House concurs, stands at ease	
		Lechowicz	Excused absence	
	3:25	Speaker Redmond		
		Conti	HB 2983, SA #1	
		Speaker Redmond	House concurs	
		Tipsword	HB 2999, SA #1	
4		Speaker Redmond		
		Bowman	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
	3:36	Greisheimer	Question	
		Tipsword		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Redmond	House concurs	
5		Lucco	HB 2869, SA #1	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Speaker Redmond	House concurs	
		Bowman	HB 3151, SA #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis	Yield	
6		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mahar	Yield	
7-8		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Getty		
		Speaker Redmond		
9		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1456, 2nd, #1 adopted	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tipsword		
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1535, 2nd, #1 adopted	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
	3:50	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1558, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Martin, L.		
10		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1562, 2nd, #1 & 4 adopted	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Martin, L.	Correction	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	3.
		Martin, L.		
		Clerk O'Brien	#4 tabled	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#5 not germane, #6 withdrawn	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tuerk	Amendment #7	
11		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd	Urge vote no	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tuerk	To close	
12		Speaker Redmond		
13		Geo-Karis	Question	
	4:00	Tuerk		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mautino	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Stuffle	Explain vote	
14		Speaker Redmond		
		Martin, L.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hoxsey		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Tuerk	Explain vote	
15		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich		
		Tuerk		
		Speaker Redmond		



4.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Anderson	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tuerk	
16		Speaker Redmond	
		Martin, L.	
		Speaker Redmond	#7 fails, 3rd
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1575, 2nd, #1 adopted
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dyer	TOOR
	4:07	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1577, 2nd, no CA
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading
17		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1611, 2nd, no CA
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1710, 2nd, no CA
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading
		Huskey	
18		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Responds
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Skinner		
19		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1841, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1859, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Edgar		
	4:14	Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Edgar		
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Edgar	Adopted	
20		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1861, 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kane	TOOR	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1864, 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Vinson	TOOR	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate	
21		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2706, 2nd, no CA	



6.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
	4:20	Dyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	Oppose
22		Speaker	
		Waddell	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mahar	Support
23		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Question
		Dyer	
24		Speaker Redmond	
25		DiPrima	
26		Speaker Redmond	
		Schuneman	Question
		Dyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
27		Hudson	Question
		DiPrima	
28		Madigan	In chair
		Jones, E.	
		DiPrima	
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
		Waddell	Renew request	
	3:37	Speaker Madigan	#1 adopted	
29		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Madigan		
		DiPrima		
		Speaker Madigan	#2 adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2978	
		Catania		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3288, 2nd, no CA	
30		Speaker Madigan	3rd reading	
		Stiehl		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Epton		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Brummer		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Epton		
31		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1725, 2nd, #1 adopted	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Brummer	Move to table	
		Speaker Madigan		
	4:47	McPike	Point of order	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Brummer		
32		Speaker Madigan		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
		McPike	Point of order	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Tipsword	Inquiry of chair	
		Speaker Madigan		
33		Brummer	Proceeds	
34		Speaker Madigan		
		Friedrich	Support motion to table	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Tipsword	Supports Amendment	
35		Speaker Madigan		
36		Davis, J.	Yield	
		Brummer		
37		Speaker Madigan		
38		McPike		
39		Speaker Madigan		
		Shuneman	Question	
		Brummer		
40		Speaker Madigan		
	5:08	Levin	Supports Amendment	
41		Speaker Madigan		
		Schoeberlein	MPQ	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Brummer	To close	
42		Speaker Madigan		
		Epton	Explains vote	
43		Speaker Madigan		
		Geo-Karis		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Madigan	
		Porter	
44		Speaker Madigan	
		Collins	
45		Speaker Madigan	
		Matijevich	
46		Speaker Madigan	
		Steele, E.G.	
		Speaker Madigan	
47		Kempiners	Explain vote
		Speaker Madigan	
		Walsh	Explain vote
48		Speaker Madigan	
		Miller	
49		Speaker Madigan	
	5:29	Burmmmer	Explain vote
50		Speaker Madigan	
		Brummer	Poll absentees and verify
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	Negative roll call
51		Speaker Madigan	
52		Brummer	Questions negative count
53		Speaker Madigan	
		Laurino	
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
		Flinn		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Brummer		
		Speaker Madigan	Motion to table fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Levin		
54		Speaker Madigan	#3 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Mudd		
55		Speaker Madigan		
		Skinner	Yield	
56	5:52	Mudd		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Schuneman	Yield	
		Mudd		
57		Speaker Madigan		
		Tuerk		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Houlihan, D.		
58		Speaker Madigan		
		Kempiners	Parliamentary inquiry	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Speaker Madigan		
		Collins	Oppose	
59		Speaker Madigan		
		Friedrich	Question	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Conti		
60		Speaker Madigan		
		Sumner	Yield	
61		Mudd		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Deavers	MPQ	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Mudd	To close	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Geo-Karis	Explain vote	
62	6:08	Speaker Madigan	#4 fails, 3rd	
		Ryan	Motion 10-B	
		Speaker Madigan	Not recognized	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Ryan	Appeal ruling	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1760, 2nd	
		Speaker Madigan		
63		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Yourell	Leave to withdraw	
		Speaker Madigan	Objection	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Ryan	Renew motion	
		Speaker Madigan	Not recognized	
		Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees	
64		Speaker Madigan		
		Kempiners	No	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Schisler	Aye	
		Speaker Madigan		
	6:20	Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
65		Speaker Madigan		
66		Ryan	Question affirmative roll	
67		Speaker Madigan	motion to withdraw #3 prevails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4	
68		Speaker Madigan		
		Telcser	Point of personal privilege	
69		Speaker Madigan		
		Bradley	Point of personal privilege	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Telcser	Proceeds	
70		Speaker Madigan		
71		Ryan	Motion	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Levin	Amendment #4	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Conti	Asks Amendment read in full	
		Speaker Madigan		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
72		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Conti		
	6:43	Speaker Madigan		
		Conti		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Kane		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4	
73		Speaker Madigan		
		Greiman	Inquiry	
74		Speaker Madigan	Rules do not require	
		Greiman		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds on Amendment #4	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Ryan	Request Republican conference	
		Speaker Madigan	Consult with Speaker	
75		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds with #4	
76		Speaker Madigan		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
77	6:55	Speaker Madigan	Ryan moves to change order of	
		Kane	business	
		Speaker Madigan	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Lechowicz	Support	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
78		Speaker Madigan		
79		Bradley	Objects	
	7:00	Lechowicz		
80		Speaker Madigan		
		Tipsword	Explain present vote	
81		Speaker Madigan		
		Greiman	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Matijeovich		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Collins	Point of order	
82		Speaker Madigan		
		Matijeovich	Continues	
		Speaker Madigan		
83		Daniels	Explain vote	
84		Speaker Madigan		
		Totten	Explain vote	
85		Speaker Madigan		
		Geo-Karis	Explain vote	
86		Speaker Madigan		
	7:16	Skinner	Explain vote	
87		Speaker Madigan		
		Davis, J.	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Martin, L.		
88		Speaker Madigan		
		Satterthwaite	Voting no	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
89		Speaker Madigan		
		Boucek	Change to yes	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Mudd	Change to aye	
		Speaker Madigan		
90		Bradley	Questions affirmative roll	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Ryan	Objects	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk Hall	Poll absentees	
		Bradley	Asks removal from roll	
91		Speaker Madigan		
		Ryan	Objects	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Bradley	Continues	
		Speaker Madigan	Motion fails	
	7:30	Levin	SB 1760 Amendment #4	
		Speaker Madigan		
92		Bradley	PPP	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Levin	Continues	
		Speaker Madigan		
93		McMaster	Yield	
94		Levin		
95		Speaker Madigan		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
		Johnson	Question	
		Levin		
96		Speaker Madigan		
		Houlihan, D.	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment #4 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Levin	TOOR	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Ryan	Introduce Senator Hynes	
97	7:45	Speaker Madigan		
		Stiehl, C.M.	HB 3227, SA # 2,3	
		Speaker Madigan	House concurs	
		Bowman	HB 3151, SA #1,2	
		Speaker Madigan		
98		Houlihan, D.	Question	
		Bowman		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Mahar	Remove objection	
99		Speaker Madigan	House concurs	
		Macdonald		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Flinn	SA #1, SB 2256	
100		Speaker Madigan		
		Pullen	Yield	
		Flinn		
		Speaker Madigan		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
		Geo-Karis	Question	
		Flinn		
		Speaker Madigan	House concurs	
101		Houlihan, D.	HB 3405	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Leinenweber	Leave to change vote	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3405, 3rd	
	7:55	Speaker Madigan		
		Houlihan, D.		
102		Speaker Madigan	Passed	
		Stiehl, C.M.	HB 157, SA #1	
		Speaker Madigan	House concurs	
		Stiehl, C.M.	SA #1,2,3, HB 158	
103		Speaker Madigan	House concurs	
		Flinn	HB 2842, SA #2	
		Speaker Madigan	House does not concur	
		Macdonald	HB 3225, SA #1,2,3	
104		Speaker Madigan		
		Johnson	Question	
		Macdonald		
105		Speaker Madigan		
		Schuneman		
		Macdonald	TOOR	
106		Giorgi	Move to adjourn	
		Speaker Madigan	Adjourn til 10:00 A.M. Monday	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
	8:14	Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate. adjourns	House

