

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

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen.

H. G. Wells said: 'Success is to be measured not by wealth, power or fame but the ratio between what a man is and what he might be'. Let us pray. Almighty God, we give Thee thanks this day for all the many blessing which Thou has bestowed upon us. We are grateful for the privileges which has been ours and we pray that we may ever prove worthy of Thy consideration. As we do tasks before us as Members of the Illinois House of Representatives, help us to see what is right, effect what is needed and provide what is just. May we seek not personal glory, but to do only that which is well-pleasing in Thy sight. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the Governor's specific recommendations for change which are attached to a Bill of the following title, the acceptance of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to-wit: Senate Bills #23, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 66, 110, 203, 280, 301, 368, 421, 473, 526, 598, 606, 624, 708, 745, 803, 1041, 1107, 1129, 1208, 1298, 1299, 1308, 1310 and 1324. I am further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copies of the Governor's specific recommendation for change to the Senate. Action taken by the Senate, November 8, 1977.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding and the passage of



which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to-wit: Senate Bills #3, 24, 126187, 281, 392, 856, 622, 413, 1012, 1312, 1322 and 1359. I am further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copies of the Governor's veto messages to the Senate. Passed by the Senate, November 8th, 1977 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has restored the items reduced by the Governor which are attached in the Bills of the following titles and restoration of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to-wit: Senate Bills #362, 437 and 1302. I am further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copies of the Governor's item reduction message to the Senate. Action taken by the Senate, November 8, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the contrary notwithstanding and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to-wit: Senate Bills #728 and 964. I am further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copies of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the Senate. Passed by the Senate, November 8, 1977, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution, to-wit: House Joint Resolution #58, concurred in by the Senate, November 7, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bills #1387 and 1388. Passed



by the Senate, November 8, 1977 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2517, Corneal Davis and Robert Mann.

A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Aid.
First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2518, Porter, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2519, Taylor et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to Circuit Courts. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is in the Chamber. Representative Bradley is moving that the House recess until the call of the Chair. Will you make that motion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The Regular Session stands in recess till the call of the Chair.

The First Special Session will now come to order.

Representative Bradley with respect to a motion on the Roll Call."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the Roll Call for the Regular Session be used for the Attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carries and the Roll Call for the Regular Session will be used as the Roll Call for the First Special Session. Representative Bradley, recognized...purpose of making a motion that the First Special Session recess to the call of the Chair."

Bradley: "I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on that motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carries and the First Special Session recesses to the call of the Chair.

Second Special Session will come to order. Representative Bradley."



Bradley: "I move that the Roll Call for the Regular Session be used for the Attendance Roll Call for the Second Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Roll Call of the Regular Session will be used as a Roll Call of the Second Special Session. House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 3 for which Representative Yourell is recognized. House Bill 3."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave to move House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Is the Amendment ready?"

Yourell: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Yourell, Collins. Amends House Bill 3 Second Special Session on page 1, line 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3 in the Second Session is a correction Bill that the Sponsors of this legislation, the Election Consolidation Bill, promised to present to the Bill after the Governor had signed it, include it in the call of the Second Special Session. Amendment #1 is to accommodate those handful of municipalities in the state which hold annual elections because they have staggered terms for the trustees. The Amendment simply shifts their election in even numbered years from the fall to the spring and permits them to have a February primary where that is necessary. This brings them into line with the spring municipal election pattern. In practice my understanding is that only the incorporated Town of Cicero conducts their elections on a partisan basis and therefore only Cicero will actually have to conduct the primary. Now this Amendment reflects the agreement reached between several Representatives who represent municipalities that have annual elections and we have been in contact with those local government officials in many of these areas to try to accommodate their preferences. Representative Klosak called this problem to our



attention when House Bill 3 was heard in the Elections Committee and we at that time indicated to Representative Klosak and others that we would place this Amendment on the Bill in order to correct that situation. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Mahar: "Representative Yourell, you are going to take care of Park Forest in my district in this area. Now just exactly what have we done to take care of the Village of Park Forest which has annual elections for village trustees and who run for a...who serve a two-year term?"

Yourell: "That...that, Representative Mahar, is in the Amendment and I'll read the language to you that takes care of that situation where we have nonpartisan elections. Where...where we have the situation that you refer to...."

Speaker Redmond: "Permission has not been granted to take pictures.

Mr. Doorkeeper."

Yourell: "On page 2, line 18 of the Amendment and 19, you will see that at the General Primary Election in each even-numbered year when trustees are elected to a...two-year terms, that takes care of the situation in Park Forest."

Mahar: "Is it..."

Yourell: "We talked, incidentally, with the village attorney, Mr. Levin, and this is the language that he suggested and he found no fault with it."

Mahar: "It's my understanding in the even years they will have their election at the March primary, is that correct?"

Yourell: "That's correct."

Mahar: "And while they hardly ever have a primary, the possibility of a primary would then be handled in a....is it February primary in that case?"

Yourell: "Consolidated primary."

Mahar: "In the consolidated primary...you wouldn't have it in February?"

Yourell: "No, well, actually it would be six weeks preceding that primary.

Should there be a necessity for a primary then from that primary



date in that even-numbered year, then you would move six weeks back for the primary...."

Mahar: "And that would be a...."

Yourell: "...That date."

Mahar: "It would be in effect a special primary for that category only, is that correct?"

Yourell: "That's correct."

Mahar: "All right, thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Yourell, Collins. Amends House Bill 3, Second Special Session, on page 2 by deleting line 34 and so forth."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 deletes one line, line 34 on page 2. And this was brought to our attention by Representative Klosak after reviewing Amendment #1 and its application to House Bill 3. All it does is take out the one line, line 34, inserting on page 3, line, 1, by deleting 13 and inserting in lieu thereof, 12. It's merely a technical Amendment and I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3, Second Special Session."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I would at this time in order to save the time of the House to waive the appropriate rule and hear House Bill 3 on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved for the suspension of the rules. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 125 'aye' and 2 'no' and the motion carries. Representative Deuster."



Deuster: "I just missed my button, I wonder if I might have the unanimous consent to be added as a 'yes' vote on that Roll Call.
Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that ever fatal? Is there any objection? Hearing none, you'll be added. . . ."

Unknown: "...Don't object."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill #3. A Bill for an Act in relation to consolidation of elections and amending certain Acts named therein. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3 is a product of the thinking of a great many individuals who had and were asked to provide input into not only House Bill 1978 but Senate Bill 1149. If I may, I would like to go back just a few moments to tell you what we've done. As you know, 1978, the Consolidation of Elections Bill, left this House with a good majority, went over into the Senate and passed that Body. Senate Bill 1149 sponsored by Senator Regner came over to the House and we deleted everything after the enacting clause and placed the provisions of House Bill 1978 into Senate Bill 1149. Now that Amendment was concurred in by the Senate and both Bills reached the Governor's desk. The Governor reviewed the legislation and because they were identical signed into law, House Bill 1149 without using an Amendatory Veto or any other action. But he did recognize as we did that there were some problems with the Bill and so he included it in the call of the Second Special Session and asked the Members of the General Assembly to consider necessary changes. Since that time we have talked to many individuals throughout the State of Illinois...many Members of the General Assembly and we decided to draft House Bill 3. What House Bill...and this Bill, incidentally, came out of the Elections Committee 14 to 0. What this Bill does is a clean-up of Senate Bill 1149. It corrects certain technical errors. But most importantly the two things that were...seemed to be the hang-up of some individuals in the state relative to consolidation of elections was the fact that in the



Bill that inadvertently left out that municipal officials elected in 1977 would have to run again in 1979. One of the provisions of the corrected Bill, House Bill 3, provides that any public municipal official elected in 1977 would not come up for election again until 1981. Now this includes all municipal elect...officers in the State of Illinois and provides for that...that provision that they will not have to be faced with another election in 1979. The other provision that seemed to draw the greatest amount of attention and...and criticism was the fact that the Bill provided for....referendums to be placed in any one of the five consolidated dates for election. The school people felt that there should be some provisions for emergency legislation....referendum. This we put into the Bill by saying that on petition of the school board, for example, declaring emergency and that petition approved by a majority of the board. Then the Circuit Court would decide whether there truly was a referendum and then decide whether that referendum could be placed at a date other than the five provided dates for the consolidation of elections. I thought this was a very good principle and some of the school board people objected to it originally until I explained to them, and I think rightfully so, that to have a truly...an emergency could not be decided by those who declared the emergency but rather some outside individual. And I told them, and I think this is true, that if a Circuit Court Judge, for example, determined that emergency truly exists that would really help their cause by declaring to the public that, yes, an opinion of the court an emergency does exist and try to select a date for the referendum. After discussing this with them, they agreed that this was the proper way to proceed. Now there are many other technical corrections in the Bill but those are the two most important things. Those are the two provisions in the original Bill that drew the most flack and criticism. And so we pledged to all of those concerned with the conduct of election in Illinois and who are basically in favor of the concept of consolidation of elections that we would accommodate any individual, any group that wanted to suggest changes to us. This we've done and incorporated fifteen or sixteen changes in the original Bill to try to satisfy



the needs and the demands of those who were concerned with the conduct of elections in Illinois. I might suggest to you that was the position of the Illinois Municipal League. The main objection was that those municipal officials elected in 1979... 77 would have to run again in 1979. But I...I suggest to you that the Municipal League's attention was directed in the bulletin not to that provision but to, and I ask you to read this if you have their latest bulletin in front of you, all that House Bill 3 does in the judgment of the Municipal League was establish procedures for emergency referendum. I suggest to you that that is absolutely accurate but it didn't go far enough. The provision that the Municipal League was opposed to was the running again of those municipal officials who were elected in 1977 to run again in '79. This they did not mention as a provision of House Bill 3, the corrective...corrective Bill. And I...I think that the Sponsors of this legislation, Representative Collins and myself and Senator Regner and Senator Graham in the Senate, have done everything that we promised to do to make this Bill and put this Bill in the position that everybody could be satisfied with. We still have 13 months before the effective date of this Bill. And if there are problems that come up between now and that time, Representative Collins and those in the Senate who were responsible for consolidation of elections that have assured me, as I now assure you, that we shall do everything possible to satisfy your demands and needs and certainly review your recommendations and criticisms. I now ask you to vote in favor of House Bill 3 because I sincerely believe that the people of the State of Illinois want, need and demand consolidation of elections. I ask your affirmative support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last spring we were told as for the last ten or twelve years this was a well thought out Bill. We heard...we passed this Bill on the guise of reform and the guise that consolidated elections is good for the State of Illinois, that it's going to save the taxpayers an awful lot of money. Well, just in one township alone, in Maine Township in Park Ridge, their school elections cost them five thousand dollars



and if this Bill goes through it'll be in excess of thirteen thousand dollars. If they've had ten to thirteen years to think this Bill over, how come we're getting so much remedial legislation on this extending the date? I...I say to you that...that what we're doing here today is making an unconstitutional Bill constitutional. And I think that we ought to take a second look at it before we pass any of these Bills and I can't seem to find any Amendments on this House Bill 3. And what we're doing is rectifying a mistake that somebody hurriedly pushed through here last spring. We were warned as late as Saturday, I spoke to a group of school officials and nobody is satisfied with the consolidated election. This is going to do nothing but cause utter chaos throughout the state because of overlapping districts and I think that if we worked on this thing for ten or thirteen years and we still have to come in for remedial legislation I think we ought to come in with a repealer and start it all over again."

Spaaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio. Representative Giglio.

"Happy birthday, Representative."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was concerned, and my biggest concern is when he's talking about consolidation of elections, if he can explain what years or what dates and what elections are going to take place and if he could explain some of the boundary line provisions."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you. I'd be delighted to do that, Representative Giglio. As you know, the schedule of elections as prescribed in Senate Bill 1149 makes no changes in the election schedule in the even-numbered years. In March of the even-numbered years which I would suggest to you will be on March 21, 1978, you'll have your regular primary at which time the county, state and national offices who will be nominated. Then in November we go right into the regular general election at which those candidates will be elected. The change really comes into the odd-numbered years. In February of the odd-numbered years which would have been 1977 or now coming up, 1979, we would have what is called a consolidated primary election...consolidated primary. That would take care of those municipal officers, township officers, road commissioner



districts and all of those entities that run on a partisan label. Then you would have, as we have now, the odd-numbered years in April, the regular municipal township park district and library elections. Then in November we would have what would be called the consolidated election at which time...huh? Nonpartisan election at which time those people who had run in the consolidated primary in February would be elected. Now, I might while I'm at that, I might if I may take advantage of this opportunity to answer the Gentleman who spoke previously to this relative to the cost. And I would call your attention to the Illinois Tax Act put out by the Taxpayer's Federation of Illinois mailed October 26, 1977. And they say among other things, and I think this is the most important thing, that they recommend for your consideration is the consolidation elections will eliminate the option of repeating referendum proposals until one finally passes. Due to the reduction in dates available, consolidation elections should force officials of taxing bodies to be prepared with timely well documented proposals. And finally, consolidated elections which limit special district referenda has far greater consequences to all Illinois property taxpayers than untold exemptions for aid, disability, home repairs, solar heating and the like. So the Taxpayer's Federation of Illinois has suggested to you that it is a dollar saving device. It is good legislation for the taxpayers in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Rigney: "Now have we straightened out all of this as far as the junior colleges and the school districts and so forth, are they what.... going to be given four-year terms?"

Yourell: "The school board members that previously had run in...in say a three-year....term, they would run some of them every year. It has been the judgment that a four-year term for these individuals would be in the best interest of those boards. So you don't have two-year terms, you don't have six-year terms, they'll be four-year terms."

Rigney: "In other words then, park districts that used to have the



six-year terms, would they then be having the four?"

Yourell: "That is correct."

Rigney: "It...it's all going to be for staggered terms so some are elected every two years, is that correct?"

Yourell: "Right."

Rigney: "One other question if I could, Mr. Speaker? The thing that concerns me is this possibility of the so-called emergency referendum. Are there any restrictions at all, any guidelines that are set down for the court in determining what constitutes an emergency type of situation?"

Yourell: "What has been determined is that the board itself will draw up a petition. That petition will outline the details of the emergency. That petition has to be approved by a majority of the board. At that point the...that is reviewed by the Circuit Court and at that time a decision would be made determining whether there was truly an emergency."

Rigney: "Well, the only thing I would be a little concerned about is that I think maybe some of these emergencies could be self-created by members of the board simply not getting around and advertising and meeting the requirements for referendum and then letting that date slide by and then petitioning the court for the so-called emergency referendum. But maybe that's a bridge we're going to have to cross when we get there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill was debated last spring I felt that it was too much for us to digest and to handle in one fell swoop, it would have some grave concerns. And therefore I opposed the legislation. After the Governor signed the Bill, I felt that we ought to try to go along with it. We ought to try to see what changes need to be made and to make those changes and see if we could not come up with legislation that will consolidate elections which most everyone seems to want. I think we're...we're on the right track, that we should pass this legislation out. We should give the...give the school boards and the library boards, the village boards an opportunity to look at it, see where they have any problems and then



come back to us and we still have time to make changes so that we'll have some efficient election laws after December 1 of 1978. And if we can't arrive at that type of conclusion then we should postpone the thing or we should then change the law. I think it's important that we...we move forward rather than backward on this because changes in election laws have been necessary for us for many, many years. Now I don't like the idea of the Circuit Court Judges ruling on...on special referendum. I think that takes one more power away from local government. But I think, as the previous stated, we have to cross that bridge when we come to it, we have to look at it. This will give local government an opportunity to come back to us with their changes and we could implement them in next spring. Also, there's an implementation Bill that tells us just exactly how the precincts are going to be set up. I want to see just exactly what the authority of the Village Clerks and the Town Clerks have. I think it's most important that the Village Clerks, the Town Clerks retain some of their authority over local elections. I think it's important that we see what type of balloting we have. All these things must be done the next few months and if we can't come up with the appropriate measures to make efficient elections, at that time I will oppose any further changes in the Bill. I urge adoption of this legislation, I think we ought to go...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe. Representative Geo-Karis."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "I notice in the analysis that you people say that wherever there is a mayor, for example, municipal elections, a municipal office who is elected in '77 to a four-year term will get a chance to serve the four-year term under your Bill. What about township elections who were...township officials who were elected to serve a four-year term in 1977?"

Yourell: "Representative Geo-Karis, there were those, the township officials of Illinois, under the direction of Mr. Cross, put that Amendment to House Bill 1978 and Senate Bill 1149 as Amendment #2 to those Bills in the Senate. Township officials who were elected in 1977 will serve out their full term until 1981 when the next



election is held for that office."

Geo-Karis: "All right, then, in this Bill of yours, what about the... the staggered terms that school...that still...school members ...school board members are usually elected to, have you eliminated the staggered terms 'cause I can't find your Amendment that's why I'm asking."

Yourell: "This Bill clarifies, and I would like to read this to you, if I may. One of the provisions that deletes the general provision for the shortening of...of any terms. There is no elective office that is provided for in the Bill that will have their terms shortened under the provisions of House Bill 3."

Geo-Karis: "But under the school board election laws, the members of the school boards are elected for staggered terms, now is that staggered term provision of the school board law changed by your Bill?"

Yourell: "No. Those will be extended to the full term and then go to a four-year term."

Geo-Karis: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have some doubts in my mind because I've talked to school board superintendents and school board members and they felt it was healthier for their school boards to be elected on staggered terms. But I think under this Bill, if I'm not wrong, the school board members will not have staggered terms. they would be elected all at the same time. And this is the impression your Bill leaves with me."

Yourell: "No, that is not correct. They would be elected for four and three-year terms."

Geo-Karis: "Representative Ralph Dunn. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor will yield for a question? Representative Yourell, I did...I didn't hear you say anything about county board elections. It doesn't change any county board elections, leave them as they are?"

Yourell: "No, it does not."

Dunn: "And...and this would apply to commission counties also?"

Yourell: "Apply to all counties."

Dunn: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr...."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for...."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Deuster: "Two questions? One question, I thought, Representative Yourell, that you intimated that the terms of school board members will now be three years. Did...that's not in this Bill, is it?"

Yourell: "No. The implementation Bill that we will be considering will have four-year terms for school board members serving staggered terms. So that's subsequent legislation to modify this even more that we will be...."

Deuster: "That's correct."

Yourell: "Picking up next spring. You see, the implementation Bill is a Bill designed to take all the statutes and the Municipal Code, the Township Code and all of the other codes and refer them to the Election Code relative to the consolidation of elections. That is a Bill that is about 400 pages long and it would not be in the...best interest of the General Assembly to go into that at this time. This is the first step in refining and sophisticating Senate Bill 1149 and do those things that those people who were concerned with those problems contained in that Bill would correct. Now House Bill 3 on page 6 sets forth the standards that a Judge must use in determining whether an emergency exists. And the Judge must find, as I read this, that the referendum...the referendum is necessitated by an imminent need for the money. Now can you imagine somebody sitting on a school board that votes for a referendum that's not necessitated by an imminent need for the money?"

Deuster: "I'm extremely concerned, Representative Yourell, that we've passed one great reform Bill that just takes away power from our local schools and we're going to make business for lawyers. I'm a lawyer, I suppose I shouldn't mind that. But here you have to have a school board vote that they imminently need the money and they need to have the referendum, now they gotta go over and hire a lawyer and appear before court and establish that they imminently need the money. They're...would you, as a school board member, vote for a referendum if you didn't need the money?"

Yourell: "Well, you know, I can suggest to you that many school boards



throughout the State of Illinois, and I can suggest to you, the Argo situation where they have run, I think, twelve referendum in about 18 months. Now, you know, I don't think that their credibility has been sustained in that kind of an action. And I would suggest to you, Representative Deuster, that you continue reading...You refer to lines 8 through 10 on page 6 and I would suggest to you that you continue to read and read imminent need for approval of additional authority in order to maintain, and I think the word we're looking for is maintain, the operations or facilities of the unit of government or school districts and that such need is due to circumstances beyond the control of the governing body. I suggest to you again that the approval of the Circuit Court in an instance such as this would lend credence and credibility to the petition of the school board."

Deuster: "One last question. The language you've referred to says that the Judge must find that the referendum is needed to maintain the operation. What if they want to expand the operation? Why've you excluded that?"

Yorell: "Well, if you want to expand the...the operations I think that you can very well not declare that as an emergency but rather wait until the next regular election to schedule that referendum. Now if you want to expand the operations of the school district I cannot in good conscience say to you or anybody else that I consider that to be an emergency."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if I might address the Bill. I think that we're probably in a position where we have to vote for this Bill holding our nose. We passed the consolidated election Bill which has created probably more problems than it ever cured, now we're curing those problems. Now we have a choice, if you want to vote 'present' or 'no', I suppose you'll keep the heat on for outright repeal and maybe that's what many of us ought to do. I'm...I'm in a dilemma, I probably will vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question? Representative Yorell, this Amendment is to Chapter 46, the Election Code?"



Yourell: "That's correct."

Ewing: "What...how does that affect Chapter 24, Cities and Villages?"

Yourell: "The chapter you're referring to, Representative Ewing, is what we intend to do with the implementation Bill as you full well know. That is a Bill that will implement the consolidation of election, Senate Bill 1149, and bring into conformance all of the statutes relative to the elections of Ill....of elections in Illinois."

Ewing: "Representative, if I full well knew, I wouldn't ask you. But this makes no changes in the Municipal Code then?"

Yourell: "No, that is correct. That is in the implementation Bill."

Ewing: "All right. Now if we pass this, is the municipality to follow this legislation or are they to follow the Municipal Code when they'll have an election?"

Yourell: "They will follow this because this amends the Election Code and the municipalities that deal with election have to deal with the Election Code."

Ewing: "And that is...that's your opinion not a...Attorney General or a Supreme Court decision then?"

Yourell: "Thank you for the promotion but I know and you know that I'm not a Supreme Court Justice. I'm in the legislative business and that's what I'm trying to do with this legislation."

Ewing: "What...another question. What does this Amendment do with the charter community?"

Yourell: "This...this Amendment, or this House Bill 3 with the provision to correct 1149 puts them under the provisions of this Bill. And then the implementation Bill will take care of the rest along with ...with House Amendment #1 that took care of those communities with the adoption of Amendment #1 suggested by Representative Klosak, Representative Mahar and others relative to those charter units of local government."

Ewing: "Can we...."

Yourell: "Which have...which have, incidentally, staggered elections."

Ewing: "Can we constitutionally change the special charter community with legislation by this House?"

Yourell: "Well, that's my judgment you can."

Ewing: "All right, now, another one...we have people who are coming up



in '79 and we're going to move those elections, I mean in '77, to '81. What about those officers, municipalities that are up for election in '79, will they be up or will they be extended?"

Yourell: "Tom...Tom, I would suggest to you that you weren't listening when we explained that...was asked by another Member of the House. What this does, one of the provisions, it deletes all the general provisions for shortening all terms."

Ewing: "Well, I just wanted you to have the chance to repeat it for everybody that wasn't listening. In another question...in downstate Illinois we have many small districts, special districts, that hold elections in one place. Under this Bill, would they still be required to have multiple polling places within their districts?"

Yourell: "This Bill does not deal with polling places or the conduct of the election. That will be in the implementation legislation."

Ewing: "One final...or one more question. We keep talk...you keep referring to the implementation legislation. Where is it? In Interim Study?"

Yourell: "At the moment it's in the Reference Bureau and I suggest to you that it will be introduced next week when we convene the Session."

Ewing: "Has this implementation legislation been introduced before?"

Yourell: "No...no it has not."

Ewing: "All right. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewing: "We followed the Sponsor's leadership in passing the Election Bill in the spring of the last Session. It comes as no surprise to most of you here that I opposed that. I think the consolidation of election has some merit: I think to do it with an ax handle or with the big broom in painting a wide swath is ridiculous. We have created so many more problems than we have cured by this Election Bill. And I think the extensiveness of this Amendment tells the tale of how poorly executed that original legislation was. Now it may be great for certain parts of the state but for the small districts downstate we could raise their expenses of holding an election by a thousand percent. In addition, our Constitutional Convention decided that our Governor should be



elected, should be elected on an off year so that we wouldn't have mixing of issues. This Bill just invites the mixing of municipal issues with county elections, with elections to the General Assembly, with school board issues. We're really going to have a bag of worms here. It falls far short of what's needed to clean up this Bill. And there are two other...two other solutions which are on this Calendar and I would suggest today that people who aren't sure vote 'present'. Let us have the chance to hear the Repealer Bill or the Bill which extends the time for the implementation of this legislation. Why should we be stampeded another time into more bad legislation? We look like we have egg all over our face anyway and I would suggest a 'present' vote at this time. It doesn't kill this Bill but we can hold it until we get to hear some of the other solutions to the election consolidation problem. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill purports to correct some of the deficiencies in legislation we passed last spring. But I submit that the very small step that is taken in this Bill is merely the first signs of crawling. There is so much more to go before we are able to walk through this consolidation mess. The only responsible vote on this Bill if you think that consolidation is going to cause problems is a 'present' vote because here we have a very small aid but it is in fact nothing more than trying to take the heat off from a couple of lobby groups. There are many more problems with the implementation legislation that is threatening us next week than what are addressed in this Bill. I urge you to withhold your votes from this Bill so that we can get really corrective legislation. My district was mentioned before by a previous speaker and it is a symbol of my support of consolidated elections on a responsible basis not on the basis addressed by the Bill that we are now trying to correct with a very small effort. In Park Ridge, my hometown, we have had responsible consolidation because the taxpayers have demanded and required it of my community. In so consolidating this spring we were able to save considerable money. But under the legislation



passed last spring it will double the cost of elections in Park Ridge. How is that saving money? Previously we heard in support of this measure that the Taxpayer's Federation was urging consolidation of elections to save money and to stop school districts and other districts from continually throwing referenda at the people and that was mentioned in support of this Bill when one of the major provisions in this Bill is to again open the door to school districts submitting special referenda. I suggest to you that this subject is much too complex to address in an immediate basis such as this. The best Bills we can pass would be to either repeal and start over responsible consolidation legislation or to extend the deadline so that we can address responsibly the chaos that was created by the Bill that we passed last spring. I ask you to withhold your vote or vote 'present'. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question."

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

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

I'm going to be very brief because I think I've said all that I think is...has to be said relative to this House Bill 3 which shows a sincerity on the part of the Sponsors to take care of the needs of those who have criticized Senate Bill 1149 and House Bill 1978. I would like to assure you that the Taxpayer's Federation not only said the things that I referred to but many other fine things about consolidation of elections. It's a concept that's long overdue. We in Illinois have been lagging behind and if you have gone to, through your districts, as I'm sure you have, people are continually asking you, 'When are we going to get to consolidation of elections?' And with the permission of the Chair, I would like to share my closing time, if I may, with the Cosponsor of this legislation, Representative Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."



Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House, I, too, will attempt to be very brief. But I've heard so many objections raised on the floor of this House today to House Bill 3 that I truly am amazed. It's been suggested that nobody is in favor of consolidation of elections. Well, I say to you, that nobody is except the people. The people who are tired of going to the polls every other week it seems to them. The people who are tired of seeing the mounting expenses of elections in Illinois. And I am truly amazed at the objections that have been raised here today to this Bill because this Bill is an answer to the objections that were raised by the obstructionists to Senate Bill 1149 at the time of its passage and at the time it was signed. Throughout the hearings on Senate Bill 1149 and House Bill 1978 we encouraged, we implored and we...we begged people to come in and make recommendations as to what they desired in their own communities, municipalities and special districts. We....we accommodated everybody that we could that came in and counseled with us. But there were those that came in and some of them are sitting in the gallery of this House today. They came in and they didn't counsel with us, they lied to us. They said, 'We're in favor of consolidation'. But they weren't. They did nothing but try to scuttle the whole concept. Then when we passed the Bill they came in with a series of objections that could have been answered to and could have been spoken to at that time. In another sincere effort we have attempted to answer to those objections today. And Senate Bill 3 will...will take out all of the serious objections that were raised to 1149. Consolidation is a concept of the people of the State of Illinois are in favor of, one that they're crying for and one that we deserve to give them. Everybody seems to be in favor of consolidation but when it comes to them they don't have the fortitude to bite the bullet and say 'We have to go along'. There's no easy course here but we, I think, have a good Bill. We have a good concept. And this is something we owe the taxpayers of Illinois. And I implore you to go along with Representative Yourell and the rest of us who have labored on this Bill and pass House Bill 3 so we can have a truly fine consolidation election schedule."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Just to explain my vote...just to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I think we deserve...we should offer congratulations to the Cosponsors of this Bill that worked so hard on it, Representatives Yourell and Collins. But as one who served on the Election Laws Commission, in fact there's a secretary back in 1971 and '72 when we first started to work on consolidation of elections, sometimes we forget some of those that have passed on who worked so hard on this project. It was my....it was my great privilege to have worked with Senator Betty Ann Keegan from Rockford back at that time and prior to her being in the Senate when she was a Member of the Election Laws Commission and this had always been her number one project, the consolidation of elections, working with the League of Women Voters, yes, and the Municipal League and other organizations. So today in supporting this good legislation that has already passed the House and the Senate and with the Amendment today which further improves and takes out some of the kinks in the original Bill, I think we should not only congratulate the Cosponsors, Representatives Yourell and Collins, and the two Senate Sponsors, but remember at this time the hard work done on this Bill in past years by Senator Keegan, Betty Ann Keegan, from Rockford and to give her thanks for her work and that of the League of Women Voters in the past as well as Dan Dougherty who was Chairman of the Commission at that time, and others who have labored over the years for this concept. And as Representative Yourell said, 'Many say they're for consolidation of elections until they're consolidated then all of a sudden they find some little pet ox of theirs is being gored and they find some technicality to oppose the consolidation'. As for myself, I congratulate the Sponsors. I think this is an excellent Bill. They've improved the consolidation Bill. And I vote 'aye' for House Bill 3 in this Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar. Edgar."



Edgar: "Pardon me. To inquire, Mr. Speaker, how many votes does it take?"

Speaker Redmond: "89. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Break up the Republican caucus, please, I can't see Representative Bluthardt. I know he's back there but I can't see him."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm one of the obstructionists referred to by that fellow who gave us so much hogwash a few minutes ago. You know, I've heard that for about six months, I've heard that same speech for six months. I...he would lead you to believe that if you're not for his Bill, or this Bill, you're against the concept of consolidation of elections. And that's not so at all. I'm sure that there are ways that we can consolidate elections that are much simpler and would cause less chaos and confusion than this one will cause when we try to run an election under it. Consol....this Bill was sold to us, the original Bill that is now law, was sold to us on three promises. One, that it would save a lot of money for the taxpayers. Most responsible supporters of consolidation now have withdrawn that promise and don't indicate that their savings are there. It may cost more money rather than less. The other one was that we have too many referendums. So we had to do away with all those special referenda, especially by the school districts. Now we turn around with House Bill 3 and we switch more provisions for additional referenda and I don't see where we're going to have less referenda than we do now. The only thing it will create besides chaos and confusion is less elections. We'll have less election dates provided we don't have too many special referendum again. So you're really haven't accomplished a great deal, you have voted for and enacted a concept but you have not provided the workable machinery, the gears don't mesh, it will not work until you have implementation. What's that implementation going to be? It's going to mean that all the election authority over the smallest tax levying body, elective body, whether it be a sanitary district, a township, a village board, library, park districts, will be



turned over to the County Clerk. That will be the next step in the implementation because unless you turn this over to one central authority there is no way it can work. That means that all townships and villages, cities, will lose the control, the authority the power to run their own election. You know, I'm right in the middle on this Bill. I'd like to see some extensions and I...I would hope that we could hold back on this and keep it...keep it alive for another week or so and let's see if we can't work out a compromise that will be more acceptable than this House Bill 3."

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

Davis, J: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's all been said eloquently by Representatives Bluthardt, Ewing and Pullen. I...I'm one of the, I guess reactionary obstructionists as well, I would only urge that everybody get onto a 'present' and do exactly what Representative Bluthardt suggested. It's to hold off until we have a chance to either further compromise the Bill into better form or at least to hear the repeal motion that is on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Prior to what some other people said, this Bill does not repeal the Consolidation of Elections Law. Consolidation is now law and there's nothing we can do about that. It's a good and necessary concept for the people of the State of Illinois. However, once the Bill did pass, certain problems did arise. This Bill, House Bill 3, attempts to correct some of those problems. It attempts to do nothing more than that. One of the previous speakers said that if...that once we passed the Consolidation Bill we now have egg on our face. If we are irresponsible enough not to pass House Bill 3 we'll have even more egg on our face. I encourage everybody to vote green on this very, very important Bill and help resolve some of the problems that we face."

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

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's too late to make any change in the vote on this Bill but I do think that we should recognize



that this is not a complete solution to the problems created by the new Consolidation of Elections Law. I think that we should wait on this. I would urge the Sponsor to pull it out. I think that we need to delay the implementation of the consolidation of elections for at least two years to give us all an opportunity to come up with proper solutions. I don't say this is a bad Bill but it is not sufficient to do the job that has to be done. And I agree with Representative Bluthardt that we should not take away controls of local elections such as townships, school boards and put all of this in the hands of the County Clerk. We are not providing the County Clerk with sufficient money to pay the extra cost of the help that they will have to have in order to handle this Consolidated Elections Bill. I urge either a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote and hold this thing back for a while. Please."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'aye' and 10 'no'. Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution #2....."

Speaker Redmond: "Don't misunderstand what this is all about. Go ahead."

Clerk O'Brien: "Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, November 9, 1977, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, 1977, at 1:20 o'clock p.m. And when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, November 9, 1977, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, 1977, at 3:30 o'clock p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi on the Adjournment Resolution."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried, the Adjournment Resolution's adopted. Regular Session. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Huh?"

First Special Session comes to order. Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution #4. Resolved by the House of



Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, November 9, 1977, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, 1977, at 1:10 o'clock p.m. When the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, November 9, 1977, stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, 1977, at 3:15 o'clock p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I move that the....be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on Representative Giorgi's motion of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' carry and the motion is adopted. Motion carries and the Resolution is adopted. The First Special Session will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. What are we in now?

Regular Session. The Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution #62. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, November 9, 1977, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, 1977, at 1 o'clock p.m. And when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, November 9, 1977, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, 1977, at 3 o'clock p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

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

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

The Regular Session, House Bills Third Reading. House Bill 2435."

We have to get the House Bills over to the Senate today if they're going to have any chance to be considered by the Senate by the time we contemplate adjourning. Representative Tipword."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2435. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections



of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'll direct the attention of the Membership to the Amendment that was attached to this Bill in the Committee. The Amendment is really the... the Bill at this time which provides for setting up a system of staggered registration of license plates in the State of Illinois and will provide for the issuance of those plates during the warmer months of the year so that no one will...will be out in the coldest part of the winter as has been our custom, trying to put on their license plates and freezing their fingers and getting very unhappy about it. This sets up a staggered system that is agreeable to the other departments of government, the Department of Transportation and the Bureau of the Budget so that they don't run into the problems of...of having adequate funds for the Road Fund at any particular time during the year. It spreads it out so that eventually this can go to a nine month staggered system over the nine warmest months of the year for the issuance of license plates and for the date upon which they must be attached to the automobile. This is a plan that I think is going to meet with great acceptance of the people of the State of Illinois. And I would certainly move for acceptance of House Bill 2435 on this vote on Third Reading."

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

Greisheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2435 is the complete extension of the license plate program that was started four years ago. As you know, in the Spring Session we adopted the concept of multi-year license plates in the State of Illinois. This Bill now completes this by allowing the Secretary of State to actually stagger the registration period. The meaning and full effect of this will not be felt by the State of Illinois for probably three or four years but it means a very substantial saving in the cost of operation of government. At the present time with all license plates falling due at the one time the Secretary of State is required to maintain a rather high number of people in this particular division of the office to satisfy



the demand-high period between approximately September and February. By going into the rotated system which was adopted many years ago in the State of Indiana they were able to reduce their manpower needs and since manpower is one of the highest costs of government today, we have a real saving. It's hard to determine what the projected savings could be, but if the Secretary of States wishes to cut to the bone and have only that number of people on hand to handle the applications on the staggered basis, it feasibly could cut that division's budget down by as much as three million dollars a year which would add to the savings in this particular area of the operation of government. As was referred to by Representative Tipsword, the staggered period would allow you to have your plates or your renewal tags placed on your car during better weather. As I understand, it is projected that for instance in 1979 the first group of people that applied so that they'd have to have their plates on September 30, 1979, the next group would be October 31st and the last group would be November 30th. It would be divided numerically so that there would be an even number of people receiving their plates rather than alphabetically as was originally proposed in the Bill which I introduced three years ago. The alphabetical system would not be operable because it would tend to change each and would not given them an even flow. The Secretary's suggestion of using the numerical system seems to be the most logical way of handling this problem. All in all this is a better government Bill. I feel it's a Bill that deserves support and it will go hand in hand through its effective date with the operation of multi-year plates in the future. I would urge your support of this important Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, I would like to ask the Sponsor a...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kelly: "The...under this particular proposal you're going to have staggered dates, Representative. I'd like to know why...what is wrong with the current system. See, I'm in favor as we've passed a five year license plate 'cause it certainly will save the people of Illinois a great deal of money. But it seems to me that it's much



more simple and even more cost-saving to have a...the system we have now where we mail an application out once a year and at that time we could send them the detail for the particular year that's being advanced instead of doing this twelve months of the year. And I'd like to know why this is being done. It seems to me it would cost more, I don't know."

Tipsword: "Well, it'll only be staggered, first of all, over a nine-month period. Actually, it will cost less because it evens out the flow of the work eventually when we get to the...when this moves into the nine-month period. You will even out those applications, or I should say, expiration dates into nine separate months of the year so that you'll only have approximately one-ninth of the applications that they're working on at any time. You can, therefore, do that work with eventually less...perhaps less personnel and consequently less cost in the handling of them than it's true under the system that we have enjoyed heretofore."

Kelly: "Well, let me ask you one more question. Right now during the month of...of August and September and so forth, the Legislators are barraged with a great many applications for preferred license plate numbers. I know the five-year system will help to reduce that number but are we going to be besieged twelve months of the year by our constituents on...on these applications or on the one-year stickers?"

Tipsword: "We still will have the same reassignment system that we have now. The reassignments will just be based upon the different day. They will still continue to send out the preprinted applications which will remind everyone of the time when they have to apply, and if they want reassignment, remind them of the time when they must have their reassignments backs in. They will all be notified in exactly the same way they are notified now. But...if...that work, too, will be spread out over a nine-month period. And they still have this and it will give a sixty-day period to the Secretary of State which is now forty-five days for reassignments. So that it even spreads that work out."

Kelly: "Thank you very much."

Tipsword: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham is importuned."

Cunningham: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Did he yield? Representative Tipsword, does your Bill require anything additional on the license plate that indicates when and where he was staggered to or what portion of the...of the nine months he got aboard?"

Tipsword: "This sticker that will be reissued for these plates will indicate the month and year of expiration upon them."

Cunningham: "Well, isn't it inescapable that that involves additional expense in administrating the program? And isn't it inescapable that the police who arrest the motorists for some infraction has to check to be sure as to whether or not it's a calendar year, a fiscal year or a Tipsword year? Is the answer yes on each of those questions?"

Tipsword: "Let me find out for you for certain. I wouldn't want to be in error in any way."

Cunningham: "Well...okay."

Tipsword: "No, the Secretary does not anticipate any additional costs by having to show the expiration date."

Cunningham: "Well, let me talk on the Bill just for a moment, Mr. Speaker. This is sheer utter nonsense. It's pap, it's uncharacteristic of the fine Sponsor to present a Bill like this. We had this cold-finger syndrome tried last year in the election. A very fine man, Bill Harris, ran for Secretary of State and that was his program to avoid frozen fingers. The voters didn't buy that. There's not ...there's not one among you that doesn't know that every motorist in the State of Illinois would prefer a fifteen cent reduction in the cost of license plates to the privilege to wait to the fourth of July to put his license on the car. It speaks very ill and very...of the virility and strength and durability of Illinoisans to say that they can't put the license plates on anytime of the year. What do they do if they have a blizzard and they have a flat tire or the antifreeze runs over? Illinoisans haven't gotten that soft. Let's figure out some way to give them a reduction, say fifty cents or a dollar on their license plates, and they'll bless the day we were born. We won't have to kid them along



with this nonsense about putting it on when the weather is better. Now the argument was made by the Representative from Waukegan a minute ago, the question was asked, 'Can you project the saving?'. It was difficult to project it but it might be three million dollars. You can't find anybody in this House that thinks this Secretary of State, or any Secretary of State, is going to fire three million dollars' worth of employees for any kind of a program that's proposed here. Somebody has said long ago, that pip without point is piffle, and that's what's involved in this particular Bill. It's operation spinwheel that...that contributes absolutely nothing to better government in the State of Illinois. If it only gets one 'no' vote it'll be mine. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question...the Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Tipword to close. We'll call on you to explain your vote, Representative Geo-Karis."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I regret that I find my name on such a bad Bill that's going to provide additional money for Lawrence County to build more roads down there. It's a shame that we have a Bill that's going...save additional monies without additional costs to the taxpayers when we keep having all of these Bills come in requiring...and billboards all over town requiring new roads to be built to and in Lawrence County, even though I understand that when it comes to building a prison there they don't really need roads to get to Lawrence County then. Actually, this Bill is not going to cost anymore money. The cost to the taxpayer is not increased. The additional funds that come to the Road Funds are going to be well received over all areas of this state. We see here all the time cries for additional funds to provide for various needed highways throughout the State of Illinois. This is just another one of those means that we can do so within the realm of their current revenues without having to tax additionally the people of the State of



Illinois and still go a small step at least toward providing for their needs and wants in the State of Illinois. Consequently, I would urge that all the Members of this House do support this Bill, which is not my Bill, but is a Bill of the people and the Bill proposed by the Secretary of State and a Bill that has come here on other occasions by other excellent Members of this House over a long period of years. And I would certainly urge that we adopt this House Bill 2435."

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

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill had a full hearing in the Committee and it was a unanimous decision of the Committee that it was an excellent piece of legislation. And I surely recommend, and so does the Committee recommend, a hundred percent 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 163 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 2450."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2450. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for fees for the Sheriff, Recorders of Deeds, County Clerks and counties of the third class. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2450 increases the Sheriff's fee in Cook County for the service of summons and the return of process. Earlier this year during the Spring Session I had a Bill introduced and signed by the Governor which increased the charges the Sheriff could charge in the counties of Illinois the same amount and also increased the mileage. What happened was the Reference Bureau had a typographical error and when it got to this provision the fees were not increased. This legislation is to correct that error and increase the fees in Cook County. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass?"



Those in...Representative McMasters."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Darrow, would not a home rule county or city already have the power to do this? The home rule county in this case?"

Darrow: "No, I understand that it would not because it deals with fees that are set by the Judiciary or the Legislature, not by the home rule. And they don't have that power."

McMaster: "Didn't Cook County already establish this fee by resolution of the Board of Cook County?"

Darrow: "Not on...not on these. This...this...last spring we increased the fees for Cook County along with the fees for the rest of the state. However, this...two lines in that Bill were not typed properly and this is just to bring those into compliance with the rest of the state."

McMaster: "All right, Clarence, I'm going to vote for this because I think they should be in line with the rest of the State of Illinois. I think it's unfortunate that we have to help poor Cook County out this way but nevertheless I'm going to give you a vote for it."

Darrow: "Well, I would agree. I just want to do what's fair for the whole state that's why....trying to correct this problem just to be fair."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 159 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 2469, Representative Abramson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2469. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations to the Liquor Control Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Abramson: "House Bill 2469 appropriates four thousand, two hundred and twenty-two dollars (\$4,022) to the Liquor Control Commission. The Commission exhausted it's two percent (2%) transfer allowance and over-obligated certain line items and other line items had lapsed in those...enough funds to cover these obligations. I urge a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I wasn't going to ask a question, I was only going to say because this is the Liquor Control Commission that, as Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee, on the request of a Member, I have written to the Director of both the Commission and DOT - and by the way it was a Republican Member of the Committee - in regard to the promise made that if there are ghost employees after the start of the fiscal year that they would provide that information to our Committee which they have never done. And I have written that Director and if we have any problems we're going to have our Committee cause many problems, I know, to the Department of Transportation, if there are ghost employees, because there was that promise made - a direct promise made to our Committee - to inform us of all employees and...and where they are employed and to forever get rid of ghost employees. And I thought this Bill would be proper to so give that information."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 158 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 2481."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2481. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2184 provides the necessary expenditure authority for the Office of Manpower and Human Development and the Bureau of the Budget to complete its fiscal 1978...or fiscal 78 requirement. The funds contained in House Bill 2481 are the result of federal funds made available to the state after the last Legislative Session for new and expanded programs to begin immediately. There's a total appropriation of thirty-five million dollars (\$35,000,000). And I would urge that the House pass 2481 as amended. It came out of the Appropriations Committee on a 22 to 0 vote."



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

Matijevich: "Speaker...Mr. Speaker, this is another Bill that I thought I ought to make some mention of the fact that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that the Director and the Agency in no way cooperated with the Democratic staff in analyzing this Bill. And I make mention of it now on the floor. If we don't get that cooperation in the future, that Director and that Agency is going to be sorry for it. We cannot properly analyze appropriations without the cooperation of the staff Agency. The Director did say that he is going to cooperate with Auditor General in a program audit, something that the entire Committee voted unanimously for. I also am directing the staff to take a close look at this Agency. I wonder in my mind why we didn't get that cooperation since I have some suspicions about that lack of cooperation. I'm directing the staff in the interim to take a hard look at this Agency."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, just to concur with my counterpart, the Chairman of Appropriations I, Representative Matijevich and myself have had some meeting with staff relative to this matter. He's absolutely correct. There are apparent...it seems apparent that there's a concerted effort by the Administration to insure that certain information is not forthcoming relative to these budgets especially to our staff members. So therefore that we cannot have the kinds of necessary input into these kinds of budgets to insure to have the kind of information available to the Members here so that we can vote on them in a most...more judicial manner. I think that one thing that I want to concur with Representative Matijevich on is that in the future if we are not in receipt of that kind of cooperation we have simply...must develop some program to insure to let these Directors know that if we can't...if they can't cooperate with us there's no way that we're going to cooperate with them and pass any of these requests for additional or regular appropriation. So...for those reasons I'm voting 'present' on this matter."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 143 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 2497. Representative Friedrich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2497. A Bill for an Act in relation to conflict of interest, amending certain Acts named therein. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. This Bill is strictly revisory. What happened in the spring is we passed two pieces of legislation, House Bill 2326, which Representative Friedrich sponsored and Senate Bill 1317, Senator 'Pate' sponsored in the Senate. There appears to be some ambiguity in the Sections of this and this could cause some disastrous effects to our schools throughout the state. What this is doing is just changing by way of revision subsection titles and allowing that we can go forward the business in bonding of the schools in the State of Illinois. And I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes. If I remember correctly the reason that we... Representative Levin and I decided to try amend this Bill was that it had something to do with ethics and so far you haven't mentioned what that is or conflict of interest. Could you tell me why Chapman and Cutler thinks we have to loosen the conflict of interest in laws...if that's what we're doing?"

Brady: "Well, let me tell you what we're doing, Representative Skinner, and then you can decide for yourself. As these Public Acts are now into law, Public Act 80376 and 80938, Bond Council has said that there may be ambiguity between the two given Acts. This ambiguity could create a situation where Bond Council would not recommend or render an opinion on bonds. If, in fact, this happens and they have said that if it comes up they will render it that way, that they will not render a favorable opinion. There can be no bonds sold over the twenty-five thousand dollar cap exemption put into the law. Now if we carry further, we can say that any school board who has a member who is a bank employee or



officer or anything else who is governed by the twenty-five thousand dollar cap that we addressed, that bank cannot participate in loans, bonds, deposits, warrants or anything else having to do with the raising funds of our school. I think if we would track this through the state we could find bank employees or officers that are on school boards around the state and this could cause disastrous effects immediately this year even if they could change the membership and say that no bank employee could be on a school board which I don't necessarily favor myself but I don't know your position on."

Skinner: "Are you... Representative, are you suggesting that a bank whose employee is on a school board should be allowed to buy bonds for that district?"

Brady: "Well, the bonds, Representative Skinner, are bid and I am suggesting that we certainly would want to allow a bank to bid because in a lot of cases, if you're familiar with the bidding right now, a lot of banks will say they don't want to bid on school bonds, it's a necessary function to carry on education in the state and I would hope not inhibit that process in any way by trying to come up with a couple of Public Acts which I don't think meant that in the first place."

Skinner: "Well, Representative, I don't know how well my experience is but I vividly remember when I was first elected County Treasurer in 1966, going to my County Board after having asked the banks in about thirteen northern Illinois counties to bid on the interest rate they would pay for county funds in hundred thousand dollar denominations, and on one side of the report I gave to my County Board I listed the banks in alphabetical order and on the other side of the report I listed the interest rates which had been bid from the highest interest rate to the lowest interest rate. And before discussion could really seriously begin on whether the county wished to maximize the return on its investment, the gentleman who had married the banker's daughter and who was on the bank board of one of my local banks moved that no banks outside of the county be allowed to be county depositories. Now that type of blatant conflict of interest, I hope, would not be allowed under



this proposal but I'm not at all sure of it. I would suggest that given the opportunity that type of conflict of interest will exist."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Levin: "Okay. Representative Brady, going to the situation of somebody being a bank employee or officer and being on the school board and the school board contracting for bank deposits or bonding authority with a bank, under the law as it was prior to these, you know, two Bills that passed in the spring, was there a prohibition against a school board doing business with a bank under those circumstances?"

Brady: "No, there was no prohibition."

Levin: "Okay. 'Cause I seem to recall a number of court cases, Illinois Supreme Court and Appellate Court cases, where it was held that it was an improper contract with the bank where there was a member of a school board or various other governmental bodies who was an employee or officer. That was no...that was not the law immediately prior to...."

Brady: "You're asking me a question, I'm giving you an answer and then you're citing some cases which you remember, Representative Levin, if you can enlighten me further...."

Levin: "Because we....if I may speak to this Bill, Mr. Speaker? I think we had a problem in Cook County with a county official who appeared to be making bank deposits where...with banks that he had... had an interest in and there was a great deal of concern expressed at the time that this occurred. And I'm...you know, I'm considering that that type of situation may occur again if this legislation is adopted. I think we need the protections that good, strong conflict of interest legislation provides. And if you get somebody where they're in a position to be a decision-maker even if there are bids, it kind of weakens the protection for the public in this respect."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, these original Bills



were designed because all up and down this state in little towns and larger towns, too, we had some very capable people who have minority interests in banks. The safeguard in this is that you cannot own more than five percent of the stock of the bank and do business with the school. That safeguard is in there. In addition to that, the person who has the stock must declare that interest, he must abstain from voting in any contractual arrangement with the bank. The safeguards that were in the original Bills are still in this one. This just merely resolves the difference so that the bonds will be salable. So far as I know, I can't see anything controversial in this and the safeguards were in the original Bill and will be in this Bill as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 113 'aye' and 34 'no'. Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. Consideration Postponed, House Bill 2410, Representative Totten. We'll have to take this out of the record...yeah, take it out of the record. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 22, Representative Totten? Out of the record. ...

First Special Session will come to order. Yeah, the Regular Session is recessed till the call of the chair. First Special Session. Representative Bradley, will you come up here? House Joint Resolution 1. In the First Special Session on page 2. Representative Katz. House Joint Resolution 1."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution 1 is a Resolution that would direct the Illinois Department of Corrections to institute on an experimental basis a program of family visitation. The Director of the Department of Correction testified. He indicated, generally, a favorable reaction to the Resolution. All of the details with regard to how the program would work would be less to the Department to administer. In general there is a feeling that this kind of



program may enable families to stay together is in the interest not only of the mental health and the family as a unit of the prisoner but is also a feeling that it will aid in the rehabilitation of the prisoner. There was no opposition to the Resolution. It was unanimously reported out by the Judiciary II Committee. It would involve at no significant expenditure of state funds. It could be accommodated within the present budget of the Department of Corrections. I would urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 1."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Katz: "Yes."

Pierce: "Representative Katz, when the...when Judge Charles Fleck felt in this House and Representative Barnes was elected and brought her daughter down here, Representative Fleck used to ask about these Bills, whether or not they constituted discrimination against the unmarried and whether the conjugal visits when restricted to family members were not a discrimination, perhaps an unconstitutional discrimination, against unmarried prisoners that wanted enjoy some kind of rehabilitation rights which you describe in your Resolution. What have you done...what have you done to remove that discrimination?"

Katz: "The Resolution, Representative Pierce, is not limited to...it is not a conjugal visitation resolution, it is a family visitation resolution. The House will recall that the distinguished Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham, came in with such a proposal several years ago. As well all know, he is a far seeing man and we are simply following the path so well begun. Representative Kosinski, Representative Stearney and I are following that well-trod path. There is no discrimination against single people because this is a family visitation resolution. The rules will be made by the head of the Department of Corrections and I am sure that our friend and judge, Judge Fleck, would be very much in favor of this Resolution in its present form."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker,...to continue, I'm a little confused. It's



a family visitation. Does that mean a prisoner and his niece, what's he...what's he talking about here? By family visitation, what does a visitation consist of? Don't we have visiting now at our prisons and releases? Is...I'm not sure what you mean by the word visitation and would a prisoner and niece would that constitute a visitation?"

Katz: "What is meant by visitation is the right of family to visit together privately. Privacy is one of the elements that enables a family to live together and to maintain and increase relationships. As to the exact details, Representative Pierce, that is being left to the Director of Corrections. I cannot tell you specifically what will be in those rules. Bearing in mind that the Director has a problem of maintaining order and security in the Department, it was felt by all of the Sponsors that it would be advantageous to leave to the Director the spelling out of the terms under which the visitations would occur. But they will visit in private and those decisions will be made by the Director. And I assume that they will bear in mind the experience that exists from the states of Mississippi, New York and California, that have such programs already in effect."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure we removed discrimination here against the unmarried. I have to...consult with Judge Fleck who previously to his...to his blissful event took an interest in protecting the rights of the unmarried. I think he's less interested today and make sure that we're not discriminating here against those whose life styles are a little different than Representative Katz'. There are numerous people who are living happily together without the...without the law necessarily making them a family. And I think we want to be careful not to discriminate against those prisoners."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Waddell: "In going...beating around the bush and not having anything substantial you still quoted the states, four states I believe. Would you mind giving the statistics as to what they did get



out of the program in those states and how it was derived?"

Katz: "Mississippi has had the program in effect for about seventy years. It is the only American state that has had a long experience with family visitation and with conjugal visitation, I might add. It has been a program that has been so well accepted in Mississippi that in more than fifty years there has never been any legislative effort to restrict or curtail the program. The feeling of all of the people with whom I have talked in Mississippi, and the witness indeed that the Judiciary II Committee heard earlier, was very favorable. The fact of the matter is, that when prisoners do come to the end of their term in prison they are going to make it or not in the outside world. And the most important single factor as to whether they make it or they don't is the existence of family ties and family relationships. And they believe in Mississippi that this kind of program has worked to lessen recidivism, to lessen the return to the prison of prisoners after their release...."

Pierce: "What do they...what do they compare their figure to if this has been going on for seventy years? How about the other states?"

Katz: "Well, all that I can tell you with regard to the other states, we have not heard actual witnesses. California and New York recently began such programs within the last two years. I can only tell you, Representative Waddell, that the people in correction in those states, I am informed, favor the program. They believe that it is a positive and constructive influence in terms of enabling prisoners to maintain family relationship so that they do not or are less likely to end up back in prison again with a return to a life of crime that brings them there. It is an experimental program and we are not taking any step in adopting it that permanently charged the court...courts. All that we're really doing is directing the Department on an experimental basis to try it out. and to report back to us how they feel it works. Now one great advantage of this kind of program is that we are going to be constructing at some time in the future other penal institutions in Illinois. It would be very useful for us to know before we construct those facilities



whether any architectural modifications ought to be considered. As we all know, if you have to retrofit something it is far more expensive than being able to plan ahead. And so it will be very useful and represent a saving of money for us to have some experience so that the Department will be able to gauge whether they are interested in this kind of program and whether or not in the construction of future prisons any consideration ought to be given to having facilities for family visitation."

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

Matijeovich: "Mr. Chairman, we waste a lot of time on debates on these Resolutions, so I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to close."

Katz: "I believe that the Resolution is a step forward. It will aid in the rehabilitation of prisoners. It is a program that will aid the State of Illinois planning future prison facilities that will be constructed. And I would urge the adoption of this Resolution to which no opposition has been heard and that was unanimously recommended that it be adopted by the Judiciary II Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is of the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Resolution. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair we'll have a Roll Call. All in favor of adopting the Resolution signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, to explain her vote."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Since Representative Katz did not...did not tell us how much additional security that this causes the Department of Corrections to have to implement. and since there are many people in my constituency that feel that we have a general trend toward making a country club atmosphere in the penal institutions in the State of Illinois, I will have to vote 'present' on this Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, to explain his vote."



Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support and am voting for this measure which may seem like a contradiction in terms of my voting record. I see the votes are up on the board now to pass it. However, I was privileged in Judiciary II Committee waiting for my Bill to be called, to hear virtually all the testimony that was taken on this Resolution. The Director will promulgate this and I...I'm proud of Judiciary II, I'm proud of the Director of Corrections, Charlie Rowe, for experimenting with this program and trying to see if it will work. And...and to be...have Illinois be an advanced state in the area of corrections. I might point out to Representative Pierce that the Director is also investigating the possibility of extending those privileges beyond family members and also including friends, close friends and whatever, but that will be at the promulgation and direction of the...the Director as he goes through the program."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, several of us that led the parade, so to speak in terms of law and order, we've certainly led the parade to throw them into jail. At the same time we recognize the fact that our rehabilitation system has not been working. Now we have the problem of dumping this man outside of a correctional institution with thirty dollars in his pocket and saying 'Take off from there'. We owe something more to society than just that. If we can keep a family tie between the prisoner and his family going during the period that he is in jail, there is a good, strong possibility that on his removal from jail he will somehow get back into his family, restore himself to correct type of life and no longer be an inmate of one our correctional institutions. I'm a hyphenated Sponsor because I feel we owe this to society. I would encourage more of you to get on the...the green light."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as we all



know this measure, of one type or another, has been before the House several times before. I had supported both Representative, and now Judge Fleck's measure, and Representative Roscoe Cunningham's Bill on this same score. But it seems to me that when we talk about conjugal visits being a method of rehabilitation and that using the family to keep people together as a method of rehabilitation, all we've got to look at is the divorce statistics when one out of three people get a divorce and they're living together on the outside. Twenty-eight thousand children in this state are wards of the...are wards of the state. That's part of a family structure. I think we're hoodwinking ourselves once again into believing that this is going to be some kind of a rehabilitative tool. And when the Director of the Department of Corrections, even though he's a member of this Administration, says he can accommodate this kind of Resolution within this budget he is hoodwinking the Members of the Committee he told that to. There's absolutely no way in the world that is possible."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Greisheimer, to explain his vote."

Greisheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, with the many very important issues facing this Legislative Fall Session, this particular issue has got to be given the award as the most ludicrous that we are considering. How we can possibly go into this particular phase of our criminal penal system while the general public is demanding stricter and stricter punishment through the Class X crime system seems to be in the face of what the public wants. I'm beginning to believe that Judiciary II is really the voice of the criminal defendants in this Legislature. As...as was raised by Representative Pierce, what are we going to do with the unmarried defendant criminal that's in the penitentiary? Shall we suggest that we now authorize state paid for marriage ceremonies? And if so, how about having honeymoon suites in each one of our state penal institutions? What in the world is going to happen to the children as a result of these little conjugal visits? Well, they'll be on public aid and we can pay for them too. And instead of leaving prison with thirty cents or thirty dollars



in their pockets they'll have to be able to support a family which will put them in a position they have to go back to crime. Well, we can solve that problem by giving each one of the criminal penalties, criminal persons in jail or any of these penitentiaries an opportunity to go on unemployment compensation while we're in the penitentiary. I think this entire concept is ludicrous. We're not in the business of mollycoddling defendants. We should put them in there and keep them in there. They're in there for punishment not for pleasure. And that's what you're giving them today, their pleasure."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 'ayes', 40 'nays', 16 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. On the Calendar on Third Reading appears House Bill 26. The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave to return House Bill 26 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing...hearing no objections the Bill will be returned to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment."

Clerk Hall: "Floor Amendments. Amendment #3, Collins. Amends House Bill 26 as amended by striking a second sentence from Section 186.1 and so forth."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 to House Bill 26 is...is one I would not expect would be...would generate any great opposition. It merely changes the daily compensation of board members from one hundred dollars a meeting to two hundred dollars. Now one...one of the objections in the...in the old Bill was that the salaries were set at a... at what some people considered too high of a level and therefore incurred members to be meeting too often and really becoming an operating board rather than a policymaking body. I did share that...that apprehension. At the same time, I realize that if



we are to attract the proper type of people and high quality... qualified people to the Board of Elections they should be properly compensated. So in adopting the...the proposition they should be paid on a per diem basis, we would hope to cut down the necessity of them proving to themselves and to the world that they're worth the money they're being paid on an annual basis and yet would properly compensate them for the number of meetings they would find necessary in the exercise of their duty. I submit to you that I think one hundred dollars is too low for the type of people we would expect to constitute the board. Two hundred dollars I think would be more in keeping in...with modern day consultant schedules and I would ask for the favorable consideration of the House on Amendment #3."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Redmond..."

Redmond: "I would have...I would have to oppose the adoption of the Amendment. It would seem to me that in the interest of trying to professionalize the board, that the hundred dollar per diem is adequate. If they meet more frequently than that, this would be five hundred dollars a week. It seems to me that it's adequate and I would have to oppose the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison...McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "If we're going to adopt this Amendment, I certainly hope that coming in the next Session someone will decide that the Members of the Judicial Inquiry Board, four out of seven which lawyers pick...used to being paid substantially more than a hundred dollars a day, will end up getting their salaries raised. So perhaps we can raise some...so perhaps we can get people on the board who will be willing to act in the interest of the public rather than the interest of the Judiciary."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman's been...the motion...or the question's on the adoption of Amendment #...oh, Mr. Collins, you wish to close the debate, Sir?"

Collins: "Well, I...I would just like to clear up one thing. This is not in addition to salary, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, they would not receive a salary. This would be their total compensation. And I think that the Speaker inadvertently



misled the Membership when he would talk about a level of five hundred dollars a week. It would be the fervent desire, I think of all of us, that this board meet less often. And I would hope that they would meet no more than once a month. This...it has always been the concept of this board, would be a policymaking group and the day-to-day operations would be handled by an operating head of the Executive Director or whatever you may call him. So when we're talking about a...a....pooh-bah meetings this is just the opposite of what we're trying to encourage. We would hope that highly professionalized people would meet as seldom as possible but put in a good working day on whatever their duties require and that they would be adequately compensated for the performance of those duties. But in no way would I suggest or...or attempt to suggest that they should meet more often. My idea would be that they would meet less often and certainly much, much less often than the previous board has met. It just has not been necessary for this board to meet as they have. They have actually taken the day-to-day operations away from the operating people and this is what we, or at least, I, and I think many would hope to discourage. I think that this compensation level would be reasonable and...and I would ask the Speaker to reconsider his position. And I would solicit the support of this House."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 26. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'noes' have it. The Gentleman's motion fails.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #4. Robinson, Mugalian. Amends House Bill 26 in the first sentence of Section 18-9 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "This Amendment would limit the consultant contract that the board can give out to do special research to a maximum of sixty days with one thirty-day extension. It would also say that you couldn't have more than one consultant contract in a year. We have exempted from these exclusions hearing officers and lawyers



litigation for the board who may have to have their term extended for a longer period. As the Speaker said in the previous debate, in addition to setting up the board we're trying to professionalize the operations of the board. The consultant contracts should no longer be away for giving political favors to members of either party. I feel that the work of the board should be done by employees who are hired by the board and who are really accountable to the people of Illinois. And so many of us who have worked on this over the past year on both sides of the aisle have proposed this Amendment in our Bill. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call to professionalize the board."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would oppose the adoption of the Amendment for several reasons and not the least of which we are attempting to professionalize the State Board of Elections by taking it...the members as taking them from the active Administration and appointing an Executive Director. I feel that it's in....it's not in the best interest of the orderly conduct of the board, or the orderly conduct of the government of the General Assembly, to try to interject itself in all of the daily operations and hamper the operations of the board. And I strongly urge that the Amendment not be adopted."

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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to...wondered if the Sponsor of the Amendment would yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Keats: "Mr. Robinson, well, I wondered...you're saying that lawyers are excluded from this limitation?"

Robinson: "No. Only those lawyers who are hired to do litigation where court dates and so on may...have to extend it beyond... beyond sixty days. But any lawyer who is hired as a consultant would be under the provisions of this exclusion."

Keats: "In other words, the lawyer could only have that one contract for the year unless it ran over?"

Robinson: "That's right."

Keats: "Oh, okay. Good. Thank...thank you, Mr....Robinson. I



appreciate that...that was the question I had unclear because to me one of the greatest problem with...with the board is these ...these lawyers who run their contracts over. So it is a good Amendment and I would support you. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Majority Leader has explained the Amendment to me and I withdraw my objection."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Pullen: "Mr. Sponsor, can you tell me whether there's an open primary in this Amendment?"

Robinson: "Not in this one, there might be one coming up, I...I don't know."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, could I ask Speaker Redmond a question, please?"

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

Redmond: "I don't think it's provided for in the rules."

Kempiners: "Could I suspend the rules?"

Speaker Bradley: "If you have 89 votes."

Kempiners: "Mr...I doubt that. Mr. Speaker, when you addressed the Amendment I believe you responded to the wrong Amendment. This is the one regarding the contractual services and you responded to the one about professional staff."

Redmond: "I think that's another reason why I changed my mind."

Kempiners: "That's what I wanted to ask, which one you changed your mind about. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Robinson, you wish to close? All right. The question is, shall the...on the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 26, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #5. Robinson, Mugalian. Amends House Bill 26 as amended by striking the first sentence from Section 1A-12 and



so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "This Amendment is aimed at the same problem as the previous Amendment. This one deals with the actual employees of the board. It puts them under the State Personnel Code. Again, we feel that there's a need to professionalize the operations of this board by making sure that those who are...are qualified, that they've passed tests, that they know what they're doing. In addition, we want to protect those who are doing their job. One of the things that board employees may have to do is take on a County Clerk who is not doing his job. We want to make sure that in doing his job, an employee of the board is not going to be subject to political pressure. It's a very sensitive job that employees have to do and they ought to have these Personnel Code safeguards."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 26. All in favor of the Gentleman's...all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #6, Totten. Amends House Bill 26 as amended by striking Section 1A-3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 made several changes on House Bill 26. First of all, the point of procedure has been changed to say that from each major political party...or the appointment shall be made with the advice and consent of the Senate only and that a three-fifths majority in this Amendment would be required. Secondly, there are considerable loopholes in the appointment procedure and the second portion of the Amendment says that within thirty days after the effective date of this Amendatory Act the Governor shall appoint three members of the board by submitting in writing to the President of the Senate the name of each appointee and the office in turn. They also cover some loopholes regarding when the board starts acting and the vacancy procedure in the present Bill is unclear so we do provide...we do attempt to clarify that provision. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment #6...."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment runs contrary to the entire concept of the State Board of Elections as visualized and envisioned by the Constitutional Convention. I read the proceedings of the Convention last night and originally they intended to have a Central Election Authority in the state. And that was subsequently abandoned for the State Board but the thought was that the Board should be neutral, should be nonpartisan and run the elections in order to ensure that they would be fair and equal. There's absolutely no reason why there should be any change from the Bill in its original form to permit the Governor, whatever his political party may be, to appoint four members and the highest officer of the opposite political party to appoint the other four members subject to a three-fifths confirmation by the Senate. For many years prior to 1960 all of the State Constitutional Officers were Republicans and the only member on the State Electoral Board was the Chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee. And we got along quite well. And the Secretary of State at that time was...was Charles Carpenter and we had practically no problems there. After 1960 the entire Constitutional...elected Constitutional Officers were Democrats, the only Republican member on the State Electoral Board was the Chairman of the Republican Central Committee. And we had no problems. It seems to me that we're trying to throw the conduct of the elections and the supervision of the elections back into the partisanship which the Constitutional Convention did not desire. Therefore, I would have to oppose the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the adoption of Amendment #6 to House Bill 26. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion

Mr. Totten, do you wish to close? Proceed, Sir."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think I'm as concerned about getting the State Board of Elections off our back as the Speaker is and I'm surprised that he would not speak more favorably on this Amendment. Every indication from the Governor's Message that there would be certain things that he



would require in a Bill and one would be the appointment procedure as outlined in this Amendment rather than the way it exists in the Bill. And if we proceed with House Bill 26 to the Governor's desk in its present form, there's every likelihood that he will probably veto it and we will be back considering the same measure again. Rather than do that, let's get this thing off our back and use the procedure which is most commonly used on the appointment procedures, the one that's outlined in the Amendment 6 and let the Governor make the appointment. They have to be approved by three-fifths of the Senate. We're going to ensure pretty good Members. I have Amendment #8 later on that's going to change that requirement a little, hopefully. But I don't think we're going to get rid of this thing unless we do something as we've outlined in Amendment #6 by putting the appointment power in the Governor and then requiring the three-fifths confirmation as we do with so many other appointments in this state. So, I would move for the adoption of Amendment #6 notwithstanding the objections of the Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #6 to House Bill 26. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'noes' have it. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Ladies.... Miss Macdonald, do you wish to....to explain your vote?"

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my vote by supporting Amendment #6 and I would like to say to the Sponsor of this Bill that if everything had gone so well through all those years I do not think that the Constitutional Convention would have found it necessary to have established this statewide Board of Elections."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 84 'ayes', 92 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Is there further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #7, Ryan, Kempiners. Amends House Bill 26 as amended by striking Section 1A-3 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."



Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As most of you are aware, I've been involved in the State Board of Election controversy for longer than I would care to have been involved in it. And as we debated this particular subject it's become obvious that there's got to be compromise. And I think Governor Thompson in his speech to this General Assembly pointed out that he was willing to move from a five-member board to an eight-member board which is an even numbered board. And it was a major compromise on his part. This Amendment which is offered, Amendment #7, is a further compromise but it does ask the people who are sponsoring this Bill to move a little bit. It provides for an eight-member board but it permits the Legislative leaders to submit an advisory list to the Governor of five members each. The Governor may or may not select from that advisory list. It also calls for confirmation by three-fifths of both Houses in any case whether he appoints from the list suggested by each of the Legislative leaders or not. This points out that the recognition on the part of those of us who work for a five-member board that the Legislature will have an impact in any Bill that is submitted. But yet it answers the Constitutional questions which have been raised and mentioned by the State Supreme Court on Legislative leaders offering just two names which the Governor must select from. I think that this is a good compromise between the Governor and the Legislature. Between those of us who wanted a five-member board and those of you who wanted a four-member board. I think it's something that everybody in this House ought to be willing to support. And I would ask for adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the time the first Bill came up authorizing the Legislative leaders to submit or to name the members of the State Board of Elections I voted against it because I didn't think that the Legislative leaders should be interfering with the prerogatives of the Executive Department. I believe the Constitution also has that same prohibition. I'm perfectly happy to let the...the appointments be made by those in the Executive Department as set forth



in the Bill. I think that we take another gamble that we're liable to run into that Constitutional thicket that the Supreme Court evidently wants to get into every once awhile. We're jeopardizing the Bill, therefore, I strongly urge that we do not adopt this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to close the debate."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close just by saying that a previous Sponsor of an Amendment indicated to you that the Governor will more than likely veto the Bill that is before us and I suggest even stronger, strong, more strongly that he will veto that Bill because he believes very strongly that there ought to be a responsible official of state government highly recognizable by the public making these appointments so that if they are bad appointments people of this state will be able to retaliate at the ballot box. The type of Bill before us without Amendment #7 diffuses the appointment power to a point where there is no identifiable person who can be held accountable. And I suggest that the Governor also, as Representative Totten did, will veto this Bill if that provision is not changed. I've had many discussions with the Governor and he has indicated....on this subject and he has indicated that he would veto such a provision. I am offering a substitute compromise and it's a very, very difficult compromise for me to offer because of the position I've taken on the State Board of Elections. I think it's a good one and I think we would be well-advised to look carefully at it and adopt it. And I would ask your support for Amendment #7."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #7 to House Bill 26.....all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'....."

Kempiners: "Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "In the opinion of the Chair the 'noes' have it. And the Amendment....pardon. On the...on the question, we...those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. All voted who wished? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The



Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 64 'ayes', 92 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendment?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #8, Totten. Amends House Bill 26 as amended in subparagraph 4 and so forth."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #8 makes one simple change. We presently have a three-fifths provision for confirmation and this would change that three-fifths to two-third. That would mean that rather than 36 to confirm we would need 40. I think this provides a better protection if should we get into some partisan difficulties on appointees and would ensure a more acceptable board by both the Governor making the appointing...the Legislature and by the State Board of Elections. And I would...I would urge your 'aye' vote for Amendment #8."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "I would oppose...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I oppose the adoption of this Amendment. It would seem to me...I've been here when there was only 17 Democrats in the Senate and there may be a time when the Republican side will be that low. So there have been times that it would really make any difference what fraction you had. I have perfect confidence in the Senate. I think that the three-fifths majority is reasonable and therefore I oppose the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten, you wish to...Mr. Collins on the question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was rather surprised to hear the Speaker say he had confidence in the Senate. That must make him unique among House Members. But be that as it may he did speak previously about protection for the minority and I think that is what this Amendment does address itself to, three-fifths is an extraordinary majority, two-thirds is even more restrictive. I think we lived under two-thirds under the old Constitution on many provisions for years and I think it really is reasonable. And if you're truly interested in the protection of the minority, I would urge the support of



this Amendment."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to reassure Representative Collins that I think the Republican Party needn't worry that I don't think you'll fall below one-third for...a share of the House. So I...I would rise to oppose this Amendment also."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "If you think that you can't fall below the one-third, I happened to serve in the House here when the Republican Party less than one-third of the Membership in 1965 when one of its Members died. And they only had 59 Members prior to that. And if that court suit throws out the appointment selection of a replacement of a Member and you fall below the Constitutional Majority of one-third by a vacancy, you're going to be in severe problem. I think it's a bad Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, do you wish to close the debate, Sir?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm really ...in looking at this Amendment in view of what probably will happen in November 1978 with the top ticket on this side of this aisle....I've put the Amendment forward to protect the Members of the other side of the aisle should we have greater than a three-fifths majority in the Senate. And I think that you carefully on the other side of the aisle should look to have this protection because the State Board of Elections really after 1978 will get going. Us on this side of the aisle, maybe for the present, have some concerns about the three-fifths versus two-thirds. But that protection for the minority is important; two-thirds is easily achievable by one side of the aisle or the other and I think that this precaution that is in this Amendment is important that should be considered in that light and I would urge your 'yes' vote on Amendment #8."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of Amendment #8 to House Bill 26. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'noes' have it. The Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"



Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr...the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I think we're entitled to a Roll Call on these issues and I wish you'd do that instead of trying to ram home the Speaker's package. If you'd give us a shot we'd appreciate it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ryan, we try to please. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.on Amendment #8. Have all voted who wish?

Clerk will take the record. This question, 75 'ayes', 88 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. Is there leave to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of House Bill 26? Hearing no objections, the rules are suspended and the...read the Bill a third time."

Clerk Hall: . . . "House Bill 26. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The...the Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in House Bill 26 the House has an opportunity to get off our backs something under which we have been laboring for quite some time. I happen to think that it was a serious mistake for the General Assembly to have insisted upon making the appointments to the Electoral Board and as I have said before, I didn't support it and I voted against it. We all know that the Supreme Court has given us, I believe, until the 30th of November to provide for the method of selection which will meet the Constitutional requirement. Representative Totten has always been characterized as a Republican Chairman of the Schaumburg Township as being so concerned about the protection of minority. So I would have to interpret his suggestion about two-thirds as being kind of a concession that the majority of both the House and Senate is probably going to be for the Democrats."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, on a point of order."

Walsh: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, while you rammed through the unanimous consent, or whatever consent, you just did to consider this Bill



now, you did not take into consideration the time honored rule that the Speaker has imposed on, the permanent Speaker, has imposed on every Member of this House and that is a Bill that has been amended may not be called on the day it has been amended. Now I would urge the permanent Speaker and the Sponsor of this Bill, in the interest of fairness, to have that rule apply to him as well as to the rest of us and take this matter up later."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair recognizes the rule that that is exactly the rule we suspended and I heard no objections from your side and I'm sure if you would have objected I would have heard. We're at Third Reading and...the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, you can probably save yourself a lot of hassle here if you put that up to a Roll Call vote."

Speaker/Bradley: "That were...that's untimely."

Ryan: "No, it's not untimely."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, it is. We're on Third Reading. The Speaker has...Speaker Redmond has made the opening remarks on the Bill and that's the position we find ourselves in, you're just not timely." Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't go to a specific Bill, I go to what the Speaker has done in principle. We do not have an Enrolled and Engrossed Bill incorporating the Amendments that were adopted here today before us. Now, the Speaker has ruled previously in each and every case, as a matter of fact, it's the only instance where I can recall he has been consistent. He has ruled that we cannot consider this Bill at this time."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, your ruling on Mr. Ryan's point was well taken. You requested leave to consider this Bill immediately. There was no objection from any Member of the House, including Mr. Ryan and Mr. Walsh. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that you are proceeding pursuant to the rules and that we ought to get on with the debate on this very, very important Bill and send it over to the Senate so that once and for all we can resolve this issue."

Speaker Bradley: "Point is well taken. Proceed, Mr...Speaker Redmond



on the...on the Bill."

Redmond: "...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 26 provides for a State Board of Elections which is Constitutional in every respect and meets the provisions of the Supreme Court requirements. It would consist of an eight-member board, four Democrats, four Republicans, four selected from Cook County and four from downstate. No board member may be active or hold office in any political party. The appointments to the board, there will be four by the Governor and four by the highest member of the Executive Branch of the opposite political party. Confirmation by a three-fifths Senate vote except where all five executive officers are of the same party, in which event, the Governor's appointment would then be subject to a three-fifths confirmation of both Houses with no nomination requirement. Compensation as is provided now is a hundred dollars per day for board meeting. The incumbent board shall remain until all eight new members are confirmed. The act...no action of the board will require...the action of the board will require five affirmative votes and a forum of five members. The Executive Director shall be appointed by the board. Now...you heard the Amendment submitted by Representative Robinson earlier. There was some suggestion that maybe it would be difficult to have an even numbered board. I would like to submit to you that it's a time honored tradition in practice in both England and in this country the jurors would consist of twelve people which is an even number. And except in very, very rare instances are they unable to arrive at verdict and you have a hung jury. It seems to me that the board that we have now that has four members have had very rare occasions when they were unable to agree. I think that our inability to ...to put together a State Board of Elections is a discredit to every Member of the General Assembly. Now, I would like to call your attention to the fact when there's adverse criticism you do not single out any particular Member. They say the General Assembly and the Legislature failed to do this and the General Assembly failed to that. Now there was a suggestion made that there would be no reason for this if everything had gone well.



As I said, I did read the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and all of the...the debate and all of the testimony and all of the argument had to do with trying to centralize elections throughout the state in one central authority. And among the things that would make possible would be an ease of registration and when there would be a transfer of registration from one jurisdiction to another it would be automatically and would be handled by the Central Election Authority. There is nothing in this Bill that seeks an advantage. There is nothing in this Bill that seeks to any disadvantage. And I may say, that this Bill has to get out of here today if we're going to be able to do anything or within a reasonable time. We're trying to run this program so that we don't have to meet during the week of Thanksgiving. And we're trying to get out of here at a reasonable time today. I understand that the storm warnings are out and all of the efforts to prolong and delay this thing are a disservice to ourselves and to the Members. And therefore I earnestly urge and entreat that you affirmatively support House Bill 26."

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

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I tried to get your attention before....but...Robert's Rule, on a point of order, but Robert's Rule of Order have apparently been abandoned. I voted on the prevailing side on the motion for leave and I'd like to have that motion reconsidered at this time."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, on a point of order I tried arise before and you neglected to observe my light. What I rose for on a point of order was that I had voted on the prevailing side on the motion for leave and I would like to move that the...."

Speaker Bradley: "I think that was a voice vote and it's...we can't determine.. Besides it's not on...it's not timely. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh." Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Yeah, you can determine because leave had to be unanimous and so everyone of us voted on that so any Member is within his right to make that motion."



Speaker Bradley: "You're...you're simply not timely with your request. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that the Sponsor of this Bill, the permanent Speaker, it seems to me, went out of his way not to respond to our objection to hearing this Bill at this time. He knows very well that this is absolutely not in accordance with rulings that he has previously made. He attempts to obfuscate this by talking about storm warnings, by talking about getting out of here before Thanksgiving, by talking about every other matter than what the point we are raising. I suggest to you that during his ...I suggest to you that during his regime, and it has been a regime, because he's been an absolute dictator, Mr. Speaker. He has tended in his own simple way to confuse matters to his own benefit. Mr...Mr. Speaker, would you get some order please? Mr...Mr. Speaker, he does not talk to the point that we raised in objecting to hearing this Bill and he is in fact taking more time with this matter than he should be taking because he refuses to abide by the rulings he has so frequently made...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In all fairness to the Body, Mr. Walsh, I believe that when you accuse anyone of being part of a dictatorial regime you should explain to the Body that you were the Majority Leader for Speaker Blair."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Speaker Blair was an absolute angel compared to the present Speaker. Speaker Blair...."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we're going to do something that Speaker Blair wouldn't do and we're going to give Mr. Totten a Roll Call on this motion and I don't ever recall that being done by the Speaker...by Mr. Blair. So we're going to...Mr. Totten, we... use the Attendance Roll Call in adopting the motion to suspend the rules. And you are...you are moving to reconsider that vote?"

Totten: "Not moving to reconsider the Attendance Roll Call, I move to reconsider the vote by which we adopt...."

Speaker Bradley: "And we use the Attendance Roll Call to adopt the... you're moving to reconsider?. Okay."



Totten: "Correct."

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

Matijeich: "Well, I raised the point of order that that motion is out of order while we're in debate. I make that rule on that....that motion. There are some motions that are in order in debate when you're on debate but I don't think that's one of them. And I raise the motion...the issue...point of order that his motion is out of order."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair recognizes technically you're quite correct, but in all fairness to this side of the aisle in our generosity today, we're going to give them that vote, so the.... Mr... Mr. Stuffle, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Stuffle: "Point of order, first of all. Is the order of business before us a vote on reconsideration?"

Speaker Bradley: "The suspension of the rules."

Stuffle: "Of reconsideration on the leave? I move to table the motion to reconsider."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman moves to table Mr. Totten's to reconsider the suspension of the rule to address ourselves to House Bill 26 on Third Reading. All in favor of Mr. Stuffle's motion to table will vote 'aye' and opposed will vote 'no'. Mr. Ryan, the Gentleman from Kankakee, to explain his vote."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a perfect example of what Representative Tipsword was talking about last night...the total abuse of the Chair. There's no need to ram this Bill through here. The rules say that you have to wait twenty-four hours or the next day. It hasn't done that. You rammed it through again, Mr. Speaker. You are totally abusing that Chair as you have done all Session. And now you try and tell me this is in the...spirit of fairness. Well, you're wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I...I don't know what...what the big hurry on getting this Bill out of here is. There's motions for other State Board of Election Bills on the Calendar and I guess the Speaker's afraid they're going to prevail and that's why he's got to ram this through here with your help. And I'm sure disappointed...."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



Clerk will take the record. On the question there are 89 'ayes', 77 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion to table...Mr. Totten's motion prevails and we return to House Bill 26, Third Reading. Mr...Speaker Redmond has moved the adoption of House Bill 26. Are there...any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, on House Bill 26."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to address some of the comments that the Speaker made in closing because I think that there has to be some correction of the record. He talks about bad weather for this afternoon and he talks about the court deadline and the pressure that's being put on us to do something. Well, it was two years ago on a Special Session that I put in the first State Board of Elections Bill even before the Supreme Court decision. So I think that...that pressure is invalid. We've had two years to do something and we haven't done it and now the pressure is on. Well, let's see what kind of pressure we get if the Governor vetoes this Bill. And I think he should veto it if it passes in the form it is. Those of us on this side of the aisle who have been concerned about some of the reforms and very significant reforms in addition to the structure of the State Board have been rebuffed time and time and time again. And I think it's time that the people on this side of the aisle take a look at what's being done. We're going to wind up with a State Board of Elections under this proposal like we had under the old one. If you think that there aren't going to be violations of Personnel Code and ways of getting around it, you're wrong. If you don't think there'll be consultants hired with political connections, you're wrong. And if you think that the people of the State of Illinois are going to know who's responsible for the bad...decisions made by that Board of Elections, that's exactly what's going to happen, people aren't going to know and the same old political cronyism that's going on now and has gone on is going to continue going on. And I, for one, cannot support this Bill. As I indicated in my remarks on the Amendments that I offered, or the Amendments that I offered with Representative Ryan, we've made some significant moves to compromise and a compromise



just doesn't seem to be coming from the people who are proponents of this Bill and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, all that I wish to say is my name was mentioned in debate. The action that we have taken here today on these last few votes are entirely in accordance with the rules and there's certainly nothing in opposition to the rules in this and is being acted upon properly."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, on a motion."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 26. And I oppose it for several reasons. One is that I don't see where an eight-member board is any better than a four-member board. I don't see how you're going to solve impasses and I don't see how you're going to have an operable board with condition prevailing. I think the logical answers that we must have, an odd-member board...we should have a five-member board. It seems so logical I can't understand why, other than for partisan reasons, that we won't accept and create a five-member board with a tie-breaker. There are many ways that can be done. I point out to you that the majority of the people of this state, in fact of this nation, are not...are nonpartisan. They are not members of either party. They ought to be represented on the Election Board. If the majority of this...the people of this state, the voters of this state, are nonpartisan it should not be difficult to find a qualified person to fill the office on the State Board of Elections. I tell you again that I'm convinced from what the Governor told me that he will veto any Bill that does not give him the authority to make the appointments. And I think it's only proper that the Chief Executive make those appointments and have them subject to the confirmation of at least the Senate. And therefore I ask you to oppose this Bill and let's get a Bill that is workable. Let's get a five-member board and that will work and that will solve our problem."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor



of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Speaker, Mr. Redmond, to close....Speaker Redmond to close the debate."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it would seem to me that the Constitutional mandate says that no political party shall have a majority on the board pretty well precludes the suggestion about having an odd-member board. As I said in my...in the...in the opening comments, for years and years we had twelve-man juries and when they got too expensive we had six-man juries. Even numbered people can agree if there is the compulsion to agree because they must agree. I don't suppose that it's appropriate in this Body to suggest that we also had twelve apostles. So there's nothing really significant about an odd number. I think it's about time that we get this thing off our back and I would also like to call your attention to the fact that the Constitution says that it's the General Assembly that is going to decide how the State Board of Election is going to be made up. It's not the Governor. It's not the Lieutenant Governor. It's the General Assembly. It is our responsibility. There isn't any way that we can shirk it. And it seems too bad indeed that it looks like partisan consideration and partisan politics may interfere with us doing what we have to do and what the Constitution tells us we must do and the peoples and the court are expecting us to do. Therefore, I encourage an 'aye' vote."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In voting against this horrible Bill which you are cramming down the taxpayers' throat today, I would like to reject the analogy of the Speaker to a jury because juries must be unanimous to bring in a verdict and what you are giving us today and what you are giving the people is a permanent hung jury. And I think that's what you on the other side of the aisle desire, and especially you from Chicago, who want a do-nothing Election Authority. You want a permanent hung jury. And just to make sure it's permanently hung, not



only is it an even number of four but now you've expanded to an even number of eight. And I submit to you that if a four member board is ridiculous, an eight member is ludicrous. This is just giving added expense, added patronage to the people of the State of Illinois that they don't want. This has been a political dumping ground. The consultants have made this a lawyer's aid society and you are perpetuating that fraud today. The only answer is...the odd-numbered board that Representative Bluthardt expounded, or better yet, let's support a Constitutional Amendment to get...get rid of this monstrosity and strike it from the Constitution once and for all. In the meantime, I think that we owe it to our constituents to turn down this very horrible proposition today."

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

Gaines: "Mr Speaker, I've been trying to get recognition for a long time since debate because I have very serious concerns about the legality of this legislation because the Supreme Court declared the old one invalid because legislative leaders took part in the selection. Now what happens after next year when there'll be no Democrat state official to appoint them? Would then the Democratic Minority Leader of the House be the highest ranking Democrat in the state? And then...wouldn't that now make a legislative leader do the appointing? I've never heard of a Bill that says that we have to have members of both parties elected on statewide elections. This automatically becomes inoperative when one party or the other have...all the elected officials like happens from time to time in this state. So I just wanted to know if that was the thinking of the Speaker that perhaps being Minority Leader of the House he might get an opportunity to appoint all the Democratic members?"

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

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to explain my 'no' vote on this. First of all, there is no limit on the amount of money that you can pay consultants and I think we all know what happens when we have supposed technical consultants."



I think it's a means of padding the payroll. I think another fallacy in this Bill is that it allows an eight-member board with half of the appointments being made by the highest ranking state officer of the other party. Now what happens in the case when there is no high ranking officer of the other party? And I say that because I'm worrying about the Democrats who might not have any after next year's election. And you wouldn't have any representation on the board. And it makes...does not direct itself to that particular problem. I think it's a bad Bill and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

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

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a good election Bill regardless of what they're saying on the other side of the aisle. It's a Bill that's been worked out with compromise. It has the support of many various groups throughout the State of Illinois. It's a reform election Bill that the Democratic Party is sponsoring and the Republicans are just mad about that. This is a good Bill. and the people on the other side of the aisle ought to get on this Bill and become a part of a reform movement for the State Election Board and this is what this Bill represents."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry before you take this Roll Call. What is the required number of votes for this to be declared passed?"

Speaker Bradley: "In the present posture it takes a 107 votes."

Telcser: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes' and 77 'noes'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, under the rules, I know ask that this matter be reconsidered in the light of the requirement of the 107 votes in order that 89 votes and we can defer the effective date of it."



Speaker Bradley: "Under Rule 39 it provides, 39-B, that the Sponsor has the right to have the Bill automatically reconsidered and returned to the Order of Second for an Amendment to remove the earlier effective date. And the Speaker has requested that we return House Bill 26 to Second Reading for that purpose and.... Amendment #9 then....Bill is at the posture of Second Reading. Amendment #9 on the Amendment....read the Amendment."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #9 to House Bill 26. Amends House Bill 26, First Special Session, by deleting Section 3."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, arise?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, so we don't get into unnecessary hassle, if this goes back to Second and the Sponsor amends the Bill by taking out an effective date, let me point out that that Amendment to be distributed to the Members for twenty-four hours before it can be called on Third Reading. Let's just understand that."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think that correct. It has to be distributed prior the Bill being considered and the...if you'll read the rules...."

Telcser: "It has to remain on Second Reading for twenty-four hours...."

Speaker Bradley: "If you'll read the rule, the Amendment....we're talking about 39-B and if you'll read the Rule Book on 39-B, 'The Amendment, if offered, shall be printed, placed on the desk of the Members before the Bill is taken up again on the Order of Third Reading'. That's all. And that's the Bill that's a period. The Speaker moves the adoption ...pardon me, Representative Madigan's Bill....Representative Madigan moves the adoption of Amendment #9 to House Bill 26. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion....Gentleman from...Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "All right, Mr. Speaker, let me also refer you to Section B of Rule 39 which says that you have to establish that 89 Members did in fact vote for the Bill before he can bring it back to Second and change the effective date. Now you don't have... Roll Call, that is, a record Roll Call. So I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there were not even enough votes for the Bill in order that the Sponsor bring this Bill back to Second. We have..."



you may have the printed sheet or you may not, but you did not declare the number of votes which were on that Bill. A verification certainly would have been and was requested, that piece of paper with that Roll Call was meaningless and you know."

Speaker Bradley: "I read the number of votes on the Bill not declaring what happened."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, where was the verification that was requested? Now you know that you didn't properly record that vote or announce it. Let the Bill be on Second, we'll be here next week. There's no need to rush with this Bill. There are ...there are ample number of legislative days left with which to deal with a House Bill going over to the Senate. There's no need to be in such a tremendous hurry and get everybody all worked up and excited."

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

Matijevich: "Well, I raised a point of order because the Speaker when he brought the issue said that he has that right under the rules. The Speaker at the podium also declared that he had that right. The matter again goes on Third Reading when you can verify or do whatever you can. But the Speaker has the right to go back to Second to put that Amendment on if the House so desires. So I think that the...Representative Telcser is out of order by what he asked for. It is purely not timely at this time and he can raise his verification if he wants when we go back to Third Reading. There's going to be another Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point is well taken. Posture that we're in, and we went through it very clearly, you're not timely at all. in what you're requesting to do. The only request I had for verification is...if it passed, from Mr. Ryan, it did not pass, I did not declare it passed but under the rule we declared that we could go the rules definitely provides for what we're doing. Now if you can point out where it does not provide that let's point it out in the rules. Mr. Telcser. "

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I think the issue which you were discussing before was Rule 35-C. All right, now I'm...I'm referring you now to Rule 39-B. You're...you're interpreting the wrong rule, Mr.



Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "I refer to your 39-B provides what happens specifically to special proceeding if a...with an effective date and that's the rule we're abiding by, 39-B. And that's the posture, it's the only rule that applies and we're applying it to this situation. It's a special situation. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I...I have no idea whether you intend to consider this Bill again on Third Reading today but if you do, I suggest that you refer to Rule 35-C."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, let's wait till we get to that point, Mr. Walsh. We...we haven't requested to go to Third Reading again on that Bill. We are...you're not timely on that issue. I'll recognize you at the proper time. Now, the...the motion before us right now is on the adoption of Amendment #9 to House Bill 26. All in favor of the adoption of 26 to House Bill, or Amendment #9 to House Bill 26 signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Now we'll return the Bill to....Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "All right now, Mr. Speaker, you're gonna say that Bill's on Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "The Bill is on...Third Reading...."

Telcser: "Now the Bill cannot be called till the Amendment is distributed, printed and distributed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "I request that we take this out of the record and when we come back we'll stay here long enough to pass it with 89 votes. Now that may be Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday or next Thursday or whenever it may be. But we'll take it out of the record so that you can read the Amendment. I'm sure that you'll take it home over the weekend and study it. Take it out of the record."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any...any other business in the First Special Session...that wants to be...anybody wants to call now? Hearing none we will will recess the First Special Session to the call of the Chair and we will... Gentleman from Lake...we read... let's get this recess first. We'll recess till the call of the Chair



and we will call to order the Second Special Session. Now, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand that one of the Members has a birthday and that the somebody in the back offices had a birthday cake baked for this Member so I'd like to have leave of the House that we go onto House Resolution 519 and let the Clerk read in full House Resolution 519 so we can enjoy some birthday cake. 519. Read the...Mr. Hanahan's Birthday Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could give us the weather report before we go into this like you did prior to this? How are the storm warnings now, do you know?"

Speaker Redmond: "It was all right until we called House Bill 26 and then the storm clouds gathered."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 519. Giorgi, Matijevich, et al.

Whereas McHenry County has contributed many humble Legislators to serve the State of Illinois, the humblest of the humble celebrates his 43rd birthday on November 10 and; Whereas, Thomas J. Hanahan, Irish-Italian extraction has earned him such deserved titles as the Fighting Irishman, the Italian Terror, the Smiling Irishman and the Italian Stallion; and

Whereas, Terrible Tommy has received national recognition and heaped wide and varied reviews from such authorities as Henry Hanson and Mike Royko for his famous phrase, 'The brainless, braless broad'; and

Whereas, Tom Hanahn was educated in Chicago Catholic schools and learned early that education was for the smart guys, and he put a hammer in his hand and nailed down a profession as a carpenter; and

Whereas, his work in the construction trades directed him into the union movement, where his fighting spirit led him to high officialdom in his Carpenter's Local and state union councils; and, Whereas, Tom Hanahan's fight for the working guy was broadened in the political arena, where has reached such heights as McHenry County Chairman, seven terms in the Legislature, and many prestige



appointments and offices in Legislative and party affairs; and
Whereas, Representative Hanahan enjoys fighting executives but
he equally enjoys living like executives; and
Whereas, the McHenry Madman has exhibited independence and profiles
in courage on many occasions, like his forceful stands against
ERA and RTA when his union brethren took opposite positions; and
Whereas, labor's spokesman in the General Assembly has gained
respect from friend and foe for his gutsy daring, his tactful
techniques, and his free spirit; now therefore
Be it resolved that the Members of the Illinois House of
Representatives now join in a proud salute of congratulations
to Thomas J. Hanahan on the occasion of his 43rd birthday on
November 10, 1977 and we wish him many more."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in moving adoption of that Amendment, I want
the Membership to know that there's no truth in the fact that
that November 10 deadline that we've got on unemployment compen-
sation legislation was picked on Tom Hanahan's birthday. I
wish him a happy birthday from all the Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, you're speechless."

Hanahan: "Thank you, Representative Matijevich and my colleague, Mr.
Speaker, and thank you to the secretaries and the girls in the
offices over there that took their time to bake this cake. I...
I do notice for those of you can't see it, there is a bra-less
brainless broad sitting on this cake and it's quite cute and
I want all the Members in the House, the doorkeepers and all that
would like to have a piece of this cake to come over and grab
it. Thank you very much."



Speaker Redmond: "Second Special Session. Second Special Session appears Senate Bills Third Reading, Senate Bill 6. Representative...Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 6. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 6 may be the most important piece of legislation we're going to consider this fall. Every person in this chamber is aware of the serious consequences that would result if we fail to approve this legislation. The Bill we have before us today is the result of a compromise. Both parties in the House or in the Senate and the Governor approved this legislation. The Senate approved it Monday by a margin of 55 to 2. When this legislation was initially proposed, the Governor announced his opposition to state financing for any portion of the burden on local governments. Senate Democrats pressed for complete state funding of that burden. Senate Republicans stood with the Governor. But reacting as reasonable men and women should, all parties compromised. They did so because they recognized that passage of this legislation was crucial to the people of Illinois. That compromise was an act of statesmanship on the part of the Governor and both political parties. And last evening we rejected Amendments which would have jeopardized that compromise. There's no doubt that this legislation is necessary. We're facing a Thursday deadline which, if not met, will have serious implications for all Illinois employers. Portions of this legislation are certainly less than palatable. The Congress has placed an unfair burden on local governments and ultimately a portion of that burden has now fallen on us. But unhappy as we might be with the action of Congress, it's up to us to be responsible and protect the Illinois employers by approving this legislation. As I mentioned earlier, the chief matter of disagreement has been the share of the cost the state should bear. This Bill represents a compromise between those who wanted to have the state pay all of the nonfederal costs



for local government and those who wanted the state to pay nothing. I believe it's a most reasonable compromise. Time is of the essence today. Let us approve this Bill so we can meet the federally imposed deadline of Thursday. To fail to do so would result in a catastrophic situation for Illinois employers. Members of the Senate have set aside partisan politics in approving this legislation. Let us match their statesmanship and send this legislation to the Governor and then onto Washington. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I regret that Representative Ryan felt it necessary to inject a certain political air into his remarks concerning this Bill. Certainly, I did not take the initiative in this regard, he did. He has characterized this Bill as a compromise on the issue of state support for local government. I say to you, Mr. Ryan, and I say to the Body, last night's Roll Call on Amendment #9 will clearly verify my statement. There is no compromise in this Bill. This Bill is not a compromise version. This Bill was drafted by the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. It was drafted by the Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber of Commerce is supported by the large employers. The Bill does not attempt to help those within the system who have worked so hard to develop a good record in this system. On the contrary, it deliberately penalizes them. Concerning state subsidies, there's no compromise here and I suggested in my remarks last night and I will reiterate them now. Those of you who did not vote for Amendment #9 can explain to your local governmental bodies why you didn't vote for that Amendment when they asked you in the preparation of their budget, 'Why didn't the state supply some subsidy for us in this area? They subsidized local governments all over the state. They subsidized areas of government all over the state. They subsidize, subsidize, subsidize, but they could not help local governments in this one temporary area of crisis and travail.' Mr. Ryan, this is not a compromise. It is your Bill. You are the Sponsor of the Bill. It is the Governor's Bill. It is approved wholeheartedly by the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce and the



Manufacturer's Association and you and those who vote for the Bill can live with it, Mr. Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Two-third of those voting. Have all voted who wish? On this...have all voted who wish? On this question there's a 100...take a record. This question there's a 109 'aye' and 45 'no'. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "What...excuse me, that was on a vote on the Bill itself? Okay. Okay. Thanks. I was off the floor, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Requires two-thirds of those voting and it failed to receive the necessary vote. The motion fails. Two-thirds of those voting. My Parliamentarian is a Parliamentarian, I guess. The Clerk, the Clerk has advised us that it takes 91 votes so the motion carries. Representative Ewell...Yourell."

Yourell: "I'd like a verification of the affirmative vote. I want a verification of the affirmative vote because I've been reading all kinds of press releases about this Bill. I want to see if they're really here."

Speaker Redmond: "The...the storm is moving in on us. Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dunn and I thought we were voting on the Bill, we therefore jumped on the yes button. Having voted on the prevailing side, I now move to reconsider the vote by which that was passed."

Speaker Redmond: "We may do that but it doesn't solve the request for the verification. He's still entitled to that. State your point."

Geo-Karis: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know about the rest of us here but I'm so confused, I don't know which way I'm voting for what. Would you kindly tell us what we did vote on?"

Speaker Redmond: "In which Session?"

Geo-Karis: "Pardon? What did you say?"



Speaker Redmond: "In which Session?"

Geo-Karis: "Right....just preceding this 109 vote to 25, would you please explain why because there's so much confusion, we can't hear. What's goin on? And, Mr. Speaker, you have a...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative....Representative Schuneman moved that the...the....moved the previous question. Representative Hanahan requested a Roll Call. Representative Yourell, rather, requested a Roll Call. And Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Is this a Roll Call on the motion to move the previous question?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Yourell: "I will withdraw my motion for a verification but if this goes to a Roll Call, now, on Senate Bill 6, I want a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has withdrawn his...request for a verification. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I now move to reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "Move to reconsider the vote by which the previous...."

Darrow: "The previous question was moved."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms has moved that Representative Darrow's motion to reconsider the vote for the previous question by which the motion...or previous question was adopted. The question's on Representative Simms' motion. Those in favor of Representative Simms' motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'no' on the motion to table and the reason is, it seems that....very odd that some people who know the least about Senate Bill 6 are so much in a hurry to hurry up and hide this Bill and get it out of their sight because they have to vomit...they have to vomit when they get to know what's in it and what's going to happen to the employers of this state. So I could just say to them, that go...hurry up and pass the Bill, don't take any deliberation on it, just rush it through, don't let anyone debate, don't let anyone explain any of the issues or any of the Amendments that were attached in the Senate the night before last. Just vote to hide the Bill and then reek



next year when your employers are on you because they've had a hell of a tax increase placed on them because the Legislature did not want to take the time to debate the issue."

Speake-Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of this House were here last night when...when this Bill was debated. And most Members had an opportunity to say what they wanted to say on it last night. And I...my motion was made, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save the time of this House but in no way am I trying to shut off debate on this most important Bill. And consequently, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to withdraw my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "This is on...this is on Representative Simms' motion to table the motion to reconsider. I will declare that his motion carries and the motion to reconsider is tabled. Now, I presume that we could go back to Representative Schuneman to withdraw his motion to...to the previous question. Simms. Representative Simms, maybe the easy way so that we can get at this and permit the withdrawal is for you to withdraw your motion to table. You don't want to do it? Okay. Have all voted who wish? ..Ninety-one...91 on this question. There's 91 'aye' and 51 'no' and the motion to table prevails. The Sponsor, Representative Ryan, to close."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was certainly amazed at the lack of knowledge by the Majority Leader on the Bill that we have before us today. The claim that it was drafted by the Chamber of Commerce, evidently he hasn't done his homework. The Chamber's opposed the Bill. They opposed any part of state funding for this Bill as has the Manufacturer's Association. And I'd also like to remind the Gentleman that the Bill, as amended, is amended with the Senate President's Amendments. Senator Hynes put the Amendment on the Bill. It was a compromise that he worked out with Senator Shapiro. And I would suggest that the Gentleman from Cook check with his Senate President before he makes those kinds of statements. This is needed legislation. We all know what it's about. It's been over and over and over and all I ask is for a favorable Roll Call."



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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The question's on...."

Bradley: "At the proper time."

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

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote. Last night there was an Amendment offered by one of the Members of the House to help the small businessman. And we talk about somebody who has no voice at all in government, no lobbyists down here. Somebody who hires a person in their employee, keeps them for a long time, has a good relationship with them insofar as that employment is concerned, does not have an increase in his tax rate because he keeps that employee with him for a long time....that, that Amendment last night that would benefit that employee that was offered by the Gentleman from Rockford received 21 votes. And I heard a lot about going home to talk to your local governments, what about those small businessmen? Go home and talk to him and see what we've done to him recently and see what this has done for him. And I hope that they ask you, 'Did you vote for that Amendment that Representative Giorgi offered last night?'. That's an important Amendment that we all overlooked. There were 21 votes for that Amendment. I get kind of sick and tired sometimes hearing about local government to put a tax on people that pay for their share that they're going to have to pay? What about the small businessman, I hate...I don't particularly like the title of the ma and pa businesses but there are a lot of small business people up and down each one of your main streets when you go up and down those streets that are going to have a nine hundred percent increase and those are the people who've done a good job in employment...employee a lot of people in Illinois. And in my opinion we've completely ignored them. We've completely ignored them with this legislation when we should have...we should have and we could have helped them last night. But too many of us were addressing ourselves to what was going to happen to local government and the school....and one thing and another



and the schools throughout the State of Illinois. And again we ignored somebody who has very, very, very minute voice in state government, the small businessman. I'm going to vote 'aye' for the Bill because I have no choice. But we certainly could have done something last night with that Bill. I voted for the Amendment, one of those 21. But there...we didn't get very much support and unfortunately I have to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative....can't see. Who's that hand sticking up? Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, what Minority Leader Ryan interjected in here, the word compromise, and the word compromise was from the... emanated from the Senate because there are compromises that should have been in this Bill. This Bill was introduced April the 8th of 1977 by the Minority Leader Shapiro and he conveniently let it die the 20th of April because of the tax increase in it. I introduced five Amendments to help the ma and pa stores, the small construction people, the small manufacturer and the small businessman and you could have accepted those compromises. What I said was there are 75,000 employers that have a minimum tax and they should have been allowed to retain the minimum tax and they should all have been proportionately increased their tax. And you refused to accept that. I also said that we ought to opt out for the public employees in the event this is declared unconstitutional. You said you wouldn't accept that either. The one to allow the school boards to levy the tax that's desperately necessary, you said, 'No'. Then I said the best Amendment of all was to allow these employers to deduct their unemployment compensation premium payment and you refused to accept that. This is a horrible Bill. This is a Bill that was perpetrated by lies by the Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Association of Manufacturers. They had half of the employers hysterical who are still ranting about House Bill 236 today. And we're talking about Senate Bill 6 that should have been introduced April the 20th. So I'm going to vote 'no' on this because you didn't effect the best compromise for that little guy. Again, you Republicans have a penchant for destroying yourself. You're two to one in the Congress. You're



beat. You only have fifteen governors out of fifty and I don't know if you're going to have any left in Illinois. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that one thing has to be made clear. The Congress of the United States which is Democrat from the word 'go' has mandated that one percent, and we had nothing to do with that. I have asked this question over and over again and they have told me that the one percent was mandated. I don't want the little businessman to be hurt either. And I have asked and asked and asked about this. So I think the place to call is Congress and tell them that we are hurting our small business people. I am voting for this Bill because of the rules and regulations that have been sent down for us. And I think that we would be very foolish at this time to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Clarification because I do want to explain my vote. Just to explain to the Lady that every Republican Congressman in this state except Representative Michel voted for that tax she's talking about. And if she belongs to the same Republican Party or not...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell, for the purpose of an introduction."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the gallery to our left are a group of women who watched the General Assembly at work and they are the Women's Club of Lovington and they are in the 57th District and represented by Representatives Johnson, Wikoff and Satterthwaite."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "I see the guy who wrote the Bill up there, Bill Dart."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one of the few times I've gotten up on an issue like this. And I don't talk too often in this House, but I hear the sob stories from the other side of the aisle about the little businessman. And I want to tell you that we're mandated by the Federal Government in this particular legislation. But when this thing was originally perpetrated in the State of Illinois under Senate Bill 285 in 1975 from the



other side of the aisle, they didn't have one damn bit of use
 for the little bit of use for the little businessman at that time,
 I can tell you that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr....thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I had promised many people when I came to Springfield that I would not vote for any mandated programs. I don't care if it came from God Almighty in Washington, D. C., whether it came from Springfield. And this indeed is why I'm not going to vote for this Bill right here. Last night we had an opportunity to pass Amendment #9 which would have funded to the tune of fifty percent for a two-year period this particular program. And it was rejected. So when I go back to the 35th Legislative District I can be able to tell my constituents that I did not vote for mandated programs. And that's exactly what it is. And to my colleagues, to my friends in the Chamber of Commerce, the Industrial Commission, write your letters back to the Chamber of Commerce in my district and explain what I said here today. Don't have them write me anymore form letters, I'm sick and tired of it. We are not going to fund...I'm not going to vote to fund mandated...I'm not going to vote for a mandated program if we're not going to fund it. That's exactly what's happening right here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "...To explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's very interesting to learn and read...hear of all these diatribes how terrible the Republican Party has been. Remember, you fellas put this miserable situation in order, you created it. And number two, when we talk about helping the municipalities and helping everyone else, sure, let's bankrupt the State of Illinois and make it like the City of New York that takes forty million dollars out of the taxpayer's money from the State of Illinois so we can be bankrupt and charge our people more taxation in income taxes and sales taxes. That's what my side wants to do, so it's the lesser of two evils. It's not the best Bill but certainly it's a better



situation...it'll create a better situation than we have in the past. And remember, Gentlemen, labor needs business and business needs labor. You can't work without the other...each without the other."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

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

There's a lot of rhetoric going back and forth. I'd like to address for a few minutes Senate Bill 6 and what's in it. I'd like to point out, and very reluctantly, by way of explanation on my vote that there are some provisions in here that since my explanation will not change anyone's vote or even attempt to change it. But I think there's things that have to be addressed once this Bill passes out of here. I point out to every Member in the General Assembly we are legislating away authority that we in fact were not given by the Federal Government, and I point that out on page 38 of the Bill where we're giving the Director the authority and responsibility to reexamine and recommend the rate changes and structures for those new people that are coming under the Unemployment Compensation Act. We're legislating that away. So you might as well know it unless someone comes up with an Amendment at a later time, and I hope they do, that would at least have the Director responsible to the General Assembly for those rate changes. We're making legislation here that in my estimation is very similar to the heinous crimes legislation, the Class X, and maybe this should be called the 'Class X Tax Increase Act' because that's what we're doing. Right now when we adopt this legislation, and it looks to me like it will be overwhelmingly adopted, the immediate effect will come upon us in April and October of next year. For the better employers of the State of Illinois, their premiums and their increases will be astronomical. I'm sorry to say that it's happening. But I do point out to you that additional changes had better be made in Senate Bill 6 or it will be more catastrophic than it is right now in its present position. Reluctantly, I'm voting 'aye' because we have no other choice. But basically we're going to have to come up with some funding very shortly for those areas that are not covered. We're going to have to once again



reexamine the formula. All I can say is, Good luck, Ladies and Gentlemen, what we're doing here today, we're really going to suffer for.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh wants to advise the General Assembly that it's raining outside, that the storm has arrived. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Just to verify."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote. I...I certainly, like many of the other Members of this House, feel that a compromise is a compromise between Senate Members and a compromise between House Members and a compromise between the House and the Senate. And then we've got something that answers the problems of everyone concerned with this legislation. Now we have a part of a compromise to ultimately leave some people out. And those are going to be the people, small business. and the people in the public sector. I want everyone to remember what that Amendment was last night. It was Amendment 9. Amendment 9 was the one that you're going to be hearing for the next eight or twelve months. So remember the number. That's the one you didn't vote for. Number 9."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.M.: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be very brief. I've heard a great deal of rhetoric here relative to this Bill. The easy way out would be to vote 'yes' and I'm sure that most people are doing that and feel that that's the way to do it and we can come back later next year and take care of the situation. But for one who has been saddled with the problem and the responsibility of trying to fund education through our Appropriations Committee at an equitable level this year and the years to come, there's simply no way that I could stand before you and take the easy road out to again mandate local school districts to spend monies that they don't have. We have not given them financial wherewithal to raise those monies. The...the assessment bills are already out...last September. They cannot raise the additional money that this program would cost them between now and their next fiscal year. So, again, we are saying to them, and



again next year I'm sure the Governor will come down like a white knight on a charger saying, 'We will fully fund the formula at this time'. But what he will be saying to those local school districts, 'I will fully fund the formula to give you the dollars that will buy less than what you had last year because we incurred additional mandated programs without giving you the financial wherewithal to meet those obligations'. There's no way, no way that I can say that to the local school district and be consistent, consistent, with what I know is right. I vote 'no' on this Bill. I realize it's going against the grain but sometimes, somewhere you must take a stand and I think this is the point to do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk." Representative Meyers, I can't see Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote. We've been requested by the opposite side of the aisle there to go back to our districts and explain the Giorgi Amendment and why we didn't support Giorgi. I think if I went back home and told my people that Giorgi submitted an Amendment to this Bill most of the people back there would ask me what that man's last name is. They'd say, 'Representative Giorgi? Who's he? Giorgi who?'. Now the point is, that Representative Giorgi's Amendment was so off base that nobody here could have supported that Amendment last night. Now in further explanation of my vote relative to the...all the crocodile tears that have been shed on the opposite side of the aisle relative to small business and local government...local units of government, I wish they would keep that...those thoughts in mind as we go down the vale of future legislative proposals that are going to be detrimental to the small businessman as well as local units of government. In further explanation of my vote, all the people who are shedding those tears relative to the raise in taxes for the small businessman, for local units of government, all they would have to do is to take some time and understand what the federal law mandated and they would understand why we're here today taking the course of action that we're taking at this moment. And without this Bill, the local units of government and the small businessmen throughout this state would be paying a higher rate of



tax than what they'll be paying in this Bill that we're approving today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

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

I'm going to support the Ryan Bill, Senate Bill 6, that he's handling in the House. I just want to point out quite vividly though that the Democrats had legislation addressing this problem early last spring. Tried to inform the Governor of the necessity of this type of legislation last spring. Unfortunately, it was falling on deaf ears. So did Phil Rock put an Amendment on a House Bill, House Bill 236, because Senator Shapiro didn't have the guts to do what was necessary. I just want to point out to the business community of this state that this is a compromise issue supported by both parties. It's an issue that we do not like to result in this Bill because there are 75,000 business...small businessmen in this state that are going to be severely affected by this Bill in conjunction with local government. I would hope that every Member of this Body, both in the House and the Senate, would address themselves to the respective congressmen in their districts as I have and tell them about the inequities that were passed in Congress...hopefully that the Congress would address themselves and correct two areas. One, the small businessmen and the tremendous inequity in rates that has been imposed by the implementation of the Federal guidelines. And, two, the exclusion, if possible, of public employees. Now we're talking about a seven hundred and fifty-one million dollar debt (\$751,000,000) that the private sector has to pick up. And the small businessman is being faced with a point ten percent (.10%)...from point ten (.10) to a one percent (1%) increase. Ladies and Gentlemen, at the thousand percent (1000%) increase in rates that they're going to be paying next year, I think that if we really want to do something for the small businessmen of this state, get the Illinois delegation moving in conjunction with other states that are placed in the same dilemma and have it corrected from Washington. I strongly encourage that we work in this vein to correct inequities presently in Senate Bill 6. I'll be supporting a Bill to increase the funding coming into local government. But I would hope that



the record is quite clear that it was the Democrats...it was the Democrats that addressed themselves early in this issue. And it's the Democrats that really tried to protect the small businessmen of this state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesan."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I... this is more on a point in reference to what Representative Lechowicz just said about the Senator from my district and also the Minority Leader in the Senate, that he didn't have the intestinal fortitude to introduce the legislation. I would like to advise this House as a point of information that he had the legislation but it was killed in Committee by the Democratic Party. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff. What's your point?"

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I've been on my feet this Session of the Legislature. Speaking as one of those small businessmen who has been so downtrodden, as a former Mayor of a municipality which has been so downtrodden by this action, I will be more than happy to go back and explain to my constituents, the other small businessmen, the other local officials, just exactly what did take place and what happened not only this Session of the Legislature but the other preceding Session predominately controlled by the Democratic Party and to really explain what has happened so they will not be swayed by the flowery rhetoric that is used to excuse past transgressions. And I've taken very careful note of all of those who have been so much in favor of the small businessmen and Members of this House, I will be around to see you next spring when legislation is introduced to alleviate some of the problems that we have not only in this but in Workmen's Compensation and I have you counted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, you've already spoken. For what purpose do you rise now?"

Hanahan: "...Just a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't understand what that is in the rules. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 160 'aye' and 6 'no'. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I want to withdraw my motion for a verification.



To make very certain though that nobody goes up to the well and adds their name to this Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk. John. Nobody will be added to this Roll Call. On this question there's a 160 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.



Speaker Redmond: "I'd like to call the Members' attention to the fact that we have some other business here that we're going to go to that is just as necessary as Senate Bill 6, so please give the Sponsor of the...couple of Bills the courtesy of your attendance. House Bills Third Reading Consideration Postponed, House Bill 5. Representative Friedrich. This Bill has been read a third time."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill got quite a bit of conversation yesterday and I'm not going to belabor you with it again. The Governor...the Governor has indicated he wants two new prisons of site...these two sites were...selection. This is the Bill for the sites in the appropriation. I need a 107 votes and I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question there's a 128 'aye' and 7 'no' and the Bill having received the necessary Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill Third Reading House Bill 6. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 6. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capitol Developmental Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This includes the bond authorization not only for the prisons but for a number of other projects. And, incidentally, there's some in almost every district that were approved by...by the CDB and in addition that the...there were two others added, one was Luke College and one was SSU. And I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Waukegan Port Authority. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 13 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. The Order of Motions, House Bill 13. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard



quite a bit today about the Election Reform Bill. One of my suggestions for correcting this measure and one which I received a great deal of support on was that this measure be repealed and that we should start over. We have pointed out in lengthy debate the number of fallacies with the Election Reform Law. I propose two measures, House Bill 11, 12 and 13 in the Second Special Session, all of which would do one thing. They would repeal the Consolidation Election Bill and put us back in the status we were before this ill-timed, ill-conceived and poorly-drafted legislation was passed into law by this General Assembly in the haste of the closing of the last General Assembly. I went to the Elections Committee with House Bill 11. We had a hearing on this Bill and everybody was allowed to give their testimony. This Committee, of course, is the Committee which fathered the Elections Consolidation Bill. They voted 13 to 3 to do not pass House Bill 11. I believe that it is only fair that this General Assembly have all options open to it in repairing the damage of the Election Consolidation Bill. Therefore, I have filed a motion to discharge Committee on House Bill 13. House Bill 13 would merely, yes, would merely repeal the Election Consolidation Bill and put us back into the status where we were prior to this legislation. My motion is to discharge Committee and to place House Bill 13 on Second Reading in the Second Special Session. I would ask your support so that we can have all options available to us. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Yourell on 13."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 11 and House Bill 12 and House Bill 13 were introduced into this House and placed on the call for the Elections Committee to consider. All three Bills, as the Sponsor had indicated, dealt with one subject. The subject matter was the outright appeal of Senate Bill 1149. A subsequent action in the Senate Election Committee for a delayed effective date for two years was defeated. House Bill 11 which is identical to House Bill 13, the Bill presently under consideration, received only three votes out of fourteen in the House Elections Committee.



House Bill 3 which you voted on favorably with a 116 votes just a short while ago and only 10 'no' votes received a vote out of Committee of 14 to 0. As I had indicated to your before, the Sponsors of House Bill 3, Senate Bill 1149 and House Bill 1978 were sincere in their desire to address the situation and the subject matter to try to alleviate any problems that might have developed or somebody might have thought had developed. This we did with the introduction of House Bill 3 making fourteen changes. Now, this Bill, Senate Bill 1149, still has thirteen months...thirteen months before it becomes effective. Now, to have a Sponsor of a repealer come up and say that we should go back to regress to the point where to repeal existing legislation relative to the Consolidation of Elections is not a sincere effort. They're opposed, the Sponsors of this motion, the Consolidation of Elections, they say not. But if they were really sincere in their desire for a good Consolidation of Elections Bill they would be working with us, with Amendment, to make the Bill palatable to everybody in the State of Illinois. Not to simply repeal, not to simply repeal a Bill that received a very favorable majority out of both this House and the Senate and was signed into law by the Governor. The Governor placed that Bill as part of call in the Second Special Session so that we could address ourselves to that Bill and any deficiencies that might exist in that Bill. As I've said many, many times we have done that with House Bill 3. We're going to continue that with the implementation Bill that will be introduced in this chamber next week. Now to say that they're sincere in their desire to do something about Election Consolidation simply does not wash. To repeal legislation that is not yet effective, it will not be effective for thirteen months, is not a responsible position for a Member of this House to assume relative to this very, very important legislation. Now the Municipal League was opposed and they did their job well. They did their job in an excellent fashion. But they did not prevail because the people in this House who were charged with the responsibility of recognizing good legislation and rejecting bad legislation have already done that on three occasions and rejected



the repealer in the House Elections Committee by an overwhelming vote of 11 to 3. The Taxpayer's Federation of Illinois has come out with an endorsement, a one hundred percent endorsement, of House Bill 3 and Senate Bill 1149. And to say that we have to go and start all over is not a responsible position because we have the Bill on the books today. It's part of our statute and it's in this posture that we can improve the legislation. But if we don't have any legislation on our books, you know what's going to happen. We're going to do exactly nothing for consolidations of elections in Illinois. I would hope that you would give this Bill the same kind of treatment that its companion Bill, House Bill 11, received in the Senate...in the House Elections Committee and defeated with an overwhelming vote. You've already sent House Bill 3 out of this chamber into the Senate with a 116 affirmative votes and only 10 'no' votes. I ask that you vote 'no' on the motion to discharge Committee relative to House Bill 13."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Laurino on the motion."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The House Elections Committee two weeks ago heard testimony on House Bill 11 which does the same thing as House Bill 12 and House Bill 13 and was defeated unanimously. The Bills were on ...for 12 and 13 were posted for the next preceeding weeks. Representative Ewing and Representative Monroe Flinn were called repeatedly in their offices to come down and have their testimony presented to the Committee for another vote. They refused to come down. I...subsequently have posted those Bills for hearings next week, Wednesday. If Representative Ewing would like to come into Committee he can have a fair hearing. He had one two weeks ago. I suggest a 'no' vote on this motion. It's not necessary. House Bill 3 has been sent over with an overwhelming affirmative vote to the Senate. I think that's where it belongs. I think this Bill deserves to be defeated on the motion and in context. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Flinn to close."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Yourell talks about being irresponsible."



The...the people on the floor of this House have not had the opportunity to vote on any Bill of this sort so far. The Elections Committee, of course, was stacked against House Bill 11. It was in opposition to what they thought to start with ought to be done. Now Representative Ewing has done a good job in explaining how piecemeal we have done so far on 1149 and having to come back and correct with House Bills for these and even the Sponsor of House Bill 3 admits a lot more needs to be done before it's operable. Now I think...we are being responsible, very responsible for offering the Members of this House the opportunity to answer to their people back home, the school boards and the various other municipalities ...the people that are going to be forced to run, try to run an election under these very adverse conditions. This is your opportunity to say to those people back home what you believe in. I ask for an 'aye' vote on the discharge of the Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to discharge the Elections Committee and placed on Second Reading the First Legislative Day, House Bill 13. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. It'll take 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Conti to explain your vote." Conti."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is our last chance. Now House Bill 3 had fourteen remedial paragraphs to correct the legislation that was very thought of in the last ten years. They ask us to buy these fourteen remedial points and then they said that next week they're going to come in with the implementation. So, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, why don't we just always buy a pig in a poke, don't worry about it. Next week we're going to come in with implementation legislation and remedial legislation to take care of the bad Bill that we passed last spring."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I didn't get a chance to close on my motion. But I would ask in explaining my vote that we have some more green votes up. Let's have all the options open to us. The Chief Sponsor of the legislation



which opposes...which I would repeal, talks as if they passed ...with such a large margin out of this House. The truth of the matter is it barely passed out of this House. And it scares me to death that we aren't going to have this option open to us 'cause he talks about his implementation Bill. And if it's as big a mess as his first Bill I can see our election process coming to a clattering, clanging halt in about another year and a-half. And Representative Laurino says that we had such a fair hearing, I don't think I sat through a Committee Hearing with such obscene talk to the witnesses. I was...I would hate to take them back in there for a second hearing. They didn't have a fair chance. They were abused by the Members of this Committee. And I believe we have the right to have all options out here on this floor to be voted upon by the Members. And I would appreciate some more green votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 68 'ayes', 83 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the motion fails. Please have a...Representative Ewing again."

Ewing: "I'd like to have that on Postponed."

Speaker Giorgi: "You didn't receive the 70 votes, Mr. Ewing. The Minority Leader, Mr. Ryan, for what reason do you rise?"

Ryan: "To be recorded 'aye', Mr. Speaker, please."

Speaker Giorgi: "... 'Aye', the 70 votes are put up for Postponed Consideration. Just a couple items in the....then we can retire. On page 6 under Motions, motion by Representative Daniels on House Bill 2427. Read the motion, Mr. Clerk. Page 6, House... here...here...here Johnny. Mr. Madigan on the adjournment of the Special Session. He wants to introduce...read the first read the First Reading of some Bills."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 16, McMaster, et al. A Bill for an Act in relation to the financing of the payment, contributions by political subdivisions, municipal corporations and instrumental. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan moves to recess the Special Session to the call of the chair. The Special Session in recess..."



Speaker Giorgi: "We are now back in Regular Session. And on page 6, is a motion by Representative Daniels to House Bill 2427. "

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask leave that this be heard with the motion on House Bill 2485...two of them together."

Speaker Giorgi: "Leave to hear....Mr. Daniels, House Bill 2427's motion will take 107 votes because you're discharging rules and the other motion will take 89 votes."

Daniels: "We'll still have them heard together if that's all right with you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, does the Gentleman have leave to hear both motions together? Representative Madigan?"

Madigan: "What's the question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He wants to hear both motions together, 2427 and 2485. 107 for one, 89 for the other."

Madigan: "Leave."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman has leave. Read the motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. Pursuant to Rule 66 (a) I move to discharge the Committee on Rules for the consideration of House Bill 2427 and advanced to the Order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day. Motion. Pursuant to Rule 66 (a), I move to discharge the Committee on Appropriations I from further consideration to House Bill 2485 and advanced to the Order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day. Representative Daniels."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels on both motions."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2427 is the new Act creating the Real Property Tax Procedure Commission. The duties include study on the present real property tax procedures in recommending improvement. House Bill 2485 is a companion appropriation Bill appropriating twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) to the Real Property Tax Procedure Study Commission. The purpose of this motion is to bring to the House floor, Second Reading, Second Legislative Day the concept of creating a Real Property Tax Study Commission so that we can study the various tax procedures and assessments throughout the State of Illinois. There are, of course, many reasons for the necessity



of creating such a commission and I think most of you from the Cook County area are experiencing the present taxpayer's revolt that you have because of the reassessment and we're going to attempt to answer those problems and to address the issues that brings about the presentation of this motion. I suggest to you that this is a very important commission. It'd be a small commission in size and we hope that we'll be able to bring it straight to the House floor so that we can have it considered next week. I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan on the motion."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion.

Mr. Daniels appeared before the Rules Committee this week on behalf of one of these Bills and what he proposes to do is to open up an area of study that is currently under consideration by a Subcommittee of the House Revenue Committee which has been considering this subject matter for approximately six months to nine months of this year. On the same day that the Rules Committee considered this Bill, they considered several other Bills in this area. And it was a considered judgment of that Committee that this area of study is so difficult and complex that it ought not to be dealt with in an emergency rush fashion such as proposed by this motion today. It...rather than that, we ought to send these Bills to a Committee and when we return in the spring during our normal Spring Revenue Session that we ought to consider the Bills and the entire subject area at that time. For this...for these reasons I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Katz on the motion."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I do want to point out that this matter did have a hearing in the Rules Committee and it was the substantial view of the Rules Committee that this Bill should not be exempt. I have a Roll Call in front of me so that the Members of the House will understand that it was a totally nonpartisan vote. I notice here that Mr. Deavers voted with the majority. I notice here that Mr. Flinn, Mr. Friedrich, voted with the majority. I notice here that



Mr. Ryan voted with the majority. I notice here that Miss Stiehl voted with the majority. I notice here that Mr. Waddell voted with the majority. And so I want to point out that what that means is that the Rules Committee made a considered judgment based on two factors. One is that there is an existing Subcommittee of the House Revenue Committee that is studying this very problem that has already heard testimony, held hearings with regard to this problem. It is well under way and it is being accommodated and handled through the existing structure. And the second matter is that I think that none of us want to remain here on a Session that has been called for a specific purpose longer than the time that was intended. And since we are handling this matter through the existing structure, the overwhelming vote of the Rules Committee including the top leadership on both sides of this House voted not to exempt Mr. Daniels' Bill along with some others. Everybody was treated the same and Mr. Daniels received no different treatment than all of the other revenue matters that were proposed and I would urge a 'no' vote with regard to the motion to discharge the Rules Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman on the motion. Representative Daniels, I'm sorry. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the storm has hit.

Maybe we could take this out of the record, take it up next week."

Speaker Giorgi: "Gentleman have leave? Leave has been granted. Your last request. Representative Jaffe on the floor? Mrs. Chapman to handle the motion on House Bill 2506."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to discharge the House Committee on Human Resources from consideration of House Bill 2506. The Committee is absolutely saturated with study and consideration of this particular issue. We have in response to House Bill 113 studied this matter of limited licensed physicians and last week proposed a Committee Bill by a vote of 14 to 1 in the Committee. The Bill has strong bipartisan support in the Committee. We have thoroughly researched this matter so there really is no point in having this Committee consider again a Bill which they proposed last week. Save us from having a Committee



meeting next week by voting 'yes' on this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no discussion the question is, shall the motion on House Bill 2506 prevail? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. It'll take 89 votes. 2506 is the motion. On House Bill 2506. Takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "...Explain my vote. This measure had strong bipartisan support when the Committee studied and proposed the Bill last week. The affect of the Bill remaining in Committee is that the Human Resources Committee will need to have a meeting next Wednesday in order to study again a Bill which we have reported out with strong bipartisan support. Any Member of the Human Resources Committee who is here please provide some support for this proposal. I...I believe that the results of a further Committee meeting would be exactly the same as they were last week."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 31 'ayes', 30 'nays' and the motion failed.Any announcements? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise for purpose of an announcement. Just today this Body passed Senate Bill 6 which provided for a repayment mechanism and for deferral or rather for compliance in the area of unemployment compensation. During the debate on that Bill I attempted to provide state subsidy for local government. There was no answer forthcoming from the Sponsor of the Bill, Mr. Ryan, as to how we would help the beleaguered local governments in this state. Governor Thompson, Representative Ryan, Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturer's Association, no one offered us any indication as to how Mr. Ryan and the Republican Party proposed to help local government. But now just a few minutes ago they have come forth with the answer because the...a Republican has introduced a Bill, House Bill 16, in the Second Special Session which will allow all local governments to adopt a nonreferendum property tax increase to pay for the cost of that Bill. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, the answer has finally come forth from Mr. Ryan and the Republican Party. We



are going to raise local property taxes to pay for this new system. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "That....(tape difficulty) necessarily in the nature of an announcement but Representative Skinner, for what reason do you arise?"

Skinner: "Well, I guess a point of personal privilege. I would hope that those who are looking out for what the Republican Party are going...is going to do for small business will take a close look at the concept included in my House Bill 2521 which expands on the temporary Speaker excellent nub of an idea, and I do say nub, because he didn't quite have it. I would provide a credit on the corporate and personal income tax bill form of small businesses that are going to be had by House Bill 6. I would welcome anybody who wishes to Cosponsor that Bill just to go to the well and let Jack know that you care about small business."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McMaster, for what reason do you arise? Announcement?"

McMaster: "An announcement or in answer to a previous speaker who used a Bill of mine to make a statement of his own."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

McMaster: "I think that I would be recognized perhaps as Principal Sponsor of that Bill, Mr. Majority Leader. I think you would also notice that there is bipartisan Sponsor of that Bill. And I think you must also recognize that it was a Democrat Congress that forced this upon local government in the State of Illinois. And I think that if anyone is responsible, I think that we are in saying that local government must have some means of paying the cost of their share. And this Bill would provide that. I think that any attempt to brand this as a Republican-sponsored tax increase has completely false and erroneous. And I would like the records to show, Mr. Madigan."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bluthardt, for what reason do you rise? For the purpose of an announcement? None. Read the Agreed Resolutions, please, Mr. Clerk...we'll get out of here. Agreed Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 511, Greisheimer. 512, Matejek."



513, DiPrima. 514, Rich Brummer. 515, Williams. 516, Wikoff.
517, Gaines. 518, DiPrima. 520, Younge. And 522, Williams."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr...Representative Lechowicz on the Agreed Resolution!"

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 511 by Representative Greisheimer honors Mrs. Rinaldo and her one hundredth birthday. House Resolution 512 by Representative Matejek honors Fred Redell on their marriage. House Resolution 513 by Representative DiPrima honors Federal Post 1525 on their 50th anniversary. House Resolution 514 by Representatives Brummer and Bradley asks the Illinois Commerce Commission to address themselves to a shipping problem in their district. House Resolution 515 by Representative Williams congratulates Richard Lindblom on achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. House Bill 516 by Representative Wikoff congratulates Professor Carl Weiss and Professor Wolf on their recent discovery at the University of Illinois in the...in the third kingdom science area. House Resolution 517 by Representative Gaines asks that the United States address themselves to the serious problem of unemployment, such as layoff at Zenith and U.S. Steel in the dumping of foreign products. House Resolution 518 by Representative DiPrima congratulates Lawrence Lundin on the Eagle Scout Award. House Resolution 519 congratulates Tom Hanahan on his birthday. House Resolution 520 by Mrs. Younge congratulates alummis of Delta Sigma Theta and other fraternities. House Resolution 522 by Representative Williams congratulates George Miller on being elected the president of Township Officials of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner, do you want to speak on the Resolutions?"

Skinner: "I certainly do. I object strenuously to a...a Resolution condemning the foreign steel producers of...for dumping steel when they have more modern steel plants than U. S. Steel has in the State of Illinois to be an Agreed Resolution. If we're going debate foreign trade and free trade I don't think the Illinois General Assembly, the Members of which supposedly represent the



top exporting state in the entire county for both manufactured good and agricultural goods should come up in favor of restricting free trade. And that's what that Resolution does. I would ask that I...my name be entered in opposition to that Resolution in the Journal if indeed it remains an Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Waddell on the Agreed Resolutions."

Waddell: "Yes, I would suggest that the Representative read the Resolution and read it carefully. Here, let me point out to the Representative Skinner that all he's doing is asking that the President and the Congress of the United State to take necessary steps to protect American businesses and their workers from the unfair foreign competition."

Speaker Giorgi: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Representative Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "If the Resolution is as explained by the two prior speakers I certainly still wish to be opposed to it because I am certain that I am not going to be in favor of what the present administration is going to decide is going to be concluding as needed to protect United States Steel Company."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Walsh on the Resolution. Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, if there is an objection, Mr. Speaker, then it is no longer an Agreed Resolution and should be taken from that list."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, let's take it out of the record, Mr. Lechowicz, and then move for the adoption of the...of all the Agreed Resolution except for that one."

Lechowicz: "Except for House Resolution 517."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, you've heard the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it. The House...announcements...for the purpose of an announcement, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "I'd just like to be recorded as 'no' on the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Record her dissent to the Agreed Resolution. It's the intent of the Speaker that the House now be recessed.... Representative Bowman, for what reason do you rise?"

Bowman: "Yeah, that...I've...since I've been in this chamber I don't



recall anyone saying that they wanted to be off an Agreed Resolution. ...Vote me 'present' until I find out what's going on."

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote the Gentleman 'present'. Resolutions General."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 517, Gaines, et al."

Speaker Giorgi: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 521, Levin, Bowman, with respect to the memory of the Reverend Ralph Pomeroy of Chicago."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lechowicz on the Death Resolution."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Death Resolution."

Speaker Giorgi: "Gentleman moves the adoption. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Resolution's adopted. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2520, Peggy Smith Martin. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2521, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2522, McBroom, Ryan. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to convey 109 acres. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan, for what reason do you arise?"

Madigan: "I rise to offer an Adjournment Motion that would provide that we would adjourn in fifteen minutes and thereby allow time for the Clerk to perform housekeeping duties."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any objection? Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave has been granted. Representative Bluthardt, for what reason do you arise?"

Bluthardt: "For the matter of inquiry. I notice the Chairman of the Elections Committee has just walked off the floor and I...I wasn't certain as to the time of the Elections Committee meeting on Wednesday. It indicated perhaps at 11 o'clock but he wasn't sure. And I would like to have him announce the exact time of that meeting on Wednesday."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does anyone know what time the meeting's scheduled for Wednesday? Not at this point, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "When and how are we to learn?"



Speaker Giorgi: "Here's Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Schedule the Elections Committee meeting the...to 11 o'clock."

Bluthardt: "11 o'clock Wednesday morning. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "The House will now...Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1387. Mautino. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1388. Brummet, Lucco. A Bill for an Act authorizing Capitol Development Board to grant a sewer easement to certain real property in Madison County. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Recess the Regular Session to the call of the chair."

Speaker Giorgi: "First Special Session. Introductions and First Readings."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 39. Lauer, Dan Houlihan. A Bill for an Act in relation to subsidies for probation officers. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 40. Conti. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following title and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bill #12. Passed by the Senate, November 9, 1977 at the First Special Session by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill #12, Kempiners, Dan Houlihan. A Bill for an Act in relation to provisions of certain services for State's Attorney. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Adjourn the First Special Session subject to the call of the Chair till Wednesday. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

Speaker Giorgi: "The Second Special Session will be convened and then



held in abeyance for a few moments. Objections. Recess
...Special Session...(tape difficulty).

Speaker Giorgi: "The Regular Session will be in order. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2524. Giorgi, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2525. Giorgi, et al. A Bill for an Act amending Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2526. Giorgi, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Committee on Assignments. Regular Session will be adjourned till Wednesday at 1 o'clock."

Speaker Giorgi: "I'll reconvene the Second Special Session and we will stand at ease for a few moments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Second Special Session will be in order. Messages from the Senate. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution, to-wit: House Joint Resolution 2. Concurred in by the Senate, November 9, 1977, the Second Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following title and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bill #1. Passed by the Senate, November 9, 1977, of the Second Special Session by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of



Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bill #3. Passed by the Senate, November 9, 1977, at the Second Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1. Chapman, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 3. Yourell, Collins. A Bill for an Act in relation to Consolidation of Elections. First Reading of the Bill. No further business."

Speaker Giorgi: "The House will be....the Second Special Session will now be adjourned."



1.			
<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	11:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
1		Speaker Redmond	
1,2,3	11:05	Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
3		Speaker Redmond	Introduction & 1st Reading
3		Clerk O'Brien	
3	11:20	Speaker Redmond	Move House recess-call of chair Regular Session
3		Speaker Redmond	1st Special Session to order
3		Bradley	Roll Call, etc
3		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
3		Bradley	Motion
3		Speaker Redmond	1st Special Session recess- call of Chair
3		Speaker Redmond	2nd Special Session to order
4		Bradley	Roll Call, etc
4		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
4		Yourell))	HB 3 - leave to return to 2nd
4		Speaker Redmond)	
4		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Yourell	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5,3		Mahar))	
6	11:25	Yourell)	
6		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted
6		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
6		Yourell	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
2.			
6		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		Yourell	Waive appropriate rule to hear HB 3
6		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
7		Deuster	
7		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3 -3rd Reading
7		Speaker Redmond	
7,8,9		Yourell	
9		Speaker Redmond	
9	11:35	Conti	
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Giglio	Question
10		Yourell	
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Rigney)	
)	
11,12		Yourell)	
12		Speaker Redmond	
12,13		Mahar	
13		Speaker Redmond	
14	11:45	Geo-Karis)	
)	
14		Yourell)	
14		Speaker Redmond	
14		Dunn, R.)	
)	
14		Yourell)	
15		Speaker Redmond	
15		Deuster)	
)	
15,16		Yourell)	



3.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16,17		Ewing)	
	18		Yourell)	
	19		Speaker Redmond	
	19,20		Pullen	
	20		Speaker Redmond	
	20		Mudd	Moves previous question
	20		Speaker Redmond	
	20		Yourell	To close
	20		Speaker Redmond	
	21		Collins	To close
	22		Speaker Redmond	
	22		Pierce	
	22		Speaker Redmond	
	22		Pierce	Explains vote
	22	12:05	Speaker Redmond	
	23		Edgar	Parliamentary Inquiry
	23		Speaker Redmond	
	23		Bluthardt	Explains vote
	24		Speaker Redmond	
	24		Davis, J.	Explains vote
	24		Speaker Redmond	
	24		Steczo	Explains vote
	24		Speaker Redmond	
	25		McMaster	
	25		Speaker Redmond	HB 3 passed
	25		Clerk O'Brien	HJR#2-Adjournment Resolution Wed-16th-1:20 p.m.



4.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
25		Speaker Redmond	
25		Giorgi	Move adoption
25		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted-1st Special Session to order
25		Clerk O'Brien	HJR #4-Adjournment Resolution
26		Speaker Redmond	
26		Giorgi	Move adoption
26		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted-1st Special Session recess-call of chair Regular Session to order
26		Clerk O'Brien	HJR 62-Adjournment Resolution
26		Giorgi	Move for adoption
26	12:17	Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted Regular Session-HB 3rd Reading
26		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2435-3rd Reading
27		Speaker Redmond	
27		Tipsword	
27		Speaker Redmond	
27		Greisheimer	Support
28		Speaker Redmond	
28		Tipsword)	
)	
29		Kelly)	
30		Speaker Redmond	
30		Cunningham)	
)	
30		Tipsword)	
31		Speaker Redmond	
31		Lechowicz	Moves previous question
31		Speaker Redmond	
31		Tipsword	Explains vote



5.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	32		Speaker Redmond	
	32		Von Boeckman	Explains vote
	32		Speaker Redmond	HB 2535 passed
	32		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2450 -3rd Reading
	32		Speaker Redmond	
	32		Darrow	
	32		Speaker Redmond	
	33		McMaster)	
)	
	33	12:31	Darrow)	
	33		Speaker Redmond	HB 2450 passed
	33		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2469-3rd Reading
	33		Speaker Redmond	
	33		Abramson	
	34		Speaker Redmond	
	34		Matijevidch	
	34		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	34		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2481-3rd Reading
	34		Speaker Redmond	
	34		Winchester	
	35		Speaker Redmond	
	35		Matijevidch	
	35		Speaker Redmond	
	35		Barnes, E. M.	
	36		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	36		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2497-3rd Reading
	36		Speaker Redmond	
	36		Brady	



6.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	36		Speaker Redmond	
	36		Skinner)	
)	
	37		Brady)	
	38		Speaker Redmond	
	38	12:42	Levin)	
)	
	38		Brady)	
	38		Friedrich	
	39		Speaker Redmond	HB 2497 passed
				Regular Session-recess to call
				1st Special Session to order
	39		Katz	HJR #1
	39		Bradley in the Chair	
	40		Pierce)	
)	
	41		Katz)	
	41		Speaker Bradley	
	42		Waddell)	
)	
	43		Katz)	
	43		Speaker Bradley	
	43		Matijevich	Moves previous question
	43		Speaker Bradley	
	43		Katz	To close
	43		Speaker Bradley	
	43		Hoxsey	Votes 'present'
	43		Speaker Bradley	
	44		Davis, J.	
	44		Speaker Bradley	
	44	1:02	Kosinski	



7.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	44		Speaker Bradley	
	44		Peters	Explains vote
	45		Speaker Bradley	
	45		Greisheimer	
	46		Speaker Bradley	HJR prevails
	46		Redmond (Speaker)	HB 26-3rd Reading Leave to return to 2nd
	46		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted
	46		Clerk Hall	Amendment #3
	46		Speaker Bradley	
	46		Collins	
	47		Speaker Bradley	
	47		Redmond	Opposes Amendment #3
	47		Speaker Bradley	
	47		Skinner	
	47		Speaker Bradley	
	47		Collins	
	48		Speaker Bradley	Amendment fails
	48		Clerk Hall	Amendment #4
	48		Speaker Bradley	
	48		Robinson	
	49		Speaker Bradley	
	49	1:16	Redmond)	Opposes Amendment #4
)	
	49		Speaker Bradley)	
	49		Keats)	
)	
	49		Robinson)	
	49		Speaker Bradley	



8. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
50		Redmond	Withdraws objections
50		Speaker Bradley	
50		Pullen)	
50		Robinson)	
50		Speaker Bradley	
50		Kempiners)	
50		Redmond)	
50		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #4 adopted
50		Clerk Hall	Amendment #5
51		Speaker Bradley	
51		Robinson	
51		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted
51		Clerk Hall	Amendment #6
51		Speaker Bradley	
51 /		Totten	
51		Speaker Bradley	
52		Redmond	Oppose
52		Speaker Bradley	
52	1:24	Totten	To close
53		Speaker Bradley	
53		Macdonald	Support
53		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #6 fails
53		Clerk Hall	Amendment #7
53		Speaker Bradley	
54		Kempiners	
54		Speaker Bradley	
54		Speaker Redmond	



<u>9.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
55		Speaker Bradley	
55		Kempiners)	To close
55		Speaker Bradley)	Amendment #7 fails
56		Clerk Hall	Amendment #8
56		Speaker Bradley	
56		Totten	
56		Speaker Bradley	
56		Speaker Redmond	Oppose
56		Speaker Bradley	
56		Collins	
57		Speaker Bradley	
57		Bowman	
57		Speaker Bradley	
57		Hanahan	
57		Speaker Bradley	
57	1:35	Totten	To close
57		Speaker Bradley	
58		Clerk Hall	
58		Speaker Bradley	
58		Ryan	Asks Roll Call
58		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #8 fails-3rd Reading Rules suspended (HB 26)
58		Clerk Hall	HB 26-3rd Reading
58		Speaker Redmond	
58		Speaker Bradley	
58		Walsh, Wm.	Point of order
59		Speaker Bradley)	
59		Ryan)	



<u>10.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
59		Speaker Bradley	
59		Walsh	Objects to calling of Bill
59		Speaker Bradley	
59		Madigan	
60		Speaker Bradley	
60		Speaker Redmond	Proceeds with Bill
60		Speaker Bradley	
61		Totten)	
62		Speaker Bradley)	
62		Walsh	
62		Speaker Bradley	
62		Madigan	Point of order
62		Walsh	
62		Speaker Bradley	
62,63		Totten)	Move to reconsider vote-
)	rule suspended
)	
63		Speaker Bradley)	
63		Matijevich	Point of order
63		Speaker Bradley	
63		Stuffle	Point of order
63	1:50	Speaker Bradley	
63		Stuffle	Move to table Totten's motion
63		Speaker Bradley	
63		Ryan	
63		Speaker Bradley	Motion to table prevails
64		Kempiners	
65		Speaker Bradley	



11.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	65		Tipsword	
	65		Speaker Bradley	
	65		Bluthardt	Oppose
	65		Speaker Bradley	
	65		Van Duyn	Moves previous question
	65		Speaker Bradley	
	66		Redmond	To close
	66		Speaker Bradley	
	66	1:55	Collins	Explains vote
	67		Speaker Bradley	
	67		Gaines	Explains vote
	67		Speaker Bradley	
	67		Wolf	Explains vote
	68		Speaker Bradley	
	68		Byers	
	68		Speaker Bradley	
	68		Telcser	Parliamentary Inquiry
	68		Speaker Bradley	HB 26
	68		Redmond	Asks rule be reconsidered to return to 2nd Reading
	68		Speaker Bradley	
	69		Clerk Hall	Amendment #9
	69		Speaker Bradley	
	69		Telcser)	Amendment must be distributed
	69		Speaker Bradley)	
	69		Telcser	Sec 13 - Rule 39
	70		Speaker Bradley	



Matijevich Point of order

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	71		Speaker Bradley)	Telcser not timely
	71		Telcser)	
	71		Speaker Bradley	
	71		Walsh	
	71	2:06	Speaker Bradley	Amendment #9 adopted-3rd Reading
	71		Telcser	
	71		Speaker Bradley	
	71		Redmond	Out of record
	71		Speaker Bradley	Recess 1st Special Session- call of chair
				2nd Special Session to order
	72		Matijevec	
	72		Redmond	
	72		Ryan	
	72		Speaker Redmond in the Chair	
	72		Clerk O'Brien	HR 519-Hanahan's
	73		Speaker Redmond	
	73		Matijevec	
	73		Speaker Redmond	
	73		Hanahan	
	74		Speaker Redmond	2nd Special Session
	74		Clerk O'Brien	SB 6 - 3rd Reading
	74		Speaker Redmond	
	74		Ryan	
	75		Speaker Redmond	
	75	2:17	Madigan	
	76		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
13.			
76		Speaker Redmond	
76		Bowman	
76		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries .
76		Yourell	Verification of Affirmative
76		Speaker Redmond	
76	2:19	Darrow	Moves to reconsider vote
76		Speaker Redmond	
76		Geo-Karis)	
)	
77		Speaker Redmond)	
77		Yourell	Inquiry-withdraws verification
77		Speaker Redmond	
77		Darrow	Moves to reconsider vote
77		Speaker Redmond	
77		Simms	Moves motion lie on table
77	2:21	Speaker Redmond	
77		Hanahan	Explains votes
78		Speaker Redmond	
78		Schuneman	Withdraws motion to move prev ques.
78		Speaker Redmond	Simm's motion carries Motion prevails
78		Ryan	To close
79		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
79		Bradley)	Explains vote
80	2:20	Speaker Redmond	
80		Giorgi	Votes 'no'
81		Speaker Redmond	
81		Kent	



14.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Houlihan	Point of clarification
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Waddell	Introduction
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Matijevich	Introduction
	81		Speaker Redmond	
	81		Campbell	
	82		Speaker Redmond	
	82		Mulcahey	
	82		Speaker Redmond	
	82		Geo-Karis	
	83		Speaker Redmond	
	83		Mautino	
	84		Speaker Redmond	
	84		Yourell	Verification
	84		Speaker Redmond	
	84	2:40	Mudd	Explains vote
	84		Speaker Redmond	
	84		Barnes, E. M.	Explains vote
	85		Speaker Redmond	
	85		Tuerk	Explains vote
	86		Speaker Redmond	
	86		Lechowicz	Explains vote
	87		Speaker Redmond	
	87		Ebbesen	
	87		Speaker Redmond	



15.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
87		Wikoff	
87		Speaker Redmond	
87		Hanahan	
87		Yourell	Withdraws verification
87,88		Speaker Redmond	SB 6 passed
89		Friedrich	HB 5
89		Speaker Redmond	HB 5 passed
89		Clerk Hall	HB 6 -3rd Reading
89		Speaker Redmond	
89		Friedrich	
89		Speaker Redmond	Passed
89		Clerk Hall	HB 13 - motion
88		Speaker Redmond	
89,90		Ewing	
90		Speaker Giorgi	
90,91,92	2:55	Yourell	
92		Speaker Giorgi	
92		Laurino	Suggests 'no' vote
92		Speaker Giorgi	
92		Flinn	To close
93		Speaker Giorgi	
93		Conti	Explains vote
93		Speaker Giorgi	
93		Ewing	Explains vote
93		Speaker Giorgi	
93		Ryan	Recorded 'aye'



16.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
93		Speaker Giorgi	Put on Postponed Consideration
93		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction & 1st Reading
95		Speaker Giorgi	Recess Special Session-call of chair. Back in Regular Session
95		Daniels	Leave to hear motions on HB 2425 & 2485
95		Speaker Giorgi)	
95		Madigan)	
95		Speaker Giorgi	Leave granted
95		Clerk O'Brien	Reads motion
95		Speaker Giorgi	
96	3:10	Daniels	
96		Speaker Giorgi	
96		Madigan	Oppose
96		Speaker Giorgi	
96		Katz	
97		Speaker Giorgi	
97		Daniels	Out of record
97		Speaker Giorgi	
98		Chapman	HB 2506 - motion
98		Speaker Giorgi	
98		Chapman	Explains vote
98		Speaker Giorgi	Motion fails
99		Madigan	Announcement (SB 6)
99		Speaker Giorgi	
99		Skinner	Point of personal privilege
99		Speaker Giorgi	



17.			
<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
99		McMaster	
99		Speaker Giorgi	
99		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
100		Speaker Giorgi	
100		Lechowicz	
100		Speaker Giorgi	
100		Skinner	Object to Resolution
101	3:22	Speaker Giorgi	
101		Waddell	Suggest Skinner Resolution
101		Lechowicz	
101		Speaker Giorgi	
101		Skinner	Still opposed
101		Speaker Giorgi	
101		Walsh	Point of order
101		Speaker Giorgi	Take HR 517 Out of record
101		Lechowicz	
101		Speaker Giorgi	
101		Catania	Recorded 'no'
101		Speaker Giorgi	
101		Bowman	Votes 'present'
102		Speaker Giorgi	
102		Clerk O'Brien	General Resolution
102		Speaker Giorgi	Committee on Assignment
102		Clerk O'Brien	Death Resolution
102		Speaker Giorgi	
102		Lechowicz	
102		Speaker Giorgi	Resolution adopted



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>18.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
102		Clerk Hall	Introduction & 1st Reading
102		Speaker Giorgi	
102		Madigan	Adjournment Motion
102		Speaker Giorgi	
102	3:26	Bluthardt)	
103		Speaker Giorgi)	
103		Laurino)	Announcement
103		Bluthardt)	
103		Speaker Giorgi	SB 1st Reading
103		Clerk O'Brien	
103		Speaker Giorgi	Recess Regular Session-Call of chair
104		Speaker Giorgi	1st Special Session
104		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction & 1st Reading
104		Speaker Giorgi	Messages from Senate
104		Clerk O'Brien	
104		Speaker Giorgi	Adjourn 1st Special Session
104		Speaker Giorgi	2nd Special Session convened
104	3:37	Speaker Giorgi	Regular Session in order
104		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction & 1st Reading
104		Speaker Giorgi	Regular Session adjourned
104		Speaker Giorgi	2nd Special Session at ease
104	4:01	Clerk O'Brien	2nd Special Session in order
104		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
105		Speaker Giorgi	Senate Bills First Reading
105		Clerk O'Brien	
105		Speaker Giorgi	2nd Special Session adjourned

