

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and the Members please be in their seats. We'll 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. In the Book of Psalms it is written: 'O praise the Lord, for it is a good thing to sing praises unto our God; yea, a joyful and pleasant thing it is to be thankful'. Let us pray. This is a Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Fruits of the Earth and all the other blessings of His merciful Providence. From 'The Book of Common Prayer'. Most Gracious God, by whose knowledge the depths are broken up, and the clouds drop down the dew; we yield Thee unfeigned thanks and praise for the return of seed-time and harvest, for the increase of the ground and the gathering in of the fruits thereof, and for all the other blessings of Thy merciful providence bestowed upon this nation and people. And, we beseech Thee, give us a just sense of these great mercies; such as may appear in our lives by an humble, holy, and obedient walking before Thee all our days; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be all glory and honour, world without end. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is in the chamber. Roll Call for attendance. Representative Geo-Karis is in the chamber. Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 12."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #12, 'Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend Section 1 of Article X of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article X, Section 1. Goal-Free Schools. A fundamental goal of the people of the state is the educational development of all persons to the limits of their capabilities. The state shall provide for an efficient system of high quality public educational institutions and services. Education



in public schools through the secondary level shall be free. There may be such other free education as the General Assembly provides by law. The state has the primary responsibility for financing the system of public education. The General Assembly shall establish by law a formula for the equitable distribution among school districts of adequate state aid to provide high quality education through the secondary level, taking into consideration the student enrollment or attendance, the compliance of the districts with state established standards, and the availability and utilization of funds from the local tax sources and federal revenue sources. For each fiscal year the General Assembly shall appropriate, and the Governor shall approve, such amount as may be required to fully fund the distribution of state aid under the formula. Schedule. The Amendment of Section 1 of Article X of the Constitution proposed by this Resolution shall take effect July 1 next after its adoption by the electors of this state and shall apply to the appropriations of state funds for the fiscal year beginning on that date'. Third Reading of the Resolution. Out of the record."

Clerk Hall: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #15, 'Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend Section 2, Article X of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article X, Education-Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected by the electors of the state and shall hold office for four years beginning on the second Monday of January after his election. To be eligible to hold the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction a person must be a United States citizen, at least 25 years old and a resident of this state for the three years preceding his election. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be the chief education officer of the state having general supervisory responsibility in relation to public elementary and secondary schools, and shall, except as limited by law, establish



goals, determine policies, provide for planning and evaluating education programs, recommend financing, and have other duties and powers as provided by law. Transition Schedule. If this Amendment is approved by the electors of the general election in 1978, a Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected at the general election in 1980 for a term of two years and shall take office on the second Monday of January after his election at which time the State Board of Education shall cease to exist. Thereafter a Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected in 1982 and every fourth year thereafter for a term of four years'. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Held on Third Reading.

House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 24, 'Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state, at the general election next occurring at least six month after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 9 of Article VII of the Constitution to read as follows: Salaries and Fees. (a) Compensation of officers and employees and the office expenses of units of local government shall not be paid from fees collected. Fees may be collected as provided by law and by ordinance and shall be deposited upon receipt with the treasurer of the unit. Fees shall not be based upon funds disbursed or collected, nor upon the levy or extension of taxes. However, when a county officer collects or extends taxes for other units of local government, the county may charge the other units of local government its actual cost thereof which cost shall be apportioned among the several units involved proportionately on the basis of the amounts of taxes collected for the respective units. (b) An increase or decrease in the salary of an elected officer of any unit of local government shall not take effect during the term for which that officer is elected. Schedule. This Amendment shall take effect on the first day of January in the year following its adoption. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Held on Third Reading. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 33, 'Resolved by the House of



Representatives of the State of...of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 12, Article VI of of the Constitution to read as follows: Election and Tenure. (a) Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Judges shall be nominated at primary elections or by petition. Judges shall be elected at general or judicial elections as the General Assembly shall provide by law. A person eligible for the office of Judge may cause his name to appear on the ballot as a candidate for Judge at the primary and at the general or judicial elections by submitting petitions. The General Assembly shall prescribe by law the requirements for petitions. (b) The office of a Judge shall be vacant upon his death, resignation, retirement, or removal. Whenever an additional Appellate or Circuit Judge is authorized by law, the office shall be filled in the manner provided for filling a vacancy in that office. (c) A vacancy occurring in the office of Supreme, Appellate or Circuit Judge shall be filled as the General Assembly may provide by law. In the absence of a law, vacancies may be filled by appointment by the Supreme Court. A person appointed to fill a vacancy 60 or more days prior to the next primary election to nominate Judges shall serve until the vacancy is filled for a term at the next general or judicial election. A person appointed to fill a vacancy less than 60 days prior to the next primary election to nominate Judges shall serve until the vacancy is filled at the second general or judicial election following that appointment. Schedule. This Amendment, Section 12, Article VI, of the Constitution takes effect on January 1 following its approval by the electors of this state. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Held on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The Order of business is Speaker's Table. And on the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 80. Representative Yourell? Out of the record. House Resolution 150, Representative Kucharski and Skinner. Out of the record. 154, Representative



Taylor. Out of the record. 158, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. 213, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. 457, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Resolution 561... out of the record. House Joint Resolution 26, Stearney. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 60, Dawson. Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution 60 is asking the Governor and Department heads of the State of Illinois that any contracts for construction that we have, if they would consider buying the products being manufactured in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Dawson: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "What does the Resolution say about the State Purchasing Act and the requirements that there be competitive bidding and that the bidder who comes in with the lowest price and the best quality should be the one to receive the contract?"

Dawson: "You're always asking that they take this into consideration if it is possible to purchase it here from the state. It's not demanding anything, it's just asking if it's possible."

Schlickman: "Well, is there anything in the Resolution acknowledging the statutory requirement that there be competitive bidding and that price and quality be considered?"

Dawson: "One second. Mr. Speaker, could the Clerk please read those Resolution...? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 60, 'Whereas, a healthy, vigorous business climate in Illinois is in...is in the best interest of all citizens of our state; and, whereas, a strong and viable economy is a boon to employment and general economic...economic well-being, thus enhancing the overall standard of living in Illinois citizens...of Illinois citizens; and, whereas, Illinois manufacturers and producers are...contorted...are contorted with severe economic crisis,



compounded by high local taxes compared to many other states, rising costs due to environmental factors and unfair foreign competition; and, whereas, when economic conditions mitigate against industry, it means loss of jobs, flight of industry from our state and general economic decline; and, whereas, it would be advantageous to the Illinois economic base and to industry beset with tremendous financial problems in Illinois, if state government bought, for use in public works projects, products and materials, particularly steel, that are manufactured in Illinois; therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that we urge state agencies to consider, at every possible opportunity, purchasing steel and other building materials used for Illinois public works projects from Illinois manufacturers; and be it further resolved, that copies of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to the Governor, the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Capital Development Board and to the other state elected officials, as a formal expression of our firm belief that purchase of Illinois building materials whenever possible by state agencies would help our state's economic base and would help protect jobs and the general economic well-being of our state's citizens'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, if there isn't any further questions..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I reluctantly arise to oppose the adoption of H.J.R. 60. I do that, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, because it is in opposition to the State Purchasing Contract Act, which provides that all purchases shall be made through the process of competitive bidding. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the process of competitive bidding is designed to avoid favoritism and it is designed to secure for the taxpayers of this state products and materials to provide them with service at the lowest cost and the highest quality. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Resolution is contradictory



to state law; and by its adoption, we would be encouraging state agencies to temper the existing law, perhaps even to violate the existing law. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if we want to go this route, let's not be hypocrits, let's change the law and eliminate competitive bidding. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I urge a 'no' vote in the adoption of H.J.R. 60."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Resolution. I think what our country is facing today is a situation where we have competitive bidding in government to assure honesty; and, therefore, have the very poorest quality going into governmental products. Look at our roads. Our roads are falling apart in the State of Illinois; and yet we make no real attempt to do anything about it. We are not pursuing quality, we're pursuing the cheapest price for the cheapest product. And that leads me into the reasons that I really stood on the floor today to support this motion. I believe this entire House should rise indignantly to support the Secretary of State of this state, who is presently being blackmailed by a firm outside the State of Illinois concerning our license plates. All of us in this House and in this Senate have worked diligently over the past several months to create a new multi-year license plate in Illinois to better serve the people at a better economical rate. And yet because of the situation we are facing today, a certain corporation in Arkansas, whose president has been convicted of felonies is now blackmailing the State of Illinois, saying, 'Either you buy your plates from us or we're going to raise the price'. Now, I really think what this Resolution is pointed at is getting more business in the State of Illinois and that should be our business in this House of Representatives. And I think we should rise up behind the Secretary of State. We should urge him to find a producer for these license plates in the State of Illinois and all other services that are provided to the state with state funds; and we should close our doors to these illegal operations operating outside



of the state with crooks at the head of the business blackmailing our government. I think it's about time that we looked to our own, and our own is within the boundaries of the State of Illinois. And forget about cheap prices for cheap products."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I thought I knew what we were voting on before the prior Representative spoke. I didn't know this had anything to do with multi-year license plates..."

Speaker Redmond: "Or the R.T.A."

Skinner: "...or the R.T.A. I thought it had to do with whether we wanted to use taxpayers' money to subsidize the United States Steel Company and perhaps the Inland Steel Company and other steel companies with plants in the State of Illinois because they re... adamantly refused to modernize their plants. I don't think that we as a legislative and deliberative Body have within our skill and knowledge to be...to determine whether or not the Japanese are dumping steel on the United States market, whether or not the English or the British...or the English or the Italians or the Germans are doing the same. And that seems to be the thrust of this Resolution. I would...I'm a little...I'm not surprised that the Sponsorship should come from a district that is...which has many steel workers; but I would remind the Body that Representative Yourell and this House successfully fought a battle to keep the United States Steel Company from ripping the State of Illinois off by grabbing lake bottom property at \$100 an acre. This seems to me to be somewhat parallel to that. We're asking the taxpayers of the State of Illinois to make a sacrifice and pay more than market price in order to save a company that probably doesn't deserve saving. Either they should modernize or they should go out of business."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in opposition to this Resolution for the reasons that have been very eloquently stated by the...previous opponents. Also, just one more into the hopper, even if the State of Illinois were to purchase all of the steel products from Illinois



companies, let me tell you that would not make a dent in their steel sales. The United States Steel Corporation and the other major corporations in the country do not rise or fall on our purchases; and I can't see how passing this Resolution would in the slightest, and I mean that literally, in the slightest would benefit the private interest that it's supposed to serve. And I think the public interest requires us to vote against this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a tempest in a teapot really and a...what is an innocuous Resolution as we had said before. If you'll look at the wording of the Resolution, it says, 'may consider'. That doesn't mean that they shall buy anything but; and as a result of this, I understand that the Gentleman probably wants to make points back home. And he says, 'We ought to consider the manufactured products of Illinois. And I see nothing wrong with this. It has nothing to do with the violation of the Fair Practices and Purchase Act, nothing at all. This is an innocuous one; and I think it should be supported.'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have had much critical periods in work shortage, we've had Zenith go out of business leaving 5,000 employees out, we're having a lot of imported steel. I think, as the prior speaker said, we should support the Resolution. If nothing else, it's an indicator that we should try to support our local out...input and output, instead of depending on supplies from overseas. What are we going to do when we have more massive unemployment because of the high cost of steel here? We can't help it, but perhaps something should be done to support our local suppliers. Otherwise, we're not going to have many jobs left. And I certainly urge support of this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put?"

Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, Representative Dawson to close."



Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a few of my other colleagues have stated, this is just asking the state to look into this. I think it is much better for the state to look into this than rather be paying all these people on the public aid and unemployment rolls that we...we have companies in our state that are able to do this job. And if there's any way possible, we should take and give them the work, instead of chasing them out of here. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 60. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'...Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 16 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails. And the Resolution's adopted. 56, Representative Dawson, do you want to go to that one? Do you want to go with that one?"

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, that was the one sent over from the Senate, which is exactly the same. Can we take the same Roll Call on that, if it's possible?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave for the same Roll Call on Senate Joint Resolution...hearing no objection, leave is granted, the same Roll Call. Senate Joint Resolution 57, Representative Matijevich. Representative Katz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Katz: "Just to be recorded 'no' on those joint Roll Calls, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Joint Resolution 57 would create a Joint Committee on Financial Management Systems. It is a bipartisan, 8-Member Committee of the Senate and the House; and it would study the feasibility of costs of establishing a legislative financial management system. And it would report its findings to the General Assembly no later than April 1st, 1978. The Leadership in both the Senate and the House and the Chairman of the Appropriations and the Revenue Committees in both Houses has been looking at a computerized financial management systems, and everybody agreed, both the Republicans and Democrats, that the best way to go is to create a Committee to study the feasibility of such a system. I move for the adoption of Senate Joint



Resolution 57."

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

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Resolution. I discussed this with Senator Buzbee some time ago, and thought that we were going to do this through the Data Processing Commission that we now have set up; and I think that's where this ought to be studied and looked at. And would recommend that we defeat the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as far as this Resolution is concerned, this is already being done. And it's in the same Commission that is supplying you with your daily update under the Chairmanship of Senator Regner. And the fact of the matter is, at the last meeting, they are even going to the extent of now considering the purchase of their data machinery to get this done. So this is far lagging in that respect; and I would suggest that... defeat because it is just going to clutter it up."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell. Anything further? Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was not aware of any opposition. I've attended, I think, most of the briefings that the...that the company is interested in providing such a system; and I'm sure there are other such companies. But I think I attended all of them, and I was not aware of any opposition. I think it would do us well that the Legislature go into such a computerized fiscal management system. I'm not sure, but I think the Minority Leader might be a little afraid that the General Assembly might take away some of the powers of the Governor as far as fiscal management. And I think that's good. Now, you can defeat this Resolution. I thought it had bipartisan support; but I know why George Ryan is afraid of it. He's afraid that the General Assembly is going to have a good system of fiscal management, a better system than the Governor's got. Go ahead and defeat it; but that's the reason."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the



adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 57. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It requires 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this...leave it open...have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 'aye' and 52 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. Senate Bills, Third Reading. On Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1261. Representative Walsh...Leinenweber, I guess. 1261."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1261, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Controlled Substance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1261 is a strip-down Bill. It merely corrects a spelling error for the drug, ethchlorvynol. Now, as I pointed out yesterday, some smart lawyer in Cook County freed a doctor of 42 counts of selling a...a controlled substance by virtue of the fact that there was a spelling error. And we don't want our kids getting this ethchlorvynol. So I would move the adoption of Senate Bill 1261 so that some smart lawyer in Arlington Heights won't have another opportunity to win a case."

Speaker Redmond: "Smart lawyer from Beverly Hills, Representative Meyer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Meyer: "Is this in the myaglyacin family?"

Leinenweber: "Myaglyacin is a derivative of the poppy straw. This is a separate chemical."

Meyer: "This must be a good Resolution. We should all support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion?"

Leinenweber: "This is not a Resolution, it's a Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "This is a Senate Bill on Third Reading. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye', no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. The Order...House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 2506. Representative Gene Chapman. Representative



Jaffe, pardon me."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2506, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2506 is the work product of the Human Resources Committee; and this is a Bill that passed out of Human Resources Committee as a Committee Bill by a vote of 14 to 2. Let me tell you that this comes March 1st of 1977 we are going to have chaos in the institutions...in our mental institutions in this particular state. All the experts have told us that the ratio of doctors to physicians should be in the area of about 25 patients to one doctor or to 30 patients to one doctor. In Illinois at the present time, the patient ratio is on the average of 34 or 38 to 1. Comes March 1st, as you know, what's going to happen is all the limited licensed physicians are going to be fired in the State of Illinois. I would refer you to the Governor's second progress report of September...Governor's Task Force second progress report of September 1, 1977, wherein, as a conclusion they say that they anticipate and they do have severe shortages of positions projected at 6 to 8 of the mental facilities in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion?"

Jaffe: "No, I'm not done yet..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me."

Jaffe: "...Mr. Speaker, I want to explain the Bill. What House Bill 2506 does essentially is the following. It says that as of March 1st... well, first of all, it deletes provisions terminating license... limited licenses on March 1st of 1978. Secondly, it provides, and I wish that the Members would pay attention to this, that there will be no new limited license physicians issued after March 1st of '78. What it does do is it authorizes current holders of limited licenses to renew those licenses if they apply to the Limited License Review Board, which is created by this Bill, prior to March 1st, 1978, and the Board approves that application. And, basically, what the Board



has to do, and they make a recommendation based upon three things, a thorough review of the applicant's employment record, a successful completion of a clinical or oral examination conducted by the Board or certification by the Board, and three, certification that the applicant is completing training and improvement of language and communication skills and further obtaining medical education. I might say that this Bill has been endorsed by a wide range of groups. It's been endorsed by the Service Employee's Union, it's been endorsed by the Polish National Alliance, it's been endorsed by Operation Push, it's been endorsed by the Polish American Congress, I could go on and on and on and on. Plus suffice it to say, and I would be happy to answer any and all questions that we have, that the thing that we have to understand is that we're dealing with a crisis situation. And come March 1st, if we lay off 120 doctors, when our ratio at the present time is 34 or 38 to 1, I think our mental institutions will just about collapse. And I don't think that we should wait until that day in order to do something. Let me say to you that we did previously, and I supported the Governor's program previously, passed Bills extending the time to March 1st of this year; and also the Governor came in and asked at that time for physician's assistants, if you'll recall. I must tell you that as of this date, there is not one physician's assistant in government service. Their program has just not worked, and has not operated; and I must say that the physician-patient ratio is higher than it was a year ago. So I really implore every Member of this Body to take a close look at House Bill 2506 and for us to take a step forward to solve this problem by casting an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2506."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Skinner: "You have the Governor's commitment that he will sign the Bill?"

Jaffe: "Cal, I wished that I did have the Governor's, you know...I don't know of anybody who's ever stood on this floor and said that they have



had the Governor say that he would sign any particular Bill. No, I do not have that."

Skinner: "Do you..."

Jaffe: "But I don't have anything saying he won't either."

Skinner: "...Well, I think you have the testimony of the Department of Public Aid or the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Registration and Education in Committee that they are against the Bill."

Jaffe: "Well, let...let me say this to you...well, let me say this to you, Cal, I've been on the floor in many, many situations wherein you've had something where the Department head comes up and makes one statement and then the Governor signs the Bill. That's happened to me in many, you know, under every Governor that we've had. That's happened under this Governor, happened under Walker, and it happened under Ogilvie."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might address the issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "There are two points I would like to make today. The first is that while the Sponsor may be able to go on and on and on and on in quoting those organizations which support this Bill, there are two organizations which do not support the Bill, both of which are significant. The first of which is the group that represents the mental health patients and their relatives. The second of which is the Illinois Medical Society. That's the first point. The second point is that this is the wrong month to pass this Bill. There is going to be a licensing exam next month, and if this Bill passes, what we're...you didn't turn Matijevich's volume down. There's no reason to turn mine down...if this Bill passes this month, there are any number of doctors who are going to stop studying, limited licensed doctors who can pass the exam if they try. And I think this Bill is an absolute disservice to those people who are very near the margin, very near to passing the test. Some might not even take the test because they're going to say...they'll conclude the General Assembly is going to bail them out. Now, if you want to vote for this Bill, vote for it in January, vote for it in February. Don't



vote for it in November. You can even vote for it in December, after the test. And I would ask the Sponsor to withdraw the Bill from consideration for that reason until the test is completed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support House Bill 2506. Primarily because of my familiarity of what is going on in the...in the Galesburg Mental Health Hospital. Currently we have seven limited licensed physicians; four of them have licenses in other states. What will happen if this Bill does not pass is that the State of Illinois will have given them all of the experience and training and they will go to other states to work in a mental health hospital. You know, we look at the alternative and say...the Department has said that there are other doctors that can do the job. They can do it on a volunteer basis and in emergency situations, et cetera, et cetera. Let me tell you what happened in Galesburg. When it seemed apparent that those seven limited licensed physicians would not be able to practice, they sent a letter to every medical doctor in the City of Galesburg. They didn't get turned down, they never even got a response. No one even took the time to say, 'You've got to be kidding'. These men are currently employed at about \$18,000 a year. We're paying a maximum of \$33,000. We are saying that we are going to replace them with fully licensed physicians. Let me tell you what's happening in our district in that regard. We have three cities today, three towns in our district, that have said, 'We will guarantee \$60,000 a year for any medical doctor to come to those towns to practice. Furthermore, we'll even provide the clinic. Now, I ask you are they going to take \$60,000 from a community? Or are they going to start practicing for the state of a maximum of \$33,000? I think the answer is obvious, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are not going to be able to replace these doctors. They are competent doctors in their own right. In fact, if you'll check the record, you will see that they have quarterly examinations for the medical clin...the medical groups to which they are affiliated, the local doctors come for periodic reviews for at least four times a year. They look over



every prescription and every diagnosis. I submit to you that they are well schooled; and, in fact, often times better than some of the other doctors. I think this is a very badly needed Bill. I think the time is now. I think it's time for us to act and to get this situation cleared up. We've got good doctors, we can't replace them, and we need this Bill badly. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition of this legislation. I agree with Representative Skinner in his analysis of why this legislation is not needed. But I think even more serious, I don't think this Legislature is doing a service to those unlicensed physicians that are practicing in the state hospitals in the State of Illinois. They're not going to be able to pass that test. They haven't been able to pass it for the past 10 years. And I don't think we can be in a posture in this Legislature by establishing two levels of health care for the citizens of the State of Illinois. Those in mental institutions, you can have second class physicians, second class health care; but at the same time in the private sector of this state you must be fully licensed. I think we're doing a disservice to the people in the state by allowing such a system to continue. I think we're doing a disservice to the health care of the citizens of the State of Illinois by allowing the continuation of this type of situation in our state institutions. I think Representative McGrew did make a good point regarding the cost situation involved; but I don't think you can put a dollar value on health care delivery cost for a competent physician. I don't think there's one Member of the House or the Senate, if they had their choice, would go to an unlicensed physician for medical care. And, basically, as Representative Skinner says, that an examination is to be held next month. We don't allow other licensed professional people to practice their professions in the State of Illinois. We don't allow nonlicensed or non-admitted attorneys to the bar to practice in the Attorney General's Office or in the State's Attorney's Office handling a regular type caseload. At the same time, especially in the area of



medical practice, we're perpetrating an unjust situation to the citizens of this state. We're doing an unfair thing to those unlicensed physicians by allowing them to believe that they are going to be able to continue practicing medicine without a license. I don't want a second class doctor in a state facility. I think the people in the mental institutions in the State of Illinois are entitled to excellent and the most professional health care delivery system that an individual would have in the private sector of our state. And for these reasons this legislation should be overwhelmingly defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that every Legislator in this Assembly should, if he hasn't visited his mental hospital or the state institution in his district, if he has not visited them, then he probably doesn't realize the need for this. If he has visited them, then I think he should be up on the floor asking that this important Bill be passed. This is a very important Bill. You know, it's not been too long ago we passed the assistant to a physician. Here we are now debating whether a foreign doctor who has passed a test in a foreign country, is now in this country, or someone who has passed a test in another state but has not passed the one in Illinois, and maybe cannot. And the head doctor of civil institutions where I have been has made this statement after being out from the practice and study I couldn't pass the state exam either at this time. So what we're asking here is let's take care of the thousands of patients that are in our mental institutions and give them the kind of care that will take them through until we can get all licensed doctors in the institutions. I ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 2506."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I arise to join with the Sponsor of this Bill in a bipartisan effort to solicit your support. What we're talking about, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, are a handful of people in this state who a number of years ago at the state's initiation...at the state's request by the state's



employment dedicated their lives to providing indispensable medical service in our state mental health institutions. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that service has been indispensable. And it's been service that has been competent to the best of my knowledge. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it would be cruel and unconscionable to tell these people after they have committed many years of their life in providing an indispensable competent service to the mentally ill of this state that we...they should no...could no longer be employed. And where will they go? And what will they do? Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think there is a reasonable solution to the problem that lies in House Bill 2507. There would be created within the Department of Registration and Education a Review Board. These unlicensed doctors...and that does not suggest they're incompetent...these doctors would be required to apply to this Board for a renewal of their opportunity to continue providing needed service. There would be testing that would be given. And I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are talking about doctors who were trained in other countries, who have a different heritage, who have a different cultural background. And I don't think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's a Member in this Body that can deny that many of these tests are culturally oriented. And it's different for one...difficult for one culture to take an exam designed for another culture. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we do have a problem. There is a reasonable solution to the problem that lies in House Bill 2506; and not to pass this Bill would be cruel and unconscionable. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This undoubtedly is one of the worst Bills in the whole Session. It comes down to a case of, 'Are we going to stand by our guns and do that which we said five years ago we were going to do?' That we would have fully licensed physicians in state mental health facilities. Okay, there are 127 or 128 that have been relying upon the fact that faced



with any kind of an ultimatum, that the House and the Senate and the Governor would cave in, that they would fall back. It's just like, you know, when you draw the line in the dust and say, 'You step over that line, I'm going to knock your block off'. And the guy steps over, so you fall back, and you draw another line, and you say, 'Step over that line and I'll knock your block off'. Well this is exactly what has been happening in this state because for the five years I've been down here we've been wrestling with this problem. But I think the crux of it was probably said very well by three limited licensed physicians that practice in a facility in my own district. We're in a special situation, and the issue came up as to whether or not they were studying, preparing for the exams that they must pass. And the consensus, and it was rather crassly and brutally stated, was, 'Hell, no, we're not going to study for exams because we know damn well you need us, and we are not even planning on taking the exam because as soon as it gets close you will change the law'. It seems to me, Ladies and Gentlemen, the time has come to make good on our word to say that mental health and d.d. patients are not second class citizens, that people who would practice medicine in the general population have one standard, and people who practice medicine in mental health have another standard. No longer should we allow the patients, just because they have the misfortune to be in a mental health facility to have to settle for second class care. It's just not fair, it is not worthwhile for the state to ignore the problem again, sweep it under the rug, and in essence do just like what many families have done in...in institutionalizing their loved ones that have a mental health problem, brush it under the rug, ignore it, hope it will go away. I strongly solicit a 'no' vote on this bad, bad Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

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

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



Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would just like to make a couple of comments. I think the issue has been fairly well debated. But let me say to those who say...who are for one standard, you know, I think the Human Resources Committee is for one standard. I'm for one standard; but how in the world are you going to have one standard when you're ratio in the state of Illinois is 34 or 38 to 1 at the present time when it should be 25 to 30 to 1; and then you say come March we're going to...we're going to fire 30 to 40 percent of your physicians. That percentage is going to go way, way, way up. You're going to have not only a second class standard, if that's what you want to call it, you're going to have a fifth class standard. And I really think that that's sort of a specious argument. The entire package...and we have another Bill coming up right after this ...deals with another portion of the problem. You know, I think that if you want one standard, this is one way that you're going to be able to get it. Let's face it, after March 1st of '78 no one else will be able to apply for limited licensed physician's licenses anymore. That's...yes, they will be over; and in a short period of time, in a period of 5 to 10 years, I think all those physicians will really be out of the service anyway. But what you're going to have is you're going to have a transition period in which maybe we're going to be able to recruit fully licensed physicians. So those who say that we have two standards I think are really begging the issue, and they're not correct at all. And let me ask you, all those who are opposed to this particular Bill, what alternative do you have? You don't have any alternative. I have not heard one alternative yet. I've read the Governor's Task Force statement, and I must say to you when...the last task force statement, and I want to reiterate this again, is that they admit that they have severe shortages projected at 6 to 8 of the mental institutions in this particular state. As indicated by Representative Schlickman, I think it would just be inhumane not to pass this particular Bill. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2506."

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



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

I would urge my colleagues to give this Bill an affirmative vote. I stand...or sit on the Human Resources Committee, sat through the testimony and weighed the evidence in this matter; and I couldn't agree more with Representative Jaffe that what we're talking about is guaranteeing a level of care in our mental hospitals. I don't understand why there's this...why there's this constant reference to second class care, when during all of our hearings, during all of our investigations there was not one...and not one single allegation of incompetence on the part of the...of the physicians involved. And taking a look at what the Department's plans are, we find that they have had minimal or no success in recruiting fully licensed physicians in the state mental hospitals. In a year in which they say they devoted an extraordinary effort to recruiting we have a net gain...gain of something like 5 fully licensed physicians, 3 of those happened to have been limited licensed physicians who passed the exam. If we don't pass this legislation, what you're talking about is replacing these physicians with part-time community physicians; and you heard Representative McGrew tell you about what the response was in his part of the state. You're also talking about maybe replacing these people with physician's assistants, and is that progress? I'm all for physician extenders, but physician's assistants only have 20 months of training past their grad...their undergraduate degree. That is not progress. I would further like you to think about the human element of this. Many of these people have...have given 20, 25 years of their lives to the State of Illinois, have gotten ratings annually that say 'superior, excellent, good service' to the individual hospital. And yet 25 years later we are now deciding that we no...that they have become politically expedient and we no longer need their services."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted..."

Holewinski: "This is an important measure, and I would urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last spring when



we passed the Bill to extend the limited licensed physician system for one more year, I was one of those who demanded from the administration the promise that it would be only one more year. Well, we can all make mistakes, and we can all learn. And today I am voting green. I urge you to join me in doing so. These men and women have been educated in foreign countries. They cannot pass the exam here where many of them could go to another state and pass the exam there because we require a 75 score and other states require only a 70. We need these people to work in our hospitals, and they need to be able to serve people in the profession which they chose. They will be digging ditches next March, our mental patients will be without care; and I urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I think the issue has been very well stated. We need these limited licensed physicians, the ones who are already there, to operate our mental health institutions. We happen to have a very good cadre of doctors in the City of Galesburg. They are also very busy. There is no way that they can take over the job that these limited licensed physicians would be doing at our state mental health institution in Galesburg. I strongly urge a 'yes' vote, more green lights upon this board. We need it. Please vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 35 'no'; and Representative Ryan has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Jaffe desires a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Catania, John Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Hudson, Emil Jones, Kucharski, Mann, McAuliffe, McAvoy, Nardulli, Peters, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Van Duyne, Wall, Winchester and Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Record...Representative Mann, will you...record him as 'aye'."

Mann: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."



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

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Winchester as 'no'. Proceed...

Representative Dunn, John Dunn, 'no'...proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Antonovych, E. M. Barnes, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bluthardt, Boucek, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Conti, Daniels, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hoffman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Hoxsey, Huff, Huskey, Jacobs, Jaffe, Kane, Katz, Keats, Kelly, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mahar, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Matula, McBroom, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Mulcahey, Murphy, Neff, O'Brien, Walsh, R. V., Pechous, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Pullen, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Walsh, W. D., Willer, Younge, Yourell; Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs...J. J. Wolf desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Catania desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Lee Daniels."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, after talking to the Department of Mental Health and going over this Bill a little bit further, I think it's best that it does not pass; and I would like to change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Daniels from 'aye' to 'no'.

Any questions...Representative Mulcahey."

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



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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'aye' to 'no', please."

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

Hoxsey: "The name is Hoxsey, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Change my vote to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Jane Barnes. Change the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'. Sorry you lost your job. Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Hudson: "Would you vote me 'no', please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative Mahar. Record Representative Mahar as 'no'. Representative Klosak."

Klosak: "'Aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Klosak from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I've got a meeting, could I have leave to be verified yet?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does Representative Robinson have leave to be verified? Hearing no objections...Representative Porter."

Porter: "Change my vote to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter desires to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to have...a count before we start the verification."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the count, Mr. Clerk? They're not all posted yet. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, could I change my vote from 'yes' to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Huskey from 'yes' to 'no'. 114 'aye'. Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

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



Speaker Redmond: "We'll take a three-minute recess until Representative Ryan completes his telephone message."

Ryan: "Representative Brandt?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Capparelli?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off the Roll Call. Capparelli off the Roll Call. Here he comes, put him back on."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, what did...what...what did we start with, do you remember?"

Speaker Redmond: "114, is that right, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "114 'ayes' we're starting with."

Speaker Redmond: "Capparelli is back on."

Ryan: "Representative Chapman?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's down in front."

Ryan: "Representative Dawson?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Domico?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Domico recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Doyle?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Redmond: "Farley is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Hanahan?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Harris?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's in his seat. Representative McBroom, for what purpose do you arise?"

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, change me from 'yes' to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Giglio has returned, put him back on the Roll Call."

Ryan: "Representative Katz?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote to 'present', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady from 'aye' to 'present', Macdonald.

Representative McCourt. Representative James McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change me to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. According to Hanahan's rules, the Members must be in their seats."

Ryan: "I would think the presiding officer would make sure that would happen, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, would you please sit down? Representative McBroom, would you please sit down? Representative Totten, would you please sit down?"

Ryan: "Are we ready to proceed here, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Representative Geo-Karis...Representative Van Duyne, please take your seat. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I just noticed that this Bill provides that no new limited licenses shall be issued after March 1, 1978. I'd like to change my vote to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady from 'aye' to 'present'...the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Ryan: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson has returned, put him back on the Roll Call."

Ryan: "It'll be a lot easier to have an oral verified Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Well..."

Ryan: "Representative Polk?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Representative Schisler?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Sharp?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Steczo?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Steczo recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Is he in the chamber? Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Taylor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Ryan: "Taylor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor? He's here...in the back there."

Ryan: "Representative Terzich?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Representative Waddell?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell is coming in the main track here."

Ryan: "Representative Yourell?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

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

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative
Deuster, for what purpose do you arise?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm recorded 'yes' and I'd like to
change that to 'no', please."

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

What is the count, Mr. Clerk? 103 'ayes' and 50 'nos'. Representative
Jaffe."



Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry before I do anything else. Could you tell me in all probability if we're going to be adjourning today, this Bill will first be going to the Senate, I believe, they will first hear it in January...can we pass this Bill out of the House with 89 votes at the present time? That would not be final action; and if the Senate actually voted after January 1st, we would be in a position of having passed the Bill out with the requisite number of votes, or do we have to have more than 89 at this particular time. We have to have extraordinary majority?"

Speaker Redmond: "You'd have to take it back from...take it back to Second, and take off the effective date, and then if we pass this with 89 it would go over to the Senate. My understanding is that they could pass it with a normal majority over there after the first of January. He sought recognition is the reason I didn't. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, would you put this on Postponed, and then we will probably offer an Amendment a little bit later on."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want it on Postponed, is that correct? Is that what you're..."

Jaffe: "Yes, well, that's what...Mr. Speaker, that's what I'm requesting. And inasmuch as you've indicated, that in order to get this Bill over to the Senate, we need 107. Is that correct, or..."

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

Matijevich: "Well, I just wonder why the Sponsor...under the rules, he automatically can move it to Second and take off that effective date...under the rules you have that right to do that. And he could pass it out with 89 votes and get it out of here."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct, and that's what I thought I said when you asked me for the parliamentary ruling."

Jaffe: "...right, and then I would ask leave to take it back to Second to remove the effective date."

Speaker Redmond: "Under the rules, the Gentleman has asked leave to return it to Second for the purpose of removing the effective date."



It will be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 amends House Bill 2506 by deleting the immediate effective date."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would move the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved...Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question. Isn't March 1st the magic date; and if you make this effective July 1st, this is an exercise in something, I'm not sure what..."

Jaffe: "You are correct, Representative Ryan. What's your point?"

Ryan: "My point is, why bother to do it?"

Jaffe: "Because I think if we could pass it on...if you want an answer, I'll be happy to give it to you."

Ryan: "I didn't hear you, Representative."

Jaffe: "If you want...if you want an answer, I'd be happy to give it to you. If we can pass it out today, we can get it to the Senate. They would get it in January. I think they could pass it out at that particular time. They might put an Amendment on and send it back here, and then we could pass it on with 89 votes. It's a parliamentary procedure, Mr. Minority Leader."

Ryan: "I see."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it...the motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. Would you read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk? Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Can we have leave to hear this on Third Reading now, Mr. Speaker, is that procedure?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll leave it on Third Reading for a while until the Amendment is printed and on the desks."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar under House Bills, Third Reading, appears 2507. Evidently..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2507, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Department of Mental Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, are you handling



this Bill, Sir?"

Jaffe: "Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the second portion of the package passed out by the Human Resources Committee. And for those that've talked about one standard of care, well, then I think they're going to have no problem actually voting for this particular Bill. Because basically what House Bill 2507 does is it provides new money for fully licensed physicians. What we have in the State of Illinois is we have a situation wherein we cannot get doctors into the service of mental institutions because of the fact that we are just not paying enough money. It's just that simple. We've held hearings time after time after time after time again, and it always...the bottom line is that there's just not enough money to pay doctors. So why should a doctor be in a mental health institution when he can be out in private practice earning 2, or 3 or 4 times as much as he's earning in the mental institution? So what we've done in 2507 is we have provided new money for doctors. First of all, we have provided something like \$288,000 for increases for doctors. That would represent an increase of approximately 20 percent for the doctors in the mental health institutions at the present time. In addition to that, we provide \$500,000...\$525,000 for 50 new doctors. As I indicated in the prior debate, we are very low on doctors. Our ratio is now between 1 to every 34 to 1 to 38 when it should be 1 to 25 and 1 in 30. So for those who want good care and they want fully licensed physicians, they should have problem with this portion of the Bill. I might say that in addition to all the other people that we've indicated supporting the other Bill, I think that also the group that represents retarded citizens also support this particular appropriation. This did pass out of the Human Resources Committee, and it passed out of the Appropriations Committee; and I would urge a favorable vote on this particular Bill."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to



House Bill 2507 for a couple of reasons. In the first instance, the Members ought to be aware that the cost of 2507 for this fiscal year will be \$1,000,000; and that would then lock us into a \$5,000,000 program starting the next fiscal year. This in itself given the situation whereby we have not yet really resolved the limited physician's problem I think is really not logical. There's no need to pass House Bill 2507 for two reasons. One, the budget constraints which this puts on the General Revenue Fund; and secondly, because we simply have not solved the problem of limited licensed physicians. Now, the Sponsor of this Bill is going to ...still attempt today to pass the Bill he just called to extend the life of the limited licensed physician who are currently limited licensed holders by means of a board of some sort. It seems to me that he still wishes to pass the previous Bill. That in itself is reason not to pass the 2507. So, Members of the House, I really urge you to vote 'no' on House Bill 2507 for both reasons; that is, the budget problem and secondly the fact that the limited licensed physician problem is not yet solved. And it will probably still be with us until next March at which time we could consider raising the possible salaries of regularly licensed physicians."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Hart: "Representative Jaffe, are your salary or money increases for people in your Bill, who are not fully licensed to practice medicine?"

Jaffe: "No, I think that Representative Telcser probably was not reading the right Bill. There is no money for limited licensed physicians in this Bill. These...this money is all for fully licensed physicians."

Hart: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, to close the debate."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think everybody understands this Bill. Perhaps with the exception of the Assistant Minority Leader. This Bill has nothing to do with limited licensed physicians, it just has to do with fully physicians. I must tell you that you can't have it



both ways. You know, you're going to have to improve services at the mental institutions, and you're going to have to just pay more money. It's just that simple. What we've had is we've had the revolving door type of situation where you get a fully licensed physician who will come in for a couple of months until he establishes a practice or something else to that effect, but he won't stay because we're not paying him at all. What this Bill does is it provides monies for 50 new doctors. It provides increases for the other fully licensed physicians. It has nothing to do with limited licensed physicians at all. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on it."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill did pass through the Appropriations II Committee, and what we're talking about here really is an appropriation for a three-month period, for three months. And in that three months beginning in March to June of this next year, we are talking about raising the salary of current fully licensed physicians. It has nothing to do with limited license. We're talking about raising the salaries of the current fully licensed physicians by some \$324,000, we are also talking in this Bill about hiring an additional 50 licensed physicians at \$589,000. We're talking about an expenditure here for the last three months of the fiscal year in mental health of \$900,000, which if you extend over the entire year for the next coming year is going to commit this General Assembly for somewhere near \$4.2 million of additional spending for the next year for just these physicians. Now, let me just suggest to you for your consideration that in terms of the salary increase for physicians...for physicians it comes to about a 20 percent salary increase. There is no evidence that that salary increase is enough or that is not enough. Is it reasonable to give a 20 percent increase or would it be more reasonable for 10, or 25, or 30 or 40 percent increase? Will higher salaries in fact attract more physicians to the mental health institutions? Or are we really talking about a whole load of other kind of services that



are needed in the institutions in terms of work conditions and assistants and medical aides and cooperative kind of situations to make the mental health situation and unit function as it should. Money is not totally the answer and the only answer. I suggest to you for your consideration again that before you cast your vote on this that you consider very seriously what we're doing here. We're raising the salaries of some positions and not others. We're raising them by 20 percent mark that is not indicated by any evidence from anywhere. This particular Bill is not fully endorsed by all people who are involved, some endorsed the concept, some endorse the money, some want the money, some don't want the concept. This is a situation which I would hope the Human Resources Committee and Representative Jaffe would much better address next year so that we can fully...fully address this question for the budget for the next fiscal year in terms of what we really need and not go about it in a manner here which is certainly laudible upon the part of Representative Jaffe and the Members of the Committee; but I don't think goes to really solving the problem. And I would suggest, again, that you consider a 'no' vote."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the previous speaker wanted to know where the evidence is that we need to increase these salaries. Look, the evidence is as plain as the nose on your face. We have a shortage of qualified doctors in mental institutions. Now, I voted 'no' on the last Bill sponsored by Senator...Representative Jaffe to put the...put some pressure on the limited licensed physicians to convert their license to full...full licensed status. And I think that we have to recognize the very...the very plain fact that the reason we have limited licensed physicians in the first place is because we can't get the requisite number of fully licensed physicians in our mental institutions. And why can't we get the...those people to work in the mental institutions? Because we don't pay them enough. The medical profession pays very well in private practice. It does not pay very well at all in...in



public practice. And I think if we want to provide the kind of quality medical care that the citizens of Illinois deserve, we have got to be willing to pay the price; and this, I think, actually only goes part way. I think if there's going to be any gap after this Bill passes it's going to be that we're still probably not going to be paying them enough. But we've got to start making up that gap right now. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "I'd be happy to close the board right now; but I would like to point out the Human Resources Committee did not hear all of the evidence on this issue. And the missing piece of evidence is how the Veteran's Administration and the other institutions run by the United States Government manage to get doctors, how much they pay, what side benefits they allow, what recruiting techniques they use that we don't use. That...they did not have limited licensed doctors I'm informed, Representative Madison. That type of questioning was impossible because no one from the Federal Government was invited to testify at the hearing in question. And I am voting 'present' because I think that it is absolutely essential we know this information. Maybe the Mental Health Department is just incompetent in this area, maybe they're recruited...well, it is incompetent in other areas...it certainly is incompetent in other areas. Now, maybe their recruiting techniques are just no good. The evidence is not in on this issue at the present time."

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

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm a little bit dismayed when I look at the board. I have to tell you that when we undertook this project, the Human Resources Committee, it was not a...a bipartisan...it was not a partisan issue at all. It was a bipartisan program that was passed out of the Human Resources Committee. And yet when I look at the board, when I look at the workings of the Majority...the Minority Leader, when I take a look at the Governor's people running around this floor like cockroaches,



I have to come to the conclusion...I have to come to the conclusion that the Governor has taken its stand...and acts against this particular program. Well, I have decided that's it's become more and more obvious to me, you know, that the Republican Party is talking out of both sides of its mouth...that the...there's one side...that the Governor really doesn't care about people, he doesn't care about, you know, the human resources that we have in this particular state. All he cares about is getting reelected and playing his raquetball. I'd like to say about the Governor, you know, everybody talks about him becoming President. I don't think he wants to become President, I think he wants to become emperor...I think he wants to become the Emperor Ming in the Flash Gordon series. But let me say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen in this House, I think... could I have a little order, Mr. Speaker?..."

Speaker Bradley: "Could we give the Gentleman some order, please?"

Jaffe: "...I think the callousness that's shown by the Republican Party indicates their feeling when it comes to people. You just don't have any feeling for people, you don't have any heart. All you're interested in is the Commerce Commission; and I think that the people are going to understand that. And when it comes to November of this particular year, I think you're going to find that there's going to be a change because the people will understand that this Governor does not have a heart and that the Republican Party doesn't have a heart. And that they are uninterested in mental health, or public aid or anything else but their own selfish business interests."

Speaker Bradley: "The...the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm new in the House, and I don't recognize the things that the previous speaker said as being particularly humorous. What we're interested in on this side of the aisle, and what Governor Thompson is interested in, is the people of Illinois and their welfare. If Representative Jaffe, through these two ridiculous Bills, intends not to protect the welfare of the people of Illinois through the particular things we're concerned with, then that's his own decision. But I think the people of Illinois are going



to recognize particularly with respect to him that that's not the kind of thing we count.... in Illinois, and that the Governor and the people on this side of the aisle are interested in protecting everybody."

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

For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, arise?"

Kempiners: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, that's your business..."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I thought that's what Mr....I recognized Mr.

Johnson for and then he was, I think, on a point of personal privilege.

So explain your vote, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "...I would just like to say that, you know, this...these

Bills comes from the Human Resources Committee of the House; and I think that there ought to be some people voting green...take a look at the source of these Bills and reconsider. I mean, after all this is the best vote that Committee has ever gotten in this House; and I think that we ought to think about that."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 90 'ayes' and 68 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to bring this back to Second Reading for an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "You have that right, Sir. We'll return the Bill to Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Jaffe, amends House Bill 2507 on page 2 by deleting line 3."

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

Jaffe: "I would move its adoption, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1...#2. Discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, on a point of order."

Skinner: "I don't see the Amendment on my desk, I see an Amendment to 2506. I think we're on 2507, is that correct?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Amendment does not have to be on your desks, according to the rules, until Third Reading. And we assure that, as we did in the last Bill, it will be on your desks before the Bill



is taken up for the...again at Third Reading."

Skinner: "I apologize for asking you to follow the rules."



Speaker Bradley: "Did we adopt the Amendment? The Amendment is adopted... pardon me, wait a minute, we'd better back up here. All in favor of the Gentleman's...or Amendment #2 to House Bill 2507 signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "No further Amendments? Third Reading. On the Calendar ...on the Calendar...on the Calendar appears House Bill 2517."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2517, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 5, an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis...or Mr. Mann, are you handling this Bill, Sir?"

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to my distinguished colleague, Representative Davis. I would like to be recognized during the course of the debate."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis. Could he have some order, please?"

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to make the statement that this is not a political Bill. This is Thanksgiving Eve, and this is a Thanksgiving Bill. Coming back from the Budget...the Bureau of the Budget was a statement that \$60,000,000 would be lapsed from A.F.D.C., aid to dependent children; and since we are all familiar with what happens to lapsed money, we did not put this Bill in to embarrass anybody, the Governor or anybody else. We put it in because we've had the experience of what has happened to lapsed money in this House. The poor, the lame, and the blind and the halt didn't receive it...the benefits of it. It went some other place. Now, I come to you on this Thanksgiving Eve to simply ask you to give to the aged, the blind and the disabled \$900,000 of that money, to give to those who are on general assistance, walking the streets looking for jobs, \$900,000; to give to these... to dependent children \$18.6, which will make a total of \$20,430,000... \$20,430,000 of that money. That will be a 5 percent increase. Now, let me say that is has been four years since there's been an increase.



The Public Aid Code requires the Department periodically update standards of needs. The last Department review...in '75, was reported to the Legislative Advisory Committee; and at that time, no increase. It's been almost four years since there's been any increase to these poor. I'm not blaming it on you fellows on your side of the aisle; but you know what happened when they put the flat grant on. You know exactly what happened when they put it on. You know what happened to the special needs, I don't have to stand here and tell you. The 103 Psalm, that great Psalm of David, 'Cried out, who satisfies your mouth with good things so that your very soul is renewed?' This is what's going to happen to you tomorrow when you sit around your tables with the turkey and all of the trimmings. I'm pleading with you now in the name of Him who said, 'I was hungry and you fed Me, I was naked and you put clothes on Me, I was thirsty and you gave Me to drink, I was even in prison and you visited Me; when so we eat, hungry and naked, inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, ye have done it also unto Me'. It's not a Republican Bill and not a Democratic Bill; but it's a Bill for the aged, the blind, the lame and the poor. And I call upon you in the spirit of Thanksgiving to pass this measly 5 percent increase. It'll mean another loaf of bread for someone. It'll mean another pair of shoes for some little child. This is going to be a very severe winter, and it is harden not your hearts for the poor and give us a vote here today. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I plead with you, I plead with you, his excellency the Governor said and I said, 'Thank God for him', when he said that... That he would exercise his moral obligation and leadership on any question where the lives of thousands upon thousands of people are in jeopardy. And I tell you that their lives are in jeopardy, the lives of their children are in jeopardy. And I don't believe he was making an empty statement. And I call upon you, because the money has been lapsed, to give it to the poor, the hungry, and the blind and the needy. In the spirit of Thanksgiving I plead with you to give me a vote on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Davis, have you concluded? The Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Mann, then."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, may I have a little order, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir. Give the Gentleman some attention, please?"

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget has said that \$60,000,000 in the A.D.C. line item will lapse. Tomorrow as we sit down to our sumptuous Thanksgiving dinners, and I really wish, Gentlemen, that you'd give me your attention because Thanksgiving is the time in which we all thank the Lord for what he has given us. But there are hundreds of thousands of blind, aged, disabled, hundreds of thousands of children who in a family of four have to live on \$316 a month in housing with exposed wiring, in housing that has not had any heat. They pay \$210, \$215, \$220 a month for rent, that leaves less than \$100 for food and clothing. They end up in hospitals in which we pay astronomical costs. They end up committing crimes because they don't have the clothes to put on their children's back. Tomorrow, Ladies and Gentlemen, many of us will spend more money on our Thanksgiving luncheon than a family of four gets in two weeks...in two weeks, mind you. Now, is Thanksgiving a sham? Is it a commercial holiday or is it a religious time in which we consider all that has been good to us and all that has not been good to the hundreds of thousands of poor in this state. I ask you to walk your districts tomorrow morning and see people living off the walls, getting heat from their gas stoves, children having to suffer because they eat wallpaper that's peeling due to the fact that their ceilings are cracking. I can take you to a building on 49th and Blackstone where people live like a hunk of meat in a cooler. They haven't had any heat since last April. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is \$60,000,000 available. We haven't had a cost-of-living increase in close to four years. Inflation has gone up over 25 percent for food. What are these people going to live on and with? And we tell them, 'Pull yourself up by your bootstraps'. We have an obligation to do what is right by the poor of this state; and pretending not to listen to what I'm not saying...to what I'm saying is not going to change that obligation. Face up to your consciences,



Gentlemen and Ladies, and vote for this paltry 5 percent increase."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Anderson: "Now, Representative Davis, what is the A.F.D.C. level in the State of Illinois for a father, mother and two children?"

Davis, C.: "\$317..."

Anderson: "Do you know what it is in Indiana, Representative Davis?"

Davis, C.: "...No, I don't have the..."

Anderson: "Well, we checked that out and it's \$275. Do you know what it is in Kentucky?"

Davis, C.: "No, I don't live in Kentucky, I live in Illinois."

Anderson: "\$235. Do you know what it is in Mississippi?"

Davis, C.: "Listen..."

Anderson: "...\$54."

Davis, C.: "...He asked me did I know..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, on a point of order."

Davis, C.: "...you asked..."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Davis...Mr Houlihan on a point of order, Sir."

Houlihan, J.: "...Mr. Speaker, I think the Gentleman's questions are not towards the Bill. We're not the Legislature in any other state, and I think he's out of order. And I think his questions are improper."

Speaker Bradley: "I think the point is well taken. If the Gentleman wants to make those particular points in the debate, fine; but the questioning was out of order. The Gentleman...Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr....yeah, Mr. Speaker, I disagree. How are we to vote on things, you know, we did that with unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation. We got way out in front of all the states surrounding us and we're suffering for it now; and I think..."

Speaker Bradley: "The...Gentleman from Rock Island...the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, you have ruled. The Gentleman is completely out of order. You have so ruled, he knows the remedy of it. I wished we'd



get on with the debate and vote this Bill up or down."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think Representative Anderson has the right to question and to debate this issue...the same courtesy should be extended to him that was extended to Mr. Davis. And I think both of the Gentlemen have valid points of view and so I, for one, would like to listen without Mr. Anderson being constantly interrupted by the other side of the aisle by their inconsiderate actions. Let's hear the debate."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair is going to recognize Mr. Anderson for the purpose of his debating the question. Mr. Anderson, do you wish to proceed now with the debate?"

Anderson: "Yes, I...Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if Representative Davis knows how many families are non-natives to Illinois. Now, by non-natives, I mean, where both the husband and the wife have come from another state in the last 10 years."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The law is well established. This point that is being raised is not material to the issue, and I...I don't know why this Gentleman keeps bringing up irrelevant matters. I ask that he..."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point is well taken. I so ruled if you wish to discuss the issue...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman is completely out of order. He knows that the Supreme Court of this land has ruled that an individual is not a resident of a state, but rather a resident of the United States. And as such you enjoy the freedom of moving about this state to enjoy better benefits wherever they can find them. That's the Supreme Court ruling. He knows it, and he's just baiting the Sponsor of this Bill to say something that he wants him to say. He's entirely out of order. You have ruled, Mr. Speaker, he's out of order. And if he has any problem with that, his next course is to appeal the ruling of the Chair. And I suggest he do that."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, I wish you would re...put your remarks in the context that's appropriate to the debate of the House..."

Anderson: "Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to. You know..."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, the other side persists in interrupting people just because they don't like what they're saying. Now, if...if it's out of order for a Gentleman to stand on this floor and make a mistake, the other side of the aisle would never be heard."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Anderson, you wish to proceed, Sir?"

Anderson: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if Representative Davis knew that in the last 10 years 39,021 families came up from Mississippi and now reside in the State of Illinois and are on A.F.D.C.? I would also like to point out that Illinois has the second best medicaid program in the United States, second only to California. Theirs is better than ours. Illinois is also one of 18 states that there's no unemployed father's program; in other words...well, that's not...excuse me...I would just like to make the point that we couldn't give our own state employees a 5 percent raise, and now we're trying to give the people on public aid a 5 percent raise. And I think this is wrong."

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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wasn't going to stand up today. I was sitting here listening to this debate, and it just finally reached a point, I said, 'I can't take any more of this garbage, I've got to get up and say something'. All those who at this time say, 'I'm for the poor', that's the biggest bunch of hypocrisy and crass garbage I've heard in ages. If you were really for the poor, you'd quit slitting their throats every time they try to get something done. You sit there and you vote for minimum wage so the poor, black teenager can't get a job. He can't get his first job to learn his skills. Then you refuse to vote for...for proficiency tests in the schools, that same poor, black teenager can't learn to read, can't learn to write."



Nobody is going to hire that guy for minimum wage because he's worthless, because of the schools you've refused to have put under proficiency testing scores. Then you vote to throw the businesses out of the State of Illinois so that poor guy can't get a job even if they're willing to pay a minimum wage for a fella' who's illiterate. The businesses aren't here anymore because you're chasing them, not that they're just leaving, but they can't cut it anymore. They go out of business. Then...then at the same time you support organized labor with their exclusive pact where a young, black teenager or a young Chicano can't get into the union because he can't get in through their apprentice program. And then you come right back and you'll remember that famous work rule called, 'Last hired, first fired'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Keats, Mr. Keats...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, on a point of order. Mr. Madison on a..."

Madison: "Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind my esteemed colleague that the majority of the people on welfare are white. Thank you."

Keats: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "...Mr. Keats, proceed."

Keats: "...Mr. Speaker, all of those who are poor have problems whether they're black, or white or Chicano; and we're dealing with the same problem for every one of them. But I think you're overlooking the point. Who has kept so often people out of work whether he was black, or Chicano or white? It was your unions who said, 'Last hired, first fired'; and they laid off all these workers that you were claiming you wanted to help. And then after you've hurt them in these ways, the poor guy finally owns a home, and you decide it's trash. And your housing bureaucracy comes in and tears down all their houses, and throws them into a worse house somewhere. The house they lived in may have been bad, but it was the best they had. You then threw them out for a bunch of bureaucrats, by bringing in your poverty bureaucracy who make their livelihood out of poor people. The more poor people, the better off they are. And your poverty bureaucracy goes on and makes it worse; and what do you do



to make your poverty bureaucracy responsive? Nothing! We tried to put in a welfare reform proposal that will help hold families together; but, no, we've got to come up with more programs that throw the father out of the house. All I say is when you're crying for the poor welfare recipients, let's cut out this trash and tell it like it is. There's a lot of Bills that came up that you hung poor people with, whether they were black, or white or Chicano. And you say, 'Where's this money come from?' The point is one person's welfare check is another person's tax burden. Every unmet need in the state that's brought up, many of them may exist; but the greatest unmet need in America today is for the average taxpayer to get and keep more of his or her own honestly earned income. I thank you for your attention."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm not going to dignify that man on the other side of the aisle with an answer to the statements that he has just made because I have consistently put in Bills to try to eliminate that type of situation. The Governor of this state just vetoed a Bill that was geared for this type of help in order to educate and give those type of individuals a chance to earn their fair way, and you have a...so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, on a point of order. State your point, Sir."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I, frankly, believe that any Member of the House really has a right to say whatever he wants to say in debate; but since the Chair has already ruled that the debate must be limited to the very narrow confines of the Bill, I would suggest that Representative Taylor, in all due respect to his wise and good comments, was out of order. And if we're going to maintain one rule for Representative Anderson in fairness and in affirmative action, we ought to maintain it for all."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think the Chair was quite that specific in that narrow determination as you might suggest. It seems to me we've been pretty....pretty liberal here this morning. The Gentleman



from...or the Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite. We've got a number of people who want to speak, we'll..."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, simply..."

Speaker Bradley: "...the Gentleman from...pardon me, Mrs. Satterthwaite..."

Mr. Taylor, I thought you had concluded."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I did...I was not talking to the other side, I was just trying to move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "Did you move the previous question, Sir?"

Taylor: "I did so."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it and the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, to close the debate, Sir."

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the distinguished Gentleman on the other side asked me a question. Certainly I wanted to answer it. I don't mean to be discourteous to anybody in this House. I wanted to tell him when he asked about Mississippi, that Mississippi at one time, if you'll look at the record, appropriated \$2 a year to educate black children. This is the reason you have that condition. Now, let me talk about the founder of your party. Since I was a Member of it for many years, you see that man there? That's Abraham Lincoln. That's the founder of your party. Do you know why he was so popular? Do you know why he was assassinated? Well, let me tell you about his philosophy. He said, 'God loved the common people because he made so many of them'. He was their friend. That's why he was assassinated. Don't you see, the founder of your party. Let me tell you something else...let me tell you something else..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr...Mr. Davis...Mr. Davis, just a minute. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, again, on a point of order. I'm certainly very interested to hear whatever the Reverend Deacon has to say at any time; but I...but I..."

Speaker Bradley: "What's that...."

Peters: "...but I believe Representative Anderson was ruled out of order



when he brought up the question, Mr. Speaker, so it doesn't deserve an answer. I'm just talking about fair as being fair, I think."

Speaker Bradley: "I think he was trying to answer those questions. He couldn't answer..."

Peters: "But you ruled the question out of order."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's obvious after what happened to Representative Jaffe's Bill and the debate on this Bill that the Republican Party needs the lecture, it needs to go back to its founding fathers. I think Representative Davis has got a good point, and I think we all ought to take the benefit of that lecture. You Republicans, you know, I heard...I heard Governor Thompson...I heard Governor Thompson say that he's going to be more liberal, that you're going to be more middle-of-the-road. Now, listen to what he has to say."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich...Mr. Matijevich, he re...I think he concluded, he concluded. Mr. Davis, would you try to confine your remarks to the..."

Davis, C.: "All right, I'll try to confine my remarks."

Speaker Bradley: "...everybody would be happy."

Davis, C.: "I was...I was just going to ask him about...I think I know as much about the founder of his party, if not more, because I believe in his philosophy, you see, I believe in his philosophy. Now, let me say to the distinguished Gentleman, why didn't you ask me about Wisconsin? Why didn't you ask me about the northern states who wrap their arms around the founder of your party, Abraham Lincoln? Why did you have to go back to the deep south? Well, thank God, there's a change in the south now. Do you hear me? I just came back from Nash...from Tennessee, where the Black Caucus met. And at least five...four black men stood up, represented in the State Legislature in Mississippi. Black men...do you know they have black sheriffs down there now? Do you know that they're almost ready for black governors? And in New Orleans the other day they just elected a black man. Why don't you get into the 20th century



over there? Why don't you make...why don't you make an effort... all right, you say you believe in the two-party system; but I don't believe you do. I don't think...because you're ignoring the poor. Every... the poor can't give you any campaign contributions. The poor have no...down here."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...Mr. Davis, I have to recognize the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, on a point of order. Would you state your point, Sir?"

Simms: "Well, on a point of order, the distinguished Assistant Minority Leader is not addressing himself to 2517...if he would...if he is so...if he is so impressed with Abraham Lincoln, I suggest he become a Republican because the Gentleman's picture that was above his side of the aisle was for slavery and for continuing it. So I would suggest that he confine his remarks to the Bill and not to the progress or the lack of progress in the southern states."

Speaker Bradley: "The...I think, the point is well taken. This is a very serious matter that Mr. Davis is very conscientious about; and Mr. Davis, if you would address yourself to the contents of the Bill and conclude your remarks, we'll try to get a...Roll..."

Davis, C.: "I will...I will..."

Speaker Bradley: "...it's a very matter: and..."

Davis, C.: "...in all seriousness...in all seriousness, I go back to my original statement, this is a Thanksgiving Bill. This will mean an extra loaf of bread to some poor person. This will mean a pair of shoes to some child. This will mean some clothes to fit that some child will have to wear to go to school. This will mean that some poor people, perhaps, will be able to enjoy a Thanksgiving dinner like all of us are going to enjoy. I ask you, in the name of decency, to give me a vote for this Bill. To say with David of old, to say with King David of old, 'The Lord satisfy my mouth with good things'. And this is what he's going to do to you tomorrow. Will you show forth your thankfulness, will you show forth your kindness by what you do here today for all of the goodness and all of the loving kindness the Lord has bestowed upon you, I ask you to give me a vote for this Bill."



Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote. And it might be a good idea if we'd limit it to about one minute, according to the rules that's the...so one minute."

Barnes, E. "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in all seriousness, in addressing myself very briefly to some of the comments that was made in debate. I would like to point out to the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle that was so concerned about raising salaries for state employees that in the Appropriations II Committee, where most of these Bills were heard, consistently... consistently on every proposal for raises for state employees, the Minority Party to a man opposed those Bills. Apparently, they're taking...they're taking a page from the old Renaissance where, I believe, there was a queen in France when the multitudes were asking for bread, she suggested that they eat cake. The problem is they can't afford cake either. That's the problem here. Relative to the Gentleman's statement concerning all of the various programs for minorities, I would suggest to that Gentleman that every Republican Governor in the last two decades has vetoed Bills that would help and increase opportunities for minorities to get into the mainstream of our society. Relative to the many other comments that have been made here, I think what has been indicated here today and in recent weeks consistently that the Minority Party is, has been, will be in the future always the party to oppress the poor, the down-trodden, the people who does not have the wherewithal to get here, to have their lobbyists hear them. Those people will not be served by the Minority Party, and consistently by the vote on this Bill and all social Bills coming down the pike. I think that would be reaffirmed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote for one minute."

Willer: "Yes, Mr....Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would be happy to cast my 'yes' vote for this even if we had not restored House Bill 333. I find it unconscionable for any of us who say we are pro-life to be



voting against this Bill. We set into action...put the wheels in motion, so to speak, to cut off medicaid funds for abortions for poor women. I believe it was Representative Gaines, and if I'm wrong, I'm sorry, who said that night, 'You're so anxious to get them born, but after they're born, you don't care about them', words to that effect. I think the vote shows on the part of the those who call themselves pro-life he was absolutely correct. And I'm really sad to see so many 'no' votes that were 'yes' that night to cut off medicaid funds for poor women for abortions. You really don't care about them, do you?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote for one minute; and there is an immediate effective date on this Bill. It will take 107 votes."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now that Mrs. Willer has given half of my speech, I won't need a minute. But I'm getting up to say that the reason that the poor stay poor is that you don't give them any boots to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. The reason that the poor have no hope is that they see billions voted for roads, but none voted for food. And as Representative Willer so ably put, 'You vote to say they have to have the child, then you won't give them a cost of living increase so they can feed that child'. And in answer to my colleague on this side of the aisle about Mississippi, if you will compare the Mississippi Legislators' salary to our salary, you'd find the same difference between that as you'd find between their public aid requirements. And I want to say that the party of Lincoln, and the party of Teddy Roosevelt, the Party of La Guardia, the party of Norris...of Nebraska and Bob Taft, who said that 'Where the... '--I'm talking about Bob Taft, Sr.--'Where the private sector shows that they have no interest in acting, the public sector has the responsibility to act'. The private sector has not hired the poor, so, therefore, it's all upon the public sector to protect the poor and to nurture them and train them so they can work. So without this increase, you are sentencing these people to degradation and poverty that leads to crime and corruption. And you have to spend more money on



prisons. Like the man says in the...unintelligible...'Pay now or pay me later'. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote for one minute."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, no one on the other side of the aisle has said one word why a child of five or below should live on 38 cents a day. What are the statistics of people that have returned to the south? I'll tell you they're fantastic; and as far as our having the second best medicaid program in America, that is a joke. It is the most fraud ridden medicaid program in America, a joke. And one more thing, the \$2,000,000,000 we appropriate does not go to recipients. Over a billion go to medicaid, and another \$304,000 go to a bureaucracy that's breaking its own standard of needs, that poor people be treated with dignity, and live in health and decency. Come on, loosen up, loosen up."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote for one minute."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think that we ought to be aware of several things; and that is, if this were a deficiency for the doctors, for the medicaid who are getting the lion's share of the Bill, we couldn't hold the Bill in this House. The votes on the other side of the aisle would flow like water; but what are you talking about? You're talking about approximately a \$2,000,000,000 program where less than \$600,000,000 go directly in grants. When you talk about the \$1.1 billion that goes to the doctors, every one of you would be here voting. And if we had to stay until tomorrow, you'd call a Special Session to see that the doctors and that the medicaid programs were taken care of. And when you're talking about the bureaucracy, Mann talks about it, one half of the money that the recipients receive goes to the bureaucracy in this welfare system. Gentlemen, it's been said to you once and it's been said twice, perhaps you have allowed these people to be born, now that they're here, those of you who were so tender, who were so feeling, and who were so caring, and yet you say you cannot hear their cries or whimpers.



But I guess you have an answer for that because after all now we do have Class X. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote for one minute."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to prolong this, I just...add a kind of a philosophical thought as I looked at that board, and I noticed all the Republican votes there, they were voting red. And as I see that my mind kind of reflects back to the old historical adage about the sun never setting on the British Empire, the reason being the good Lord didn't trust...quite trust it. And I think that that may be apropos here. I would just like to say one thing to those of you who are voting 'no'. Put yourselves in the shoes of a welfare recipient, and I think that Biblical phrase that says, 'To whom much is given, much is expected'. I think you have some appreciation for that. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

Davis, C.: "Since...would you call the absentees..."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, you want us to poll the absentees, Sir? Would the Clerk poll the absentees? The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Von Boeckman: "Change my vote from 'present' to 'yes'."

Speaker Bradley: "'Present' to what, Sir? 'Present' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "First a point of parliamentary inquiry. Does this take 107 votes?"

Speaker Bradley: "It takes 107 votes...for immed..."

Johnson: "Well, I would suggest that the Gentleman's motion is dilatory because even if all the absentees voted 'yes', we wouldn't have enough votes to pass..."

Speaker Bradley: "...always given the courtesy...of polling the absentees. So we will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt, Don Brummet, Deavers, Dyer, Ebbesen, Friedrich, Geo-Karis, Getty, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Lauer, Nardulli, Walsh, that's R. V. Walsh, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Stearney. That's all."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis...there are 82 'ayes'
...the Gentleman moves to Postponed Consideration. Does he have
leave? Hearing no objection, it will be placed on Postponed
Consideration. On the Calendar under Consideration Postponed is
...appears House Bill 2410. The Gentleman from...Postponed Considera-
tion."



Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Being the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 2410 on Consideration Postponed, I move to table that Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to table. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill will be tabled. On Third Reading appears House Bill 2506. Mr. Jaffe, do you wish to take these Bills separately or are they companion Bills?"

Jaffe: "Well, I would like to take...well, we could take it together if I'd have leave of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "If you'd rather, Sir..."

Jaffe: "Well, if I could have leave to..."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman have leave to hear these two Bills together? There are objections. 2506, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe. The Bill has been read a third time."

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a limited license physician Bill. It got over 100 votes beforehand. We were a little bit short on 107. We took off the effective date. I really don't want to tie up the House any long...with long debate. I would just urge an 'aye' vote. I think it's been debated fully; and I would just hope that we put at least 89 votes up there and go ahead with it at this time."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain your vote, Sir."

Skinner: "No, I'd like to get a message to my Leader on the other side of the aisle. I think enough people have left that he might pull off a verification here and defeat the Bill outright."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, requests a poll of the absentees. Mr. Adams, wishes to be...Mr. Adams wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Adams wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'...and Mrs. Catania wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Schlickman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."



Mrs. Willer wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Meyer, for what purpose do you arise? 'Aye', Mr. Meyer wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Deavers wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mr. Mudd, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. And Mr. Brandt wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Mugalian wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mugalian. Mr. Peters, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, would I be out of order if I suggested that we retake the vote we might solve the whole problem, or an Oral Roll Call or something?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think the posture of the House is in...pretty good shape right now; and..."

Peters: "All right."

Speaker Bradley: "...let's continue...all right, now, the Gentleman requested a poll of the absentees as soon as the Clerk is ready. Did you call a poll...did you poll the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Jane Barnes..."

Speaker Bradley: "Jane Barnes wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Jack Davis, Domico, Dyer, Ebbesen, Friedrich, Geo-Karis, Emil Jones, Kane, Lauer, McPike, Nardulli, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Stearney...that's all."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams..."

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

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if we could see what we're starting with.

We had 94 and we added Mr. Adams and Mrs. Willer, am I right? 95?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...We're starting with 100. We added Adams, Brandt, Catania, Meyer, Schlickman and Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, change me from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mr. Peters, change Houlihan...verified. Mr. Davis wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. All right, if everybody would be in their seat, we'd proceed."



Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Antonovych, E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bluthardt, Boucek, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Conti, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deuster, DiPrima, Doyle, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Katz, Keats, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Levin, Lucco..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Peters, can Mr. Lucco be verified at this time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...Luft, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Matula, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, Meyer, Molloy, Mulcahey, Murphy, Neff, O'Brien, Walsh, R. V., Pierce, Pouncey, Pullen, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Schlickman, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tuerk, Vitek, Von Boeckman..."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Madigan."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Walsh, W. D., Willer, Williams, Wolf, Younge, Yourell; Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Pechous. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Questions of the Affirmative Roll? Mr. Peters?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, we start with 101, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Bradley: "101, right."

Peters: "Thank you. Williams?"

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

Lechowicz: "I believe it should be 102. Pechous has changed."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think, as I recall, Mr. Campbell changed, is that correct?"

Clerk O'Brien: "One changed from 'aye' to 'nay', Mr. Campbell changed from 'aye' to 'nay'."

Lechowicz: "Oh, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "101. Questions of the Affirmative. The Gentleman from



Logan, Mr. Lauer."

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Lauer: "Vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record him as voting 'no'."

Peters: "Mr. Williams?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Williams?"

Peters: "Williams?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman is not in his seat, is he in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Von Boeckman? I see him."

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

Peters: "Mr. Tuerk?"

Speaker Bradley: "Tuerk? In his seat."

Peters: "Mr. Stuffle?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Stuffle? Is he in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Sharp?"

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Robinson?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Robinson is not in his seat, is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Rigney?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Rigney..."

Peters: "Oh, he's here, I'm sorry. Ms. Reed. I see her."



Speaker Bradley: "She is in her chair."

Peters: "Okay, I see her. Mr. Nardulli?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Nardulli is not in his chair, is he in the chamber?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Schneider: "I'm sorry to ask again, Mr. Speaker; but I have an urgent meeting downstairs, can I be verified?"

Peters: "Okay, okay."

Speaker Bradley: "Verified."

Peters: "Mr. Meyer?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Meyer is standing next to his chair."

Peters: "Mr. McGrew?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McGrew is in the aisle."

Peters: "Mr. Matijevich?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich? Is he in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Marovitz?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Marovitz is in his seat."

Peters: "Mr. Luft...Luft is here? Is he?"

Speaker Bradley: "Luft is here."

Peters: "Oh, okay. Mr. Huff?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huff, is in his seat."

Peters: "Mr. Harris?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Harris is in his seat."

Peters: "Mr. Hanahan?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Giglio?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giglio is not in his seat, is he in the chamber?"



How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Getty? I see him. I see him."

Speaker Bradley: "He is here."

Peters: "Mr. Garmisa...oh, okay, I see him. Mr. Dawson?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dawson is here. He's not in his seat, right down here in the front."

Peters: "Ms. Chapman?"

Speaker Bradley: "She's in her chair."

Peters: "Mr. McClain?"

Speaker Bradley: "McClain is not in his chair. Is he in the chambers?"

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Ms. Catania?"

Speaker Bradley: "Ms. Catania? She is in the chamber, in the rear."

Peters: "Mr. Byers?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Byers, he's not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Mr. Holewinski, for what purpose do you arise, Sir, at Schneider's desk?"

Holewinski: "Can I have leave to be verified now..."

Peters: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "You have leave, Sir."

Peters: "Mr. Brummer?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brummer is in his seat."

Peters: "Mr. Birchler? I see him. Mr. Yourell?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Yourell? He's right...here, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Up front, okay. Mr. Brady?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brady? He's not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "We'll have to take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Ms. Younge?"



Speaker Bradley: "She's in her seat."

Peters: "Mr. Steczo? I see him. Mr. Matejek? He's here, okay. Mr. Darrow?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, arise?"

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, how am I voted?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is Mr. Bowman recorded?"

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

Bowman: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Peters: "Mr. Keats?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Keats is not in his seat. Is he in the cham...in the rear of the chamber. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, arise?"

Conti: "I was just wondering if I could be changed from 'aye' to 'no'?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman be recorded as voting 'no'."

Peters: "Mr. Matula?"

Speaker Bradley: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Yeah, he's in the rear of the chamber."

Peters: "One second to confirm that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Further questions...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. Further questions, Mr. Peters? For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer..."

Meyer: "Change me from 'aye' to 'nay'."

Speaker Bradley: "...The...change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'nay'. Further questions, Mr. Peters? Mr. Peters, further questions?"

Peters: "...yes, just one more question, Mr. Speaker. Let me...Davis, Jack Davis?"

Speaker Bradley: "Jack Davis is not in his chair. Is he in the chamber? How is he...how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, for what purpose do you arise, Sir? Change your vote from 'aye'



to 'nay'. And the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Dunn, J.: "Change me from 'no' to 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Dunn as voting 'aye'. Mr. Peters, further..."

Peters: "No, I think that's enough now, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Bradley: "...Okay."

Peters: "I think it's 87, Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Bradley: "Return Mr. Giglio to the Roll. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, arise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Representative Keats just came in."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Keats?"

Lechowicz: "There he is. He was taken off the Roll. He still wants to be recorded as 'aye', Mr. Speaker. Keats, what are you doing, Keats?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Keats is still on the Roll, I believe."

Lechowicz: "Oh, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Lechowicz: "That's fine. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Rigney, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Rigney: "I don't know."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded as voting...voting 'no'. Mr. McPike, for what purpose do you arise, Sir? Mr. McPike wishes to be recorded...you were not recorded, I believe, Sir...and the...Mr. McPike wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Robinson...let's not...hold it now, just a minute...Mr. Robinson. Was Mr. Robinson verified off?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, he was taken off the Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Return Mr. Robinson to the Roll. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, arise?"

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I normally don't arise on an occasion like this, but, you know, there's more Governor's aides on the floor of this House than there are Representatives. And they must have 15 or 20 of them running around trying to get votes on this Bill; and I'd like to have all unauthorized people off the floor of the House. Not all of them are authorized...they have to check this with each



Representative..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr.....just a minute...Mr. Stuffle has returned to the chamber. Put him back on the Roll. Mr....Mr. Byers wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'? Record him as voting 'no'. Now, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Just to be put back where I belong, 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "You were taken off, Mr. Matijevich. And we'll return Mr. Matijevich to the Roll. Very seldom is he ever off the floor. Mr. Matijevich is returned to the Roll. Now, the Gentleman from... Mr. Matula."

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is Mr. Matula recorded?"

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

Matula: "Change it from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Now, Mr. Terzich, for what purpose..."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I did make a request. I would like to get all unauthorized personnel off the floor on this verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Would all unauthorized persons not entitled to the floor please retire from the floor and would the Doorkeepers see that all unauthorized personnel are removed from the floor. Are there any further changes now before we announce the...Mr. Abramson, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Abramson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Abramson: "Would you please record me 'no'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, do you want to change your vote?"

Peters: "No, just a point of inquiry of the Clerk. Did we remove Miss Pullen? Is she here? I'm sorry."

Speaker Bradley: "Miss Pullen is here."

Peters: "Well, did we take her off or not? No, okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "She wasn't removed. 91 'ayes', 61 'nos'."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 91 'ayes', 61 'nays'; this



Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "I'm...I move to reconsider the vote by which 2506 was adopted."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that that motion lie on the table.

On in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The motion is tabled. On the Calendar appears now...we'll go to 2507."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2507, this Bill has been read a third time previously."

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

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the appropriation Bill for fully licensed physicians. We had enough votes to pass it beforehand; and I really wished that we would get through it very quickly. I'm not going to go into any explanation of this particular Bill. I think we all understand it. I just wish that we would put the 89 votes on the board, pass it out, and let's get home for Thanksgiving."

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

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'...the Gentleman from Logan... the Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you. Would the Gentleman yield for a question? Representative Jaffe, does this appropriation contain any money for increases in the salaries of the limited licensed physicians?"

Jaffe: "Well, in explanation of open hostility..Sponsor of the question I've responded to it four time, 'No, it does not...it does not have any money for limited licensed physicians'. These are all fully licensed physicians. And to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I wanted to tell you that the Medical Society supports this portion of the Bill. So let's just turn a few green lights over there."

Lauer: "This is only then increases for fully licensed physicians?"

Jaffe: "Only for fully licensed physicians. Basically, what it does is increases the salary for fully licensed physicians that you have and it provides for additional fully licensed physicians."

Lauer: "Thank you."



Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished on this question? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "I responded to a question for Mr. Lauer. I did extend him that courtesy. I wished that they would extend me some courtesy occasionally. You know, let me...you know, let me say to you that you can't have it both ways. If you're against fully licensed physicians, you've got to do something to get fully licensed physicians into the institutions. And we heard hour after hour after hour of testimony on the floor of the House; and the Human Resources Committee, I'm sorry; but this Bill was also referred to the Human Resources Committee and it passed out at that particular time. We changed the Amendment...we changed the Bill by taking \$100,000 out of this particular Bill, as you recall, yesterday; but it still does provide an increase in salaries for the doctors that you have there at the present time, and these are fully licensed physicians. It seems to me, you know, sort of ludicrous to stand on the floor of the House and say that you're going to be for one standard of care if, in fact, you're not going to give the Department the money that it needs in order to bring about one standard of care. If you're going to have one standard of care, you've got to keep those doctors in there. And up until the present time you've not been able to keep any doctors in there. I might tell you that since the Governor has tried to solicit new doctors, I think the sum total of doctors that they've actually brought into the fold is somewhere around 6; and I think out of those I think 3 of those were limited licensed physicians who qualified under the old 'flex' exam. So they're just not coming into the mental health service; and I think that this is a very, very important Bill if you care anything about the people, you know, who need mental health treatment. If you care anything about people who are in institutions, I think that you just have to vote 'yes' on this particular Bill. And I would just like to see a couple more green lights up there; and then I think we can pass it out, and we can go home with easy mind."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Holewinski, to explain his vote."

Holewinski: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I couldn't agree more with Representative Jaffe. To those of you who are voting 'no' I think you ought to realize that you cannot have it both ways. We've had...if you want to come up with...to a solution of the problem, to the problem of the level of medical care by way of the number of personnel in our mental hospitals, then you've got to face up to the realization that we're going to have to spend some more money. During all the time we sat in hearings on this matter we heard over and over again that we cannot attract competent...or...or cannot attract experienced physicians to our institutions because the pay level is not there. Because they can make a lot more money and it's far more lucrative to enter into private practice or into some other endeavor. If we're serious about solving this problem, if we're serious about bringing in fully licensed physicians as the limited licenses are phased out, then I think you ought to take a second look at this and cast your vote in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson, Deuster, Domico, Dyer, Ebbesen, Ewell, Ewing, Friedrich..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Ewing, Friedrich, Gaines, Geo-Karis, Hanahan, Emil Jones, Nardulli, Polk, Schisler, Stearney, Totten and Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Turn it off...thank you...'no', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. On this question there are 87 'ayes' and 71 'nays'; this Bill having failed to receive the...having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared...Mr. Jaffe...the Gentleman requests it be put on Postponed Consideration. It will be placed on Postponed



Consideration. On the Calendar on Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1383. Mr. Ebbesen...Mr. Ebbesen in...I think Mr. Mautino will handle the Bill. Mr. Schuneman, are you handling the Bill?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk Hall: "1833, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Downstate County Working Cash Fund Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Schuneman: "...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm handling this Bill today because Representative Ebbesen is ill and unable to be here. Senate Bill 1383 would allow only one county in this state to make a correction because of an administrative oversight. This Bill would allow DeKalb County to levy a tax for a Working Cash Fund for the year 1977, which was omitted in DeKalb County because of an oversight in the County Clerk's Office. The DeKalb County...both the General Assembly and the DeKalb County Board had authorized the tax but the tax was never extended. I would move adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will ...the Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 155 'ayes', 1 'nay'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the Calendar appears 1387."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1387, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1387 was moved out of the Rules Committee, bypassed the Committee on Assignments, which went through Labor Committee and brought to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day yesterday. This legislation corrects the drafting errors in Senate Bill 1019, which the Governor signed last year. In certain places the term in manufacturing industry used for the formula to calculate workmen's



compensation. Payment was eliminated in other areas it remained. So this legislation is simply technical. It takes out those other references to...in manufacturing industries, rather than what it should be. It's now corrected to be in the state's average weekly wage...in covered industry. I would appreciate an affirmative vote to correct the legislation which was promised at the time the Governor signed the Bill last July."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 158 'ayes', no 'nays'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared... and received a Constitutional three-fifths majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1388."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1388, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Capital Development Board to grant a sewer and easement in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Fayette, Mr. Brummet."

Brummet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill has been okayed by the Capital Development Board. And what is happening now, we're running behind time. And it's for a \$309,000 E.P.A. grant to the City of Maryville; and I'd appreciate a 'yes' answer...yes..."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 156 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the Calendar on Concurrences appears House Bill 2467. Mr. Taylor. Mr. Taylor, the Gentleman from Cook."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this is a Court of Claims Award Bill. It passed out of this House a few weeks ago. However, a Senate Amendment was put on there for \$459,86...886, which had been awarded by the Court of Claims in...in that particular Amendment. The Amendment deals with the 'J. C. Summerson Company'; and there has been some



litigation filed in the last 8 or 9 years on it. And they have approval by the Attorney General and the courts, and it's now been awarded by the Court of Claims. I solicit your support for Senate ...House Bill 2467. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur with..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2467. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This is final passage. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 153 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2467. House Bill 2469. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2469 was a supplemental appropriation for 1977 for the Liquor Control Commission. It was for \$4,022; and the Senate Amendment just added the requirement that it must be spent for the 1977 expenses. This was to cover transportation costs and laboratory fees...paid...incurred during 1977. I urge concurrence with..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2469. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 153 'ayes', 1 'nay'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2469. House Bill 2471. The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment that was added in the Senate on 2471 just line items the appropriation and rounds out the figure adding \$34. I would move to concur in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2471. All in favor of the Lady's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Final action, 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 147 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2471. House Bill 2472. The Gentleman



from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Senate Amendment simply line items the appropriation for the federal grant and makes no other changes. I move for concurrence in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2472. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 145 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'; and this then...the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2472...with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. House Bill 2473. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2473 reduces the data processing item by an amount of \$29,600; and I move the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2473."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2473. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'."

Telcser: "It's the R.T.A. Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2473 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. House Bill 2474, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2474 is a supplemental appropriation to the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Senate Amendment broke the amount of money from the Old-age Survivors Insurance Fund for services to disabled individuals into claims for '70 ...for fiscal year '77 and claims for fiscal year '78, and appropriated money for all total outstanding claims rather than just those which had been vouchered right now. So that it is a total increase



of \$117,924 to cover those outstanding claims; and they are identified by which fiscal year they fall under. And I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2474. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 27...2474 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. House Bill 2476. The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to move that we concur with Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2476, which is the...for the energy conservation supplemental appropriation to the business and economic development. Senate Amendment #1 breaks out the \$4,000,000 appropriation by agencies. Senate Amendment #3 reduces the intergovernmental coordination program business and economic development from \$48,000 to \$10. Senate Amendment #4 reduces appropriation to the Capital Development Board by about \$41,000. I move we concur with these Amendments on House Bill 2476."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2476. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Jaffe, did you have a question?"

Jaffe: "My only question, Mr. Speaker, was that I don't see any of this stuff on my desks; and I have been looking for these concurrences, and I don't know...were they distributed? If they were distributed, I have no objections..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Tipword indicates he has them on his desk, Sir. Have all voted who wished?"

Jaffe: "...I see, I...okay."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 1 'nay', 3 voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4



to House Bill 2476 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority.

House Bill 2480. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, excuse me, the Senate has put on one Amendment, and I'd like to move to concur. The Department is satisfied with it. It's the reduction of about \$35,000. I move concurrence."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2480. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Jaffe: "You...you indicate that the budget for the aged is being reduced. Could you tell us where it's being reduced?"

McBroom: "Representative Jaffe, as I understand it, it involved reduction for people in personnel, and the Department...one of the Department aides is here on the floor and they tell me they're comfortable with it."

Jaffe: "Well, could you tell us, you know, where it's being reduced. I don't care whether or not they're comfortable with it. I've seen this administration comfortable with too many things, you know."

McBroom: "Mr....Representative Jaffe, this was a supplemental appropriation ...an increase of about \$1,000,000, over \$1,000,000; and we're talking about a reduction of \$35,000 in round figures. I..."

Jaffe: "Where...where is that reduction coming from? You know, I've seen them take \$20... away from the blind, you know, take away rehabilitation features. Where is this money coming from? I think we ought to know."

Speaker Bradley: "Jaffe, did you have your question answered? Are you through?"

Jaffe: "No, I've been waiting for an answer, Mr. Speaker, I mean, you know."

McBroom: "The staff is being phased down, Representative Jaffe, because half the year is over. The reduction, if you want to know, is on page 2, if that helps you any."

Jaffe: "What I'm asking, where...where are you taking staff away from?"



Are you taking it away from the blind or where are you taking staff away from? It's a relatively simple question. You've got 20 guys from the Governor's Office, can't you give me an answer?"

McBroom: "Let's have a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Jaffe: "Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I think that I just want to comment on this..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Jaffe on the...on the Gentleman's motion."

Jaffe: "...I...you know...I didn't rise to...to oppose or to support the thing. All I wanted to know is where the money is coming out of. You know, we're dealing with the Department of Aging. I've seen the Governor take money away from the blind people. I've seen him take it away from a number of other people. All I did is ask Representative McBroom where is this money coming from, he's surrounded by...by Governor's people. They won't give me an answer to the thing. You know, I just don't understand the Governor's attitude, and I don't understand the Governor's people. And I really am...am sort of disappointed in Representative McBroom; and I'm going to vote 'present' because I don't know where they're taking this money away from the Department of Aging."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Jaffe, I have answered you; and I think you make an excellent political speech and you're to be commended on it. And I'd like to have a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur...Mr. Jaffe, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Jaffe: "On a point of personal privilege..."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Jaffe: "...The Gentleman...the Gentleman referred to me in debate. I've asked him at least six times already where the money is coming from. He didn't answer it. I'm going to vote 'present', you know; if he wants to play cutsy, let him play cutsy."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2480. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to explain his vote."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there appears to be a little bit of confusion on this particular Bill. The Senate...the Senate, not the Governor, the Senate reduced this appropriation by \$35,000 and for a fairly legitimate reason, I must say. A program is being phased in. They do not need the same number of people for a six-month period as they would need for a entire year period in terms of implementing this program. It's not a reduction in any kind of services, it's an attempt to provide the number of people that are needed to phase-in a program for the amount of time that's involved."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished?"

Peters: "Your Senate reduced it, James."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 122 'ayes' and 2 'nays'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2480 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. House Bill 2482. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin. The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin."

Martin, L.: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate Amendment merely changes from one line item to another on this Bill to make very sure the employees understand they are temporary and if the federal funding goes they would go. I ask for concurrence."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2482. Discussion? The Lady from Cook, Peg Martin."

Martin, P.: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Ms. Martin?"

Martin, P.: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates that she will yield."

Martin, P.: "All right, Representative Martin, I'd like to know please in what area is S.E.P.C. affected with the appropriation. Is it a decrease or an increase in appropriation? And if so, in what area?"

Martin, L.: "It's an increase federal funds totally, Representative Martin. In personnel services, \$105,000."

Martin, P.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, the Lady moves that the



House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2482. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 151 'ayes', 2 'nays'; and this Bill...and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2482 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. House Bill 2497. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I yield to Representative Brady."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, the Senate Amendment on House Bill 2497 simply did three things. It changed an interest amount from 5 to 7½ percent; it changed the word 'pecuniary interest' to 'interest'. And it said that 'A majority of those members presently holding office must be approved for any contract that one would enter into'. This Bill was revisory to bring into context the language of House Bill 2326 with the language of Senate Bill 1317, which were both passed last Session. And I urge that we do concur with the Senate Amendment which just clarifies this."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "I wonder if he could explain to me the difference between an interest and a pecuniary interest?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brady?"

Brady: "Yes, Representative Brummer, a pecuniary interest is a monetary advantage accruing to an official or the official's spouse or dependents. All the other exemptions in the law say just interest, which is a much broader term; and they're just broadening the term here, they're not restricting it."

Brummer: "And what does an 'interest' mean?"

Brady: "If you want, I'll go to the dictionary to try and define what interest means; but I think we all know what an interest means on having an account."

Brummer: "Well, I agree with the intent of the legislation and the Amendment, you know, I don't know if you're half interested in



something if you're over 7½ percent interest then. I fail to understand what an interest is if it's not defined as a monetary or pecuniary interest."

Speaker Bradley: "Do you wish to address the legislation, are you sure, Mr. Brummer...the Gentleman from Cook moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2497. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 7 'nays', 23 voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2497 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 64, 'Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, November 23, 1977, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 11, 1978, at 12 o'clock noon'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; and the Amendment is...or the motion is adopted. On the...on the Supplemental Calendar appears a concurrence, prior to that we will read the Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 2435 together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended November 23, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr....Supplemental Calendar appears...under Concurrences, House Bill 2435. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 2435 is the staggered registration Bill for automobile license plates. It's been amended in the Senate to make it applicable the 1st of July of



next year. This does not in any way affect the Bill...and by being applicable the 1st of July, the Secretary of State can still proceed. There is no provision for expenditure of money in this; but they can make all the preparations in order to see that this goes into effect at the beginning of the extended license plates. And I would move concurrence with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 2435."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2435. And on that point, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the Gentleman's explanation of the Amendment. Would he...would you run that by me again, Representative Tipsword?"

Tipsword: "The Amendment only changes the effective date."

Ryan: "To what?"

Tipsword: "To the 1st of July."

Ryan: "Would you pull that out for a minute, Representative Tipsword?"

Tipsword: "I will if we can take it up while we're in the Regular Session ...before we go out of the Regular Session?"

Ryan: "Yeah, I just want to talk about it for a minute."

Speaker Bradley: "We've got one other thing to do in the Regular Session, maybe you can work it out and we'll get back to it. The...House Resolution 574."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 574, Caldwell-Conti."

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

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to move for the...to suspend the appropriate rule to...immediate consideration of House Resolution 574, which asks to set up a four-man Subcommittee of the House Public Utilities Committee to study the feasibility, et cetera, of the laws governing public utilities in this state. I think that this would be the appropriate way to go into this matter and we would report back by January 1979."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate rules so...for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 574. All in favor of this motion...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on this motion. Mr. Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Where is this on the Calendar?"

Speaker Bradley: "It's not on the Calendar. That's why he's moving to suspend the appropriate rule to the immediate consideration."

Schlickman: "I object."

Speaker Bradley: "The...all in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 votes to suspend the rules. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 voting 'present'; and the Gentleman's motion is adopted. Now, on the Resolution, Mr. Caldwell. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, I move to...the adoption of House Resolution 574."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amend...or House Resolution 574. All...discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Schlickman: "You say that by this Resolution there would be created a Subcommittee of the Utilities Committee?"

Caldwell: "I beg your pardon?"

Schlickman: "You say that by this Resolution there would be created a Subcommittee of the Utilities Committee?"

Caldwell: "Yes."

Schlickman: "The Committee itself can do that. Why do you call upon the House to adopt a Resolution? It seems like a useless act."

Caldwell: "Well...well, this...this...I feel that this would be a four-man Committee that could go into detail and give it the necessary time, rather than have an entire Committee do it. It gives it the specific legislative charge."

Schlickman: "Well, I repeat, the Committee itself can create whatever Subcommittee it desires; and I'm asking, why you come to the full House for the creation of a Subcommittee when the fully Committee itself could do it without any action by the House?"

Caldwell: "Well, in my view, Mr. Schlickman, the Committee could not do



this, and this is why I'm coming to the full House for that permission."

Schlickman: "What powers or authority would be vested...would be vested in this Subcommittee?"

Caldwell: "You want the Resolution read?"

Schlickman: "I think that would be helpful because we're in a very, very sensitive area."

Speaker Bradley: "Read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 574, 'Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois that there be created a special Committee of the House, Committee on Public Utilities, consisting of four Members of that Committee, two appointed by the Chairman, and two by the Minority Spokesman; and that vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment; and that this Subcommittee shall select a Chairman from its Membership; and that this Subcommittee shall have the following responsibilities; a) to study all Illinois statutes and case laws relating to public utilities, including the administration of such laws, b) to determine if changes should be made in such statutes, and to make appropriate recommendations, including drafts of suggested legislation, and c) to determine if it is feasible to codify the Illinois statutes relating to public utilities and if the Committee determines the codification is feasible to include drafts of recommended legislation in its report to the General Assembly, and that this Subcommittee shall file its report with the Clerk of the House of Representatives before January 10, 1979'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you were listening to the responsibilities that would be given to this Subcommittee of the Public Utilities Committee, you would see that it has a very, very awesome responsibility. The scope is tremendously broad. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that if we want to review the entire chapter on public utilities of the revised statutes, we ought to come up with a body that isn't confined to just four people, but rather a body that does include Legislators and includes Members of both chamber's of the General



Assembly. And it would provide for membership of people who have consumer interests as well as those who have utility interests. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we will have something here very limited relative to input; and I'm very, very concerned as to what might come out of it. I would further suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what resources will be available to this Subcommittee to do anything. To review the existing Act, to review the existing case law relative to that Act, requires a lot of research. Where is that coming from? And who's going to do it? This is a very sensitive area, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There have been a number of Bills that have been introduced in this Session as well as in previous Sessions affecting that Act. And I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to all interested parties and in support of the principle of a deliberative process that we do not adopt this Resolution in that it is a grossly deficient vehicle to secure some end."

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

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I would...while I sympathize with the intent of this Resolution, I don't believe that we need it right now. I think that, you know, this has been presented without consultation of the Members of the Public Utilities Committee. There is a meeting scheduled of the House Public Utilities Committee at the beginning of December, I think that's the appropriate place to discuss this. And the Committee can act at that point to appoint such a Subcommittee without the need for taking up the time of the House right now. I think that is a matter that first needs to be discussed by the Members of the Committee. They need to be consulted, and after that, the Committee itself can act. And I...as I say, I sympathize with the intent. I think something clearly needs to be done along the lines that are suggested. Now, I think we need some consultation first to get a fair and a balanced approach to accomplishing this. Therefore, I must reluctantly urge that the Resolution at this time be defeated."

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

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



I would like to take this opportunity to commend my Chairman of the Public Utility Committee for having the wisdom and the foresight to sponsor this kind of Resolution. This is my first experience on the Public Utilities Committee; and I found that we were consistently time after time being asked to consider issues and topics on the spur of the moment or on a basis for which we were very ill-prepared to deal with. The idea of taking a...a small group and looking at these issues in the interim between now and the time when we come back I think is a...is an excellent suggestion. And as one Member of that Committee, I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for coming forth with this Resolution at this time so that we might be better...we might be better prepared when we come back in the spring. Thank you, Sir."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I speak in favor of this Resolution because I am one of the many people who've been taking pokes at the Illinois Commerce Commission. Under this type of a Resolution, I feel that it will have subpoena power. We'll really have a chance to take a good look at the administration of the laws affecting public utilities. It is the apropos Committee, it has joint Sponsorship by the Chairman, Lewis Caldwell, Representative Caldwell, the Democrat, and by the Minority Spokesman, Elmer Conti, the Republican; and I think since it's a bipartisan effort, I think we should support it. I'm sorry, Representative Schoeberlein is the Minority Spokesman; but I know Elmer Conti as my seatmate, anyway I think it's a good thing. And if you...I think it's high time that those laws are reviewed because some of them, for example, there's one law that says, a railroad company cannot go over a certain amount of miles per hour in a municipality. There's a case law against it. So perhaps some of the obsolete laws can be removed and some of the laws should be re...reaffirmed, be brought forth more vocally than ever before. I speak for the Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Caldwell, do you wish to close the debate, Sir?"

Caldwell: "Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what has been said pro and con. I think this is a right step. I think that the Public Utilities



Committee in this past Session has indicated that we can deal with all sides of this very critical issue and I believe that the Resolution indicates that we intend to deal with this subject and report back to our Committee and to the General Assembly. And I believe that this is the way to go, and I would urge all of my colleagues to vote 'aye' on this Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall House Resolution 574 pass?

All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 126 'ayes', 7 'nays', 18 voting 'present'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails, and the House Resolution 574 is adopted. The Speaker has requested that we take now the Attendance Roll Call. So those people who are on the floor, we will now take the Attendance Roll Call for today. And I would suggest that only those Members that are here be voted as in attendance today. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Domico is excused because of illness, and that Representatives Nardulli, Hanahan and Sharp are also excused?"

Speaker Bradley: "It will so...it will so indicate."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, and also that Representative Emil Jones is excused because of the death of his mother."

Speaker Bradley: "The record will so indicate. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, excuse Representative Epton for sickness today, would you please?"

Speaker Bradley: "The record will so indicate. Mr. Tipword, have you resolved the problem with...on the Calendar on page 1 of the Supplemental appears House Bill 2435. Mr. Tipword, the Gentleman from Christian."

Tipword: "Mr....Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, we have got together on this Bill and I would now move that we do concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2435. This is a Bill that provides for staggered registration for license plates when we go upon the multiple year license plate schedule. This Amendment merely changes the effective date to the 1st of July. It will not in any way



interfere with the implementation of staggered registration. Once we know that the Bill will be effective the 1st of July, the arrangement that must be made can be made during the spring. There is no expenditure of money necessary."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2435. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 157 'ayes', 4 'nays', 3 voting 'present'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2435...all right...The Regular Session will now stand in recess. We'll be back to it though; and we will now move to the Second Special Session. Third? The hour of 9:40 having arrived, we will now convene the First Special Session. The Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session will be used for the Attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session. A message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 26, together with Amendments passed by the Senate as amended by a three-fifths vote, November 23, 1977. First Special Session, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution #5, 'Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, November 23, 1977, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 11, 1978 at 12:15 o'clock p.m.'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan moves the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying...or signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The motion is adopted. On the Calendar in the First Special Session in the Supplemental appears House Bill 26. And on that question, Speaker Redmond, the Gentleman from DuPage."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House



Bill 26 is here on the Order...to concur in the Senate Amendments 3, 8 and 10. I would ask leave to consider the motion for concurrence of all Amendments on one Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #3 sets forth that the amendatory act takes effect on April the 15th, 1978. Amendment...the second Amendment is Amendment #8, which changes the compensation from \$100 a day to \$200 a day and puts the cap of \$10,000 in any fiscal year. And Amendment #10 in the main is a technical Amendment to clean up the language of the Bill; but the main import of it is it takes away from the House...the concurrence in the event that the...all of the officials, the constitutional officers that belong to one political party, the original Bill provided for a three-fifths vote on both the House and the Senate. This Amendment provides for a two-thirds vote in the Senate only. And I, therefore, move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 3, 8 and 10 to House Bill 26."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments 3, 8 and 10 to House Bill 26. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 147 'ayes', 14 'nays' and 5 voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 3, 8 and 10 to House Bill 26 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Mr. Collins. Show Mr. Collins as voting 'no'. Is that what you request Mr. Collins. And Mr. Collins...we'll pass that a little bit, I think, Sir, we've already announced the Roll. We've announced the adoption and we would allow you to change your vote if you want."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Somebody voted me 'yes' for this horrible Bill; and I don't know how anybody could vote for it. And I see there's 146 others who've made the same mistake. So please, please change me to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Collins as voting 'no'. On the Calendar ...yes, Sir, Mr. Bluthardt, the Gentleman from Cook."



Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, in my absence somebody voted me 'aye' on this horrible Bill. I reiterate what Representative Collins said. I can see that the skids have been greased, and I wonder how many votes are up there that don't belong up there. I wasn't even on the House floor and they...here they got me voting 'yes'. I'm totally opposed to this Bill, and I want my vote recorded 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman will be...the Gentleman will be recorded as voting 'no'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, arise?"

Wolf: "I'd like to change my vote, Mr. Speaker, from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. On the Calendar on the First Special Session...on the Third Reading appears Senate Bill 12. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 12, a Bill for an Act in relation to the creation of certain services for State's Attorneys. Third Reading of the Bill."

Kempiners: "...Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

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

Kempiners: "...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is identical exactly to House Bill 20, which was reported out of this House by an overwhelming 153 to 5 vote. It basically creates a Commission for the State's Attorneys Appellate Service to provide assistance to State's Attorneys in appellate cases. And I would urge the support of the House in the passage of Senate Bill 12."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', no 'nays', 3 voting 'present'; and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the Calendar on...for what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin, Peg Martin, arise."

Martin, P.: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to be recorded as 'present' on House Bill 2497. I inadvertently pressed the wrong button."

Speaker Bradley: "It's in the Regular Session, does she have leave? Let's



wait until we get back to the Regular Session for that kind of a motion. That last Bill I declared it with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Ms. Geo-Karis, do you wish to be recorded as voting 'aye' on that..."

Geo-Karis: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "...Does she have unanimous consent? Hearing no objection, she will so be recorded as voting 'aye' on Senate Bill 12. Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, may I have the same permission, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, he will be so recorded. On the Calendar on Concurrence appears House Bill 21. Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "This is concurrence, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the appropriation for the Appellate Services Commission of the State's Attorneys. There are two Amendments, and I would ask leave of the House to consider both Amendments together."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to hear both Amendments together? Leave being granted, let's hear them both at the same time."

Kempiners: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the appropriation by \$72,965, cutting off one month of service. The appropriation ran for 8 months and because it would have started November 1, and it was not, a statutory body at that time were eliminating the funding for November, and it will begin funding December 1st. Senate Amendment #2 reduces the request by \$41,900 for 5 new positions which have been eliminated by the Senate. I would move at this point to concur in both Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 21. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155...156 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 21 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. The First Special Session will stand in recess until the



Call of the Chair; and we will convene the Second Special Session and the Attendance Roll Call...Mr. Lechowicz moves the Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session be used for the Attendance for the Roll Call of the Special...of the Second Special Session. Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 3, 'Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly to the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, November 23, 1977, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 11, 1978, at 12:30 o'clock p.m.'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor signify by...Mr....the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on the Adjournment Resolution."

Matijevich: "I just didn't hear the date."

Speaker Bradley: "The 11th of January."

Matijevich: "Oh, beautiful. God bless all of you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished on the motion? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion is adopted. On the Calendar in the Second Special Session, House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 14. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill...House Bill 14..."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act relating to county and municipal jails. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a motion on the Calendar concerning House Bill 14. I wonder if we could have that motion called at this time."

Speaker Bradley: "The motion, I'm sure, is to recommit, Mr. Dunn, do you have a druthers, we have to go to the motion."

Dunn, J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the motion lie on the table. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, do you wish to address that motion, Sir?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion lie on the table?...I oppose...I



oppose the motion to lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, the question is then on Mr. Dunn's motion to table Mr. Ryan's motion to recommit House Bill 14. All in favor of tabling and support Mr. Dunn will vote 'aye' and opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 'ayes' and 75 'nays'; and the Gentleman's motion to table prevails. Now, back to...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Schlickman: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."

Schlickman: "My understanding is that there's an accompanying appropriation Bill, is that correct?"

Speaker Bradley: "My understanding that there is an accompanying appropriation Bill, Mr. Dunn, is that correct? That's correct."

Schlickman: "Then may I ask where that appropriation Bill is?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dunn, where is the appropriation Bill?"

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the appropriation Bill was passed out of House Executive Committee and was to be reassigned to House Appropriation Committee I, is my understanding."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on that basis, I would object to the reading...the Third Reading of House Bill 14. It has been the time-honored tradition of this House that a substantive Bill not be voted upon Third Reading until the appropriation Bill has been caught...has caught up with it. We could be engaged in a useless act; and I would object to the reading, Third Reading, of House Bill 14 at this time on a basis that it's premature."

Dunn, J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, there are no motions on file and I'd like to proceed with the Roll Call on this Bill. I don't want to take the time of the House, but it is an important Bill to many of us across the State of Illinois. And we have a lot of support for this Bill, and I'd like to get a Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr....state the...state the rule, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I'm talking about the common law of this House and decency



and fairness; and it has, Mr. Speaker, you know full well...it's been the custom and tradition of this House that no substantive Bill be voted upon at the Order of Third Reading until the accompanying appropriation Bill is at the same order."

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

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to only point out at this time that during the current Session this year and every Session that I've been here we've passed so many Bills with the substantive Bill first and then passed the appropriation and omnibus Bill, the number is untold to count. So it has been a common practice in the General Assembly since...in my four terms that I've been here that we did this so consistently I don't see how anyone can say that we've ever did anything else. We've just passed numerous Bills, and then passed the appropriation at a later period of time. We've did it consistently in the 7 years that I've been here."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon persists in the...on the question on House Bill 14. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that was filed in this Special Session in order to help out county jails which are under mandate from the Department of Corrections of the State of Illinois. As you know, a number of jails across the state were mandated by the Department of Corrections to make certain improvements. County boards across the State of Illinois are all in the same fix. They don't have the money to make...to do anything, let alone renovate their county jails. The purpose of this Bill is to provide authorization by means of Capital Development Board issue to bonds to provide for the funding of grants approved by the Capital Development Board and the Department of Corrections jointly to those who apply, who are under mandate, so that these mandates may be complied with. And that the counties can meet their burden. This is a good Bill. I would urge a favorable vote. If we can bond to build new prisons, certainly we can bond to renovate our county jails. I request a favorable Roll Call."

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



Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think what is being attempted here...is a good Bill. In fact, I'm one of the Cosponsors of this Bill. And I think what...what we've done this year in regards to putting together a package to insure that we're going to have good facilities, prison facilities, some to meet standards and that can supply the needed facilities for holding state prisoners. I think also you got to consider that this isn't going to be something that's going to take care of all our problems. I think to insure the good prison facilities that we also have to look at our local municipal facilities, you know, and kind of take the pressure off too. And they're going to be new, they're going to be modern, they're going to be able to hold different types of criminals, and it's going to take the pressure off of our state system. And it's going to kind of answer the question that a lot of people had on the location of prisons throughout the state. This is a good Bill; and I think it deserves the support of the people that feel that...that these type of facilities are needed."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, you did not rule on the objection raised by Representative Schlickman. This is an exercise in futility, the permanent Speaker has consistently ruled that the...unless the accompanying appropriation was with the substantive Bill then we would not hit it. Mr. Speaker, you're playing favorites, you're leading to your side of the aisle. I object to it. This should not be considered now."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh, I think you're correct in one respect that it has been kind of maybe a time-honored procedure; but I don't know that it's ever been a rule that the Speaker rule that..."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "...it must be done..."

Walsh: "...go in and awaken the permanent Speaker and get him out here to rule on it. You owe us that."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman has persisted in moving the Bill, and he has that right to call this Bill. And there's no way that we can...do anything that...to prevent him from doing that. The Gentleman



from Lake, Mr. Matijevich on a point of order, Sir."

Matijevich: "Well, I was going to remind Representative Walsh that, as you recall, during the Regular Session I was trying to make a conscious effort that both the appropriation Bill and the substantive Bill go right along. And, as you recall, I also had a list, and I would give it to you...your side of the aisle; but I must also remind you that that was violated at least a dozen times during the Regular Session. So this procedure isn't that rare. It's happened very, very often. So I...I go along with you, I would like to see that. In fact, even written into the rules; but it's been violated very, very often."

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

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question if we're going to proceed or if there's not going to be..."

Speaker Bradley: "We're proceeding, and he indicates he'll yield."

Davis, J.: "Representative Dunn, does the Department of Corrections' mandate also include conditions of overcrowding as cause for renovation of prisons...or of county jails?"

Dunn, J.: "That may well be part of it. The...I might point out that the...the mandate of the Department of Corrections may include capital as well as noncapital items. And if that's what you're referring to, this Bill is carefully drafted now, as a result of an Amendment adopted in Committee, to make certain that grants can only be approved for capital items."

Davis, J.: "In other words, then, Representative Dunn, are you saying that even if a county has a substantially new facility, one that's equal to its current load, but because of the request of the Department of Corrections for returning misdemeanants from the state correctional system to the county. If they're successful in that, and overcrowding becomes a condition, even in the newer county jails, that the Capital Development Board could issue bonds along with the approval of the Department of Corrections for construction of new jail facilities?"

Dunn, J.: "No, this Bill is...this Bill is drafted to provide that only those who are under mandate from the State Department of Corrections



are eligible to apply for a grant. So simply because there is an increase in population in a local jail would not be a sufficient qualification to authorize an application. There would have to be a mandate issued by the State Department of Corrections. And, of course, in the circumstances you describe it is possible that a mandate could be issued; but until such is done the particular county would not be eligible to apply."

Davis, J.: "So you're saying that mandate is not now included in the Department of Corrections' mandate to the county jail system?"

Dunn, J.: "The Bill does not describe the degrees of mandate if that's what you're talking about. The Bill simply says that a county which is under mandate from the Department of Corrections to renovate its jails is eligible to apply. And, of course, application doesn't mean that acceptance will...will follow as a matter of course. So the Bill simply provides that if a county is mandated, it is eligible to apply. It does not say...it's just that simple...it doesn't say what the mandate must contain."

Davis, J.: "So the possibilities then are limitless as far as...as possible construction of new jails throughout the State of Illinois?"

Dunn, J.: "Well, I would think that your Governor and mine would use some discretion in...as to what is mandated through his Department of Corrections."

Davis, J.: "Representative Dunn, I would suspect that our Governor will use his discretion if this Bill succeeds. Thank you."

Dunn, J.: "Well, I would hope so and not veto it because he wants to build new prisons to warehouse all the people that will be in our penitentiaries; and we're going to have people coming back to the county jails as you have indicated. And we've got to have them up to standards. So I...I would certainly hope to see his support for this."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dunn, do you wish to close the debate, Sir?"

Dunn, J.: "I just ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 14 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Skinner points out this will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wished?"



Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like for the Members of this House to carefully consider this Bill. While there are only some dozen or dozen and a half counties presently under mandate from the Department of Corrections, I've had occasion to be in contact with the Department of Corrections because one of those counties does lay within the district which I represent. And I asked them if this is...I was concerned at the time, that if they were just simply picking out counties to give them a difficult time. They certainly are not. They gave me a full rundown at that time on what they were doing, and advised me that every jail in the State of Illinois would be subject to the same scrutiny and investigation. Big counties, small counties, medium-sized counties, every single one of them. And that anywhere they were found lacking under the present requirements that they now have, many of those requirements, by the way, have been set forth in U. S. Supreme Court cases, by the way, those counties that are found deficient would be subject to the same deficiencies. And that the reason there is only now some dozen or a dozen and a half counties presently under mandate is simply because they have not got around to all the counties yet. And, in fact, they inform me that they knew that there were counties that perhaps were even in worse conditions than some of the counties that they had already been to. So you do not...just because there's not a mandate in your district today does not mean you're free and clear because that mandate is going to apply to the counties in your district if those counties have jails that do not meet the specifications of the Department of Corrections. And they will be mandating that you...your counties provide those jail facilities, renovate their jail facilities, and they'll get the courts to back them up on it, I can assure you of that. And you'll have an overnight obligation to provide these jail facilities in your counties or else you will be violating the constitutional rights of the prisoners that are placed therein. So I urge you to carefully consider...this may very, very well be applying to your county tomorrow or next week because they



certainly have this authority to do this and they're going to be backed up with the courts as they have been in the past. Thank you."

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

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm really a little appalled at the number of 'no' votes up there. I would like to pose a question to the Membership. Just what are you going to do when you go back to your counties and you have to face your county boards that are under a mandate from the...from the Department of Corrections, and you have to tell them, 'Well, I voted against the Bill that would've provided you with the funds to bring those correctional facilities up to a minimal standard. I just don't know what you're going to be able to tell them. I would think that you ought to be on this Bill. Right now there are only six counties involved. Well, what's going to happen when...when Lake, and Will, and Macoupin, and, yes, even Cook County is faced with this kind of situation? I wouldn't want to be the one that has to tell those county board members that I voted against the Bill that would've provided the funds for them to bring those correctional facilities up to minimal standards. I think you ought to be on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 88 'ayes', 66 'nays', none voting 'present'; this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared lost. On Concurrences appears House Bill 3. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3, Second Special Session, are technical Amendments and follow along with several Amendments that we placed on House Bill...House Amendments that we placed on the Bill while it was here. Amendment #1, as I said, is a technical Amendment that...that provides for a primary to nominate candidates for the Office of Trustee. And that primary to be held six weeks...on a Tuesday six weeks before that election. Amendment #2..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Yourell, you had...you had better request that you



hear both Amendments together, and the Gentleman asks leave to hear..."

Yourell: "...leave to hear..."

Speaker Bradley: "...yeah, are there any objections? Hearing none, the two Amendments will be heard jointly."

Yourell: "...thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 also is a technical Amendment with an additional clause and in the general provisions of the Act; and it applies to those charter units of government in Illinois that elect a councilman and mayors rather than trustees. And it also applies if they're elected annually in a partisan election. It provides also with a...for a primary six weeks on a Tuesday before the election. I move for the concurrence of Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of...moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3. All... the Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Are these additional Amendments to clear up the election consolidation law?"

Yourell: "That's correct."

Ewing: "Are there more coming?"

Yourell: "No, this makes a change, and there are no more corrections coming to House Bill 3."

Ewing: "This...and these were necessitated by the recent passage of the Election Consolidation Law, is that correct?"

Yourell: "This makes a change that the municipalities requested, as you recall, during the debate..."

Ewing: "That wasn't the question. I realize that probably the municipalities requested it. I was just asking if this was necessitated by that?"

Yourell: "...Yes, that's right."

Ewing: "Thank you."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House; will the Sponsor yield for a question?"



Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Mahar: "...In the Senate Amendment that generalizes the provision that any municipality may conduct annual elections, assuming that municipalities that where they run four year terms every other year, could they then hold a referendum at that annual time in lieu of an election for officers?"

Yourell: "No, this is only where the schedule puts them on that date."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "Is there a provision in the Amendment, I'm sorry I don't have it before me, but is there a provision that eliminates the ...the municipal binder?"

Yourell: "No, that was an Amendment that was put to House Bill 3 in the Senate and was defeated. You're talking about the third card, Ed?"

Bluthardt: "Yes."

Yourell: "That Amendment was defeated in the Senate. These are the only two Amendments that came out of the Senate."

Bluthardt: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh, do you have..."

Walsh: "Yes, the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "...He indicates he will."

Walsh: "Does the Bill still contain a provision that for a taxing body to have referendum on any date other than the 5 days in the two year period that they submit that matter to the...to the courts?"

Yourell: "That's correct."

Walsh: "Yeah, I'd like to be heard."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, before the Gentleman proceeds, may I make a suggestion?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Yourell: "That was taken care of when we moved House Bill 3 back to Second Reading to contain that provision. I think what we're talking



about now is Senate Bills 1 and 2 on Concurrence."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman responded that the Bill still contains that provision. I object very strongly to that provision, and if we are to defeat the Bill then we must vote 'no' now. Now, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable misunderstanding on this Bill, not just the objection that I have, but others that are certainly unclear. Now, for a taxing body, a municipality, for example, to have to submit to go to the courts hat in hand and request that the court grant them a date for a referendum to increase taxes is just simply absurd. It's got to have one of two affects. Either the municipality will not be in the good graces of the court and the courts, in spite of what their needs are, will turn them down or what is more likely is that the court will not get involved in what the needs and requirements of the municipality or a school district are...and will simply rubber-stamp the request for a referendum. Now, if they rubber-stamp the request for a referendum then we have not consolidated elections, we are right back to where we are now, except that a referendum will have some sort of sanction in having been approved by the courts. And if those people can submit that and say, 'Look the court said it's all right, you ought to approve it'. Now, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is certainly in violation of the separation of powers. I can't see how it can be constitutional to place in the hands of the courts the decision as to whether or not taxes shall be increased, whether or not that question shall be put to the people. We've got a year, Mr. Speaker, a year from December 1st in which to make corrections in the consolidated elections Bill. Let's take that time and let's do it. There's no need in humming anything through now. The Bill that's on the books now doesn't take effect until December 1st. I urge that you vote 'no' on this concurrence because that's the only way that we can possibly beat it."

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

Deuster: "Well, I'm sorry to prolong this too, but all I have heard so far is that we are being asked to concur with two Amendments that the Senate has offered to this Bill. And because of the great



concern on the part of my schools and municipalities and everybody, they want to know exactly what we're doing to help them because they know we put them in a jam right now. And could you possibly in one or two clear sentences say what are we concurring with? What do the Senate Amendments do? What can I tell my mayors and school board officials that I've done today?"

Yourell: "Is that a question?"

Deuster: "That's a question."

Yourell: "Okay, what the Senate Amendments do. The problem that you're expressing now and have any doubts about was taken care of in previous Amendments. What these two Amendments did to the Bill as it came over from the Senate are merely corrective Amendments and take care of chartered districts in the State of Illinois in the same fashion that we took care of a request by Representative Klosak as it relates to the problem they have with annual elections in the town of Cicero. This has no connotations or any affect on a school board in your district. It is...it only deals with technical Amendments putting those provisions that we already put in the Bill in other portions of the Bill and the general provisions of the Bill. There's nothing earth-shaking, it doesn't change anything, it merely does what many individuals have requested that we do; and I might suggest to Representative Walsh, while I'm speaking to this issue, that in all discussions with school boards and other units of local government, when we expressed the position of the Circuit Court determining whether there really is an emergency insisted. After we talked with them, they agreed. So to say that they don't agree with that provision is simply not the case. Now, Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3 do not deal with anything except providing for a primary to be held six weeks on a Tuesday prior to the election at which trustees are elected in one section of the Act, and where mayors and councilmen are elected when they run on...in a partisan election. That is all that it does. It's very... they're very technical in nature; and that's it...that's all I can tell you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate



Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Conti to explain his vote."

Conti: "I want to congratulate the Sponsors of both of those Bills. This is going to make me a powerful man back at home, and I'll be able to control all my school elections, all my referendums as a committeeman."



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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 25 'nays'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3. The Second Special Session will now stand in recess to the call of the chair, and we will reconvene the Regular Session. And under page 3 of the Regular Session under Concurrences appears House Bill 1500. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill..."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, there is on the Calendar under the Order of Motions a motion relative to House Bill 1500; a motion which was filed with the Clerk yesterday, which was received by the Clerk before House Bill 1500 and the Amendments. I would respectfully suggest in terms of timeliness, in terms of order that that motion first be considered prior to the consideration of the motion to concur with the Amendments...Amendment to 1500."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair agrees; and we will go to that motion. Mr. Getty."

Getty: "...Mr. Speaker, I would move to table that motion to recommit. I think that it's quite apparent to all the Members of the House that that motion is dilatory. There was a motion on this floor last night to have a meeting of the Committee of the Whole and the maker of this motion opposed that. I think at this time to persist in his motion to recommit would be dilatory and is certainly not in good taste."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the Gentleman's motion lies on the table. Mr....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on the tabling motion."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm very sorry that the Gentleman who just spoke accused me of being dilatory. He as much as anybody in this House knows that the...knows and should appreciate the concern that I have regarding a sound and effective administration of justice. And for the few years that he's been here, relatively...relatively speaking, I would hope he would



appreciate that I have a great commitment to the deliberative process of this House. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are talking about House Bill 1500, a Bill that came from this House... was introduced in this House, was passed by this House as a Committee Bill, a Bill that comprehensively amended the existing Criminal Code relative to the administration of justice, a Bill that went to the Senate, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and was subject to major surgery behind closed doors by individuals that the Governor of this state said couldn't see straight. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have before us now Amendment #8, Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 1500..."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, arise?"

Katz: "The motion to table is non-debatable, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker."

Schlickman: "...Mr. Speaker, the maker of the motion spoke to the motion and it's a matter of course in this House that the Sponsor of the motion to commit can address the measure. Now, if he doesn't like what I want, that's...what I'm saying, okay; but don't deprive me, Mr. Rule Reform, of my right to speak on this floor and to speak my conscience."

Speaker Bradley: "...I don't think anybody is denying you that, Sir. I think if you would address the motion..."

Schlickman: "That's exactly what I'm doing because there's sound basis for this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "On...not the Bill...the..."

Schlickman: "I'm not going into the substance of the Bill, I'm going into the matter of procedure; and this motion..."

Speaker Bradley: "...The motion to table is before us, and all the Chair is asking you to do is to address yourself to the motion to table, your motion, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "...I'm simply saying, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we have here an 80-page Amendment, Amendment #8 to a very important Bill, a Bill that was greatly changed in the Senate. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, regarding this motion to commit,



and directing my remarks to the Gentleman who has moved to table, a very discourteous thing to do, I had suggested to the Chairman of Judiciary II a week ago that considering the significance of this Bill that when it came back for Concurrence that it be committed. And the Chairman of that Committee would not entertain that motion twice when it was the concensus of Judiciary II Committee--and you weren't there, Sir, but the Chairman was--it was the concensus of that Committee that this Concurrence should be committed to Committee; but the Chairman, Mr. Rule Reform, wants to railroad. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was an attempt last night to frustrate this motion, a deliberative...a part of the deliberative process to...by...by having a sham Committee of the Whole when we didn't even have jurisdiction, we didn't have the Bill. And finally, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the grease job, calling House Bill 1500 as amended by the Senate comprehensively in the closing minutes of the Regular Session, to terminate debate, and to ratify something behind closed doors, a compromise that can't even be rationalized or justified by people who worked on it. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the motion to table is discourteous, it's in violation of the deliberative nature of this Body, and it ignores the rights of citizens of this state; and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, on the motion to table."

Geo-Karis: "I am in favor of the motion to table, the prior speaker's motion, because I sat in that Judiciary II Committee. It was not the general concensus of opinion...to Judiciary II..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me...pardon me, pardon me...this is not debatable."

Geo-Karis: "...Well, I have a right to speak, do I not? I...there was a statement made..."

Speaker Bradley: "Not on this...not on this motion."

Geo-Karis: "...All right, then I move to...I speak against the motion to table."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to table Mr. Schlickman's motion, and on that question those who will support Mr. Getty will be voting



'aye' to table, opposed will be voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 116 'ayes', 31 'nays', none voting 'present'; and the Gentleman's motion to table prevails. Now, we will go back to House Bill 1500. Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Just on a point of privilege. I'd simply like to..."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."

Schlickman: "...I'd simply like to comment, Mr. Speaker, that after today you won't have Schlickman to kick around anymore this year."



Speaker Bradley: "I'm sure you weren't implying that to me, Sir...referring it to me. Mr. Getty on 1500."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I respectfully move to concur in Senate Amendment 8 to House Bill 1500. I would like to explain that Senate Amendment 8 is the Bill. It is, I would say quite fairly, 95 plus percent of the Bill as it went out of this House as we passed it out last spring. It has been amended; and there have been many people who have worked long and diligently in arriving at a fair and just compromise, regaining the integrity of the original House Bill. Philosophically, this legislation basically says two things; it says we will be fairer in our criminal justice system, fairer to the victims, fairer to society, as well as to the defendent. Secondly it says we are going to come down harder on violent crime. It is a determinant sentencing system. It is one that is well-structured. It removes the arbitrary and often...often capricious nature of our present indeterminant system, a system where we find Class 4 offenders serving almost half the time as Class 1, the most violent type of offenders. It also does another thing. It greatly enhances judicial responsibility in imposing upon the sentencing Judge the requirement that he hold a hearing in aggravation and mitigation to make findings, findings that are open and available for public inspection. It provides enhanced sentences, yes, indeed it does, enhanced sentences for heinous types of offenders and for certain repeat offenders. Finally, I would say that House Bill 1500 is probably this country's first comprehensive restructure of the criminal justice system in any state. Although changes have been made, as I indicated in my opening comments, in the Senate Amendment, it does basically retain the integrity of the original Bill; the Bill that was the result of a two and a half year study by the Adult Correction Subcommittee under the Judiciary Committee, who...on who we had service so ably by Representatives Leinenweber and Daniels, Representatives Mann and Ewell, as well as the full Committee, Representative Katz. And I'd like to point out that in the very end as we sat with Members of the Senate to work out a final compromise many of them participated and our Speaker, Speaker Redmond, greatly



participated. Finally, representatives of the Governor's Office participated in that; and in several respects we did exceed to the wishes of the Governor, especially in areas where it had to do with his operation or the Executive Branch of government. And last of all, I'd like to say that we've had tremendous assistance from our council to the Committee, 'Jim Bagley'. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would respectfully move for concurrence in Senate Amendment #8."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Johnson...or from Champaign, Mr. Johnson. However, before we go to Mr. Johnson, the Chair would like to inform the Members that there are about five or six other pieces of important legislation that we must deal with this afternoon; and we urge the Members to stay in attendance upon the completion of the Roll Call of 1500. We don't anticipate that it take more than 30 minutes; but we need you in attendance. So please do not leave the chambers. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "The deliberations on this Bill by the members of the Governor's Office and by both sides of the aisle in the House and the Senate... it's been my experience and observation, one of the classic examples of good government and cooperation between political parties and branches of government in trying to work at a common problem. And I think although there may be some minor corrections that people would like to make, and each person has their own particular proclivities in those areas, that this is the best approach to criminal justice that we can devise in Illinois. And it says to the violent criminal in Illinois that we're not going to count violent crime in the elimination of those outcasts that violent criminals have now in our system. And I congratulate Representative Getty, and members of Governor Thompson's staff and all the people in the House and the Senate who worked together to make what I think is a very responsible Bill that addresses a crucial and serious problem in Illinois. And while I was an opponent of this particular...the Bill that was presented to us last spring, I'm in strong support of it now. The compromise version, if you want to call it that, is I think the best of all worlds; and I urge everyone to vote green on this."



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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm happy to say that this is a continuation of our attitude of doomsday for criminals in the Eightieth General Assembly. I wholeheartedly support this legislation. I'm delighted there was a meeting of the minds. Now, every...every coin has two sides. A package provision such as this cannot help but have some holes in it; but the holes that I see are repairable in another period of our legislative history next year. I specifically, and I address this to the 109 Cosponsors of the three-time loser Bill which we put in, I specifically wish to point out that unfortunately when that Bill was absorbed within this package the Senate emasculated it in that they made the Habitual Criminal Act prospective, which means that the 'three' convictions have to occur after the signing of the Bill. If you remember our Bill counted the first two convictions, used them as a warning for the third. It was constitutional, case law supports it. However, they emasculated it in making three convictions after the signing. That means with the continuance rate the first conviction in serving of three years..of six years, rather, the appeal period; the second conviction with appeals and continuances also serving six years; and the appeal on the third conviction really pushes our Habitual Criminal Act about 15 years in the future. Now, that is...was not the intent of House Bill 1, the original Habitual Criminal Act that 109 of you Cosponsored. It is a flaw in this legislation, a flaw that everybody recognizes, I think. When House Bill 1500 was originally written, Mr. Getty did not put in the Habitual Criminal Act on the presumption our House Bill 1 would fill that need. However despite this emasculation of the Habitual Criminal Act, I support this measure and pledge to you next year I shall do everything in my power with your assistance to bring reality to the three time loser phase of this particular piece of legislation. I support House Bill 1500."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Bennett. Bennett."

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

During the last few months, we've all taken a very close look at a



number of criminal justice proposals. And, of course, we're all familiar with House Bill 1500. I supported that at that time; and I certainly support that concept and everything that is still in it today. I originally was a strong supporter of Governor Thompson's Class X proposal; and I really look into it as a former elected State's Attorney, a former defense counsel, I had something I think perhaps the Governor didn't have, and that is, the advantage of having both sides of the issue, having lived through both sides of the issue. Knowing what it meant to be a prosecutor and knowing what it meant, also, to represent the accused. And I tried to take an objective view at that time. I think this Bill as amended through the hard work of a number of people on both sides of the aisle gives Illinois the best and perhaps the only throughout the United States a criminal justice system that we can really say we're proud of. Not only do we get tough on the criminal, which all the people, all the people are clamoring for, we know it, we hear it every day, but perhaps even more importantly there are so many protective devices contained in this Bill protection to the accused, which is as important. I'm amazed when going through the Bill in its entirety how the accused, the person who is charged with a crime, is protected from start to finish; and that is as important to me as having the Class X designation, which I personally think is important, but in having tough criminal legislation. That concern, that double concern of the people, on one hand, tough criminal laws, and also a fair system to protect the accused, is addressed by this Bill. I really believe after studying this Bill I've amended carefully that Representative Getty, the staff members who worked on this Bill, the experts--and I mean experts with the Governor's Office in criminal legislation--Mr. Speaker and everyone, our Minority Leader, everyone who has a part to play in coming up...in coming up with this Bill now that we can stand proud, that we really can say that we did something for the State of Illinois, for the people of the State of Illinois. And although we have been involved in some politics and compromised and perhaps some heated differences of opinion concerning our criminal justice system, there's absolutely no doubt in my mind



I can go back to my district, and I can go back with my background in law, and I can say, 'I'm proud to be a Member of this Legislature today in passing on this important, and perhaps the most important piece of legislation that I will ever have the privilege of voting for'. I concur and would ask you to concur in the acceptance of House Bill 1500 as amended."

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

Mugalian: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote against this Bill because it is not going to solve any problems, because it is not going to reduce the incidence of crime, it is not going to make our streets more safe; but will probably make our prisons less safe and less humane. It will probably result in more plea bargaining and lower conviction rates. And most importantly it will delay and divert our attention from the real causes of crime. I do not oppose this Bill because of the Class X label; Class X...X, I think, is a gimmick. And quite likely a political P.R. ploy. But the insistence on Class X nomenclature points out the lack of a rational approach to the criminal sentencing problem. First...and this should be obvious to a school child...Class X attempts to equate, to treat identically several different forms of criminal conduct that have no identity in terms of motivation, mental state or causation. Dealing in narcotics, for example, is essentially a criminal business operation involving, usually, careful calculating operations. But aggravated sexual assault has totally different causations and is often an expression of rage or even mental derangement. So what is the philosophy of this sentencing proposal? If it is mere punishment, revenge, vengeance, why equate crimes of passion or crimes related to mental derangement with crimes of calculation? But if it is...if it is deterrents, the Governor speaks of posting signs, this will be a Class X felony, where is the relationship between a deliberative business crime and crimes of passion? Are all violent crimes pre-meditated? Determinate sentencing may have advantages. I think it may. But must we abolish parole? On look...at the range of the determinate sentence...determinate sentencing in this Bill, they're extremely wide. The philosophy of this proposal is that the incidence



of serious crime is inversely proportional to the severity of punishment. This is not the case. Actually the reverse may be true. The philosophy of determinant sentencing is that all criminals within the class of crimes are equally punishable and further that none may be rehabilitated. Recent studies on nutrition indicate that some criminal behavior is caused by physiological conditions. Do we punish, Mr. Speaker, do we punish or can we deter actions that are the result of dietary deficiencies? I'm sure that many of you who may be inclined to vote for this Bill will do so because it is politically safe or that it will be read as a symbolic vote indicating that you are not soft on crime; but that you do not see anything in this Bill that will reduce crime or anything in this Bill that comports with your notions of crime and punishment. If that is the case, I ask you to vote against this Bill. Let's give the subject the time and study that it deserves. Let's not sweep the whole thing under the rug. This may be the most confused, political, counter-productive mishmash ever to be offered in the very serious area of criminal punishment. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I don't think any comments are going to change anyone's vote. I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, to close the debate."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, almost three years ago now, when we first introduced a Resolution to study this subject matter, there was a Judge from the Circuit Court of Cook County, Judge Marvin Aspen, who took on a very strong position in opposition to the then 'justice model', as it was called. Judge Aspen proceeded over the course of the last several years to track this legislation very, very carefully. I'd like to tell you an excerpt on comments made by Judge Aspen, who had debated people, written law review articles on the subject, had worked for many years in this area, I'd like to tell you what he says concerning this Bill as it is before you



right now; and I'm quoting, 'For several years I've been afforded the privilege of testifying before Legislative Committees in the Illinois General Assembly as to various sentencing proposals. In the past I've been highly critical of some of the legislative proposals, such as Governor Walker's so-called 'Justice Model'. I was pleased when the House undertook its long and careful study, which resulted in the original House Bill 1500. I feel the Amendments to House Bill 1500 are a fair and workable compromise to the many sincere and divergent views as to where sentencing should proceed in this state. Primarily the legislation as now offered addresses the problem of undue disparity of sentencing without at the same time prohibiting desirable sentencing differences when the individual facts of the case so warrant. The proposed legislation also reflects a modern and realistic procedural approach to the implementation of the goals and expectations of any sentencing program. Sentencing law as it exists in Illinois today is premised upon an unrealistic expectation. That is, that penitentiary incarceration will rehabilitate an inmate. The thrust of the new proposals do not deny that inmate the opportunity for voluntary rehabilitation, but at the same time accept the reality that the only proven expectation of penitentiary incarceration is that such incarceration will insure that the inmate does not commit further crimes in society during the period for which he's incarcerated. The basic fairness of these proposals provides sentencing due process to the convicted felon, and at the same time recognizes the rights of society to a sentencing system which is designed to protect it. I wholeheartedly endorse the provision of House Bill 1500 as amended; and would urge the Members of the House to approve them'. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I suggest from a former opponent of this legislation those are pretty strong words...from a former opponent who's a very learned man in this subject, I'm proud to ask that this House now do concur in Senate Amendment #8."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 1500. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman



from Katz...Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge also the help of Senator Sangmeister, Senator Bowers, Senator Egan and Senator Netsch with regard to this excellent work that the Committee of the House Judiciary II Committee has put forth. I would mention that this Bill marks the end of the indeterminate sentence in Illinois. The day of a sentence of one to life will be no more. The day of a 400 year sentence that goes to a parole board and becomes a 10½ year sentence will be no more. The prisoner when he leaves the court will know how long he will have to serve in prison. If he has good behavior, he will be permitted one half of the time of the sentence of. Everybody will know how long he will have to serve. One other feature that I think will be of particular interest to Members of the House, while the Bill does not disturb plea bargaining, the process by which the prosecution and the defendant reach agreement, plea bargaining will be controlled. A record will be made of the hearing at the plea bargain. The Judge will have to state the reasons why he is approving the plea bargain. Into the record of that proceeding will go the criminal record of the defendant. That will have to be transcribed, and all of those proceedings will be on file in the Circuit Court, Clerk's Office of every county in the state so citizens of this state may go in and discover what has happened with regard to people who have been convicted of committing crimes in their county. Our Committee has not only been blessed with the excellence of all of the people who have mentioned headed by Mr. Getty, the Chairman of the Subcommittee, we have had remarkably faithful service from 'Mr. Bagley', who has been the majority counsel of the Committee. I acknowledge the help of a great many people. I hope and believe that the Members of this House will be proud of their votes to concur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 1500."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond, at Mr. Garmisa's...Garmisa's desk."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, desire to add my congratulations to the Members of the House



who've worked so hard and diligently on the original version of House Bill 1500. And also to congratulate the Members of the House, and the Senate and the Governor's Office who've worked so hard and diligently in order to try to work out a compromise on this most difficult matter. However, I would like to say that there is one aspect of this whole program that has offended me from the beginning and it continues to offend me, and that was the methodology of the Governor's Office in attempting to impose his will upon the Members of the General Assembly. And I refer to a letter that was sent out asking for campaign contributions in which it said that the two standards of determining whether or not a person would receive support ...financial support from the Governor's campaign fund was whether or not he voted for Class X. And he was...the indication was that if you did not vote for Class X, the money would be used to...to... defeat you.....and if you voted for Class X, the money would be used to see that you were reelected. Now, the two of the metropolitan newspapers has very strong editorials with respect to that conduct. And I mirror and I echo the feelings that they had. This is an independent Body, and I resent it...and I particularly resent it when the Chief Executive of this state suggests that he is going to raise money in order to interfere with the real determination and deliberation that we make. And that is true whether it's a Republican or a Democrat. It seems to me that we should be able to judge these things on the merit; and I strongly resent it. I think it's a terrible thing; and if it was done by somebody in the commercial industry, there wouldn't be any question of what we would call it. It's improper, absolutely improper; and I hope that the Governor, this Governor or any other Governor or any other Member of government from here on in, will never say that I'm going to raise money and I'm going to use it to defeat you or I'm going to use it to support you. Legislation should be judged on its merits and we should be free and we shouldn't be fettered. I'm going to support this legislation, and if I may say one thing further, I said originally that Class X was a gimmick, Class X was a P.R. program; and I haven't changed my mind one bit. And I may do it in the future, I'm not too sure that



I have the tendency...I believe it was Martin Luther who nailed things on the...the manifesto on the door of the Cathedral.

Every time we have a Class X offense, I have the indication that I will take a newspaper article and I will pin it on the door of the Governor's Office and say, 'I told you that it wasn't going to work, Class X is a gimmick, it has no place in the deliberations of this legislative Body'. And it may live to haunt him. Thank you very much."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Bradley: "To explain her vote for one minute."

Geo-Karis: "...To explain my vote for one minute, much as I respect the Gentleman who just spoke, I also respect Governor Thompson who is responding to the calls and cries of the citizens of Illinois. In fact, our present Criminal Code has not done the job to protecting law abiding citizens. I am in favor of this Bill; I'm supporting it wholeheartedly because when people realize that it's X felony, let me tell you that it will strike terror because consecutive sentences can be imposed, number one. Number two, when they're sentenced to a certain number of years, those are the years they're going to serve. And it's high time we protected the victims of the crimes of Illinois and to stop mollycoddling the defendants."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote for one minute."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the assumptions behind this Bill are that the problems with the criminal justice system as it now exists in the State of Illinois lies in the courts and in the sentencing procedures and not elsewhere. I would say that the statistics do not bear that out. Last year in 1976 there was some 1,200,000 crimes reported in the State of Illinois. There were only 38,000 defendants that ever made it to court. And of those 38,000, 18,000 were convicted, most of them on a plea of guilty. And I would say that as long as there's that disproportion between the number of crimes committed, the 1,200,000, and the number of defendants that make it to court that crime is successful, that crime is something



that we're going to have to live with because crime is...you can make money at it. And the only reason that...that...or the only way that we're going to successfully fight crime is to take the profit out of it; and we're going to have to concentrate on the 90 percent of the criminals that never get caught. That's the way that we're going to fight crime, not by concentrating on different sentencing procedures for the 5 or 10 percent that ever get to court. Determinant sentencing and so forth is not a new idea. There was another Republican Governor in an industrial state, New York, that put together a similar package and passed it in the New York Legislature in 1973. And what's been the result of that? The result of that...let me read you a couple of sentences out of a report. The determinant sentencing Bills that receive the most publicity was the Class A1 mandatory life sentence. Rockefeller used the Class A1, rather than Class X, and I think that only shows that in the...in the succeeding years that the art of public relations is improved. But since the Class A1 mandatory life sentence..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane, would you bring your remarks to a close? We have a limit of one minute, we're trying to keep it within that..."

Kane: "...Okay, I'd like to point out that in those years, arrests have increased slightly in New York; but the law has resulted in fewer dispositions, fewer convictions, fewer prison sentences under the new laws and under the old. The report concluded there was no difference in the risk of prison faced by drug offenders under the new law and that the risk was still less than one chance in 100. And as long as crime is profitable for 99 out of 100 people that crime is going to continue. We're going to have to concentrate on the 99. And the law has resulted in increasing prison populations, more congested courts, more trials, fewer guilty pleas, fewer convictions, and so forth. And would add that if we're going to be serious about fighting crime, we're going to have to put the resources where it counts, and that's in increased police protection, increased prosecutorial resources..."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane, would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Kane: "...we're going to have to end the situations that bring about crime."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, and the timer is on for one minute to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, use the same time we used on the others.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can't waste anything of my time defending the Governor against a hard-hitting attack by our genial Speaker. 90 percent of the voters throughout the State of Illinois know that we have a Class A Governor. No one but he could've brought this Bill with this degree of unanimity on the board. I think that the product is worthy of the craftsman, the time that's been spent on it; but I think also that there needs to be a caveat that go out to the people. The public yearns for public safety. There's a great desire for it. They need to know that this is not a self-executing mechanism to bring that dream a reality. There are other segments of society that have to rally to the work if it's to be successful, I'm talking about the prosecutors, the jurors, the judges, the police. We've done our share when we pass this Bill; but it's a sentencing Bill, and these other people, these other groups must come forward if the goal is to be attained. I trust that it will, I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote for one minute."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be very, very brief, here we go again addressing the cause, addressing the effect of the problem and not the cause. It is very easy, very, very easy to put a green light up on that board to put forth this sham that we are perpetrating on the citizens of the State of Illinois. This will not deter crime one iota, and everyone sitting here in this room knows it. Here we're talking about a situation where just no more than an hour or two ago that you could not get 89 votes on that board to help people that are as involved in the kind of syndrome that create the problem that increased...that give us increased burden in the criminal justice



system. No one no where, this Governor or any Governor preceding him since I've sat in this General Assembly have effectively addressed themselves at the...the climate, the cause for creating the problems that we have in the criminal justice system. Unemployment in some of our communities is over 40 percent. No one is addressing itself to that problem because it is not easily answered. No one is addressing themselves to the problem of the ever-burgeoning welfare syndrome because it is not an easy subject to bring some solution about. Yes, we can call it Class X, we can call it Class Y or we can call it Class Z; but next year, five years from now, ten years from now, unless we address the cause of these problems someone, someone will come in here with Class X, Y and Z talking about the same thing that those 150 votes is perpetrating on the citizens of this state. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to explain his vote for one minute."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to express my appreciation and respect for all of the individuals who brought this Bill out, even though I am not voting for it, I am not at all sure that my position is correct. I have some misgivings; but I did want those who have worked so hard on this Bill to understand that I have the greatest respect, I think you've done an excellent job. I do have some misgivings. I hope you're right and I'm wrong. I certainly do apologize for voting as I am and it's one of the rare occasions where I...I'm just getting a gut reaction rather than any specific objection to your Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote for one minute."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I share with many the concern that justice is merchandise very much like detergent in our society-- a fancy title, a fancy jingle. I'm concerned with...with many of holes that one of the speakers talked about. If you'll notice, for example, on page 6--I'll just point out one--they add a category 1, 'a knife with a blade of less than three inches in length', but no place...at least three inches in length...but no place do they



take up the question of a blade which is less than three inches. So that I would recommend to all the criminals of Illinois to have a run on blades less than three inches. Because it's a hole as Mr. Kosinski referred to it. A system...systems of justice are often characterized in fiction. And perhaps one of the most...the toughest fictionally characterized was in *Les Miserables* by Victor Hugo, who suggested that there was no discretion left for courts as we have stripped the courts of discretion. I'll just read one paragraph to you very quickly from that, 'Jean Valjean was found guilty, the terms of the code were explicit. In our civilization there are fearful hours, such are those when the criminal will pronounce a shipwreck upon a man. What a mournful moment is that in which a society withdraws itself and gives up thinking a human being forever.' Jean Valjean was sentenced to five years in the galley. Had he committed the same crime in Illinois, he would have, because there's no judicial discretion left in our system, been given six years for the theft of that loaf of bread, six years. I think we have destroyed any judicial discretion. I think this Bill is wrong; and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats, to explain his vote for one minute."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to get up and make some comments concerning Class X because I think several points have been badly misrepresented. One, I wanted to comment was...was made earlier by probably the individual who caused this entire crisis, a speaker who decided his power was more important than the good of the entire populace of the State of Illinois. We had a case in this House where the Speaker decided to play politics, and the Governor went over his head, went back to the people of the state and the pressure forced the Speaker to capitulate. You and I know perfectly well the Speaker was griping about pressure because that pressure beat him. The Governor wasn't afraid to go over the head of Legislators and go back to the taxpayers. I was glad to see that done, and it ought to be done more often. We step into another area, talking about, will this really help the Judges?"



Have we taken power away from the Judges? Yes, we have taken a great deal away from the Judges; but why shouldn't we? Are there more than a handful in this room who would tell us that our Judges are doing a good job? Are there more than a handful in this room who would tell us our court system is fair and equitable? What we need to do is take more power from our Judges and more power from a few...and that's all...but a few of the unscrupulous trial lawyers who don't have the moral honesty to deal with some of the real problems. And the last deals with this routine of crime causes poverty. That's one of those time-worn arguments that anyone who's ever studied social science is well aware is not true. Some of the most people...some of the most honest people in America are some of our poorest citizens. We have almost as much vandalism and youth crime in my area as we do in the poorer areas. Crime does not cause poverty. Excuse me, poverty does not cause crime; but crime does cause poverty. As crime destroys a neighborhood, poverty sets in. So let us say this Bill may help to reverse some of the trend, but the big one being the Speaker who pulled a political ploy, the Governor went over his head and beat him at his own game."

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

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I ought to explain my vote. I agree wholeheartedly with what my young colleague has said here and whom I regard as my son; but the feature in this Bill and the reason I'm voting for it is because it is a determinant sentence. Now you and I know all of the talk that we've heard about parole boards and that sort of thing. I think that this will give...definitely give the Judge the right that he was...and power that he was elected for. It will give him the right to determine the sentence; and if the Judge...if the Judge cannot determine the sentence, then he shouldn't be a Judge. There's no question about it. And this is why I'm voting for it because they have...because they have the determinant sentence in that Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote for one minute."



Madison: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I...this Bill may have some...some merit, but I doubt it, Mr. Speaker. And I would just suggest to those of you who are Members of this Assembly who may be outdoorsmen and you decide you want to go hunting that you'd better make damn sure that you're hunting knife is less than three inches. Because if it's more than three inches you could end up in the can for six years without benefit of parole. Mr. Speaker, the problem with this Bill is...is...is perfectly said within some of the comments that were made by earlier speakers. That the...the comment about the public yearning for safety. And this Bill being the vehicle to take crime from the streets. Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been sold up and down this state as a vehicle that's going to take crime from the streets. It's a P.R. gimmick. It's a sham. It's a facade; and worse than that it's put forth under the guise of concern for public safety. Mr. Speaker, this Bill absolutely refuses to give credence to the causes, the real causes, of...and effects of crime, and with an effort to do away with crime. Mr. Speaker, one of the prior speakers was absolutely right when he said this Bill is a continuation of attitude because it is exactly that, a continuation of attitudes. And it's reflected not only in this Bill but the same people who are voting 'aye' on this Bill are some of the same people, including the Sponsor of this Bill, that refuse to support a 5 percent increase, the cost of living, for public...for public aid recipients. It's a sham; and I will not be a party to it."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just wanted to point out to the Assembly that I've just been on the phone with Judge Marvin Aspen, who says that he is still against mandatory sentencing, as he always has been. He also agrees that what we're doing in this Bill is not a step forward in the case, for instance, of rape. What this Bill has is a mandatory six-year sentence for rape. And I will never forget the day that Judge Marvin Aspen testified before our Judiciary II Committee and explained that there



are many different kinds of rape. There is the case where a man gets a woman and tortures her sexually for 48 hours and makes her a psychological disaster for the rest of her life. That's rape. There's also the case where a woman breaks off her engagement to a man, he takes her out to dinner, they have a bottle of wine, they go back to her apartment, and he forces her to have sexual relations. That's rape. But if that young man has two children to support from a previous marriage and a 60 year old mother, it's absolute insanity to send him to the penitentiary for six years. And Judge Marvin Aspen agrees. He is against mandatory sentencing, he does not want to give the authority to the prosecutors instead of the Judges. I just wanted to clear up the record. One of the things we're doing here today is selling out the women of the State of Illinois because what we will do is cause the prosecutors to bring a lesser charge to that young man whose fiancée broke off the engagement. He won't be charged with rape, even though, Ladies and Gentlemen, that is rape. And we have to call it rape. And that's why we agreed with Representative Jaffe last week and overrode the Governor's veto of his Bill, which created categories of rape. This Bill does not have categories. We will not have categories now. We almost took a step forward in behalf of the women of the State of Illinois. What we're doing here today is regressing. And I just want the record to be clear. Happy Thanksgiving."

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

Mr. Jaffe to explain his vote for one minute."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I did not intend to speak on this Bill; but I think that there are some things that are so bad in the Bill that I think I really have to call your attention to them. First of all, if you take a look at the new crime that they have...have created with this Bill, it's called 'heinous battery'; and basically what heinous battery says that if you...that if you throw a caustic substance on someone, and you leave them disfigured or disabled, that's a Class X felony. Let me explain to you what that means. It means that if someone were to throw a caustic material on you, and it were to land on your hand or your foot, you



would have a little scar. In that particular instance that would be a Class X felony. However, if you take a look at the Bill, and say if we were to take a baseball bat or a billy club or something else and beat you on the face with it and knock out all your teeth and...and really disfigure your face and you break your arm, that would be a Class 3 felony under this particular Bill. This Bill is just that bad. This Bill is not tough on crime at all. You know, let's see, I can give you example after example. Representative Catania gave you an example, I think the example that I gave you with regard to heinous battery is another example. And I, for one, you know, do not find the argument that rehabilitation has failed in the State of Illinois. Let's face it, we have never even tried rehabilitation..."

Speaker Bradley: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Jaffe: "...Okay...we have never even tried rehabilitation in the State of Illinois. And let me say to you in closing that studies show that the longer the sentence the more reluctant juries and...and Judges are to convict. This Bill will not provide more convictions.

It is not a tough...get tough on crime Bill; and I, too, believe that it is a sham."

Speaker Bradley: 'Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 24 'nays', 1 voting 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 1500...with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. The First ...or the Regular Session will stand in recess; and the Second Special Session shall come to order. And on the Order of Concurrence in the Special Session appears House Bill 4. The Lady from...the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."



Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 24 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 1500 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. The First or the Regular Session will stand in recess and the Second Special Session shall come to order and on the Order of Concurrence in the Special Session appears House Bill 4. The Lady from, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask leave to consider the three Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady asks leave to hear all three Amendments..."

Chapman: "On one motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments #1, 2 and 3 at the same time. Hearing no objection, we will hear all three Amendments."

Chapman: "I hope that Representative..."

Speaker Bradley: "And I'd like to remind the Members again we have a half a dozen pieces of business that are very important to get rid of today, so please stay in attendance. Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "I was hopeful that Representative Kempiners would be listening because this Bill which was approved by the House Human Resources Committee received one hundred seventy votes on the floor of this House as it was forwarded over to the Senate. I have no objections to these Amendments which the Senate has placed on the Bill and the other Chief Sponsor, Representative Daniels, joins me in urging you to vote 'aye' on the Concurrence, Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a Member of the Human Resources Committee, I want to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions for the purpose of making sure the legislative history of this Bill is clear. It is my understanding that because of some lack of clarity, the hospitals in particular, are unhappy with the Bill and some others, too. On the Bill, Representative Chapman, it indicates that a vendor may lose his or may be denied, suspended or terminated if and I quote, 'the vendor has engaged in practices prohibited by Federal or state law



or regulation.' And some have said that this would include a traffic ticket. Now, I would like to ask you is it your understanding as it is mine that by practices prohibited by Federal or state law or regulations we are referring to practices related to the medical assistance program in the context of this Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Sir, are you finished?"

Deuster: "No, I'm asking the Sponsor a question and she wants to have a..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Chapman, you wish to respond?"

Chapman: "Generally. Generally speaking, yes, Mr. Deuster. And as far as I know, the hospitals do not have any problem with this Bill. As a matter of fact, in the Committee the Illinois Hospital Association indicated their endorsement of the measure as did the Illinois State Medical Society where as did the home... the Nursing Home Association, I forget their exact name. There are some individual nursing homes that do have some problems with the Bill since the purpose of the Bill is to give authority to the Department of Public Aid..."

Deuster: "Well, I wasn't asking you for a long dissertation, I was trying to be helpful."

Chapman: "Oh, okay. Thank you."

Deuster: "And asking you your understanding, is that reference to offenses means offenses related to the medical assistance program rather than if somebody got a speeding ticket."

Chapman: "Generally speaking, yes, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Isn't that correct? Then the second question, it seems to me the hospitals that I... people I've been talking to out in the hall in the last fifteen minutes or so are concerned that the only choice offered to the Department is either to deny, suspend or terminate them, not to fine them. And so in a case of a hospital this might be kind of rough cause you would be closing down the hospital. Is it your understanding that the Department's attitude is that they would try to negotiate with hospitals and perhaps have a change in management or something else short of termination if they could possibly do that rather than to close down a hospital?"



Chapman: "I do not believe that the Department with the authority we are giving them which to terminate, to deny, terminate or suspend is authority which they had previous to the decision of the Illinois Supreme Court recently. I don't believe they ever closed down a facility under this authority."

Deuster: "Thank you very much. I'd like to urge support of this Bill. I think the Department will use this discretionary rather than mandatory authority with good judgment and I believe that all things considered, it's good legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates that she will."

Hart: "Representative Chapman, under Section 12.425(b) on page 5 of your Bill, you provide that a point of termination, a person with management responsibility for the vendor is barred from participation. But under the next two paragraphs, a stockholder or a limited partner can also be barred. I wonder if they can be barred without any actual notice given to them of the hearing or other proceedings."

Chapman: "There's a requirement, Mr. Hart, for reasonable notice and the opportunity for hearings."

Hart: "There is a possibility of... though that a stockholder or a limited partner of a vendor could be barred without actual notice to that stockholder or limited partner. Is that true?"

Chapman: "I'm not sure just how that would occur, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Well, I am because there is no provision in there for notice to them. Can these stockholders or limited partners be barred without any evidence that they were aware of or knew of the violation that occurred for which the managing... the person with management responsibility is barred?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniels, do you want to answer the question?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I can answer the Gentleman's question by telling him that the provision of the statute requires that notification goes to the vendor and in that notification it would specifically state that all parties connected with the vendor would be subject to termination. Now, in the



event the termination was held and the party the vendors limited partnership or corporation were to want to reapply, the Department would certainly receive his application, he could point it out at that time. But the notice itself would state in there that all parties to the corporation vendor would be subject to termination."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hart, turn Mr. Hart on."

Hart: "And that would be without actual notice directed to the stockholder or to the limited partner?"

Daniels: "That is correct. It would be similar to notification of a registered agent, for instance, under our corporate statutes right now."

Hart: "And how long would persons barred under this Act be barred?"

Daniels: "There's no time limit connected to be barred at all."

Hart: "It could be forever? Is that correct?"

Daniels: "It could be forever. However, as a practical matter, termination would not. It would be a one-year limit and that person could reapply."

Hart: "Well, is that provided in the Act?"

Daniels: "No, it is not. It's open in the Act."

Hart: "The..."

Daniels: "But it could be... Representative Hart, and probably would be defined in the rules and regulations of the authority that's given to the Department under the Bill."

Hart: "Under Section 12-425(a)481, the involved Department may suspend or terminate the eligibility of any vendor of goods or services if it finds that it has engaged in practice prohibited by state law or regulation. This is on page 5, line 15. Is there any limitation on what state law or Federal law or regulation that this could happen?"

Daniels: "The context of the violations would be in the medicaid fraud statute generally and that's what we would go under, but defined in the regulation that would be promulgated by the Department of Public Aid."

Hart: "That then... subject to the regulations..."

Daniels: "That is correct."



Hart: "...pursuant to the implementation of this Bill and not in the Bill itself. Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Hart: "All right. Now, I would direct your attention to page 7, under 12-4.26, the power of the Department to suspend to terminate is made retroactive. Why is the... this retroactive feature included in the Bill?"

Daniels: "The retroactive feature is included in the Bill because of the prior experience on vendors who were found guilty of fraud in the past and terminated. There are approximately ninety-five of them involving some approximate six... three... five million dollars. The Bill is administratively retroactive. It does not have retroactive criminal or civil penalties. It only says administrative activities can be taken in the future on the basis of activity which occurred prior to the effective date of the Bill. To that extent, this Bill is retroactive."

Hart: "Well, it would appear to me then it's an ex post facto infliction of punishment."

Daniels: "No, it is not because it does not involve criminal penalties. We have checked that particular aspect very carefully with the lawyers involved in the ninety-five fraud vendors in the past, the Attorney General's office, the lawyers for the Department of Public Aid. And we've been extremely careful in the definition of the retroactivity as this Bill is applied."

Hart: "And finally, I would ask you if you do not feel that this retroactive feature is an unreasonable impairment on the rights of the party to contracts."

Daniels: "No, Sir, I do not. The vendors that were involved in this program were fully aware of the rules and regulations that were promulgated at the time that they were terminated. We're talking about ninety-five vendors in the State of Illinois accounting for three to five million dollars in fraud against the people of the State of Illinois. We're talking about examples where one vendor turned in a bill for filling the same tooth, a simple cavity, over forty times. There are some unbelievable examples of fraud. We want to make sure that those people, that those



people previously terminated will not be brought back into this Bill by the passage of the new legislation unless they reapply and are accepted by the Department."

Hart: "I would like to speak briefly on the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm in sympathy with the objectives that this Bill attempts to attain. However, I think that we've gone much too far in some of the provisions of the legislation. It would appear to me that it's in the nature of a Bill of attainder attempting to single out certain individuals for legislative action. It would seem to me that it's an unconstitutional and it's ex post facto infliction of punishment. It would seem to me that it's an unreasonable right... of impairment on the right to contract and I believe that although the legislation... there is a need for legislation in this field that we have put together here a Bill that probably is unconstitutional and unfortunately, for that reason, I'm going to vote against it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to follow up on what our distinguished colleague from southern Illinois just said. I would call the House's attention to page 3, line 17. There the statute does not differentiate between the power to terminate and the power to suspend. The Director is given no guidelines for the use of these powers. He, therefore, has unbridled discretion in violation of recent Illinois Supreme Court decisions. Further, I would call the House's attention to the page 5, line 15 and 16. Here the Director is given the power to suspend or terminate a vendor who has violated any state or Federal law. This overbroad power allows the Director the discretion to terminate someone who had violated traffic laws or any other laws. I call the House's attention to the questions asked by Mr. Deuster on this point. I feel that the Sponsor of the legislation could not definitely state that this violation of traffic laws would result in a termination. Thirdly, I call the House's attention to page 6, line 6 through 9. In looking over this, you would see that if one partner is terminated, this provision automatically bars all of



his partners regardless of the fact that the other partners may have done nothing improper. This would effect hundreds of innocent partners. In addition, those partners are not given a right to notice and a hearing. And lastly, if we consider page 6, lines 20 through 31, these retroactive provisions, we see that these provisions are undoubtedly unconstitutional. They impair existing contracts. These provisions are ex post facto, creation of an additional punishment. I believe Mr. Hart was correct in his comments. I would echo those. I feel the intent of this legislation is very good, but that we should send it back for further study. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mrs. Chapman, do you wish to close?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to point out that this authority that we are providing for the Department of Public Aid to suspend or terminate eligibility to participate in the medicaid system is an authority that they have had up until a recent Illinois Supreme Court decision. Do you want to have a dentist who has billed the state for filling the same tooth more than forty times, one that has pulled the same tooth seven times, pharmacists who have billed for his individual time on the basis of thirty hours a day, an optical company who submits bills where more than eight out of ten were for services never delivered? Do you want those people to continue to do business with the State of Illinois? I would urge you to give to the Department the authority to proceed against these fraudulent and abusive medicaid providers by enacting this comprehensive piece of legislation. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Bradley: "The question... the Lady moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4. All in favor of the Lady's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted



who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 154 'ayes', no 'nays' and 7 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Now, the First... Second Special Session will stand in recess and we will reconvene the Regular Session in a Regular Session under Constitutional Amendments. On page 2 appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #24. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #24. This Resolution has been read a third time previously."

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

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This House Joint Resolution is nothing new except that it's a Constitutional Amendment. Representative Hart passed a Bill out of here that said essentially the same thing in the past and presently we have Senate Bill 203 which as amended levies up to a two and a half cent tax for the cost of extending and collecting taxes. This was changed in the 1970 Constitutional Convention because they felt that the existing language in Section 9 of the Articles VIII, VII is to avoid the situation where you have an official such as a sheriff or a justice of the peace whose salary is largely or entirely based on fees from fines collected as services rendered. Now, they changed that by abolishing the fees and in doing so, they cancelled out a lot of revenue of the counties which has really put the counties in terrible financial straits. Now, Representative Hart is a Cosponsor of this Bill with me and I think he could probably express it... the sentiments of mine and his own much more aptly than I could. I think the counties... this is very necessary to the counties. The Bill that he passed out, Representative Hart that is, passed out of here was judged as unconstitutional back a couple of years ago and the funny part of it was, it was because of a suit that was brought forth in my county alone, Will County. Our Treasurer tried to cream off the exact cost of extending and collecting taxes in our county and Joliet brought a suit against them and they were successful. The Judge's rendition



was it was unconstitutional. So I can't tell you how important this is to our local government back home, especially the counties. I just take the view that everybody has their own budget and everybody should accept the cost of collecting and extending the tax of their own. So when....I would defer now to Representative Hart and when he gets through I will consider this my summation and just ask you for a...an 'aye' vote. Or if there's any questions, I'll try to answer them."

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

Skinner: "What audacity! What greed county government has! It is absolutely incredible that someone should come out of Committee with a Constitutional Amendment that's going to allow a tax on a tax that they've just gotten the ability to tax two and one-half cents per hundred dollars of assessed valuation without a referendum. County government has the ability to raise the money, to collect the taxes that used to be paid for by the collector's fee. For that reason alone this Amendment should be resoundingly defeated. But there's a second reason and perhaps more importantly...a more important reason that you should defeat this Amendment if you have an interest in any other Constitutional Amendment that has not yet been reported out of Committee, and that is, the Constitutional prohibition of putting questions on the next November ballot that amend more than three Articles of the Illinois State Constitution. I do not know what Amendment, what Article this Amendment amends. However, if it is not the Revenue Article...is it the Revenue Article, does anybody know? Or is it the Fees and Salaries Article? Local Government Article, all right. If this is the Local Government Article and we're going to amend a Judicial Article and we've already sent an Amendment over amending...what was the third Article, first one? The...the Education Article to get rid of Cronin that means we cannot amend the Revenue Article. Now all those of you who have taxpayers at home, property tax payers, who are asking for changes which might include the classification of real estate statewide, for example, will have to know that you will not be able to have that...you will not be able to have more than three of those proposals on the ballot. This thing, this Amendment is really not



needed now. We...we've passed the Bill to give county government the money they lost to the collector's fee and let me tell you, I know what I'm talking about, I warned my county board as County Treasurer of McHenry County not to endorse the 1970 Constitution and they did it anyway. You know, so some county governments knew what was coming off and they slit their own throats. They have the ability to get the money and by passing this Amendment we are precluding other Amendments from being...from being on the ballot. There's no need and it may do absolute harm by having it on the ballot. So I would ask for you to vote 'no' on this...on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to close the debate."

Hart: "Well, there's so many holes in the Gentleman's discussion that just spoke that it would be hard to take all of that apart. In the first place, the Education Article is still in the House, it hasn't passed. We've never refused to vote for legislation because of something that might happen in the future. And who's to say, I voted against the...the Bill to give the counties a nonreferendum tax increase. And I don't think it's enough. It's easy to stand there representing a wealthy county and say, 'Don't do anything for the county'. But the percentage of tax that was given the county to levy and extend taxes will not, in my judgment, anywhere near unwrite the cost of it. This is a matter of equity. Before the 1970 Constitution counties were making money on other taxing districts through the collection and extension of taxes. That practice was abominable and was abolished effectively by the 1970 Constitution, however, the result is that now other taxing districts are making money on the county. All this does is to provide a cost pass-on to the other taxing districts so that each taxing district will pay its fair proportionate share of the total cost of collecting and extending its taxes. I think this is an important matter that needs to be presented to the people of the State of Illinois. All we're asking for is equity and to put this...have the opportunity to put this matter on the ballot in November of 1978. This House has passed this or similar Constitutional Amendments on at least



two other occasions. This House also passed, and the Governor signed, a Bill sponsored by Representative Lauer attempting to do this by statutes which was held unconstitutional. This is the only way that we can go, this is the way we should go... If the people of the State of Illinois adopt this Amendment to the Constitution those of you who are still here can come back then and repeal the Act that we ill-advisedly passed over the Veto of the Governor a few days ago. I urge that you vote for this to bring equity and fairness to the system."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the House Joint Resolution Con....Mr. Darrow, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Darrow: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we were past that point but if he...he indicates he'll yield. Mr. Van Duyne, do you yield, Sir?"

Darrow: "I'm sorry I was a little tardy getting up but, Representative Van Duyne, what costs exactly are included in this? For example, the Assessor, I would assume, and the Clerk, Treasurer, what... board of tax appeals, just exactly what is included in the cost, could you spell that out for the record?"

Van Duyne: "Whatever costs are...are incurred by the county for extending the taxes through the County Clerk's Office and the collection of the taxes of which used to be, as you probably know, the Township Collector and now are collected by the local Treasurer. Now in our county we have another unique system, I don't know how many counties have this but our Treasurer has chosen to designate banks that people can go to and pay their taxes and they hold the money for, say two weeks or three weeks, and then they turn it in to the county. Now exact cost is all and Representative Tipword asked the question in Committee as to what procedures were going to be set down and those procedures haven't been laid out yet. They'll have to be laid out at a further date or at a future date if the general public passes it...as to the determining exact cost and how to collect them."

Darrow: "So you would say that all taxes associated with the question would be included under this, all the costs?"

Van Duyne: "All costs only, just exact cost and this is generally again I believe



to be somewhere around one percent."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #24? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Lauer, you wish to explain your vote, Sir?"

Lauer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. See if I can persuade a few more people to put green lights up there. For those of you who remember in the 78th General Assembly, the impetus of this Constitutional Amendment was what I was addressing in House Bill 194. We were able to pass that, the Governor did sign it. And in answer to Representative Darrow's concern, that Bill did spell out the exact procedures whereby the collection was made. I think that Representatives Hart and Van Duyne have...have taken the proper approach in this Constitutional Amendment since the Supreme Court held that House Bill 194 was unconstitutional under the 1970 Constitution. They are actually just establishing the principle of letting the one unit of government charge a fee for collecting taxes and extending taxes for another unit of government. But I think that they were wise to leave out the actual implementation from a Constitutional Amendment. That simply clutters up the Constitution with details that ought to be implemented by statute. But, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is an extremely important Constitutional Amendment that is desperately needed. I know that this Bill really has the support of all of the counties in the state because it...it would implement something that is needed and the statute could definitely limit this down to actual costs and that be on a certifiable basis. Sure like to see a few more green lights up there."

Speaker Bradley: "...All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take a 107 votes. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne, to explain his vote."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I tried to get this thing in proper perspective when I started out. I'd like to attack two things in explaining my vote. The reason this thing was taken off in the Con-Con was the article I read to you. It said, 'The reason for



the existing language in Section 9 of the Article VII is to avoid the situation where you have an official such as a Sheriff or a Justice of the Peace whose salary is largely or entirely based on fees from fines collected or services rendered. This had resulted in people having a direct economic interest in in convicting people or encouraging legal action, the more things which occurred upon which fees could be charged, the higher the official's salary'. Now that was the premise on which they took it out of the...out of this in 19...in 1970. It didn't have a thing to do with the expenses incurred by the county of extending these taxes through the County Clerk's Office and then finally collecting them through the Township Collectors and turning this money into the Treasurer. This resulted in a heck of a loss of money for the counties. Now one speaker said the audacity, the audacity, he said. Well, there is a certain amount of audacity here too to assume that the townships, the school boards, the lighting dist...mosquito abat....especially the school systems have the...have the right to have the county do all the work for them and...and...and assume all the responsibility plus the...the expenses therein incurred. I remember when they took this three percent that they used to take off...off of this in the Con-Con and I didn't see...hear of any school district in the state ever lower their rate or ever take advantage of a lowering their budget. But now when it comes to where the county may be able to come up with some equity, as Representative Hart said, and...take...take off some of the expenses of this then we're charged with audacity. Now I'm appealing to your sense of fairness, of equality. Every local entity of government has their own budget, so has the county. But there...there's an unfair obligation placed on the county when they have to assume all the...the economics of extending these taxes. And it costs a terrific amount of money to do this and I don't see why any other entity of government should have some windfall, after all as I said before, they do have their own budgets and they should pay their regular share. I don't see any of us fellas who go out and are paid by the state to eat or whatever we do and one guy pick up the tab all the time and that's what this would amount to in a very simple analogy. I can't really see a thing



wrong with this Bill. It's only fairness that I'm asking for, we need three votes somewhere, if anybody there...out of there who hasn't voted is any way, shape or form has any ideas about giving fairness to the county government I wished they'd come up with another vote or two."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote for one minute."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to explain my vote but there's a lot of people's lights that are on up there that aren't here and I, for one, am going to ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "We would ask that those Members who...those Members who are not here, please do not vote. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, you wish to explain your vote, Sir?"

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this becomes very difficult for me to talk on. I know that many people here are voting in support of the counties in order to put this Constitutional Amendment on the ballot next fall. Let me point out several things however. You know that I have been very county oriented all of my time down here and I'm voting 'present'. It's very difficult to do. But believe me, we have already in this current Session voted the counties two and one-half cents to pay for the cost of collecting and extending taxes. It has been pointed out that the actual cost of extending and collecting taxes lies anywhere from one and a-half to two cents. Then what would be the result, say that we were successful in passing this Constitutional Amendment out of here, through the Senate and by the people of the State of Illinois which would also have to occur, what would we then face? Would we face the responsibility of removing that two and one-half cents from the counties that we gave them this year and would they not then be taking in less money than they would be currently? I...it is difficult for me to speak against this but believe me that's how I feel, I'm voting 'present'. And, Leroy, I'm sorry but that's the way it's got to be."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question we have 97 'ayes', 42 'nays' and 12 voting 'present'.



And the Gentleman requests that it be placed on Postponed Consideration and we will place it on Postponed Consideration. It has come to the attention of the House that for a good many years a Gentleman has served in the House for some twenty years and the House has never been in Session on his birthday. So if the Speaker Redmond would come to the Speaker's....Mr. Redmond, would you come up here for a minute, Sir? And we have a Resolution, believe the birthday and still we're not going to be in Session on his birthday. I believe his birthday is Friday but we're going to...that's a maybe...the...would the Clerk please read the Resolution?"

Clerk Hall: "House Resolution 576. Whereas, Friday, November 25, 1977 marks the 69th anniversary of a most auspicious day for the movie industry, the advertising industry, the County of DuPage and the State of Illinois; and

Whereas, on that date in 1908 was born a beautiful child who was to achieve success as a model, as an actor, as an athlete, as well as in his chosen profession in the law, in government, and in politics; and

Whereas, that little baby boy was none other than our own Speaker, William Aloysius "Wild Willy" Redmond; and

Whereas, Wild Willy has endured through four decades as a Democrat in a county overrun with Republicans, and through 93 ballots in his first election as Speaker, and through three years of the trials and tribulations of running this House; and

Whereas, Willy Willy, our Speaker, is affectionately and highly regarded, both as a colleague and a friend by every Member of this House; and

Whereas, Wild Willy will celebrate his 69th birthday on Friday when this House will not be in Session;

Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives that the Membership, and each of us, wishes our Speaker a happy and hearty birthday, and convey to him our heartfelt wishes for many, many more; and

Be it further resolved, that as a token of our esteem, and in recognition of our deep obligation to him, the unwritten rules are hereby suspended and that all Members join in singing Happy Birthday



to our friend, our colleague, and our Leader, the Honorable William A. "Wild Willy" Redmond, Speaker of the House in the 79th and 80th General Assemblies."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Geo-Karis and Mr. Tipsword if they would lead us in Happy Birthday."

Geo-Karis: "Everybody join us too."

Geo-Karis & Tipsword: "Happy Birthday to you. Happy Birthday to you. Happy Birthday, Speaker Redmond...(dear Speaker)...Happy Birthday to you."

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

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to offer the congratulations of the entire Republican side as we celebrate this momentous occasion. On occasions like this, they are usually remembered for all the laudatory remarks that we can make about the person celebrating their birthday but in all honesty I just can't make those remarks. I originally had asked Senator Hynes and Senator Shapiro to Sponsor this Birthday Resolution as Amendment to House Bill 1500 but...but they refused because they didn't want to put Speaker Redmond in a situation of ruling ungermaneness. Jim Edgar and Roger Stanley had suggested that we call the Resolution five minutes before twelve so they could see if the House would be as democratic in discussing this Resolution as they were in discussing the extension of voting hours. I talked to the Governor and he requested that we hold this Resolution until he had a chance to respond and until Speaker Redmond had actually put his signature on some criminal justice measures that he seemed to be concerned with and when I left him he had his legal staff researching the Constitution to see if there's any way he could veto Resolutions. And I talked to Jack Hill today and he told me he'd like to have been here but he said that once he escaped from this chamber nothing could drag him away from his family right before a holiday. I've thought for several days about what I could possibly give you as a token of my respect and after thoughtful consideration we decided that we'd give you Adeline to sing Happy Birthday since she's going to go across the chamber and be able to be the soloist in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, congratulations and best wishes on your birthday."



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

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I want to join with everyone in wishing you the happiest birthday but my eyes are...aren't so good any more, could you tell me about that cake? Are there any figures on it and if they are, are they dressed? You know, some of us are very modest and we have a lot of concern about that kind of thing. Could you enlighten me on that?"

Redmond: "Just sweet flowers."

Chapman: "Oh, I'm so relieved, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ryan moves the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor of the adoption will signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. While we're taking the Roll we'll see if the Speaker can get a wish and blow out those candles."

Redmond: "Mr. Temporary Speaker and Members of the House, obviously this gives me a great deal of joy and pleasure and I'd have to confess it took a Constitutional Amendment to arrange to have the House in Session even close to my birthday. I used to be very jealous of all you that were born between January and July but I don't think I have to say that my nineteens years have been probably the happiest years that I have ever spent. And I was just commenting to some of my colleagues that if I only had the ability to write and describe the General Assembly, here we are the day before a holiday and I know that many people are having family gatherings and some have to do the cooking and the attendance is superb and everybody seems to be perfectly happy. Sometimes I think that we are disappointed when we have to go home but I hope that all of you have the privilege of serving as long as I've had and thank you very much for the kindness."

Speaker Bradley: "Somebody snuck in a Republican candle there. On this question-the Clerk will take the record...on this question there are 161 'ayes', no 'nays' and the Resolution is adopted. Messages from the Senate. Finally."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following titles, to-wit: House Bill 2462, 2463, 2477 and 2481



together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended by a three-fifths vote. November 23, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Two supplementals being passed on now. We deal with the supplementals and while we're waiting for the supplementals, under motions, under motions, appears Senate Bill 82, Mr. Polk. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's come to our attention that we made a mistake on a piece of legislation last year and it's necessary that we discharge a Committee, Judiciary Committee, on Senate Bill 82. The Sponsor, as the Sponsor of the Bill discussed it with the Chairman of the Committee he concurs that it should be done and I request permission to do so."

Speaker Bradley: "We have leave to use the...the Gentleman moves... asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call on this motion. Are there objections? Hearing none the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the motion is adopted and the Bill is discharged from the Interim Study Commission Calendar Judiciary II and will be placed on the Order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day."

Polk: "Now...now, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Now we have...the reason of course for doing this is that we have an Amendment which has been passed out, Amendment #1 and I move that we adopt Amendment...."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's...let's hold that. I don't think that's absolutely necessary that we do that right now. The...on the Calendar under Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1322, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill was fully debated twice during the Regular Session of the General Assembly and twice in the Senate. This is the Bill that requests from the Director of Revenue to give a taxpayer a written notice that the Federal Government, the IRS or a neighboring state is surveying his income tax return. That's all this Bill does, it doesn't abrogate any existing agreements between Illinois and IRS and other states. And I would like to see sufficient votes to override this veto."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the...that Senate Bill 1322 will pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor



of the Gentleman's motion will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Jaffe to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of Representative Giorgi. I think that this is consistent with the policy that we have all...all...that we have always taken with regards to the right to know. I think that anybody who is in that type of situation ought to be given notice and I think it's really an excellent Bill. And I think we ought to put the 107 votes on that board that Representative Giorgi needs in order to sustain his position. I think his position is an excellent one. We...we voted on it several times beforehand and it's always passed out of the House with...with a great vote and it's always cast out of the Senate with a tremendous vote too. And I would like to see those additional votes on the board. I think we just need a few more and Representative Giorgi will have done his job and really passed, I think, a major piece of legislation that is good for the people of the State of Illinois."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to agree with the comments made by Representative Jaffe in regard to this particular Bill. I think it does afford to the taxpayer the kind of protection he needs. It's not a...unreasonable imposition on the Department of Revenue to inform the people who are being investigated of what their rights are and I think this legislation certainly as a...as a measure involving due process and the protection of rights of people ought to be passed by the General Assembly. It ought to get the 107 votes that it...that it needs and is required to make this legislation effective immediately."

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

Skinner: "No, to ask for an oral verification if indeed this does get... well, you can always take the 'yes' votes off and put a 'no'...."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we would suggest to those Members that there aren't any...if there are Members being voted that are not in attendance that their light would be changed to 'present' to save the



time of the House for a Oral Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? ...All voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 104 'ayes', 36 'nays' and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority hereby declared lost. On the....Supplemental #2 Concurrences, House Bill 2462, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the corrective language on the Deferred Compensation Bill and Senate Amendment #1 provides that the administration expense may not be paid from the continuing appropriation. In other words, before these can be paid out that it would have to go through the General Assembly Appropriations Committee and vote....well, this Amendment was supported by the Department of Personnel, the State Treasurer and the State Board of Investments and therefore I would concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2462."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves that the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2462. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115...116 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2462. 2463, Mr. Terzich. Oh with a...pardon me, with a three-fifths majority. Mr. Terzich on 2463."

Terzich: "Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a similar Amendment and it provides that the monies in the State Employees' Deferred Compensation Plan Fund may be expended subject to the appropriation for payment of administrative expenses. It provides that the expenses of the Deferred Compensation Plan must be from appropriations by the General Assembly and not from the continuing appropriation for investments and disbursements. Again, this Amendment is supported by the Department of Personnel, the State Treasurer and the State Board of Investments and I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2463."

Speaker Bradley: "The...Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2463. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 128 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 with...to House Bill 2463 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. House Bill 2477, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 2477. Both Senate Amendments have a net effect of further reducing the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission Appropriation by now some two, or excuse me, a hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars (\$185,000) further than when it left this House. When we sent it out of here it was a net reduction of a quarter of a million dollars so we're going in the right direction. And I would encourage you to vote 'aye' on this concurrence of Amendments 2 and 3."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2477. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. ...All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. This question, 134 'ayes', 2 'nays', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 2477 with a three-fifths majority....does concur. On the Calendar now we'll back up to House Bill 82 and the... Clerk will read House Bill 82 a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 82. ..."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry, Senate Bill 82."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 82. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code of 1961. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "...Hold it, we'll...we'll...let's move to it to Third Reading when you come back in January we'll move it back. With the....is there any objection to the Amendment?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think rather than get into that there... Problem? Mr. Houlihan. Mr. Houlihan."



Houlihan: "I think he's just going to leave it on Second Reading anyway so the issue's....."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we want to...we want to move it to Third Reading and then he can call it back...it's the intent of the chair. Mr. Polk, either take it out of the record or let's move it to Third and you can move it back to Second at a later time....so we can move ahead here. We'll leave it on Second Reading on...we'll go to Supplemental Calendar #3. Right now that Bill's on...we will recess the Regular Session and reconvene the Second Special Session, On the Supplemental Calendar #3...yes, Mr. Madigan, the Gentleman from Cook."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, it's been suggested that the Bill be read a third time today but left on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "The posture then is the Bill has been read a second time, it's on...it's held on Second."

Madigan: "Are they having their Second Reading for the first time today? So they can't have their Third Reading today. Well then leave it on Second Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "Second Special Session will reconvene and again we're on the...under Concurrence, House Bill 5. Just a minute, before we go to that, Messages from the Senate."

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

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of Bills of the following titles, to-wit: House Bill 5 and House Bill 6 together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended by a three-fifths vote, November 23, 1977, of Second Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Now on House Bill 5, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich. And the chair would like to inform the Members that there is an error in the Supplemental and the Senate Amendments 4 and 5 to House Bill 5 are not for House Bill 5 but should be included as 4 and 5 in House Bill 6. So, Mr. Friedrich, on House Bill 5."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 5 is the Bill for the appropriation for the two new prisons. When the Bill got over in the Senate they made three amendments. The Senate Appro-



priations Committee requested a complete breakdown line item and that's been done. The total's the same. The other thing that... one of the other Amendments that was a typographical error said 'recreational area' and that's 'reception area' and it changed Marion County to Clinton County, otherwise it's the same Bill we passed. I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham. And I assume, Mr. Friedrich, you're moving to address ourselves...."

Friedrich: "To concur."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, but you want to adopt Amendments 1, 2 and 3."

Friedrich: "That's right. Leave."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The.....from Lawrence."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies..... Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the incomparable Sponsor of this Bill when it came before the House before implied that I didn't act from honest motive purely or it was a case of sour grapes. So I've taken a polygraph examination administered by Doctor Dwight Whitlock of the Illinois Bureau of Investigation and I have a clean bill of health. And I assure you that I act from honest motive purely in this matter. When it came before you before I told you it was in the wrong county and when they went over across the...the rotunda they found it in the wrong county. And I tell you again it's in the wrong county. This matter is messed up worse than a Chinese fire call and you need to recognize that. I must confess to you I do have a certain personal interest and if you came to the County of Lawrence and you found the melancholy pall that's come over that community because we weren't able to save the taxpayers of this state one million dollars by being selected as the site you would understand better within your own heart why we feel as strongly as we do. I suggest to you that this is the Bill which I should not stand alone. I have so many Bills where just one or two vote with me. I deserve better fate than that. I plead with you, let's have a...a very fine representation on the negative side so we can look at this matter again in January or February that cooler heads might prevails and the taxpayers might be saved needless expense."

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



Geo-Karis: "...Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I submit the Gentleman who just spoke has a conflict of interest and let's move on with the show."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Friedrich, do you wish to close?"

Friedrich: "Well, merely to say that the Gentleman from Lawrence is about to lose his help for his race for Congress. And number two, that the site he proposed was in a swamp, he forgot to mention that. I appreciate your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 5. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted pointed out that I, too, intend to vote for this Bill even though there was a lack of support on the other side of the aisle for the Bill I had up previously which would have provided funds for the county jails which are in difficulty because of mandates from the State Department of Corrections. I hope, should that Bill come back again, that those on the other side of the aisle who are voting green this one will see a change of ways and...and vote green on my Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 5 with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, on House Bill 6."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the Bond Authorization Bill for CDB. There've been a number of Amendments, five to be exact, they result in a total reduction of thirty-eight million. The prison....the authorization for the prison have been reduced from fifty-eight to twenty-two on the grounds that that was all the money that could be used in the current fiscal year. There's a number of other changes but they're not significant. If you'd like to have them, I'll be glad to give them to you, otherwise,



I'd appreciate your vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 6. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have a 123 'ayes', 3 'nays', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 6. We will now recess the Second Special Session and reconvene the Regular Session. And on the Supplemental #4 appears under Concurrences, appears House Bill 2481. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the supplemental appropriation for the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development. And I move that the House do concur on Senate Amendments 1 through 12. I request one Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman asks leave to hear the...would you read those Amendments you want to hear all at one time, Mr. Winchester?"

Winchester: "I'd like to have them all at one time. And that was Senate Amendment 1 through 16."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, there's...not the way it is on the Calendar. You've got 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15..."

Winchester: "13, 15 and 16."

Speaker Bradley: "16, those are the Amendments you wish to concur with?"

Winchester: "That is correct."

Speaker Bradley: "The ones he's asking leave. Are there any objections? Hearing none....Mr. Conti is objecting."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Bradley: "You wish to divide the question, Mr. Conti?"

Conti: "No, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make an observation here that I was appointed to the Public Utilities Committee along with other Members and there are a group of Bills from 1171 to 1175 that were introduced that were Consumer Advocate Bills. And in one of those packages there was a hundred and eight thousand dollars (\$108,000) in there to hire special attorneys to restructure the rate lines on lifelines with the Illinois Commerce Commission. Now this



appeared two or three times. I don't have the staff. I'm a little dismayed that I don't have the help behind me to check and see when some of these Bills come in, what they did is they put 1171 and the 2481 not as an Amendment but in one paragraph alone federal funding is small, 'A hundred and eight thousand, eight hundred dollars (\$108,800) and shall only aid in the establishment of the minority, disadvantaged or economically depressed group participation in utility proceeding'. Now if this is not hiring special attorney... to restructure the rate for lifeline or to bring back lifeline into this House again, I don't know what is. This is a Christmas tree package appropriation and I just want to call it to the attention of the House that Elmer Conti is not asleep at his desk. Now we've been fighting this lifeline night rate all the way through to the very last hour and here we have it right back in House Bill...2481."

Speaker Bradley: "Pete, are you through, Sir?"

Conti: "If they can take that hundred and eight thousand dollars (\$108,000) out of this package I have no objection to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's...it's my understanding from the Director of the Governor's Office to Manpower and Human Development that is...this is not lifeline, this is a hundred and eight thousand dollars (\$108,000). It's for a fiscal year that would end in October of next year and in no way, shape or form is it related to lifeline. I think that Representative Conti is mistaken here."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry? How many votes will this take?"

Speaker Bradley: "Immediate effective date it was 107 votes."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I might be recognized for the purpose of verifying the Roll Call should this pass."

Speaker Bradley: "...Is entitled to that. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, has this Bill been...with the Amendments been distributed? I can't find it anyplace on my desk."

Speaker Bradley: "Yeah, it's on the Supplemental Calendar #4."

Brummer: "Well, you indicated it was on the Calendar, have the Amendment



and the Bill been distributed?"

Unknown: "Yeah."

Brummer: "...Understood the Speaker correctly there are some sixteen Amendments here, are those Amendments...been distributed?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, those Amendments have not been distributed, Sir, they just got the message an hour or two ago, or fifteen minutes ago, I'm told."

Brummer: "Well, I certainly object to proceeding with that unless we have the Amendments before us or at least have them individually explained."

Speaker Bradley: "...There are objections, Mr. Winchester, the Chair has no other alternative but to wait until the Amendments are printed and brought up and that's going to be some time."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to go through the individual in...Amendments if....please the Representative."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr.....Is there leave to take them up one at a time without them being on the desk, Mr. Brummer?"

Brummer: "If...if each one of those are explained individually and we have an opportunity for asking questions with regard to each individual Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Peters, on that question?"

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on that question. In the event that they are in fact discussed and voted on individually what vote will it take for each of these to pass?"

Speaker Bradley: "107 on each...each Amendment."

Peters: "Then I respectfully would request the call to verify each and every one of these should they pass."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2481. Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had leave to hear all of them as one package but I'd be willing to explain each one individually but hear them all on one Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we had objections that the Amendments are not on the desk from Mr. Brummer and he's entitled to make that objection and so he has consented to address them one at a time if they were explained one at a time without being on the desk. And we would



take them up at that time and without...with Mr. Brummer objecting that's our only alternative...."

Winchester: "Well, then, should I proceed?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brummer. Mr...."

Brummer: "Yes, I'm not insisting that each Amendment be individually voted on, I am insisting that each Amendment be individually discussed."

Speaker Bradley: "That's the place we're in, where I just announced or called upon Mr. Winchester for Senate Amendment #1 so we'll proceed."

Winchester: "Senate Amendment #1 deletes sixty-two thousand, three hundred and sixty dollars (\$62,360) for the Illinois Occupational Information Coordinating Committee. Senate Amendment #2 deletes thirty-one thousand, four hundred and ninety-five dollars (\$31,495) for an interagency coordination grant to BED. Senate Amendment #3 adds one hundred and ninety-one thousand, eight hundred and seventy-five dollars (\$191,875) for temporary personnel for the Crisis Intervention Program and also adds the words 'qualified individuals' to those who can receive Crisis Intervention Grants. Senate Amendment #4...."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, now wait a minute. Are we voting on them one at a time or just discussing them?"

Winchester: "Just discussing them."

Speaker Bradley: "You want to...do we have leave, Mr. Brummer, to...if he explains each one of them to take the Roll Call on each one of them?"

Brummer: "It's fine with me if we.....he individually explains each one, I don't care about a..individual Roll Call on each one. We want...as long as we have an opportunity to ask questions prior to Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed and explain your Amendments."

Winchester: "Senate Amendment #5 breaks out two hundred and eighty-seven thousand, five hundred and fifty-four dollars (\$287,554) in operations and seven point five million (7.5,000,000) in grants for East St. Louis. There's no net change in the total dollars. Senate.... #7 adds sixteen million, one hundred and thirty-two dollars...for various...or one hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars (\$16,132,000)



for various Capitol Projects. Senate Amendment #8 adds fifteen million, eight hundred thousand dollars (\$15,800,000) in School Construction Funds for Illinois schools and they are as follows: Chicago, five million (5,000,000); downstate, ten million, eight hundred thousand dollars (\$10,800,000). Senate Amendment #9 adds forty-four thousand, two hundred and seventeen dollars (\$44,217) from the Land and Water Fund to Conservation for grant for railroad crossings at the Des Plaines Conservation Area. Senate Amendment #10 adds twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) in General Revenue for back pay to Webber Borchers. Senate Amendment #13 adds four hundred and seventy-three thousand, five hundred and twenty-two dollars (\$473,522) in Road Funds for the Department of Law Enforcement for installation of radios and a hundred and fifty (150) patrol cars. Senate Amendment #15 adds one million, eight hundred and sixty-six thousand (1,866,000) in CDB Funds for the Public Affairs Center at the Sangamon State University. And Senate Amendment #16 adds an additional four million, two hundred thousand (4,200,000) in School Construction Funds for downstate Illinois schools. Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to add that Representative Conti is concerned that there is an Amendment that might be a backdoor for lifeline in Illinois. It is not a backdoor for lifeline, it's no way connected to lifeline. But this was an appropriation that was already included in the legislation for...yeah, in the legislation when it was introduced to the House and went before the Committee on Second Reading and Third Reading in the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions, Mr. Brummer?"

Brummer: "Yes, Senate Amendment #7, he indicated was an appropriation of various funds for individual projects. Could you enumerate those please and...and tell me what they are?"

Winchester: "Yeah. Senate Amendment #7 adds sixteen million, a hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars (\$16,132,000). That is a hundred fifty thousand (150,000) for the Richland County Fair Reconstruction. Seven million, five hundred thousand (\$7,500,000) for Capitol Development Board for the Loop College Land Acquisition. Six million, six hundred and eighty thousand (6,686,000) for Capital Development Board for the Triton College. Five hundred thousand



(500,000) for the Capital Development Board for WIU-TV. A hundred and eighty-seven thousand, six hundred and sixty-four dollars (\$187,664) for the General Revenue Fund for the Probation Officers in Cook County. Ninety-five thousand, fifty-three dollars (\$95,053) for the General Revenue Fund for Probation Officers in downstate. One million dollars (\$1,000,000) out of General Revenue Fund for the Mazon River. And twenty thousand (\$20,000) out of General Revenue Fund for the Kankakee River."

Brummer: "On the Triton College wasn't there an appropriation...one of the Amendments in the...one of the Appropriations Bills that Representative Friedrich just passed that included funds also for Triton College?"

Winchester: "I'm not sure, Representative, I can't answer that question. That was the Bond Authority I've been told, not the authorization."

Brummer: "Okay. Where is WIU-TV?"

Winchester: "At Western Illinois University."

Brummer: "And where is the Mazon River?"

Winchester: "Grundy County."

Brummer: "What's the purpose of the one million dollar appropriation for the Mazon River?"

Winchester: "Channel drudging and cleaning. Channel drudging and and cleaning...dredging."

Speaker Bradley: "...There any questions? Further questions? The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Would the speaker yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "I don't understand the two Amendments having to do with additional school construction funds, Amendment #8 and Amendment #16. Is 16 in addition to #8 or is it a correction of #8, I can't figure it out."

Winchester: "I've been told that it's a correction of #8."

Satterthwaite: "So. Well, are we saying then we end up with five million dollars additional for Chicago and only four point two million dollars for downstate schools?"

Winchester: "Fifteen million for downstate and five million for Chicago."

Satterthwaite: "So it's...all right. It is additive not...not correctional?"



Winchester: "Yes, it...I'm sorry, we gave you the incorrect information there. It is added."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "Was that Amendment #7 that was providing funds for WIU-TV?"

Winchester: "That's correct."

Kempiners: "What...what is the purpose of those funds?"

Winchester: "Would you repeat that question again?"

Kempiners: "Yeah, what...what is the purpose of that funding? We have had a number of requests from state universities for funds for television channels and I was just wondering what the purpose for that was."

Winchester: "I understand it was to extend the educational network to include Western Illinois University."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, when the Roll Call on this is taken I would wish to be recorded as voting 'yes' on every Amendment, to concur in every Senate Amendment except #7 which I would like to be recorded as voting 'no' on as long as it is for that purpose."

Speaker Bradley: "We will recognize you when we start...the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question, all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Gentleman...motion's adopted. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to close the debate. Oh, Mr. Walsh, what's your point, Sir?"

Walsh: "...I ask that the question be divided, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman has requested that theGentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, on the question of the division.We're waiting, the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson. On the division question, Sir?"

Anderson: "I would like to inquire whether the Amendments are germane to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "...Amendment, Sir? And if the Parliamentarian...."



every Amendment? Mr. Conti.....Ryan."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a parliamentary inquiry. If I ask to delete everything from page...on page 25, on page 4 from line 25 to 35, does the Governor have the right to convene the Senate only to concur with that deletion? Just the Senate?"

Speaker Bradley: "He could do that but he has to deal with the Amendments one at a time....and he could veto the item. In answer to Mr. Anderson's question we're going to have to rule that there are appropriations and they are germane, one Amendment to the other, to the Appropriation Bill pertaining to the....Mr. Anderson is one single subject of appropriations so that it is germane. Mr. Ryan, the Gentleman from Kankakee."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, does this require a 107 votes?"

Speaker Bradley: "107 votes."

Ryan: "Obviously the votes aren't here, I would suggest that we don't divide the question, you run the Roll Call and if there's a verification requested, give the verification. It's either up or down, the votes are here or they're not, obviously, they're not and let's go home."

Speaker Bradley: "The....Mr. Ryan, with...we've...Chair concurs with you..."

Ryan: "...We've got request for verification, I think if you could put it all on one Roll Call and run it out of here or...or not run it out of here, it doesn't matter. But let's have a vote and let's go home."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Just as a suggestion to the Chair, I think a lot more simple thing than going through the machinations of a vote and verification would be a quorum call."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is an Administration Bill. It was drafted by the Administration, it's sponsored by Mr. Winchester, plus the Republican Leadership. The objections to the Bill are now coming from the Republican side of the aisle. From my view, speaking personally, this Bill can go down to defeat and it won't bother me. However, I would suggest that it could sit right where it's at on the Order of Concurrence



until January the 11th, that'll give the Governor and his people plenty of time to mend their fences in their own shop. If they still want the Bill at that time they could move the motion for concurrence on January the 11th. And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentarian tells me you have some Agreed Resolutions. I suggest that we go to that order of business."

Speaker Bradley: "Agreed Resolutions. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "What did you decide to do with that Bill, Mr..."

Speaker Bradley: "We're going to leave it right there."

Ryan: "Well,...you....is that at the Sponsor's request?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hardin....the Gentleman from...."

Ryan: "I'd like to have a Roll Call on the Bill myself."

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

Winchester: "Did I lose control of my Bill then, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, Sir. If you want to...if you want to ask for a Roll Call...."

Winchester: "I would like to have a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Bradley: "And then it's going to be verified and Mr....I..."

Winchester: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Think the thing to do is, Mr. Tipsword suggested, we'll have a quorum call. And Mr. Tipsword has called for a quorum and Roll Call for attendance. Winchester you persist?"

Winchester: "What is the status of my Bill now as a result...."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, if we...it's up to you, Sir, you still have control of it. It will be left right where it is on the Calendar so that we can come back in January and address ourselves to this. Mr. Madigan suggested...."

Winchester: "Then let's leave it on the Calendar where it's at now."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, now. Agreed Resolutions. Now, Mr...Mr. Tipsword, we would appreciate it if you would withdraw your quorum call. The Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 564, Anderson....565, Anderson."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, there's no quorum, we can't even adopt Agreed Resolutions so let's go home."



Speaker Bradley: "He...he removed his quorum call...."

Telcser: "The record shows there's no quorum. Let's go home. You want to make a motion to adjourn now?"

Speaker Bradley: "He withdrew his motion, we didn't ever announce it. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "566, Van Duyne. 567, McGrew. 568, Van Duyne. 569, Winchester. 570, Johnson. 571, Catania. 572, Kelly. 573, Johnson. 575, Lechowicz. 578, Anderson."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr...Mr. Giorgi moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 541, Dyer. 577, Levin."

Speaker Bradley: "Committee on Assignment. Any further business? Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2550, Christensen. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill....."

House Bill 2551, Shumpert. A Bill for an Act in relation to employment, development corporation. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2552, Shumpert. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2553, Stanley. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2554, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to revise the law governing local government in school elections. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2555, Levin, Holewinski. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2556, Levin, Holewinski. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2557, Levin, Holewinski. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2558, Levin, Holewinski. A Bill for an Act concerning regulation of consumer reporting agencies. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2559, Levin. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the



Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2560, Levin, Collins, Pouncey. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2561, Levin. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to landlords and tenants. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2562, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Misdemeanor and Good Behavior Allowance Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2563, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2564, Porter. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2565, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2566, Porter. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the adoption of persons. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2567, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill.

No further introductions."

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

Mr. Madigan moves that the House stand adjourned...."

Madigan: "Until January the 11th, 1978."

Speaker Bradley: "At the hour of..."

Madigan: "Twelve noon."

Speaker Bradley: "Twelve noon. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. And the Regular Session of the House stands adjourned. Mr. Madigan now moves that the First Special Session...First Special Session stand adjourned until the hour of 12:10 on January 11th. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the First Special Session stands adjourned.

Mr. Madigan now moves that the Second Special Session stand adjourned until the hour of 12:20 on January 11th, 1978. All in favor of



the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. And the Second Special Session stands adjourned. Everybody drive home carefully we want to see you back January 11. And the House stands adjourned."

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	9:30	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
		Speaker Redmond	
2		Clerk O'Brien	H.J.R.C.A. #12
3, 4		Clerk Hall	J.J.R.C.A. #15 & #24 \$33
5		Speaker Redmond	Speaker's Table
		Dawson)	H.J.R. 60
)	
		Schlickman)	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
6		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.J.R. 60
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dawson	
		Speaker Redmond	
7		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
8		Griesheimer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
9		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:08	Waddell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	Moves previous question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dawson	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
10		Dawson	Leave same Roll Call, S.J.R. 56
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	Record 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
11		Matijevich	S.J.R. 57
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Caldwell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
12		Speaker Redmond	H.J.R. 57 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1261, Third
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:17	Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Meyer)	Question
)	
		Leinenweber)	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 2506, Third
13		Speaker Redmond	
		Jaffe	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
14, 15		Skinner) Jaffe)	Question
16, 17		Speaker Redmond McGrew	
18		Speaker Redmond Simms	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond Jacobs	Supports
19		Speaker Redmond Schlickman	Supports
20		Speaker Redmond Lauer	Oppose
21		Speaker Redmond Huff	Moves previous question
	10:38	Speaker Redmond Jaffe	To close
22		Speaker Redmond Holewinski	H.B. 2506
23		Speaker Redmond Pullen	
		Speaker Redmond McMasters	
		Speaker Redmond	Ryan requests verification
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond Mann	Votes 'aye'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
24		Speaker Redmond	
		Winchester	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Verification Affirmative Roll
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Change to 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	Change to 'no'
25		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	Change to 'no'
		Hoxsey	Change to 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hudson	'No'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Klosak	'No'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	Leave to be verified
		Speaker Redmond	
		Porter	'No'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jaffe	What's the count?
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huskey	'No'
26		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Questions Affirmative Roll Call
		Speaker Redmond	
	McBroom	Change to 'no'	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Macdonald	Change to 'present'
		Speaker Redmond	
		McCourt	Change to 'no'
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	'Present'
		Speaker Redmond	
28		Ryan	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	Change
		Speaker Redmond)	
29		Jaffe)	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jaffe	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jaffe	Leave to return to Second
30		Speaker Redmond	Returned to Second Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jaffe	Moves adoption
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ryan)) Jaffe)	Question
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, Third
		Jaffe	Leave to hear on Third
	11:09	Speaker Redmond	Leave it awhile
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 2507, Third
31		Speaker Bradley	
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Bradley	
32		Telcser	Oppose
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hart)) Jaffe)	Yield
		Speaker Bradley	
33		Jaffe	To close
		Speaker Bradley	
34		Peters	Explains vote 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
35		Bowman	
		Speaker Bradley	
	11:22		Skinner Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
36		Jaffe	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
37		Johnson	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Kempiners	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
	11:26	Jaffe	Leave to return to Second
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment 2
		Speaker Bradley	
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
38		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted, Third
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 2517, Third
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mann	Yield to Davis
		Speaker Bradley	
39		Davis, C.	
40		Speaker Bradley	
41		Mann	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Anderson)	Yield
)	
		Davis, C.)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan, J.	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
		Anderson	
		Speaker Bradley	
42		Darrow	He's out of order
		Simms	Point of order
	11:40	Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Anderson	Proceeds
		Speaker Bradley	
		Beatty	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
		Yourell	He's out of order
43		Speaker Bradley	
		Anderson	Continues
		Speaker Bradley	
		Collins	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
		Anderson	Proceeds
		Speaker Bradley	
44		Keats	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
45		Keats	Continues
		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Point of order
46		Speaker Bradley	
		Satterhtwaite	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	Moves previous question
	11:48	Speaker Bradley	
		Davis, C.	To close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
47		Peters)) Speaker Bradley)	Point of order
		Matijevich	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
48		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Simms	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
49		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Barnes, E.	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
50		Willer	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
51		Gaines	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
	12:00	Mann	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
52		Ewell	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Davis	Poll absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Von Boeckman	Change to 'yes'
		Speaker Bradley	



Second tape

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Johnson	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
54		Speaker Bradley	82 'ayes', Postponed Consideration
55		Totten	House Bill 2410, move to table
		Speaker Bradley	Tabled
		Jaffe)	
)	
		Speaker Bradley)	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Veification
56		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Question
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
		Peters)	
)	
		Clerk O'Brien)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Campbell	Change to 'no' vote
		Speaker Bradley	
57		Clerk O'Brien)	
)	
		Speaker Bradley)	
		Peters	Question
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	Question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
58		Speaker Bradley	
59		Lauer	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Bradley)	Verification
)	
		Peters)	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Schneider	verified
		Speaker Bradley)	Continues verification
)	
60, 61,		Peters)	
62)	
		Clerk O'Brien)	
		Dunn	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	
		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
		Lechowicz)	Question
		Speaker Bradley	
		Rigney	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
63		Terzich	Asks people to leave
	12:30	Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	Return to Roll
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matula	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Terzich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Abramson	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Point of inquiry
64		Speaker Bradley	House Bill 2506 passed
		Robinson	Move to reconsider
		Jaffe	Move lie on table
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 2507
		Speaker Bradley	
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lauer)	Yield
)	
		Jaffe)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Jaffe	To close
66		Speaker Bradley	
	12:48	Holewinski	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewing	'No'
67		Speaker Bradley	Postponed Consideration
		Schuneman	
		Clerk Hall	Senate Bill 1383, Third
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Schuneman	Handles Bill for Ebbesen
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	Senate Bill 1387, Third
		Speaker Bradley	
68		Mautino	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk Hall	Senate Bill 1388, Third
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummet	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
69		Taylor	House Bill 2467, concurrence
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs S.A. 1
		Abramson	House Bill 2469, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
	12:50	Kent	House Bill 2471, S.A. 1
70		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Reilly	House Bill 2472, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Telcser	House Bill 2473, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
71		Kempiners	House Bill 2474, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Dunn, R.	House Bill 2476, S.A. #1, 3 and 4
		Speaker Bradley	
		Jaffe	
72		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		McBroom	House Bill 2480, S.A. 1



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Jaffe	Yield
73		McBroom	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Jaffe	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Bradley	
74		Peters	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Martin, L.	House Bill 2482, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	
	1:02	Martin, P.)) Martin, L.)	Yield
75		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Brady	House Bill 2497, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummer)) Brady)	Yield
76		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Clerk O'Brien	H.J.R. 64 (Adj. Res.), Wed., Jan. 11, 1978
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
		Speaker Bradley	
77		Tipsword	House Bill 2435, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan)) Tipsword)	Explains Amendment?



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	H.R. 574
		Caldwell	Moves to suspend rules
		Speaker Bradley	
78		Schlickman	Question, object
		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails
		Caldwell	Moves adoption H.R. 574
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	Yield
79	1:14	Caldwell	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.R. 574
		Speaker Bradley	
80		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	
81		Hoffman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
82		Caldwell	To close
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
		Madigan	Excused absences
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan	Excused absences
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
83		Tipsword	House Bill 2435, S.A. 3
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs; Regular Session in recess; First Special Session in order
	1:29	Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Resolution 5(Adj. Res.)
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
84		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 26, S.A. 3, 8, 10
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Collins	Change to 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
85		Bluthardt	Change to 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Wolf	Change to 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners	
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 12, Third
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Martin, P.	Leave to vote 'present' 2497
86		Speaker Bradley	Wait for Regular Session
		Kempiners	House Bill 21, SA 1 and 2
87		Speaker Bradley	House concurs, First Special recess, Call of Chair, Second Special Session in order
	1:38	Clerk O'Brien	H.J.R. 3 (Adj. Res.)
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Matijevich	Question
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 14, Third
		Ryan	Motion also
		Speaker Bradley	
		Dunn, J.	Moves motion lie on table
		Speaker Bradley	
88		Ryan	Opposes Dunn's motion
		Speaker Bradley	Dunn's motion prevails
		Schlickman	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman)	Question
)	
		Dunn)	
		Speaker Bradley	
89		Schlickman	Objects
		Speaker Bradley	
		Barnes, E.	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Dunn, J.	Persists with House Bill 14
		Speaker Bradley	
90	1:46	Mudd	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Walsh, W.	
91		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Davis, J.)	Yield
92) Dunn, J.)	
		Speaker Bradley	House Bill 14
93		Tipsword	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
94		Madison	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	House Bill 14 lost
95		Yourell	House Bill 3, S.A. 1 and 2
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewing)	Yield
)	
		Yourell)	
		Speaker Bradley	
96		Mahar)	Yield
)	
		Yourell)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Blurthardt)	Yield
)	
		Yourell)	
		Walsh, W.)	Yield
)	
	2:00	Yourell)	
		Speaker Bradley	
98		Deuster	
99		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	Explains vote
100		Speaker Bradley	House concurs; Second Special recess, Call of Chair; reconvene Regular Session
		Getty	House Bill 1500
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
101		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Getty	Move to table motion to recom- mit
		Speaker Bradley	
102		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Katz	
		Schlickman	
103		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
104		Speaker Bradley	Motion to table prevails
	2:15	Schlickman	Point of privilege
105, 106		Getty	House Bill 1500, S.A. 8
		Speaker Bradley	
107		Johnson	Urge green vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kosinski	Supports
108, 109		Speaker Bradley	
		Bennett	
		Speaker Bradley	
110		Mugalian	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Wikoff	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	
111		Getty	To close
112		Speaker Bradley	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
Third tape			Katz	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
	113, 114		Speaker Redmond	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
			Geo-Karis	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
	115, 116		Kane	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
		2:47	Cunningham	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
	117		Barnes, E.	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
			Epton	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
	118		Greiman	Explains 'no' vote
			Speaker Bradley	
	119		Keats	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
			Davis, C.	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
	120		Madison	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	
	121		Catania	Explains vote
			Bradley	
	122		Jaffe	Explains vote
			Speaker Bradley	House concurs; Regular Session recess, 2nd Special to order



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
123		Chapman	House Bill 4, leave to hear S.A. 1, 2 and 3
		Speaker Bradley	
124	3:01	Deuster)) Chapman)	Questions
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hart)) Chapman)	Yield
		Speaker Bradley	
126		Daniels)	Answers Hart
127		Hart)	
128		Speaker Bradley	
129		Darrow	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Wolf	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	To close
130		Speaker Bradley	S.A. 1, 2 and 3-H.B.4-concurs in; 2nd Special recess; Regular Session convened
		Clerk O'Brien	H.J.R.C.A. 24, pre. read
		Speaker Bradley	
131		Van Duyne	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	
132		Speaker Bradley	
		Hart	To close
133		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
134		Darrow)) Van Duyne)	Yield
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lauer	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
135	3:30	Van Duyne	Explains vote
136		Speaker Bradley	
		Hoffman	Passible verification
		Speaker Bradley	
		McMasters	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	Postponed Consideration; anno. Speaker Redmond's birthday
137		Clerk Hall	H.R. 576 (Sp.'s Reso.)
138		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Sings
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan	Congratulates
139		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
140	3:44	Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
		Speaker Bradley	
		Polk	Senate Bill 82, motion
		Speaker Bradley	Placed on Second Reading, 2nd L.D.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Polk	
		Speaker Bradley	Senate Bill 1322, motion
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Bradley	
141		Jaffe	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	Possible verification
		Speaker Bradley	Senate Bill 1322 lost
142		Terzich	House Bill 2462, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Terzich	House Bill 2463, S.A. 1
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
143		Davis, J.	House Bill 2477, S.A. 2 and 3
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bill 82, Second
		Speaker Bradley	
144		Houlihan, D.	Leave on Second
		Speaker Bradley	
	3:57		Madigan
		Speaker Bradley	Second Special Session convenes
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
		Speaker Bradley	
		Friecrich	House Bill 5, S.A. 1, 2 and 3
145		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
146		Friedrich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Friedrich	To close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Dunn	
		Speaker Bradley	House Bill 5, S.A. 1, 2 and 3 passed
147	4:03	Friedrich	House Bill 6, S.A. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs, Second Special Session recess; reconvene Regular Session
		Winchester	House Bill 2481
		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	Objects
148		Speaker Bradley	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummer)) Speaker Bradley)	Question
149		Winchester	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummer	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	
		Speaker Bradley	
150		Winchester	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummer	
	4:10	Speaker Bradley	
		Winchester	Proceeds with S.A. 1
151		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummer	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Winchester	Proceeds
		Speaker Bradley	
152		Brummer)	Question
)	
		Winchester)	
		Speaker Bradley	
153		Satterthwaite	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners)	
)	
		Winchester)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Byers	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	Motion adopted
		Walsh	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Anderson	
		Speaker Bradley	
154		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
		Ryan)	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madigan	
155		Speaker Bradley)	Agreed Resolution
)	
		Ryan)	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Bradley	Call for quorum
		Winchester	Leave on Calendar
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Telcser	
156		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolution
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
151		Clerk O'Brien	Further Resolution
		Speaker Bradley	Introduction and First Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	Regular Session; House adjourn Jan. 11, 12 noon; First Special Session adj. 12:10; Second Special Session adj. 12:20

