

Doorkeeper: "Attention, Members of the House of Representatives.

The House will convene in fifteen minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your number? Is your phone working? The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Seneca is attributed as saying: 'Part of our time is snatched from us, part is gently subtracted, and part slides insensibly away.' Let us pray. Almighty God, Who measures to man the days of his existence, Who alone has caused there to be periods of light and periods of dark, we thank Thee for the life which Thou hast given to us in Thy Divine Wisdom. Make us, O Lord, to be zealous of each moment of our days, that we may use it well for the good of our fellow man, and in harmony with Thy Holy Plan. Enable our services in this House of Representative to be well spent for the peoples of this State of Illinois ensuring justice, tranquility and peace. This we pray in the Name of Jesus Christ. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that Representative Birchler in his seat? Would you stand up? Do you see Representative Birchler? Representative Ebbesen, is he here? Representative Ebbesen was wearing your slacks the last session. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 164th Legislative Day. The House met pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker in the Chair. Prayer by Father William Kreuger, Chaplain."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading



of the Journal and let Journal number 164 of November 29, 1978 be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Is there any discussion? The question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. The reading the Journal is dispensed with and the Journal stands approved. House Bills, Second Reading. 2973, Representative Abramson on the floor? Out of the record. 2978, Representative Catania on the floor? Out of the record. 3316, out of the record. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1469. Is Representative Brady on the floor? Out of the record. 1879, Representative Polk. Is there any motion with respect to that? Would you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1879. A Bill for an Act to amend to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of various State agencies named therein. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendment 1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions....any Amendments on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Advance it to the Order of Third Reading with the understanding that if the Sponsor wants to return it we will do so. 1880."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1880."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, I guess, I see that's been read a Third time, or Second time already. 1890. It's been read a Second time also. 2792. Oh, I guess that's right. Representative Barnes, what was the Bill that you discussed with me? Department of Labor's Bill? Yeah, but the doors were open...the doors were open. Who's handling the appropriation for Mr. Ross and the



Department of Labor? Representative Ewing, is that yours? Representative Polk, for what purpose do you rise?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, just a question. I have a Bill on Second Reading for the..."

Speaker Redmond: "We moved it to Third with the...1879?"

Polk: "I'm just looking for it..."

Speaker Redmond: "On page 3, is that the one? 1879?"

Polk: "Yes...yes, but I thought..."

Speaker Redmond: "We moved that to Third with the understanding that if you wanted to bring it back we'd..."

Polk: "That's quite all right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Barnes. Representative Matejek has cornbeef and cabbage."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, on that Senate Bill 1879, is it my understanding that that Bill was read a Third time last week?"

Speaker Redmond: "The record doesn't show it. The record shows it would be on Second Reading today."

Barnes: "Was is on Second Reading...Well the problem is that I met with some people from the Bureau and I'm sure Representative Polk is familiar with it, Representative Peters is not in the chambers yet and we have an Amendment that we've got to offer on it, so could we come back to this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, why don't... Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that we have another Amendment but we're moving it to Third so that we can... I'll be glad to move it back and put an Amendment on it."

Barnes: "That would be just fine...that would be just fine as far as I'm concerned. You can move it like it is and then we can bring it back."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Third with the understanding it will come back to Second..."

Barnes: "That's just fine."



Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of....Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1878. Representative Hoxsey. Representative Hoxsey asks leave to return 1878 to the Order of Second Read for purpose of Amendment. Is there any objection? Representative Ewing objects."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I think she ought to speak to me first."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't get your....."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I agree, she can."

Speaker Redmond: "O.K. Return it to the Order of Second Reading."

Hoxsey: "Yes, the purpose is to correct the figures that were originally in the Amendment. There was an error on the figures. They are now corrected and I would ask the House to vote on the corrected Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, as the House Sponsor of this measure, I would approve this Amendment. It actually reduces from 5 hundred and 48 thousand 5 hundred to 347 thousand dollars...part of the appropriation for correcting the damage at the Pontiac Correctional Institution caused by the riot."

Hoxsey: "I would the ask the approval of the House on the corrected Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey has moved the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1878. Is there any discussion? Representative Keats, are you seeking recognition? O.K. The question is on the Gentleman'sor on the Lady's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Amendment is adopted. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Is there a sixth Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Vinson, amends Senate



5.

Bill 1878 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 4.8 the following, so forth. 4.B it is."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Sponsor of this Amendment, it appropriates only 4 hundred 97 dollars and 97 cents for the payment of a Bill which the money had lapsed on. And I would move the adoption of Amendment 6."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #6. Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and Amendment #6 is adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Pullen, are you seeking recognition?"

Pullen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to introduce the Gentleman who has come from many miles to the United States and comparable mileage from the rest of us to be here today. He is Casper Venter, who is the Information Counsel in Chicago of the Republic of South Africa. And I wanted to let everyone know that he is here in case they have any questions about his country or his office in Chicago and he is here at my desk for a few minutes. Thank you very much for the opportunity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Barnes, what....which Department of Labor Bill was that? I'm worried about Mr. Ross."

Barnes: "Yes, it's Senate Bill 1879. But we're working it out now...."

Speaker Redmond: "That's the one that Representative Polk had."

Barnes: "Right. It's on Third, but Representative Polk is going to bring it back to Second because there's two or three other Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "O.K. O.K. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of Bills on Third Reading which need to be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. I announced this the other day when I moved them to Third. They are the Legislative Reference Bureau Revisionary Bills 1886 and 1887. And I would like to have those returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, Mr. Clerk. What was the number again, Representative?"

Friedrich: "1886 and 1887. They are Senate Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "1886 and 1887. Is there any objection to ...hearing no objection, be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, amends House...Senate Bill 1886 on page 1, line 18, by deleting 80-1467 and so forth."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, these are updates of the revisionary Bills which were necessitated by some changes in this current Session. And I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentlemen, is there any discussion? The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1886. Representative Madigan, are you seeking recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, simply to suggest that we might take an Attendance Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for Attendance. Now the question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the motion for the adoption of Amendment 1 indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of excused absences



would the record show that Representative Pierce is excused because of official business and that Representative Peggy Smith Martin is excused because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to having the record so show? Hearing none, the record will so show. Representative Ryan, do you have any excused absences?"

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Macdonald, Representative Bianco...I've got another one I can't remember."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that, Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "Representative Macdonald, Representative Bianco...excused today, Mr. Speaker. I've got another one I can't remember. Hang on."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any...."

Ryan: "I've got one more, Representative Everett Steele."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to having those Members absences excused? Hearing none, the record will so show. Did we move Representative Friedrich's Bill to the Order of Third Reading?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments on Senate Bill 1886."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that ready to go to Third Reading, Representative Friedrich? Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1887. Floor Amendment #1, Friedrich, amends Senate Bill 1887 on page 20, line 5 by deleting 3-5-2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is additional revisionary Amendment that's put in by the Reference Bureau so that they'll have all this on computer at the end of the year. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is



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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Friedrich, amends Senate Bill 1887 on page 66, line 10 by deleting 11-1003 and so forth."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1819. Representative Bradley is recognized." Representative Bradley, 1819."

Bradley: "Would the....I believe this Bill has been read a third time, Mr. Speaker. Would...if the Clerk would check that and if it hasn't I would appreciate him reading it a third time."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't understand that. Would you repeat, please."

Bradley: "Was 1819 read a third time?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's on the Order of Third Reading right now."

Clerk O'Brien: "No, it hasn't been read a third time yet."

Bradley: "Would you read it please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1819. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was a Bill that we worked with last week and took the Bill to Committee for a hearing on the issue of people doing business in the State of Illinois that are nonresidents of the State of Illinois and who they are doing business with it is mandatory with the Bill that we passed a year...a year and a half ago that



certain particular groups collect income tax on those people who are collecting funds and earnings earned in the State of Illinois but who are nonresidents of the State of Illinois. We had a hearing in the Revenue Committee. It came out of the Committee unanimously. Let me give you an illustration of the adverse effect that this particular legislation that we are attempting to repeal has on the business in the State of Illinois. For instance, those companies or corporations that are operating a livestock...or a stockyard in Illinois and are fortunate enough to have people in the livestock business ship from Missouri into the East St. Louis stockyards, that that particular stockyard will be losing a great deal of business. In fact, in the testimony that we heard in the Revenue Committee was to the effect that it would eventually bring about the closing of the East St. Louis stockyards because they would have to charge those people from out of state bringing cattle into East St. Louis, they would have to take off of the gross sale, a two and a-half percent income tax and file it with the State of Illinois. The packing houses in East St. Louis...and we all know that East St. Louis has a problem anyway, their economical problems that just are unbelievable, that this would be another...have a devastating effect on that particular industry in that particular community. The idea although does have merit. The Department of Revenue and there... has problems with it in giving out to the various people who would be collecting this money the kind of rules and regulations that are necessary to be clear so that the tax money can be collected and returned to the State of Illinois. It just caused all kinds of problems and we've got to do something with it. And the best thing to do with that particular Bill is just a complete repealer. I might say, the Bill as originally..



or the Amendment or the way the law became a law was the fact that it was put on as a Senate Amendment to a House Bill. There was never a hearing in the House on that particular Bill so that there could be some input from Members of the House. It was put on as an Amendment and we concurred in that Amendment. It just caused all kinds of problems. I can't tell you all the organizations that are in support of this Bill, certainly the agri-communities throughout Illinois, the Illinois Agricultural Association, the Livestock Association, the Illinois Manufacturers Associations. There's all kind of problems with it and the best thing to do is to repeal it, to give it some thought next year and I urge the adoption or urge the passage of Senate Bill 1819. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have some order since we have at stake in this Bill about from ten to a hundred million dollars in Illinois tax revenues. I suppose if this Bill were to be given a short name, the name of this Bill would be the tax... the Nonresident Tax Evaders Assistance Act of 1978 because it is a Bill calculated to assist nonresidents..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order, please."

Greiman: "It's a Bill that is... that assists nonresidents in evading Illinois income tax. In 1977 we did set up the mechanics to reach income tax validly levied in Illinois on nonresidents, people who come to our state, people who earn here and people who then leave and don't pay a tax. The tax is there, we've levied the tax. Now we're going to give up the way to induce it. What the Bradley Bill does...Mr. Speaker, give it one more bang with the gavel would ya'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please, please give the Gentleman order."



We'll have to clear the floor of all the Members if we're not careful here."

Greiman: "What this Bill does is to create a loophole.

It's the most incredible Bill that I could imagine. Imagine this General Assembly creating a tax loop-hole, purposely creating a tax loophole. Now there's a lot of suggestions that the Department of Revenue somehow didn't do its task. But the truth is that in 1977 immediately after the passage of this Bill, it published its withholding guide and included information on the with... on how to withhold. It promulgated regulations in the appropriate time, it changed the regulations because as Representative Tipsword suggested the other day they weren't in good order and they've changed them since then. Then we asked for a fiscal note. Now here's what the fiscal note said the other day, Department of Revenue. It said that it is inestimable, the amount of taxes that will be lost are inestimable. Iowa, a state next to us, has adopted a similar procedure. They have three to four thousand taxpayers paying estimated taxes withholding and paying Iowa income tax. I suspect that many of those people are Illinois people. Now Representative Bradley comes to the Rules Committee, comes to the floor of this House, says, 'Well, it's for Ma and Pa, little grain elevators and we got to protect those little teeny farmers.' And then I look and see who are the friends of these little teeny farmers, these little teeny grain elevator operators. Who are they? Who appears at the hearing for this Bill just for the Ma and Pa folk in Illinois? Well, there's the Illinois Association of Manufacturers, long a friend of Ma and Pa grain elevator operators; the Illinois Banker's Association appeared. They're also well known for their support of little Ma and Pa grain elevator operators.



The Illinois Association of Realtors, the Illinois Retail Merchants, the Illinois Savings and Loan League, Esmark, a little teeny five billion dollar corporation and then Illini Packers, good Central Illinois name, except that it does a quarter of a billion dollars in sales, the largest packer east of the Mississippi River. So to me it's incredible, incredible that this Bill is even on this floor being considered at this late date. Where is the Governor, one might ask? Where is the Governor? Illinois may lose maybe from ten to a hundred million dollars. That makes our pay raise which constitutes about a million and a half dollars, a drop in the bucket compared to what we are about to do. The Governor says apparently he has no position. Maybe he has no position cause he doesn't want to affect eastern money interests that have investments in Illinois because he may be calling upon them to make contributions to his Presidential campaign. Maybe that's why the Governor is silent, silent on giving away the tax money of Illinois. This is an incredible Bill. If it has problems, and it may, what we should do, defeat this Bill, bring it back to Second Reading, delay the operation of the Act for six months as Representative Houlihan and Brady suggested in a Bill that they filed early in the Session that made a lot of sense and do what Representatives Brady and Houlihan suggested in the first place. That's what we should do with this Bill. We should just not give him a hundred and seven votes. It is a ridiculous Bill, it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham. Please.

You may not have very many more opportunities. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well how kind of you, Speaker. I appreciate those kind words. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House, pay absolutely no heed to the last speaker on this subject. He is a positively...genius at coining phrases that are prejudicial to the consideration of a Bill on its merits and I can't believe that all of the distortion that he gave you was inadvertent. I think some of it must have been planned. The Representative from Bloomington, as is his want, has brought you a Bill that is positively excellent. It is deserving of the 'aye' vote of every Member of this House. You need to recognize here and now that it takes a large Legislator ever to stand up and say I was in error and I made a mistake. That's true in this Bill and in other matters that are of present public concern. But in this Bill particularly an error was made two years ago as the Sponsor has recited to you. None of us foresaw what a terrible situation was created. We have created a bureaucratic boondoggle that strangles business throughout the State of Illinois. I know nothing about the stockyards in East St. Louis, but if you leave 701C as it's presently on the statute books, it will close every elevator in the 54th District because it imposes upon those servants of the public and of the economy an intolerable burden of trying to find out who lives where and making the proper deduction for out-of-state salesmen who come and sell things to the elevators. It isn't limited to the agrarian economy. It extends across all facets of life throughout the state. Even the prior speaker's district would be benefitted greatly by the immediate enthusiastic passage of 1819. If you do nothing else today but vote 'aye' for 1819 you will have struck a substantial lick for your constituents and earned your additional compensation. I pray you to give Representative Bradley a green vote in the happy confidence that you are standing tall in this instance



and publicly acknowledge an error that we made two years ago and we need to erase from the book. Please vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian." Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have some attention because I would like to talk sense about this Bill. I studied it for the last week and I really would appreciate having the ear of my colleagues. I think it's a terribly important Bill. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, what do you think of a law that permits the State of Illinois to cut down on tax evasion? I can't even hear myself think, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Mugalian: "A law which by... Mr. Speaker, a law which by the requirement of one form will capture millions of dollars owed the people of Illinois by nonresident tax cheats. We have had such a law on our books for less than one year. Several other states have a similar law - California, Oregon and Iowa, to name a few. You know what S.B. 1819 does? It repeals that law, repeals it at about the time the Department of Revenue regulations are ready to implement it. Yes, Senate Bill 1819 says to the tax dodger, the nonresident tax dodger, you're home free. You can now continue to get away with evading your Illinois income tax liabilities. Income earned in Illinois and in a large part, income earned from Illinoisans. May I have some attention, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please, Please. We're going to clear the floor of all unauthorized persons in about two minutes if you don't give this Gentleman order."

Mugalian: "We have been asked to believe that this Bill is for Ma and Pa farmers or grain elevator owners. I don't think it is, but even so, Ma and Pa shouldn't be involved in theft from our treasury. So believe me, the pressure behind this Bill isn't from Ma and



Pa and you watch to see who's working the floor on this Bill. We had a chance to amend this Bill by excluding not only Ma and Pa, we had the chance but every nonresident who have farm or livestock earnings subject to Illinois income tax. I voted for that Amendment but I think the Amendment went too far. But the Sponsor resisted and defeated that Amendment. Why? Ask him. Ask yourself why. What's the hooker? Mr. Speaker, I say right now that I asked to be recognized to ask that the vote on this Bill be verified, whether it has ten votes or fifty votes or a hundred and fifty votes. No Member should risk having a green light turned on in his absence, Mr. Speaker. I hope the news media is also watching and will publish the Roll Call. Let me tell you some of the things that this Bill does do. This Bill takes away from the State Lottery Commission the power to secure payment of the income tax due Illinois on lottery prizes. This Bill permits any insurance company to pay large commissions to nonresidents, agents and brokers and prevent Illinois from finding out who owes Illinois taxes and in what amounts. This Bill makes it easier for a European national to buy and sell Illinois real estate and escape his Illinois tax liability on his profits. This Bill invites a rock and roll star to take hundreds of thousands of dollars from Illinoisans back to his home state or home country without paying the two and a-half percent tax on whatever his net profit would be. This Bill would be favored by the thousands of nonresident Rentiers. Rentiers, Ladies and Gentlemen, owners of shopping centers, office buildings and factories who hide behind blind trusts, real estate investment trusts, syndicates of one kind or another who don't report or pay on their annual rental incomes derived from Illinois real estate. Mr. Speaker, if the



implementation of the law that this Bill would repeal has some problems for a few special situations like markets for farm products or livestock, I'm sure that we can work out the problems without giving a pass to the tens of thousands of out-of-staters who are ripping off our constituents. But I think that the so-called problems are imaginary. The Department of Revenue, I wish you'd listen to this, has made it easy for everyone by developing one form. It's form IL801NR. These forms can easily be made available to the livestock markets or grain elevators. The shipper or seller can quickly complete this form. If he needs a form IL1040ES, these forms can also be made available. Such forms are far less complicated than bills of lading or warehouse receipts and other forms that are generally required at these markets. Mr. Speaker, may I have some attention. I think I have ten minutes. If we're worried about the Missouri farmer who walks six pigs across the river and into St. Louis, East St. Louis to sell them to Swift and Company, he can claim a one thousand dollar exemption. If he's married and has three kids, he can claim a five thousand dollar exemption. Despite any protestations by the large meat packers or the banking interests or the landlord lobby how a few simple forms are going to strangle the Illinois economy, look at this Bill closely. This Bill has an interesting history but there's not time for that. But let's leave that aside. It's a repealer Bill. It will repeal a law that was passed by this Legislature and signed by our Governor in the fall of 1977, just barely a year ago. I can't believe that the Governor would sign this Bill if it gets a hundred and seven votes. Why would he abandon millions of dollars going to the General Revenue Fund? But stranger things have happened. In any



event it is your vote that will be watched by the voters of your district. One final point, Mr. Speaker. I expect that many Members of this House have made a commitment to vote for this Bill. But I also expect that a full explanation of the Bill was not made or certain assurances were made about future action that we know aren't... can't be made. If you honor such a commitment, it may be a commitment your constituents will never forget. Now how much money are we talking about? How much of a theft would this Bill represent to my constituents and yours? To our hard-pressed Illinois taxpayers? Well, Mr. Speaker, these figures are hard to come by and I've been doing some digging in the last week. We do know about the Department of Revenue fiscal note. Representative Greiman referred to that. Iowa has picked up thousands and thousands of taxpayers who were avoiding their obligations. But just today I got some information from a state agency that had a sampling on one small grain elevator, one small grain elevator. And it said that in the course of this audit over a year period that seventeen payments were made to ten different taxpayers, nonresidents, totalling a hundred and fifty-three thousand dollars. Now I expected to hear the timeworn complaint about another form required of businessmen, more governmental red tape and blah, blah, blah. Well, my friends, our Illinois wage earner files forms and has his taxes withheld. Our Illinois farmer pays his income tax. Your neighborhood storekeeper takes out his forms and pays his taxes. Go ahead, ask the taxpayers in your districts if they want to pay taxes that other, others, not Illinoisans but out-of-staters escape. The one form required will help to eliminate the blatant discrimination against our constituent taxpayers. Yes, we'll hear some bleeding about the extra paperwork and the



one form that has to be filed. Well the average taxpayer in your district files a couple of hundred forms a year to the Illinois Department of Revenue. These forms are green, they're sometimes called dollar bills. A 'no' vote, a 'no' vote is a vote for your constituents. A 'yes' vote is a vote for the out-of-state tax evader who rides on your constituent's backs. How often do you have a vote that means good government, lessens the tax burden, accomplishes equity, uncovers tax evaders and is politically popular? We sure have one here and that's a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support vigorously the Representative Mugalian, Representative Greiman. I think that we forget sometimes that the Illinois income tax is a tax on income earned in Illinois and not a tax on Illinoisans who earn income in Illinois. Illinoisans are subject to the estimated tax and to withholding tax depending upon the source of their revenue. In order to collect from our out-of-state people it is absolutely imperative that we impose one or the other of these methods of collection or else face it, there's just absolutely no way that we can collect income tax on income that out-of-staters earn in Illinois. And I suggest to you as Representative Mugalian pointed out that there are many, many, many sources of income. I think one of probably the greatest is on real estate owned in this state by people who live outside of the state. There's absolutely no way to collect it unless we require that they pay estimated tax or withholding tax. This business about grain elevators and cattle feeders is purely a smokescreen as again has been pointed out because all that grain operator or cattle dealer has to do is require that



the people dealing with him file a simple form. All they have to do is have him certify that he has filed a declaration of estimated tax. That's a very simple form, nobody has any difficulty with it in the state. I don't see why we should feel so sorry for people outside of the state. Mr. Speaker, this is truly a bad Bill. We have to have a way to collect income taxes. Frankly, I think a hundred million dollars is short in revenue loss. I think the revenue loss would be a great deal more than that and when you consider all of the possibilities, I think you'll agree. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad Bill. I think it comes close to being a corrupt Bill and I urge that your vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have the greatest respect for the last two speakers. But I think they fail to recognize that this very extensive piece of legislation was snuck in the backdoor on a Conference Committee Report. It had no Committee consideration. In fact, when considered in Committee this proposal was turned down. Now all of us want to collect tax from those people that owe it to the State of Illinois. I, for one, am dedicated to see that we rectify this situation. But here we have at the twelfth hour a piece of legislation due to go into effect which makes tax collectors out of many, many people in this state who have no talent, no ability and no experience in collecting taxes for the State of Illinois. And in fact, if they have failed to do so over the last year and the Department of Revenue only put out their regulations in the last month or so, we're going to penalize them heavily. In fact, we're going to make them pay the tax that they failed to collect. Mr. Speaker, can I have order please?"



Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. Please."

Ewing: "I think... recently I had a constituent who asked for the forms from the Department of Revenue to collect this tax which he receives not one cent for doing and they couldn't send him out the forms until he sent them ten dollars for the form. How ridiculous can we get in this state? We can with proper consideration, I think, capture most of the money due us that's being lost. This Bill is bad, it's too late to implement. The Department doesn't think it can be properly implemented and I say the only way to rectify it is to repeal it and then if the Sponsor wants to reintroduce it and not sneak it in on a Committee... Conference Committee Report next time, we'll put a workable piece of legislation on the books and start to collect this money. And I would encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a couple short questions? Representative Bradley, I was wondering, you mentioned in your opening remarks what this particular Bill if not passed affect, the effect that it would have on the business climate, the employment climate in the State of Illinois. I wonder if you could expound on that just a little more in your remarks."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Mudd, very briefly let me say this. I think there will be a greater loss to the State of Illinois if we don't pass this Bill than if we... or there'll be a greater loss if we don't pass this Bill and if we leave it the way it is. And let me explain that statement. You come from the Peoria area where they have the Peoria Stockyards, I mentioned East St. Louis, the Joliet Stockyards and adjoining every one of those stockyards there is a packing industry. We have thousands of people employed in those packing



industry and I indicated in my remarks about East St. Louis, they can ill-afford to lose any industry at all. We subsidize East St. Louis now more than any other city in the state and if they lose this kind of business, good Lord, they'll have to be leaving East St. Louis. We just might as well close the whole place down. The income tax that we provide or we are provided in Illinois from those industries will in my opinion more than make up. Something that we haven't had and how can we lose it, the Ill... the Department of Revenue say they don't know what the dollar amount because we've never had the dollar amount. We don't know that there's... what the law says."

Mudd: "All right then, what you're saying is that this Bill if passed would have a greater monetary effect for the people in the State of Illinois than just the state collecting the tax, that they would provide a business climate, jobs and some security to the people in the sector that it addresses itself to?"

Bradley: "Absolutely. And those people all pay income tax that are in that, those particular industries that we would definitely be losing in Illinois."

Mudd: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar. Please give him order."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mahar: "Jerry, what effect does this have on lotteries? I heard in the debate that if somebody out of state wins a million dollar lottery we can't collect the tax. Is that true?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I seriously doubt that it would have an effect on the lottery. I'm... I can't be explicit on the



answer, Bill."

Mahar: "There was another comment was about the fact that the insurance companies are paying out-of-state premiums or commissions which we couldn't collect the tax on. Is that true?"

Bradley: "The Department still has the ability to collect those particular taxes. They're people that are recipients of those commissions, recipients of the lottery, those particular people are still liable for the state income tax and the Department of Revenue, it's their obligation to collect those taxes."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Please, please."

Mahar: "It seems to me that while we're trying to correct an obvious problem we're also creating a problem here and that it would seem to me be better that additional work be done on this legislation so that these loopholes could be closed. I'm just wondering why in the closing days of the 80th General Assembly that we have to take on this problem, we cannot leave it go until the spring to correct it properly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Bradley, the criticism has been made here when this Bill was originally passed, not this Bill but the legislation that we seek repeal was originally passed that that was done without the benefit of the Committee process. But it is in fact true that this repealer went through a Committee Hearing last week. Is that not so? In that Committee meeting last week did the Committee make suggestions instead of having a complete repealer to amend that Section to allow us still to have some mechanism for collection but not to totally repeal the law?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."



Bradley: "In reply to the question, there was no suggestion that I recall in that Committee to do that. There has been some suggestions though that there is some merit to the idea of making sure we collect everything that the State of Illinois is entitled to, but I don't recall if that was made in that particular Committee."

Satterthwaite: "Was it not, however, suggested at least here on the floor and I would have assumed also in Committee that we exempt only the farm communities or livestock producers and farm commodity producers who are the ones having the biggest problems?"

Bradley: "Yes, there.... there was an Amendment that was attempted to be attached to the Bill that was suggesting that that would be done. I don't believe that Amendment would do everything that needs to be done to put the Bill in the proper shape, put the law in the proper shape that would... should be with... than it will be with the passage of 1819."

Satterthwaite: "Well I guess I fail to understand why you were unwilling to accept that kind of an Amendment when that was the segment of our constituency crying for help. Was there any suggestions... I fail to understand why you would not have supported that Amendment. Was there an attempt to delay the effective date rather than have a total repeal? And if not, why was that not given adequate consideration in Committee?"

Bradley: "I would suggest that you probably could have introduced an Amendment delaying the effective date last week when the Bill was on Second Reading and I don't think that there was that kind of an Amendment offered."

Satterthwaite: "And neither was there an Amendment considered to provide some kind of a reporting mechanism even if we did not require withholding of this



tax."

Bradley: "Well that's right. In that Bill as you recall last week I moved the Bill and said I would hold it on Second Reading for whatever various Amendments the Members might wish to place on the Bill. And, we went to Second Reading and Mr. Greiman offered the... offered an Amendment and that was the only one that was substantive to the Bill to do any of the things that you're suggesting could be done."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I'm... I'm dismayed I guess that even though we had a Committee process for a hearing on this Bill that the Committee process apparently broke down in considering any kinds of alternatives and we're now left in a sort of untenable position of either totally supporting a repeal or rejecting the repeal which obviously does not address the questions that have been raised. I find now it a very difficult situation in which to try to make some logical decision because several viable alternatives that would have a better solution to the problem were not given serious consideration. And I regret very strongly that in this case even though there was a Committee hearing, the Committee process does not seem to have functioned well. I still am not sure how I'm going to vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of House Bill 1819. Living in southern Illinois and living between the Ohio River and the Mississippi River, one of our biggest industries is grain elevators. One of the biggest industries in the State of Illinois or grain elevator industries is the Bundy Corporation. In Alexander County I would say that is the biggest employer that we have in that entire county. And they do most of their business from three states - Illinois, Missouri and Kentucky. Now I've



got a letter here and I'm just going to read a little paragraph that I'd like to let the legis... the rest of the Legislators know about that was written by that particular elevator. 'We shall probably lose about thirty percent of our business if this law is allowed to prevail. There are others who shall probably lose as much as eighty percent of their business. This will mean a smaller paycheck for Illinois farmers because we have operating expenses which must be met so all we can do is lower the prices we pay to the farmers and other inland elevators who ship to our plant. So prices should also be lowered for grain at country elevators far from state lines. Our reduced ability to pay a good price would be the first blow against the farmer and the trucker and the fact that we could pay less at our river terminals for elevator grain should lessen competition and lower prices for grain in the State of Illinois.' I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this legislation does not pass, this repealer, then I'm going to be putting a lot of industry, important industry in my area of the state, the grain elevators, out of business. I ask all of you who are from southern Illinois to support this piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries^s. Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly appreciate the excellent discussion and debate we've had on the issue today. I'd like to make a couple of corrections though and remind



the Members of the House when we're talking about a loss to the State of Illinois in income tax, the Department of Revenue when I asked them for a fiscal note indicated they were unable to give me any kind of a figure at all of what if there is a loss what it might be or when I asked them also if they could determine what the loss might be to business in Illinois, they said it was impossible to do it. But what some people have said remind me of a little bit of a Committee hearing that I was in a year or two ago when we were trying to authorize the building of a nuclear power plant in Clinton and the EPA and the various organizations rushed in and said, we're going to kill the environment and the marine life will be killed in Clinton. It just so happened we didn't have any marine life in Clinton to lose by building the power plant. In fact, it's going to be a plus because we're going to have some marine life in the Clinton area when we... very shortly, in fact, right now. It just reminds me how can you lose something that you don't have? The people are still obligated to pay that income tax. We're just taking the burden off the businesses who are unable, who are going to lose business and are unable to collect it. I don't wish to debate the issue any longer. I think everybody knows what we're attempting to do. We're attempting to right a wrong. We can do it today. I simply ask for a favorable vote on the motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to explain my vote. We've all been in our districts for a couple of weeks now after the pay raise and we know the heat that we've gotten on



the pay raise. Too often our constituents look at one issue and they judge us on that one issue, and they don't realize what we can do as Legislators to help the revenue picture of the State of Illinois. In this one Bill, in this one Bill it would cost the State of Illinois in the neighborhood of one hundred million dollars. Put that one hundred million dollars next to that one million dollars for the pay raise. How can you vote for this Bill? I say that those who are nonresidents have an obligation to the State of Illinois. I hear from people who are criticized... criticize the State of Illinois, they criticize nonresidents. And they say, is that all that Illinois is good for? Is to dump waste in the State of Illinois, to come from other states to dump our hazardous wastes? Is that all that this State of Illinois is good for? Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that you can justify a vote on the pay raise on this one Bill alone because you would lose one hundred million dollars. And I don't see how anybody can vote for this Bill. Secondly, it has been said on the floor of the House that we are just implementing the law, just implementing it. Is that the time to change a law? No. You give it time to implement, you find out if it works. And then if it doesn't work, you come here. Before that, you cannot vote for this Bill unless you're voting for special interests. And I would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to explain my vote. Once again we're trying to undo something that this General Assembly has done already to put a burden on the business in the State of Illinois. Not only agri-business, but business. This is a state Department of Revenue



problem between the states, an interstate commerce problem. If I have a piece of land in Indiana, my friends, I'm still paying my income tax in Illinois. Now we've got bugs in this legislation. We need to start over and put it in the proper form. Otherwise you're putting a burden on the people of Illinois that we're going to be living with for some time to come. Now I suggest to you a green vote is the way to go and the next Session we'll straighten out the problems and get it in the form it should have been in before."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent. Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to explain my vote because I think that you are forgetting the difference between selling and sales and income. We are putting a burden on the very businesses that we are counting on to buy and sell in our state. And here we are, a man that sells a pig across the state line, that is not his income. He sold that. He still has to take out the expenses. And yet we as a state are burdening the business that bought it from him in order to sell and make prices better in Illinois, we are then encouraging them and telling them they have to hire lots more people to take this money and keep it until he verifies it. This is wrong. There is a difference between sales and income and we should remember that. I hope everyone will vote 'yes' on this Bill and then we can address the income problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, Gene Barnes."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the kind of Bill that really tears at you at times because there are friends on both sides of the issue. And many of my friends and especially my friends from down southern part



of the state, in the East St. Louis area, I would really like to support. But we must be realistic here and realize and understand what will take place if this piece of legislation is passed. We must understand that if we, the citizens of the State of Illinois, must pay these taxes, we must make sure on a equal basis that people that come into this state and raise their own revenue that benefit them must pay their likewise share, pro rata share of the taxes, the tax burden that all of us and all of the citizens of your constituency is burdened with. What this Bill does in its present form is allow for every nonresident to come into this state, make money in this state and pay no state income tax on that money. There was one question raised relative to the lottery which is a very simply proposition. I don't know whether or not that will happen or how many times it has happened in the past, but if someone after this... if this legislation is adopted, if someone from out of state wins five hundred thousand or a million dollars in the state lottery, that person after this is adopted will not have to pay any state income tax. Right now that person has to pay tax. Now I think, we've heard a lot of hue and cry in the last week relative to some of the actions that we take down here and that the public not knowing exactly what goes on, I am sure, I am sure that any and all of the constituency back in your districts, if they knew that you were exempting out-of-state residents from paying their equal pro rata share of a state income tax although they raised their income inside of the State of Illinois, they'd run us all out on a rail.. I urge you, I urge you to reconsider your vote because this is purely, purely a raid on the General Revenue Fund; no ifs, ands or buts about it and I vote 'no'."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think we made a very serious mistake last year in passing this law. The simplest way to correct a mistake is to repeal the law and that's what we're doing here now. This is not fair, it is going to drive business out of Illinois and certainly as has been pointed out, gross income is not profit. And now you're putting the burden on the small businessman in the border towns for collecting this tax and I urge you to give us a 107 votes on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I keep hearing about grain elevators. I remember back at the Amendment stage when it... when it would have been possible to deal with the question of grain elevators. The Sponsors of this Bill were not interested on confining the problem to grain elevators. I would like to know all of the groups that are going to pour through the hole in the line created for grain elevators. I see no reason why Mohammed Ali or any other person collecting large sums of money in Illinois should be treated differently than the people in Illinois. I always thought that charity began at home. I would think if there was going to be a difference we would let our local citizens go and make sure that nonresidents who have transactions in Illinois are required to pay their taxes. As this now is presented, those people who said they loved grain elevators didn't love them well enough to exempt other groups so that the grain elevators could go right through. It seems we may not be able to prevent the passage of this, but I would think that those people who really say they're for grain elevators ought to try to take this back to the Amendment stage, limit this to grain



elevators and then maybe they could get enough votes to survive a gubernatorial veto. I think they've shown the wrong kind of judgment. I'm not sure they love grain elevators very much. I'd like to know who they do love. All the other interests who are going to pour through this hole, I'm going to be voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's nice if we can collect a tax but if the farmers aren't going to have the customers you're not going to have any need for the tax. I think we should go ahead and pass this Bill, come back with an amended version next year to make any corrections of inequities. But I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "...to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, briefly. I don't know how many of my colleagues received a book last week written by a Senator in California entitled, 'Whoever said we read the Bill?' Very humorous and unfortunately very telling and pretty much on the mark in some ways. I think someone from Illinois after this Bill goes through and is going through should write 'Whoever said we want to know what's in the Bill?' The high decibel level of the noise when the debate was going on, it was a very good debate, gives I think pretty well attestation to the fact that really don't know and wants to know what's in the Bill, the vote was there. The people who do know what's in the Bill are hanging over the railing in the gallery very eager to see how it's going to pass. It's pretty simple. I'm not a revenue expert but I listen to the debate and what this is is simply a special interest Bill. And if you went back to your district, explained the Bill and read it to your constituents, you'd better well be sure



that they would tell you to vote 'no'. So again it's to heck with the people and business as usual. And I heard said that this didn't go through Committee. Well the Pay Raise Bill didn't go through a Committee either. I heard said that we'll come back next year and rectify it. Well if you believe that, you believe in the tooth fairy. And you know, you keep on lifting up the pillow and the tooth is still there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had absolutely no intention of rising to speak on this Bill but solely to express my vote in opposition to it because I frankly feel that the arguments made by some Gentlemen who spoke on this a lot earlier were absolutely correct. I especially resent the fact that one person who for a week and a-half has harangued the hell out of me for voting for a pay raise for myself and others which I feel is justified, now comes to me and says, we've go to help the poor little farmer. We've got to help the poor little insurance agent. I don't see any poor little farmers here in the balcony. I don't see any poor little insurance agents up here anywhere in the balcony. Where are these poor little people that all of a sudden we're supposed to help with almost a hundred million dollars worth of cash that this state is going to lose? It's a hypocritical stand, absolutely hypocritical on the part of those who speak out of both sides of their mouth on this issue. Now I don't care how you vote on what you vote, you vote for what you believe. But I'll be damned if somebody's going to end up attempting to make me the fall guy and make me look like the bad guy and they look like the saint. You'll take your eight grand like everybody else is going to



take their eight grand. And I have got it up to my schnoz in listening to the pious platitudes of all of those people, not all, some of you have voted your conscience and conviction, but some of you who run up and hope...hope that that Bill passes to get that eight grand and are the first ones running out and running with that press release to say how terrible and how bad this is. Shame on all of you and shame on the rest of you for blowing a hundred million dollars for the state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Friedrich was right. This was a mistake in the beginning when it happened. It happened through the process of the Conference Committee. Hardly nobody knew what was going on. The Revenue Department themselves admitted that they had no position on the Bill, the original Bill itself. They had a terrible time coming up with some regulations and when the regulations did finally come down or start coming down, this is when all the problems started. Now I can relate to what this problem creates so far as East St. Louis is concerned. The City of East St. Louis right now is about to lose one of their hospitals, the loss of four hundred jobs. They are next month, in January, the end of January losing a glass plant, six hundred and forty jobs. Over a thousand jobs already we know we're going to lose. If the National Stockyards shuts down and they're likely to simply because the farmers in Missouri and the surrounding states will not bring their cattle and hogs into East St. Louis and be charged two and a-half percent of their gross and then have to fill out these simple, simple forms that we heard about here today. They just won't be here to start with. Now there's



more than a thousand jobs related to the stockyards down there. We will be more than two thousand jobs down in East St. Louis and I think all of us know that we can ill-afford that sort of thing. We need to get the 107 votes up on the board for this Bill and pass it and get it over with."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's time that we came to our senses around here. We have heard a lot of people haranguing the pay raise because of the heat that has been generated by that vote. But there is no reason to tie the pay raise to this piece of legislation. If this Bill does not pass, we are going to run business out of the State of Illinois because of the fact that people are bringing livestock and grain into this state and should not be paying state income tax on what they produced in another state, not in my estimation at least. I think it's time that we switch some of those red votes and absentees over to green votes and give this Bill the 107 votes it needs for passage and immediate effectiveness. Please, I think we need it downstate. We must protect the State of Illinois and the job climate here. It's obvious that the people from the metropolitan area do not understand downstate. The only thing they know about is driving through it on the way down from Chicago. And please, I think we need grain votes, let's get some on the board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty. Representative 'Dimarco', will you please sit down?"

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's a lot of misunderstanding about this Bill. It has a lot to do with things besides pigs and the stockyards. As a matter of fact, the full extent of the



damage that will done has yet, not yet been understood by the people in business in this state. Any county or city that borders on another state such as the Port of Chicago, will be greatly affected if this repealer is not put in. If this is not repealed, many business places will be placed in jeopardy and they will be liable to the State of Illinois for taxes that they will be obligated to collect. As it has been said previously by Representative Tipword when the Amendment on this Bill was proposed, this Bill should be reintroduced next spring and those problems with it should be corrected by a full hearing in the Revenue Committee. I urge you that... to vote for this Bill. I want you to understand that this repealer was heard in the Revenue Committee by a full hearing of the Committee, over 20 Members voted unanimously to repeal and to support this Bill. And these Members were from every part of the state. So this is not a farmers Bill. If we don't repeal it, we're going to cause many, many problems to our people in business. And if you support the Committee system, you should vote for this Bill. The Sun-Times had an article in it today showing that...there are many injustices that have to be corrected and we only can do that by looking at it more seriously next spring. So I urge you to vote 'yes' now and then come in and the Bill can be studied in Revenue next spring."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

C.M. Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think what we have before us today is very serious. For the past two years we've discussed the need for entering the industrial sweepstakes. We've discussed the need for Illinois to begin to compete with other states in attracting industry and in keeping industry here in Illinois. We know we have had an exodus of jobs from this



state and what we are doing here with this Bill? Ladies and Gentlemen, we're destroying many businesses and we're putting thousands of employees out of work. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before us this fall. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. It's important to every area in downstate Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle. Stuffle, Stuffle. Next to Ellis Levin."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I find it interesting the arguments that are made here. There are arguments that this is not equitable, it doesn't serve the purpose that its ends are intended to serve. But I would point out with all the harangues about who's hanging over the rails of the gallery and as I look up there I see people representing livestock interests, farm interests. The Farm Bureau's talked to me four times in the last two weeks. I received thirty-six messages by phone or by mail. Everyone has been from either a farmer, a livestock dealer, a grain elevator operator. No one else. It's crucial to downstate Illinois that this pass, it's the only form we have before us now. It's crucial to downstate Illinois more so than probably anything else that could be proposed. People knew this was going to happen, they know the burden it's placing on these people, particularly if you live on the edge, the border of the state, if you will. You're going to have more and more problems with this if it continues on the books. It's got to be passed now or we're going to continue to have the chaos that exists now only it's going to get worse and worse because the Department apparently doesn't know what it's doing on this activity. The people who are entrusted with, in effect, being withholders of income don't know how and they can't be expected



to. If we don't give it a green light, we're going to hurt industry and particularly those people who it's really aimed at, that we've talked about and there really are the people that are... people who ought to be helped by this and those are the people in downstate Illinois. We need a green vote very badly on this Bill, the harangues notwithstanding."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think I can add too much to what's been brought out. This Bill, they've talked about losing a million dollars. Well I'll tell you this, if this Bill isn't passed we'll lose many millions of dollars when we find out how many businesses we've run out of states by having legislation of this type. The present legislation was so confusing to the Department of Revenue that they spent almost a year trying to analyze it. In fact, it was supposed to have been in force six months before they ever got it analyzed out and decided just how to enforce it. Therefore, we do need to take this Bill and kill it, come back next year. And the Revenue Department has told me that they'll come up or be able to take care of the inaccuracies that we do have, but not the inaccuracies that this Bill puts on. Therefore if we do not vote for this, we're going to see many businesses in the... in the State of Illinois have to close up, many businesses that do business here, foreign business like livestock business and so forth that get fifty percent of the livestock out of state. And you can know... you know yourself as soon as they tell these farmers they're going to have to withhold or have to sign papers if they're going to bring the livestock to 'em, they just won't bring it to Illinois because there is other places they can go whether it's grain or livestock and what. And so we in Illinois are



going to be the losers by it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry. If this Bill receives 89 votes, will it then become law next year?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was your inquiry, Representative Yourell?"

Yourell: "What is the vote that is necessary to make this Bill become law?"

Speaker Redmond: "107 votes."

Yourell: "Now that's immediately, correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Yourell: "How about if it receives 89?"

Speaker Redmond: "Would have to be brought back to the Order of Second Reading and take off the effective date."

Yourell: "All right. If this Bill receives 107 votes or more I want a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "You and Representative Mugalian are running in tandem on that. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a green light up there and it isn't because I resent the revenue that could come into the State of Illinois through our action previous to this. We need that money. Lord knows, the State of Illinois needs that money. However, I'm voting green because it's obvious to me that if there are 101 green lights on that board right now, there's some inequity involved in the legislation as we passed it last year. There's something wrong with our legislation and it's on that basis that we're getting protests from the people of Illinois. We're hurting them at the same time we're grubbing for money, I don't think that's what we want. My idea of voting green to repeal is with the hope that Gerald Bradley in the 81st General Assembly will



come back with legislation which will bring us the justified revenue without injuring people. I don't care what part of the state they come from. I am voting green to repeal this with the fervent hope that we can pick it up next year, that next year we can come through with viable, I repeat, viable legislation that won't offend the farmers or the meat people, legislation that'll bring in revenue without hurting Illinoisans. It's on that basis that I'm voting green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ordinarily you would expect me to rise and probably talk about such things as livestock yards and grain elevators and what-not. But what we're talking about today is a whole lot more important than that. We're talking about a withholding Bill. People who are going to be required to withhold money, return that money to the State of Illinois, those people who are dealing with out-of-state folks they make payments to. Let's talk about some of those innercity tenants who might be renting property from an out-of-state landowner. They're going to have the obligation to withhold, to make payments to the State of Illinois. If they don't withhold, they are going to have an obligation here that frankly I don't think they're going to be equipped to deal with. So I think we'd better stop to consider all the various elements in this state that we're talking about when we're talking about the withholding that's required under this legislation."

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

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to explain my 'yes' vote. This General Assembly gets



itself into a peck of trouble a lot of times when we pass Bills in the closing Session of the Legislature which nobody knows the full extent of those Bills and I think we have a classic example right here. I don't believe there were ten Members of this House that knew that this provision was in that Conference Committee Report when the Bill passed in the closing days of the 1977 Session. We created a monstrosity for some business in Illinois. Now the only thing it seems to me that makes any sense in doing in this particular case is to repeal that law and next Session come back in here, have our Committee hearings, discuss the problems that are involved and pass the kind of Bill that is enforceable. Now I will join with those of you who are saying that we should make every effort to collect taxes due the State of Illinois from nonresidents. I'm in full agreement with what you're saying, but let's not do it by means of the way this Bill passed. There are very few people in the Legislature that really know the full extent of the obligation that's been placed on the citizens of Illinois. In my opinion, the only sensible thing to do is to repeal this Bill and that calls for a green vote. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis."

C. Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I look at the board most of the people that I really believe in and vote with are voting opposite the way I vote. I've listened to this debate, I've tried to analyze it. I, if you look up there on the board, I'm voting 'aye' and I'm going to tell you why. The people who live in the towns that border other states like Missouri are saying that if we don't repeal this law it's going to put them out of business. I know one of those



such towns. I know the town of East St. Louis and I know the suffering that's going on in that town now. How in the world can I stand here and say that I will vote against a Bill that will repeal this and that will give them an opportunity down here. Well I'm going to tell you now, I didn't come here to be a pallbearer at the people of East St. Louis's funeral and they tell me this is going to put them out business. And for that reason and no other reason, I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before our legislative duties became so heavy I was raising some chickens out in Lake County which is supposed to be a suburban area and I buy my chicken feed from Freemont Center Feed, just a small business operation in Central Lake County. And I just got a call from the manager of Freemont Center Feed, this was about a couple of weeks ago, out of the blue he gets a letter indicating that he's going to have an obligation to the State of Illinois to pay twelve thousand dollars for some money he should have been withholding. And he said he never knew anything about it, he never heard anything about it. And why are we going to put a burden like that, twelve thousand dollars, on a small businessman? Now one of colleagues on the floor of the House here just told me, 'Well don't worry about that. If it gets to court, it'll surely be held unconstitutional or it can't be enforced because there weren't any regulations.' Why do we want to continue a law that we think for the balance of this year is going to be unconstitutional? Why do we want to tell the businessman, 'You can go and fight the Department of Revenue in court.' The fairest thing, the best thing to do is to repeal this and to vote 'yes'."



Now during my first term I remember we had some battles with Speaker Blair and I was on my feet one time saying, 'This isn't fair, this isn't fair.' Somebody came to me and said, 'Well, you got to learn one thing about the Illinois General Assembly - fairness doesn't matter.' But I'm saying, that may be true in the past and maybe once in awhile fairness doesn't matter, but let's be fair to our constituents, let's be fair to our small businessmen and I want to be fair to the manager of the Freemont Center Feed who's got a twelve thousand dollar obligation to the State of Illinois for what he... for a law that we passed and that I didn't know we passed. When he called me, I said I didn't know about any such thing. If the Members of the General Assembly don't even know about it, how can we expect the businessman and taxpayer to cough up the money? I think a fair vote and a good vote is green and I urge more of them Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. It's simply to correct a wrong that was done in Conference Committee in... most recent Session. This does not relieve the liability of paying the taxes for any of those people and this has not been said on this House floor. But the problem arose when the Department said that they were going to make tax collectors out of every grain elevator and out of every livestock yard in this state. And for that reason that they were going to have to withhold the people from other states and the East St. Louis stockyards said that they' get about fifty percent of their animals from Missouri and other states, not from the State of Illinois. And if they had to start withholding tax on those people, they were going to



go to other states and they weren't going to come in and it was going to drive them out of business. So I simply say to you, let's repeal Section 701C and it does not relieve the responsibility of those people to pay their taxes that live out of state. And then let's work out some equitable arrangement in the next Session. I'd appreciate more 'aye' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew." McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's been a misconception here frankly that we're providing for an opportunity for people that are gathering income in the State of Illinois to escape this tax and that is simply not true. Let me give you an example of what's going in our legislative district. We have Illini Beef Packers that's one of the major beef processing plants in the State of Illinois. Nearly eighty percent of their beef comes from either Iowa or Missouri. Right now if a farmer sends their beef directly, the beef packing plant must withhold the State of Illinois income tax. Though the livestock were not raised here, none of the feed was bought here or anything else, we are now requiring them to withhold that two and a-half percent. You figure that the guy sent five hundred head of cattle that's entirely permissible, is entirely possible, you could be talking upwards... I'm sorry, I didn't mean the five hundred, I mean just send a hundred head of cattle. You could be talking upwards of five hundred dollars per head. Now we're saying you have to take out that tax, you have to withhold it. Sure you can it back. All you have to do is file, the State of Illinois gets the money free and you're out for a while. If they'd, instead of shipping that direct send it through a stockyards of some other sort, they



don't have to pay it. Now I don't know where we're getting the figure of a hundred million dollars. I called the Department of Revenue myself immediately after returning after the last Session and found out what a boondoggle we created and they told me at that point there is no discernable difference in the amount of money that the State of Illinois will ultimately end in the treasury. Now the... perhaps part of the key is how much we will ultimately have because sure, we're getting the money, we're keeping it for awhile. The thing that they're overlooking frankly is the fact that the people do have the right to get it back, they probably will, but I think that we should not be making tax collectors out of people that are not in the business and making people file and pay taxes when they legally shouldn't have ^{to}. I ask you, I plead you, give us six more votes. Thank you."

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

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would urge that we get a few more green votes on this Bill. As Minority Spokesman on the Revenue Committee, we never heard this Bill in Committee till last week when we heard it, when it came back over from the Senate. It wasn't heard, it wasn't discussed, no one knew what was in it when it got in on... in the Conference Committee Report. I think we all need to look at this. I have a district that borders on the river, that's on the Mississippi River and adjacent to the National Stockyards. Our district joins that district and I know what it would do for business and for the farmers and the grain elevators. It would put our grain elevators out of business, it would hurt our stockyards, it would put them out of business. We need 107 green votes. I certainly



would urge and plead that you give us the votes, let's come back next year and take the Bill through Committee and we'll discuss it. We'll get a Bill that's equitable and fair and one that'll do what this was meant to do. I'm sure the intentions were good, but it's a bad Bill and let's pass this... let's pass this Bill so we can repeal it. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye' and 50 'no'. Representative Mugalian has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Bradley requests a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, will you poll the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Adams."

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

Mugalian: "I just wonder if it would be easier and faster to just have a verified Oral Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think I probably should have done that to begin with, but I didn't do it. You warned me, but I didn't heed your warning. So I think it could... probably is better this way. Will you proceed with the poll of the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Bianco, Brady."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady desires to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, Epton, Gaines, Hanahan, Emil Jones, Klosak, Macdonald, Peggy Smith Martin, McBroom, Pierce, E.G. Steele. No further absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Verify the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, Bartulis, Beatty, Bennett, Birchler, Boucek, Bradley, Brady, Breslin, Rich Brummer,



Don Brummet, Campbell, Capparelli, Catania, Christensen, Collins, Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Edgar, Ewing, Farley, Flinn, Friedrich, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Griesheimer, Harris, Hart, Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis, will you step to the podium please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Hoxsey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell desires to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hudson, Huff, Huskey, Jacobs, Johnson, Dave Jones, Kane, Keats, Kempiners, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lucco, Luft."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mahar, Margalus, Matejek, Matula, Mautino, McAuliffe, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Shumpert, Skinner, Stearney, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Sumner, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, Vinson, Vitek, Waddell, R.V. Walsh, Wikoff, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker C. Davis: "Are there any questions of the affirmative vote? Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Representative Boucek."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is Representative Boucek in the House? There he is, he's in the rear."

Mugalian: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Garmisa. The Gentleman in the House? Garmisa? How is Representative Garmisa recorded?"



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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Mugalian: "DiPrima."

Speaker C. Davis: "DiPrima, Representative DiPrima. Is he back there, is he in the House? Representative DiPrima in the House? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Hold it, hold it. He's here. Representative DiPrima is here."

Mugalian: "Huskey."

Speaker C. Davis: "Who?"

Mugalian: "Huskey."

Speaker C. Davis: "Oh, Huskey, Representative Huskey in the House? He's here. Would you like to..."

Mugalian: "Kempiners."

Speaker C. Davis: "...be excused? Kempiners, Representative Kempiners. Where is he. He's here, Representative Kempiners is here. He's on the Democratic side."

Mugalian: "Representative Kane."

Speaker C. Davis: "Who? Representative Kane. He's here. What... just a minute, hold it. What purpose does Representative Ewell arise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my 'present' vote to a vote of 'aye'."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Ewell, 'pres'... 'aye'... changes from 'present' to 'aye'. Alright, proceed."

Mugalian: "Representative Lucco."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Lucco, is he in the House? The Gentleman is here. He's in the rear. Here he is, Representative Lucco."

Mugalian: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker C. Davis: "McGrew. Representative McGrew is in his seat."

Mugalian: "Representative Mudd."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Mudd. There he is in the



aisle."

Mugalian: "Representative Reed."

Speaker C. Davis: "Who?"

Mugalian: "Reed."

Speaker C. Davis: "Reed. Proceed, the Lady is in her chair."

Mugalian: "I see her. Representative Stearney."

Speaker C. Davis: "Stearney. He's not here. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

Mugalian: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker C. Davis: "Who? Who was that? Terzich. Representative Terzich. He's here. He's in the back."

Mugalian: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker C. Davis: "Hold it, hold it. Just a minute.

Representative Brandt, do you wish....Representative Brandt wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'....as... recorded as 'aye'."

Mugalian: "Who...who?"

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Brandt. Right here. Brandt...!B-R-A-N-T! (sic). Representative Madigan wishes to be verified."

Mugalian: "O.K."

Speaker C. Davis: "Stuffle did you say?"

Mugalian: "Stuffle."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stuffle, is he in the House? Is Representative Stuffle in the House? Here he is. Here he is."

Mugalian: "All right. Representative Wikoff."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Wikoff. He's in his Chair."

Mugalian: "Representative Bartulis."

Speaker C. Davis: "Bartulis...is he...he's here. All right, all right. Representative Garmisa is back, put him on.

Mugalian: "Did we ask for Representative J. Dunn."



Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Dunn, J. Dunn, he's in his seat."

Mugalian: "Representative...."

Speaker C. Davis: "Just a minute. What purpose does the Gentleman rise, Representative Gaines? Representative Gaines wishes to be voted 'aye'."

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

Speaker C. Davis: "That's all? Representative Emil Jones, what purpose....Representative Emil Jones wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Gene Hoffman...the Chair recognizes....wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Anyone else? What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: One hundred and fifteen 'aye' and forty-eight 'no'."

Speaker C. Davis: "This Bill...just a minute. For what purpose does the Lady rise from...."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker C. Davis: "Change the Lady from 'present' to 'aye' will you please. Representative Satterthwaite. What is it now? One hundred and sixteen."

Clerk O'Brien: One hundred and sixteen 'ayes', 48 'nays'.

Speaker C. Davis: "On this question there's 116 'ayes' and 48 'nays'. The Bill having received the two-thirds majority it now declared passed. Three-fifths majority. On the Calendar, Supplemental #2, is Senate Bill 1531. It's a reduction veto motion and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman Bloomington, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me first say, thank you very much from my colleagues for a long debate and I appreciate their votes. It seems to be that kind of a day. Senate Bill 1531, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is a Bill that fully funded the library grant in the office of the Appropriation Bill of the Secretary of State and



we are making a motion to override the veto of the Governor. He cut....the original total was a 16 million 45 thousand dollar grant, the Governor cut 5 million 824 thousand to give us a new total of 10 million 221...220 thousand dollars, a 25% cut in needed funds to fully fund for as I....as the best of my knowledge for the first time the library system of Illinois, the added additional dollars on this motion that would be applied would go for various things for the library, many of the things for the handicapped, for the braille system...the books, for various pieces of movie films, strips, various additional magazines, additional books rather, that are very necessary in the....to fully fund the library system. We've all heard I'm sure throughoutfrom all of our constituents or from many of them, the need for funding this particular program. And I would simply, respectfully request an 'aye' vote on this motion."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker C. Davis: "He indicates he will."

Ryan: "Representative Bradley, can you tell me what the cost is of this Bill?"

Bradley: "Yes, the original Bill called for 16 million, 45 thousand dollars. The Governor cut out 5 million and 824 thousand, giving us a new total of 10 million. So the additional cost will be for the library grants a 5 million 824 thousand. Also the research and reference grants of about 15 thousand, so we're talking somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 million, 840 thousand dollars in this motion."

Ryan: "This is an additional 5-1/2 million dollars, is that what you're telling me?"



Bradley: "That's correct, 5 million, 840 thousand."

Ryan: "And how much are they going to get without the additional 5, how much..."

Bradley: "They would receive...the original Bill calls for 16 million and the new total is 10 million, 220 thousand dollars. Plus 760 thousand for the research and reference grants."

Ryan: "How much of an increase is that over the prior year?"

Speaker C. Davis: "Mr. Ryan and Mr. Bradley, just a minute, may I interrupt? We're only taking here the first item on page 11, line 22 and 26 on the first items...only, only."

Bradley: "On that...that does not include the 15 thousand for the reference."

Speaker C. Davis: "The 16 thousand and 54."

Bradley: "Right, I stand corrected, Sir."

Speaker C. Davis: "1654."

Bradley: "The question I think the Minority Leader asked is the...10 million would be an 8% increase over a year ago."

Ryan: "You're saying they're going to get an 8% increase and it's still not enough, is that what you're telling me?"

Bradley: "It simply does not fully fund the program."

Ryan: "Well, I must oppose this motion based on the fact that it's an additional 5 million dollars that is not in the budget and I would ask for your support in defeating this motion."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is there anything...further discussion? Any further discussion? Who is any...all right. The Gentleman from McClain, close the debate."

Bradley: "I would close simply by reminding the Members that by statute in 1976 there was a mandate to fully fund this program. There are many people in the State of Illinois that get a great...they use the library system to a great extent. We're mandated to fund it. We have fully funded other programs now that...we're obligated to



do...to fund and I simply ask for an 'aye' vote now on this particular motion. Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall the reduction on page 11, line 22 and 26 of House Bill 1531 be restored to it's original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposeswhat purpose does the Gentleman rise, Mr. Bradley? Vote 'aye'? All in favor...anybody to explain their vote? Any explanations? Representative Ralph Dunn, do you wish to explain your vote? Representative Ralph Dunn...speaker, oh yeah, speaker, all right. The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn, do you want to speak, your light is on."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see there's plenty of votes up there as I understand it only takes 89 votes, is that correct?"

Speaker C. Davis: "That's correct."

R. Dunn: "I'll waive my right to speak. Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "All voted who wish? All voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 131 'ayes', 25 'nays', 3 voting 'present' and this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails. And items on page 11, line 22 and 26 is restored to its regular amount notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Now, on page 11, the same Bill...on page 11, line....what purpose does the Gentleman rise, Representative Friedrich? Pardon me."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I had two Senate Bills which have been amended...I...the proper time I'd like to have those called so that they can get over to the Senate to concur."

Speaker C. Davis: "Two Senate Bills...do you know his Bills?"

Friedrich: "1886 and 1887."

Speaker C. Davis: "All right, we'll get to them. Now the rest of this Bill is on...it's the second item on the same



motion, on page 11, lines 27 and 29 from 775 thousand to 760 thousand 900. The Gentleman...Mr. Bradley. The second one, the second one, now we've got to vote on the second one. From 775...775 to 769.

Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "The second part, Mr. Speaker...or Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is the...to restore 15 thousand dollars for the Research and Reference Grants that were cut by the Governor. And I simply move for the approval of the motion."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is...Representative Totten, do you wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker C. Davis: "He indicates he'll yield...will you yield, Mr. Sponsor?"

Totten: "Would you give us, Jerry, a more...a better explanation of what that is?"

Bradley: "O.K., I'm sorry. Yes, in the Research and Reference Grants appropriation as sent to the Governor 775 thousand dollars. The Governor, in his wisdom, cut 15 thousand dollars from the....from that particular grant and giving a new total of 760 thousand dollars. So what we're talking about here is the total of 15 thousand dollars on the override."

Totten: "For one specific purpose?"

Bradley: "What was the question?"

Totten: "Is the 15 thousand dollars for one specific item or just a total reduction?"

Bradley: "For the Research and Reference Grants that are used by colleges and universities. And the library system, yes."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Bradley, would you close



the debate?"

Bradley: "Simply and respectfully request an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall the reduced item on page 11, line 27 and 29 from....of Senate Bill 1531 be reduced from 775 thousand...be restored...775 thousand to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Speaker wants to vote 'aye'. Which one is the Speaker's? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Yes....who? All voted who wish? All right, take the record, Mr. Speaker. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 39 'noes', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails. And items on page 11, 27 to 29 have been restored. Is there any more in there? That's all on this...here. What's the next one? Senate Bills on Third Reading. 1877, Representative Dan Houlihan. Representative Houlihan, he is back there? All right. Out of the record. 1881, Representative Ewing. Senate Bill 1881."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1881. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the various state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill which was approved in Committee, passed out of the Senate. It's been sent over here to provide funds for the Department of Corrections to pay for the new guards needed at the correctional center, to pay for the advances in salaries for beginning guards and to help us beef up our whole correctional institution. This Bill also provides money for the prosecution and the defense of those incidents arising from the recent



riot. And I would of course like to have this Body to be aware that this happened in my county. I would also like them to be aware that one of my partners has been hired as the special prosecutor. And though he will be paid, none of those funds will go into my law firm, I think with the current attitude of the press that I would want everyone here on this floor to be aware of that matter. I personally don't believe that this is a conflict of interest and I'm going to vote my conscience on this Bill. But I want every Member of this Body to be aware of that fact. I would now ask for your approval of this Bill to allocate money to the Department of Corrections for guard salaries, for paying for the new guards, for the prosecution defense work of the result of the riot in Pontiac on last July 22nd."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is there any discussion? Representative Madigan. The Chair recognizes Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker C. Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield? He indicates he will."

Madigan: "Mr. Ewing, is this...I had a difficult time hearing your explanation. Is this the Bill that would appropriate money to pay for the prosecutorial costs emanating out of the riot at the Pontiac prison?"

Ewing: "Yes, that's right. That's a small part of it, 450 thousand dollars."

Madigan: "And I understand that that money is appropriated first to the Department of Corrections and then it will be transmitted from the Department of Corrections to the local State's Attorney."

Ewing: "Representative Madigan, it is required by law that this money be appropriated to the Department of Corrections. I do not think it will go to the State's Attorney. It will go to the County of Livingston or wherever the prosecution expenses are incurred and it



will not be sent out just to be spent. It will be there to pay as expenses are incurred."

Madigan: "Well I understand that and I agree with it but the question in my mind is reconciling that action with the recent opinion of the Department of Revenue, that monies appropriated to the Metropolitan Fair and Exhibition Authority in Chicago must be appropriated directly to the authority and not first to the Department of Revenue. So that we have from the Governor's office or from the executive department apparently two irreconcilable opinions. Do you understand that?"

Ewing: "No."

Madigan: "The Department of Revenue has told us that money can not be appropriated to the Department of Revenue first for transmittal to an outside agency. Apparently, the Department of Corrections feel that the money should be first appropriated to the Department of Corrections for subsequent transmittal to other outside agencies."

Ewing: "Representative Madigan, the only answer I could give that would differentiate that is that its specifically provided for in statute that the state will reimburse for these expenses."

Madigan: "I have no quarrel with reimbursing the counties for the expenses incurred in this matter. I agree with that. However, I see one of Mr. Ryan's assistance standing next to you and maybe he could confer with the Governor's office so that we can get a definitive opinion on this matter. We are, at this point in time, proceeding ahead with two Bills where the Executive has rendered apparently two inconsistent opinions."

Ewing: "Mr. Madigan, in my report here on the appropriations, maybe I was incorrect, it says that the money will go to the State Comptroller to reimburse Livingston County. Now does that make a difference in your question if it goes there instead of the Department



of Corrections?"

Madigan: "It is my understanding, subject to correction, that that money is for the defense...for the public defenders."

Ewing: "Pardon me."

Madigan: "It is my understanding that the money that is appropriated to the Comptroller is the money that was added by Representative Martin's Amendment that will be subsequently transmitted to the public defenders on the defense side. So that the Bill itself contains inconsistencies. The money for the prosecution side goes first to the Department of Corrections, the money for the defense side goes to the Comptroller. I would sincerely request that you hold this Bill until we get an opinion from the Governor's office as to how these monies should be appropriated. We have three instances today of different types of appropriations."

Ewing: "I'd be glad to hold it if we can get back to it today. I'd like to try and get that answered..."

Madigan: "Well can we get a response from the Governor's office?"

Ewing: "I haven't been down on the second floor today but I'll be glad to go."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is that the desire of the Gentleman? Mr. Clerk...is that taken out of the record?"

Ewing: "Please take it out of the record."

Speaker C. Davis: "All right. Mr. Clerk, will you take it out of the record? Let's see what's next here. 1882, Macdonald. Let's see...1882, we took that one out of the record. Yeah, Madigan asked him to hold it. Senate Bill 1882, Representative Macdonald. Not in her seat. Out of the record. Take it...1883, Representative Jack Davis."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1883. A Bill for an Act to amend Section of an Act to provide for the ordinary and



contingent expenses of various state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Jack Davis. Senate Bill 1883."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1883 is the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission Supplemental Appropriation that seems to be necessary each fall because of the law enforcement agency at the federal level who only estimates what its grants are going to be and there's a necessity in the fall for a cleaning up and changing line item transfers within the Bill. The Bill has been amended in the House and has to go back to the Senate for concurrence today. There were three Amendments added back in that were taken by the Senate, we added them back in. I think one will be nonconcurrent in the Senate but there is agreement on both sides of the rotunda. So I would simply ask you to vote 'aye' on this clean-up Bill for the wonderful Illinois Law Enforcement Commission."

Speaker C. Davis: "Senate Bill 1883. Any debate? The Chair recognizes the Lady, Miss Penny Pullen."

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

Speaker C. Davis: "He indicates he will. All you have to do is touch him. He says no."

Pullen: "I wonder if the Sponsor would please tell us what this money is intended to be used for or are we simply passing an appropriation because there is some federal money available?"

J. Davis: "Well, at this point in time, Representative Pullen, these are all transfers within the appropriation with the exception of the added money that was taken out which will be used...there's 200 thousand dollars that will be used for the Illinois Law Enforcement training situation where we passed Representative McAuliffe's Bill or



overrode the Bill to add another million dollars into the local police training boards. This is for evaluation of those training programs to see if we're getting our money's worth. The Amendment #1 for a sum of I think 52 thousand dollars is a grant to Sangamon State University for the training of circuit clerks."

Pullen: "Where does it transfer the money from?"

J. Davis: "I beg your pardon."

Pullen: "Where does it transfer the money from?"

J. Davis: "The transfer...it's all federal dollars with a small amount of GRF as these programs normally are. The transfer of the money is from the Federal Government when the increase in the LEAA Grants came through... passed the appropriation, the normal OCE appropriation of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission."

Pullen: "Is this a transfer within the department's existing appropriation statute or is it an additional appropriation which is a transfer from the Federal Government to the State?"

J. Davis: "Yes, it is. It is an additional 1 million dollars in...1 million, 4 hundred thousand in additional LEAA money grants from the Federal Government to the State of Illinois."

Pullen: "What do you anticipate this one and a-half million dollars will be used for?"

J. Davis: "As I told you it increases certain grant items within the...within the Law Enforcement Commission adjustment transfers and the grants that are already existing."

Pullen: "Why is it needed?"

J. Davis: "I really can't answer that, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill? Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill please?"

Speaker C. Davis: "You may proceed, please."

Pullen: "Thank you. This is a Bill to appropriate another million and a half dollars to the Illinois Law Enforcement



Commission of federal money because the federal agency found that it had more money that it would like to give to the State of Illinois in grants. I think it is very poor practice for us to repeatedly in these fall sessions appropriate more money just because more becomes available from Washington. We should ask really whether the money is needed, exactly what it is going to be used for rather than just whether it is available to us. And I think that in this day and age, the State of Illinois should start turning down some of those federal dollars unless it really is needed for programs that affect our people. I personally am not convinced that this amount of money is needed. And I don't think that the fact that it is available from the Federal Government is a good enough reason to vote for the Bill. So I will withhold my vote and urge the rest of you to do likewise."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Peters on the other side of the aisle and I from this side of the aisle put on the Amendments of the Appropriation Committee to obtain this federal money. Now we both understood that this is still taxpayers' money whether it is federal money or state money. But let's face certain realities. If we don't accept this money, it will be given to other states. It isn't saved money, it just will go to other states. Let's understand something else, this is for the training of law enforcement officers. Now if we expect law enforcement, we better have some well trained officers. The use of this federal money will bolster up our training efforts in various law departments. It is important in our fight against crime that we continue to support our law enforcement agencies and I recommend voting for this Bill."



Speaker C. Davis: "Any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Jack Davis to close the debate."

J. Davis: "Well, just in summing up, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these transfers and supplementals become necessary simply because we don't know how much federal money is going to be finally allocated from LEAA. And when it finally comes down the grant lines are increased to people like the Department of Corrections is involved, your local police agencies, a group and variety of local agencies that take advantage of LEAA and ILEC monies. The grant items that Representative Kosinski mentioned certainly are very important. They only represent some 250 thousand dollars of this appropriation. I might add to you that there is a net reduction of 16 thousand dollars in General Revenue Funds in this total supplemental appropriation of 1 million, 435 thousand. I simply would urge an 'aye' vote because the money is getting to our local agencies and to the Department of Corrections who desperately need it."

Speaker C. Davis: "Shall Senate Bill 1883 pass? All in favor let me know by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Anybody looking to explain their vote? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? I don't see anybody wanting to be recognized, do you? No lights blinking. Who wants to be recognized? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 142 'ayes', 6 'nays' and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Three-fifths majority. Is that what it took on this, three-fifths? Pick up 1882, Mr. Ryan will handle it. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1882. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection



Agency and Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, the distinguished Minority Leader, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you for the kind words, Mr. Speaker, they're hard to come by from the Chair lately. Senate Bill 1882 is....the original Sponsor on this is Representative Macdonald and she's not here today because of some illness in her family. And I'm going to attempt to handle this Bill for her. It's a supplemental appropriation of 2 million, 3 hundred and 23 thousand 5 hundred dollars in Federal and General Revenue Funds to the Environmental Protection Agency and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any further discussion...on Senate Bill 1882? All right. Representative Byers...the Chair recognizes Representative Byers."

Byers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker C. Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield? Yeah, he indicates he will. Representative Byers would like to ask a question, Mr. Ryan."

Byers: "Representative Ryan, are you a Cosponsor of this Bill?"

Ryan: "I didn't hear your question."

Byers: "Are you a Cosponsor of this Bill?"

Ryan: "No."

Byers: "Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is...any further questions? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1882 pass? Those in favor will let me know by voting 'aye', opposes 'nay'. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. That was too quick he said. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? I'll speed 'em up. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 138 'aye', 5 'nays' and 3 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is...three-



fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. What's the next one there? 1884, Representative Peters. 1884. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1884. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Commission on Delinquency Prevention and Department of Children and Family Services Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Peters."

Peters: "Excuse me. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unless Representative Chapman has changed her mind, I would....she's waving she hasn't changed her mind, so I would ask that Senate Bill 1884 be taken back to Second Reading for the purpose of Representative Chapman offering an Amendment which she is for but I am not."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman asks leave to take it back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objection? Hearing no objection, Second Reading of the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Chapman, amends Senate Bill 1884 on page 1, line 18 by deleting 2 and inserting in lieu thereof and so forth."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment isolates the 5.1 million appropriated...supplemental appropriation to the Department of Children and Family Services into a new section of the Appropriation Bill specifically set aside for child abuse and neglect services rather than adding this money to existing lump sum items as the Department has requested. The Governor and the General Assembly have not been overly generous to the Department of Children and Family Services the past two years. The tight fiscal policies that this administration has cost the Department 223 employee positions since January of 1977. Most of the



decrease in staffing has come in the field offices across the state where employees must deal directly with an increasing number of troubled children and troubled families. Senate Bill 1884 appropriates an additional 5.1 million to various existing line items of the Department's FY-79 appropriation. This new money would allow the Department to hire 3 hundred supposedly new field staff by February 1, 1979. However, given the recent history of DCFS, we cannot feel confident that either the new staff will be hired promptly, receive adequate training or be directed appropriately at the critical area of abuse and neglect as has been promised. This is why I am proposing through this Amendment to isolate this 5.1 million into a new child abuse section. In this way we can more clearly assure ourselves and the public that new child abuse workers are being hired quickly and are being placed appropriately throughout the state. The basic question posed here is whether we can trust this administration and this department to maintain an adequate staff to treat the growing number of child abuse and neglect reports. Let's look at the first five months of this fiscal, statewide we have dropped 114 positions in field offices from the head count we supposedly appropriated in June. And those of you who are wondering what's happening in your area, let me give you some figures. In Rockford, a decrease of 7 staff, in Peoria 17, in Aurora 19, Cook County 23, Springfield 11, Champaign 6, East St. Louis 23 staff, in Marion 8. Specifically this means that Rockford region follow-up staff will still, if this supplemental is approved, carry an average of 53.7 cases. This, when the Governor stated in his original announcement of this initiative, that the goal was to bring the case loads down to 40 per worker. The Peoria child abuse team currently consists of 1 supervisor and 1 clerical. For those of



you in the Peoria area, no social workers. Out of a staff of 5, the Rock Island child abuse team has lost 1 intake worker and 1 social worker. The Rock Island State's Attorneys office and Rock Island Press have attacked DCFS for the inability of this team to manage child abuse cases. The East St. Louis field office having 7 workers on board is down 3. Murphysboro's office is also 3 positions short of their allotment. Until the middle of October the Carlinville field office had 3 vacancies and 1 other social worker on maternity leave leaving only 1 clerical worker to handle the 133 active area cases from Macoupin County. In the first ten months of this current administration the Cook County CPS dropped 34 employees, over 27% of their entire staff. Can we trust this department to apply these new resources in a timely and wise manner? They've already failed to use 114 of the filled positions we appropriated in June. What reason do we have to expect the department to do a better job with this money? It is for this reason that I am urging you to vote 'yes' to separate these monies so that we can hold the department to their commitment to use these funds for child abuse and so we can monitor their spending. Please support this Amendment."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Geo-Karis, the Lady from Lake."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker C. Davis: "She indicates she'll yield."

Geo-Karis: "Unfortunately, Ma'am, the Amendment that you're speaking of is not on my desk and you are asking the funds, from what I've heard, to be separated from where? What are you asking to do in your Amendment?"

Chapman: "I think that you will find that the Amendment has been distributed but it sometimes is had to find one on one's desk. We are asking that rather than do as the



department has asked, add this 1.5 million to their budget to various line items that since we have been promised that this 5.1 million is going to be used for child abuse and since when I have personally checked this with the Director, she tells me this is the intent and they can isolate these funds, that we isolate this 5.1 million in this budget, this new money, into a separate section for child abuse. So that those of us who care, and I think we all do, are going to be able to see how quickly these workers are hired and where they are hired and what is happening with this money."

Geo-Karis: "Now, in other words, what you're...you're not saying that you don't want the appropriation, but you're saying in a effect that this money should be separated and put in the special section of the treasury. Is that correct for child abuse?"

Chapman: "You are right, Representative."

Geo-Karis: "All right. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on this Amendment."

Speaker C. Davis: "You may proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been attending many hearings on child abuse and child sexual abuse. There is no doubt in my mind that we have been much too slow to look into the problem of child abuse and child sexual abuse. And it seems to me that it's high time that we perhaps remind the Department of Children and Family Services that this cannot go on any longer. I have been at hearings where so-called investigators were working under PhD and checking a child abuse case two and three weeks later when a child was sexually abused at home. I think the Representative Chapman is absolutely right. I think it is a very needed Amendment. It's high time we take care of the young people who are going to be our future citizens tomorrow and particularly the ones who have been disadvantaged



by being abused. I support this Amendment and urge your vote for it."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for a period of time last spring I was the Sponsor of an Appropriation Bill which was for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services which some forces in this House saw fit not to have heard by the House of Representatives. But I found in the procedures that we almost had, with respect to this Bill, that there were great attempts continually through the entire time that I was handling it, for certain people in the Legislature to attempt to force a form of reorganization on the Department of Children and Family Services while that department is itself undergoing reorganization. I think that we will find better success in letting them complete their reorganization and then reacting to it rather than trying to throw a new monkey wrench into the action at this point. We are all against child abuse, certainly I am one who is against child abuse, but I am not convinced that it is proper for us to sit here and tell the Department of Children and Family Services exactly how they ought to operate to the nth detail in a little Bill like this in the month of December 1978. I think that it is improper for us to impose this form of reorganization on this very struggling department and I would urge you not to adopt this bad Amendment. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Lady from Winnebago, Representative Lynn Martin. Will you please be quiet? Please be quiet."

Martin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker C. Davis: "You may proceed."

Martin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker C. Davis: The Sponsor will yield...she indicates she



will."

L. Martin: "Are you suggesting by this Amendment...you have said that the Director has personally promised that the money will be spent in the area of child abuse. Is that not correct?"

Chapman: "The Governor and the Director have indicated that their intention in asking for this money is to spend it entirely for child abuse and the Amendment does not regionalize and in no way will relate to their reorganization plans...the previous Representative would discover by checking the Amendment. You are right, Representative Martin, this is how the Director intends to spend the money...for child abuse."

L. Martin: "All right. If the Director intends to spend it that way, does the Director support this Bill?"

Chapman: "I do not know what their position is but in asking them if they would oppose this, they indicated they had no problems with it."

L. Martin: "Well I guess I'm a little confused because if the Director...if there is a commitment to do something, I am a little unsure why we would need an Amendment to say they will do it unless there would be some reason to distrust the department or the department head. In this particular case I would not think that is so. And I would wonder why we would be working on what may well be a useless Amendment. In other words, if the commitment is to spend the money, why is there any need for this and I think we all support the idea that needless legislation or needless Amendments have no place on this House floor. I would...I'm surprised at the Representative for introducing this Amendment."

Chapman: "If that's a further question, the answer is very definitely since this is how the Governor and the Director say they intend to spend this money they have absolutely no reason not to support an Amendment that



puts into the Bill the requirement that they spend it in the way that they've promised to spend it. I can see no reason why there wouldn't be wholehearted support for this."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Peters, the Gentleman from Cook. Oh, pardon me, just a minute. I thought you had finished, I'm sorry. Representative Martin, did you...."

L. Martin: "I would oppose this Amendment because it turns out the department does not support it and it seems to me that this Amendment can confuse an issue. There is no question about the need for the child abuse case workers, there's no question about the need for it downstate and in the city. This Amendment, I think, merely acts as irritant in a subject that is too serious and too deeply emotionally moving for most of us on this floor to be involved in petty partisan bickering. And I would think we should just let the Bill go through without this particular Amendment."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Peters, the Chair recognizes Representative Peters, the Gentleman from Cook."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the synopsis of the Bill which you have would indicate that this Bill passed the Appropriations Committee on a 22 to 0 vote. The subject matter which is presented by Representative Chapman in this Amendment was considered and was to be presented by two individuals on the Democratic side of the aisle, Representative Barnes and Representative McClain, both of whom you all know have a very longstanding interest in the Department of Children and Family Services. We had determined in our conversations that for this short period of time it would be best for the department, which is undergoing reorganization, that it would be best in terms of ironing out some very serious problems in regional and local kind of offices that at this time we do not pursue the kind of



line iteming out that is suggested by Representative Chapman. Representative Barnes and McClain were in agreement and we did receive from the Director, in Committee, her commitment, the commitment to the department, my word that I would work and they would work with Representative McClain and Barnes in solving this problem in this year's coming budget. There are serious problems in attempting to do that in the middle part of the year. There are contractual relations which have been entered into which...with various private agencies, Catholic charities, Lutheran charities, Jewish charities, other charitable groups, other community associations to take care of these children. If this money is not forthcoming but is line item itemed out specifically there is a chance that in some areas the full amount of funds would not and could not be made available in those areas. We have protective day care services. We have both abused children and nonabused children in there. How then does the department make a determination of what child gets paid what part of money for what kind of day care? It begins to cause a bureaucratic nightmare and a nightmare for the kids that are involved and for the parents that are involved in this situation because the department very frankly at this stage of the game is not ready to undertake this kind of massive change. It's a change that is needed. It is a change that many of us end up supporting, but not at this particular time. It is something that we are working on and hope to have in this coming budget which will be presented to you later this year. I would hope that for this point...at this point, knowing the explanations that have been given and knowing that if an Amendment is put on, this whole thing goes back to the Senate again and we may end up losing the entire 5.1 million dollars in terms of our commitment here to child abuse. I ask that at this time you do not



discard the ideas presented by Representative Chapman but that you vote against the Amendment that she suggests here and let us together in the Human Resources Committee and in the Appropriations Committee work on the changes which many of us are agreed are needed. This, however, is not the time nor the place to do it. And I would solicit your 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a few months ago the Rock Island office of Children and Family Services received a call concerning child abuse. That was handled by a phone call. No worker went out to the home, no follow-up investigation. That child is now dead. The parent has been charged criminally with the death of that infant. Who's the responsibility for the death? The Children and Family Service office blamed the Legislature. Initially they said that we did not appropriate the funds necessary to fund their child abuse team. After checking with the staff down here I learned that we appropriated more than enough funds, that we appropriated more money for Children and Family Services than they had requested last year. But they did not use it for child abuse. The money that we appropriated for child abuse went to the bureaucrats in the offices. The Rock Island office of Children and Family Service has been understaffed for a number of months. We have only three workers to cover the entire county. The Rock Island State's Attorney is at the point where he's ready to bring charges against the Director and the Department. There's no way that we can assure that the funds we are appropriating will go to child abuse unless we line item it. Sure, we hear about different programs and different day care and child abuse clinics and things like this and the mixing of



abuse and neglect children together and what will happen to these programs? Well those are the programs that we have for treatment. What do we have for the child who is being abused in his home at the present time and who must be removed? Who's going out and investigate that? If we don't have the people to investigate that we are not going to prevent child abuse. The Governor has called this his number one priority. We should help him with that, it should be our priority. We should stop the senseless killing of these infants and we ought to fund the child abuse teams in a proper manner. This is an excellent Amendment and we should all be voting in favor of it. Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, to close the debate."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Amendment I am proposing to you not is not the Amendment that was discussed in the Appropriations Committee. Let me make it clear. The Amendment that I'm offering to you now does not break this out by regions, it doesn't break out all the child abuse money. It simply takes this money that we are being asked to appropriate today, 5.1 million dollars, that we have been promised is going to be used for child abuse and simply state that this is what the money will be used for. It provides the number of dollars the Department has asked for, it breaks it out in the way in which they have asked that it be broken out, it merely requires that it be used only for child abuse. The question has been raised, do we trust this department? If you have trust in the department, you may want to vote 'no' on this Amendment. Are you satisfied with the job that our state government is doing in handling child abuse complaints? If you are satisfied, you may want to vote 'no' on this Amendment. But if you want to keep faith with the public that is asking for additional



dollars to be spent to respond to child abuse, then let's make sure the money really is going to be spent in the way that the administration has indicated it will be spent. Vote 'yes' on this Amendment which is going to provide exactly what the administration asked for. The dollars they asked for, spent the way they asked they be spent, but simply requires that these monies be spent for child abuse. So the simple question is this, do you want to make sure this 5.1 million is spent for child abuse? If you do, vote 'aye'."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1884? All in favor will let it be known by voting 'aye', opposes 'nay'. Vote me 'aye', will you Mr. Madigan, please? Vote me for the Lady here. All voted who wish? The Speaker...aye...oh, pardon me. Representative Peters. The Chair recognizes Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just in terms of a short explanation of vote. This Amendment is not going to stop child abuse. This Amendment is not going to stop parents from beating their children. This Amendment is not going to do any of those emotional things which have been appealed to you on this floor. This Amendment is going to end up causing more confusion for a department that has got an awful lot of problems. In my judgment, it would be best if in fact this Bill then would not pass rather than pass with this Amendment."

Speaker C. Davis: "What question is...Representative Willer. All right. Any further explanations? Any further explanations? Representative Willer, do you wish to explain your vote, your light's on? Any further explanations? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk, please. Yes, Representative Peters...what purpose do you rise?"

Peters: It's a little bit...it's a little bit away, Mr.



Speaker, but I move for a verification."

Speaker C. Davis: "This is an Amendment, he's entitled. On this question there are 87 'ayes' and 65 'nays' and 3 voting 'present' and the Gentleman has requested a verification. Mr. Clerk...hold on. Hold on...Jack. Read the affirmative vote, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco."

Speaker C. Davis: "What purpose does the Gentleman rise?"

Hoffman: "Would you please record me as 'no'."

Speaker C. Davis: "Yes. Would you please record him...would you please record Representative Gene Hoffman too as 'no'. Hoffman. All right, proceed. Hold it, hold it. What purpose does the Gentleman rise?"

Unknown: "May I be verified at this point?"

Speaker C. Davis: "What did you say?"

Unknown: "May I be verified?"

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Peters says no. Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madigan, Mann, Marovitz, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor."

Speaker C. Davis: "Hold it a minute, Mr. Clerk. What purpose does the Gentleman rise...Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please change me from 'present' to 'aye'?"



Speaker C. Davis: "Change Representative Luft from 'present' to 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich, Tipsword, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Willer, Williams, Younge, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is there any question on the 'aye' vote? Question on the 'aye' vote...Representative Peters? Any questions?"

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker C. Davis: "All right."

Peters: "Mr. Farley."

Speaker C. Davis: "Who was that?"

Peters: "Farley."

Speaker C. Davis: "Farley. Is he in the chambers? Representative Farley, in the chambers? How did the Gentleman vote?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to what number we're starting from? Is it 88?"

Speaker C. Davis: "What number, Mr. Speaker? Is it 88?"

Clerk O'Brien: "88."

Speaker C. Davis: "88."

Peters: "Flinn. Farley's back."

Speaker C. Davis: "Farley's back. Put Mr. Farley back on the Roll he's...there he is."

Peters: "Flinn."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is Representative Flinn in the House? Representative Flinn back there? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

Peters: "Garmisa."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Garmisa, is he there? Representative Garmisa. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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



Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Giorgi."

Speaker C. Davis: "Zeke Giorgi, Representative Zeke Giorgi.

Is Representative Giorgi in the House? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "He's here. Here he is. He's here."

Peters: "Mr. Hanahan."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Hanahan. Representative

Hanahan in the House? There he is."

Peters: "Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Speaker C. Davis: "Dan Houlihan, is he back there? Dan

Houlihan. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

Peters: "Mr. James Houlihan."

Speaker C. Davis: "James Houlihan. He's recorded as not
voting."

Peters: "I'm sorry. Mr. Emil...no, all right. Mr. Kornowicz."

Speaker C. Davis: "Kornowicz... Representative Kornowicz

in the House? Representative Kornowicz. How's the
Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

Peters: "Mr. Domico."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Domico. Representative

Domico in the House? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

Peters: "Mr. Byers."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Byers. There he is, right
there in the aisle."

Peters: "Mr. Brummet."

Speaker C. Davis: "Brummet. Representative Brummet in the
House?"

Peters: "Yes, Sir, he's here. Mr....Mr...he's there."



Speaker C. Davis: "Wait a minute. Oh, I see him. Representative Brummet is in his seat, I see him."

Peters: "Mr. Brummer."

Speaker C. Davis: "Brummer."

Peters: "He's there."

Speaker C. Davis: "All right. He's there."

Peters: "Mr. Barnes... Eugene."

Speaker C. Davis: "Eugene Barnes. Gene Barnes, in the House? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

Peters: "Mr. Nardulli."

Speaker C. Davis: "Nardulli. Representative Nardulli in the House? Representative Nardulli in the House? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. Pouncey."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is Taylor Pouncey in the House? He's here in his seat."

Peters: "Mr. Mudd."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Mudd. Mudd, is he down there? Representative Mudd. Is he in the House? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off the Roll."

Peters: "Mr. McPike."

Speaker C. Davis: "Mr...just a minute. There he is.

Representative Garmisa is here, put him back. McPike
....Representative Getty, what purpose...voting 'aye'.
Vote Representative Getty 'aye'. Who is that..."

Peters: "McPike."

Speaker C. Davis: "Oh, Representative McPike...no, is that... oh, voting 'aye'. No, I don't see him. Representative ...what's his name? Representative Keats votes 'aye'.



You want to vote 'aye'? No, Representative Keats votes 'no'. He's says this...no."

Peters: "Representative McPike."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is McPike here? Yeah, there he is, put him back on the Roll. Representative McPike goes back."

Peters: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker C. Davis: "Who?"

Peters: "Schneider."

Speaker C. Davis: "Schneider, he's here."

Peters: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker C. Davis: "Leverenz. Representative Leverenz. Where is he? Oh, he's here. There he is back there."

Peters: "Representative Levin."

Speaker C. Davis: "Levin. Representative Levin. He's not in his seat, is he in the Chamber? Representative Levin, how's he recorded?"

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Take him off."

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

Speaker C. Davis: "Oh, Representative Mugalian, what purpose does the Gentleman rise?"

Mugalian: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker C. Davis: "Record Representative Mugalian as 'aye'. On this question there are 82 'ayes'...how many 'noes' where there...how many 'noes'? 67 'noes'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Chapman, amends Senate Bill 1884 on page 1, line 1 by inserting after of the following and to add Section 4.12."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is simply a technical Amendment due to a drafting error. It only affects the title and there's no substantive content to this Amendment. I move adoption."



Speaker C. Davis: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #2? Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker C. Davis: "Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1885. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ted Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1885. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the painting of a portrait of Senate President Thomas C. Hynes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1885 appropriates 3 thousand 5 hundred dollars for the purpose of having a painting of Senate President Thomas Hynes who's retiring from that Body. It's in line with the previous appropriation that we've expended by this state for previous Speakers and President pro tempore of the Senate. I ask...I'll be more than happy to respond to any questions. I ask for your favorable consideration on this appropriation for 3 thousand, 5 hundred dollars on Senate Bill 1885."

Speaker C. Davis: "Anyone who wants to be heard? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1885 pass? All in favor let it be known by voting 'aye', opposes 'nay'. It requires a 3/5th. Vote me 'aye'...'aye'...vote me 'aye'.back there on that. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 1 'no' and the question of whether or not the Bill received the three-fifths majority...having received the three-fifths majority is now declared passed. What's the date...who's next? Take 1886 out of the record."



He's wants to go....1887, read that one."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1887. A Bill for an Act in relation to nonsubstantive revision and renumbering of Sections of various Acts to correct technical errors in existing laws. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this has been amended today so I would like to ask for a suspension of the rules, 35 C, so it can be considered for Third Reading at this time. It takes 107 votes. This is a revisionary Bill for the Reference Bureau."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman asks for suspension of the rules. All in favor will let it be known by voting 'aye'. It requires a two-thirds...three...two-thirds...requires a three-fifths vote. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 129 'ayes', no 'nays'. The Gentleman's request is granted. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from...Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a revisionary Bill drafted by the Reference Bureau. We're trying to get all of the revisions in so that they'll be on computer for the new Session. There's...these are only...no substantive changes and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any questions on the passage of Senate Bill 1887? Any questions? The question is on the passage of Senate Bill 1887. All in favor will let it be known by voting 'aye', opposes 'nay'. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there is 139 'ayes', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the three-fifths majority is hereby declared passed. What's the next one. Read 1891, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1891. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "You know it's the Chair's intention to get out of here about 4:30 if we can. 1891, who's the Sponsor of that? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1891 is the...is a supplemental transfer of approximately 12 million, 8 hundred and 61 thousand dollars to the Governor's office of Manpower and Human Developments. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any questions on 1891? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems that it's awful improper almost to question the Governor in his advocacy of putting a change in the mannerism in which he wants to run the CETA programs of this state. Last week when this Bill was sailing through the House here with hardly any opposition, it failed in Committee; this Bill was moved without passage of the Committee's recommendation. And the reason why it failed...the reason why...especially those Republicans, those conservatives who are worried about the budget and everyone's telling me about how the criticism is back home about how we spend taxpayers' money. I think we ought to consider very seriously before you vote 'aye' on this Bill. I know that last week the Governor had a nice party and I hope what Representative Don Totten referred to the House about a week ago on how the Governor advocates how he could pass Bills by having a party and buying people with wine and caviar and having parties isn't going to hold true in the movement of this Bill. Because this Bill represents to me either the philosophy that any expenditure of tax dollars is justified prior to the expenditure or whether or not you advocate



the position of letting the Governor spend any money he wants or letting the administration spend the money and then hold your hand on your fanny later trying to excuse yourselves of why bad...why a vast amount of money has been misapplied and misused in application of law. I'd like to first...on the onset say on this piece of legislation that I am in favor of and completely support the concept and the philosophy of the CETA programs. Its gains and aspirations are valid. It has a lot of hopes and aspirations for the unemployed. But when you get into the administration of what has happened with the bureaucracy and the patronage army that's employed by the CETA programs and GOHR and the GOMAH and all the other fancy titled Bureaus that are created and administered, administratively eat up the tax dollars that should be going to the unemployed. I could just suggest to those Members of the General Assembly that consider themselves fiscally responsible...that's what the theory was in the election just a couple of weeks ago, to be fiscally responsible. I ask of any of you Members that if you know where this money is going and how it's going to be spent, to stand up and say it on this floor. If you can't at least withhold your vote and don't let this Governor buy it with a coca-cola or caviar or some wine as he advocated to the other Governors around this country. We should be very conservative in this respect because if you pass this Bill now prior to January 1st, what in essence you're doing is giving a carte blanche credit card to this agency to spend the taxpayers' money any way it wants. If you pass this identical Bill after January 1st, they have to justify the expenditure of money before it's allowed. I just suggest that the difference in philosophy and those of you who think that you're fiscally responsible should consider very important the issue on this Bill and vote



'no' or abstain yourself from voting."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes the distinguished Gentleman from Cook, the distinguished Majority Leader, Representative Madigan."

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

Speaker C. Davis: "He indicates he'll yield. Yield, Sponsor."

Madigan: "Mr. Winchester, could you explain to the Membership why the Governor's office apparently has attempted to effect a major change in policy with this Bill by shifting the various advocates from the Governor's Office of Manpower over the Governor's office itself?"

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "I've been told, Representative, that it's easier to respond and to act on inquiries on these matters if it's in the Governor's office where it's supposed to be instead of in the GOMAHD where it is now."

Madigan: "Did you know that this change was proposed two years ago and rejected by the Legislature?"

Winchester: "I, personally, did not know and I've been talking with the Director of that agency and he did not know and he personally believes now that that's where it should be and that's why we're trying to get it there, Representative."

Madigan: "Did you know that these positions are the successors to similar positions that were in one time in Governor Walker's GOHR agency?"

Winchester: "Well, I've been told that they are not, Representative."

Madigan: "Could you explain to the Membership why the Governor's Cost Control Task Force recommendation in this particular instance in actuality recommends an increase in appropriation whereas the task force was designed to provide for reductions in appropriations?"

Winchester: "Well, it's my understanding that it was the Task Force that is making this recommendation and they're



making that recommendation because their starting out in their own house and cleaning shop in their own house, Representative."

Madigan: "Would you consider holding this Bill and then taking it back to Second Reading to remove some of the more obnoxious Sections of the Bill?"

Winchester: "Well I don't think so, Representative. I'd like ...all right, yes, I'd be more than happy, Representative Madigan, to take the....to hold the Bill temporarily. I just...a little bird flew by and said something."

Madigan: "It's called enlightenment."

Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "Did he say take it out of the record?"

Winchester: "Take it out of the record temporarily."

Speaker C. Davis: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Take it out of the record. Where's the supplemental list, Jack? On this Supplemental Calendar we have Senate Bill 1888...who's the Sponsor? Representative Ebbesen."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1888. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to provide for the normal cost of fiscal 1979 of the increase the rate of automatic annual increases and annuities provided...Public Act 80-1408. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Ebbesen, the Chair recognizes the distinguished Gentleman."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1888 appears just to be another supplemental appropriation but really it, calling for a million, 7 hundred and 66 thousand dollars from General Revenue for fiscal year 79, the last six months and that is used as the state's contribution for the 1 per cent cost of living increases that were granted the retirees and four pension systems last spring in House Bill 1803. And I think it should be borne out that... the next Bill will bear that out, that this represents probably the, I don't know the actual payout, but an



additional 2 per cent and we really will be establishing a precedent here to these pension systems no matter how large or how small..we'll make these changes that have a fiscal impact, we must not only equal the payout in the dollars but we're making an attempt to add 2 per cent over and above that actual payout. And this is the first step in what I hope will...the General Assembly will address itself and all these pension Bills from this day forward such that we are addressing ourself to that unfunded accrued liability which everyone is concerned about. And I would urge your favorable support to Senate Bill 1888."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any discussion on Senate Bill 1888? Now, now, wait a minute. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative...."

Unknown: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favor of this Bill. As Representative Ebbesen stated that we've been striving for a number of years that when a General Assembly passes pension benefits that they have the courage and fortitude not only to pass these benefits but also to pay their liability on these benefits that they've passed. This does set a precedent and hopefully I think it sets a precedent for the future General Assemblies that when we do pass these type of Bills that we are willing to pay for them out of the current revenue and not letting the future General Assemblies or generations pay for these unfunded liability costs. So I commend Representative Ebbesen in his foresight in providing these appropriations and I urge a favorable support of this Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1888 pass? All in favor let it be known by voting 'aye', opposes 'nay'. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question...151 'ayes', no 'nays'. The Lady from...Representative Geo-Karis... 'aye'



all right...151 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'.
The Bill having received the three-fifths majority is
hereby declared passed. Yes, pardon me."

Geo-Karis: "I pushed the 'present' button instead of the
'yes'. I was the one, that 'present' was mine accidentally.
The 'present' button was mine accidentally. I voted
'yes'."

Speaker C. Davis: "Does the Lady have leave to change her
vote? Leave is granted. The Speaker's prerogative, you
can do it like that. Senate Bill 1892. I can't...
happen to my friend like that. Senate Bill 1892, read
it."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1892. A Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, this amends the
School Code that changes the School Aid Formula to
guarantee each school district a per pupil amount of 13
hundred and 10 instead of 12 hundred and 93 dollars.
This is very similar to a House Bill that we passed out
of here already to the Senate and I urge your favorable
support."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1892
...just a minute. Push your light...who wants...
someone want to speak? Oh, oh, pardon me. Representa-
tive Walsh." I didn't see your light...beg your pardon."

Walsh: "Is he through telling us about it? Ok, Mr. Speaker
and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this indeed is the
same as a Bill that passed the House and what it does
is cost the state 30 million dollars that would have
lapsed and would have been available for education or
corrections or mental health or you name it, it would have
been available at the end of this fiscal year for the
next fiscal year. Now, the schools are going to get it



and the schools don't really need it. The schools have prepared their budgets and are existing on the 12 hundred and 93 dollars per pupil that this General Assembly allotted to them back several months. Now 12 hundred and 93 dollars was a substantial increase over what they had last time. We increased spending for education tremendously for this fiscal year. This is a windfall for the schools that is not needed, is unnecessary and if you have any sense you'll vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook...all right, go right ahead."

Stuffle: "I'm the Gentleman from Coles, not from Cook, I don't want that confused. But I rise as the hyphenated principal Sponsor of this along with Representative Brady. It indeed is the same Bill that we passed and sent to the Senate. It's distribution of state school aid, 31 million dollars that's already appropriated I might add, is the same as the Bill we sent to the Senate one week ago. There arises a potential problem in the Senate if we don't pass this Bill and that is simply that they may not be in the necessary number of days to pass the Bill we sent to them. It's essential if we are to send the necessary money to the school districts in Illinois on a fair basis that we pass this Bill. It's distribution is the same...the same type pattern that we had last spring when this House and the Senate agreed as did the Governor to spend the money basically on a one-third, one-third basis. One-third to Chicago, one-third downstate and one-third to the suburbs. I submit to the downstaters that Representative Brady has been magnanimous enough to come along with we downstaters to make this fair distribution and have the other people from Cook County and the City of Chicago. It should be passed at this time. It is not a break in the budget, it is, I repeat and reiterate appropriated money that is already there, not a



new appropriation by any means and not any additional appropriation of state funds. And I, too, would ask for a green light."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any further debate? Yes, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, did you want to be heard?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hoffman. The Gentleman from Cook will be next, Representative Totten. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would only point out that the appropriation that we made in the spring at that time our estimate was that we would only be able to support it to a level of 1293. We now have the final figures in which show that with that dollar level which we agreed to at that time we can move that support level to 1310. This is small compensation from many school districts whose enrollment is dropping and I would suggest that given those circumstances that this Bill should be supported."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Totten. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems rather odd that we embark on this procedure at this date when funds are scarce and resources are limited we find a segment of our budget that has declining needs. And in this case it is education. Normally, sound fiscal policy would be to handle a declining need by reducing the amount of money. There is nothing sacred about that original appropriation that in this case over appropriated the 30 million dollars to education. We don't owe it to education, since then they've had a declining need and in this case the money should be returned to the General Revenue Fund so that those functions of state government that have increasing demands



and needs can use this 30 million dollars. This is an agency of state government that has a declining need and correspondingly the money is not needed."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Pullen, the Lady from Cook. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for many years we have all heard the cry to fully fund the School Aid Formula, even though we knew that many more millions of dollars, running to the tens of millions and hundreds of millions were being appropriated than had ever been appropriated before. It was not a matter of education needing so much more money, it was a matter of our having held out a promise and not fully funded it. Now what we are going to do if we pass this Bill is the same thing that we did when we passed the resource equalizer that caused that problem. We're going to be increasing our promise and we're going to be increasing the anticipation of the school districts and we're going to be increasing their appetite and their thirst. Maybe we do have the money this year but the problem with this Bill is its not a one time expenditure. It's not a windfall bonus that we're sending them because we found all this money that isn't even ours. It is a new base. It is an ongoing expenditure, that's the real problem. It is a commitment over the years to spend millions and millions more than we have. We may be able to afford to do it in a one shot basis, but we cannot afford to pass this Bill because it is far from one shot. I urge you to leave this money in the treasury where it is drawing good interest and let us have this money to do something with next spring when we're considering the following fiscal year's budget so that we can take a responsible action that will put the money where it is needed rather than spending it now just because we have it. Because to pass this Bill will cause us unending problems down the



line. We should not be making promises that we cannot keep. And this is one of the larger promises that we could never keep if this Bill is passed. Please vote 'no' so that we can keep fully funding the school aid formula. This will only make matters worse."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any further discussion? Representative Brady, close the debate."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, thank you very much. I think it's important that we fulfill the commitment that the Governor has said that we should spend this money on education. The Illinois Office of Education said we should spend it and I think we made a commitment that the money we appropriated for education this year that we would produce a formula that equalized that and spent that money. This formula just brings that into line, it's the appropriated money that we appropriated last June and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Schneider, explain your vote. All right, go ahead. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1892 pass? All in favor will let it be known by voting 'aye', opposes 'nay'. Representative Schneider, do you wish to explain your vote?"

Schneider: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Members, of course, education has been probably the most hard hit by inflation, increasing assessments, declining enrollment and it's the unit of local government in which we have treasured for years, our most important assets, young people and education. I don't think there's any quarrel in my judgment with the fact that we are in a position to increase the per pupil allotment. I think this Bill does it appropriately, it's money that was ready and I would of course solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker C. Davis: "The distinguished Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, you do a fine. I'm just sorry



that neither of us will be here next year, we might see you more often in that position. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, how droll it is that these 19th Century conservatives who have spoken against this Bill is almost as though they didn't want to teach the people to read. Heretofore we've thought that conservatives made an intellectual approach for the heart and votes of the constituents and if that not be true, why do they not want to have the priority to education that we all believe in. This is one where we ought to stand up and be counted with a good deal of pride by voting this way. Even our conservative friends, you render a disservice to your cause when you try to keep them ignorant, un-informed and not educated. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker C. Davis: "The distinguished Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

J. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, am going to vote 'aye' on this Bill and I won't prolong matters, I do just want to point out that those of you who come from downstate areas and particularly those who have...who represent the smaller school districts that you're going to get a little piece of the pie but this is not going to come anywhere near bringing your school districts back to where they were a year ago. In other words, even with this Bill you're school districts and your legislative district are going to receive less money, less money than they received a year ago. So don't let anybody gloat over what they're doing for the schools with this Bill. You're schools are going to get less money and the commitment that we have made in the State of Illinois to make education our top priority, as the previous Speaker has indicated, is far away from being met."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman...Representative Stuffle, the Gentleman from Coles."



Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, there's no doubt what Representative Dunn said is true but if you don't pass this piece of legislation you're going to put people farther down. You've got to put a base in that's realistic. And to those people who said, we won't be able to fully fund this next year, Representative Dunn's point is even better taken because we've got to move forward with other changes in the formula to make it fair because next year without further changes and more equity in this formula, with this Bill and other changes we're going to be about 82 million dollars less, 82 million dollars less for full funding next year even with this Bill. You should be voting green to make one equitable change now. And hopefully voting green next year to make even more."

Speaker C. Davis: "All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 13 'nays', none voting 'present'. The Bill having received the three-fifths majority is hereby declared passed. Next Bill. Oh...what you wanted...Keats wanted to vote 'no'. Does the Gentleman have leave to vote 'no'? I hear objection. Representative Van Duyne. Do you vote 'aye'? Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave, Van Duyne? Van Duyne, 'aye'. Do both Gentleman have leave? Put them together now. Record both Gentlemen."



Speaker C. Davis: "On the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1850. Representative Kucharski. You going to handle it, Representative? All right. The Chair recognizes... Representative Kucharski. Representative Kucharski will..."

Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1850 deals with the group insurance program for state employees with the renewal of the contract this past July 1st, certain coverages were reduced or eliminated through the negotiations. These coverages consider psychiatric care for in and out patients and what we attempt to do..."

Speaker C. Davis: "Just a minute, hold it. Representative Ebbesen, did you want to be recognized? I saw his name on the b... did you want to be recognized?"

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, there was only one Bill left, the one I'm handling - 1893. If we could finish that Bill after we finish Representative Kucharski, we'd go back and do that."

Speaker C. Davis: "All right."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Kucharski. Proceed, Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "What we attempt to do with Senate Bill 1850 is to reinstate these coverages so I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any discussion on 1850? Senate Bill 1850? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker C. Davis: "He indicates he will."

Schuneman: "Representative, how much will this Bill cost the State of Illinois?"

Kucharski: "Additional costs for the premium would be



five hundred and ten thousand or thereabouts."

Schuneman: "I beg your pardon?"

Kucharski: "Five hundred and ten thousand."

Schuneman: "About five hundred and ten thousand will be the cost to the State of Illinois? How much will this Bill cost the state employees for their share of the dependent's coverage?"

Kucharski: "Those employees who opt out, opt to take the extra coverage for their dependents will receive an additional charge in their premium. How much, I'm not sure."

Schuneman: "I beg your pardon?"

Kucharski: "How much, I'm not sure."

Schuneman: "You're not sure what it's going to cost the state employees to insure their dependents?"

Kucharski: "Figures that I received said it could cost as much as two dollars extra per month."

Schuneman: "It could cost the state employees as much as two dollars per month, an increase in their insurance for their dependents if we pass this Bill? One other question. Do you realize that the effect of this Bill is to reduce coverage for the most seriously ill psychiatric patients who are confined to hospitals, especially those in Chicago where the rates are so high?"

Kucharski: "I don't think that's entirely true. It reduces coverage in one area, and yet increases coverage, I think, in the most important area. And that would be the out-patient area which is treatment designed to prevent in-patient care."

Schuneman: "Is this Bill supported by the State Employees Group Insurance Commission?"

Kucharski: "I don't know."

Schuneman: "I beg your pardon?"

Kucharski: "I don't know."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, could I address the Bill please?"



Speaker C. Davis: "You may proceed."

Schuneman: "This Bill is not supported by the State Employees Group Insurance Commission. They are opposed to the Bill. The Bill would seek to put the coverage for psychiatric care back to the level where it was prior to July 1 of 1978 and there's a fatal flaw in this Bill in that it takes coverage away from certain employees. And it takes coverage away from those employees who are most seriously ill. For example, the hospital room rate for in-patients in Chicago or throughout the state really was limited to a hundred and twenty-five dollars a day prior to July 1. Now that limit has been increased to two hundred or I think it's two hundred dollars a day. What the Bill seeks to do is put the limit back to where it was before July 1. So the fact of the matter is that those employees and their dependents who are most seriously ill would have less coverage if this Bill is passed than they do now. The people that would have more coverage are those people who are being treated as out-patients. That is, those who are less seriously ill. And I suggest to the Members of the House that perhaps the greatest beneficiaries of this Bill if it passes would be the psychiatrists in this state who could then book their patients for several calls a week instead of just one call as is presently covered under the insurance program. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in this case the Governor is right, his veto is right and that we should vote against this effort to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker C. Davis: "Thank you. Representative Kucharski. Representative Kucharski, to close."

Kucharski: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The financial end of this question, I think, can be answered by what happened with last year's contract on which



the state received back eight million dollars even with this type of care included in that contract. The other question, I think, is that the reason behind daily therapy is to allow the patient to subsist in active society while being treated at the same time. The benefit to the out-patient, increasing the out-patient care, which by the way was a decrease with this new contract, would be that we'd be preventing more patients from becoming in-patient care and therefore relying or asking upon them to be contributors to our society. Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1850 pass notwithstanding the veto of His Excellency the Governor of the State of Illinois? All in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposes 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? I'm holding. There ain't nobody... there's nobody asking to talk I don't think. Representative... I don't see it. Put on your... oh, yeah, yeah. Representative Kucharski, to explain his vote."

Kucharski: "Again I'd just like to reiterate that the important aspect of this Bill is to allow patients to be, to continue with therapy which would add to their, add to their contribution to the family and social and working life. To deny them this type of therapy and out-patient care is to subject themselves to regressive action. So the out-patient care is intended to prevent any excessive in-patient complications."

Speaker C. Davis: "Finished? Have you finished? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd urge a 'no' vote on this motion to override. And the reason I am urging that is that the impetus for this override is not coming from the state employees who would be covered by this particular



program. The impetus for this override is coming from the psychiatrists and from the Medical Association in ^{the} this state. Since the...the limits on psychiatric coverage has been put into effect in the last five months there has not been one, not been one complaint, one request from a state employee to reinstate that coverage. The only time that we've gotten any kind of request is from the psychiatric providers. One of the fastest growing costs in state government over the last five years has been the cost of group health insurance for the state employees. In the last five years the costs have gone up forty-two percent one year, forty-seven percent in '76, fourteen percent in '77, eighteen percent in '78 for a total increase in the last four years of about a hundred and twenty percent. What happened last year is the State Employees Advisory Commission got together and said because of the...of the costs of this program we are going to have to put a lid on the kinds of coverage for group health for state employees. One of the things that they did to cut the costs was to put a limit on the number of visits that an employee can be reimbursed for, for out-patient service. That limit was put on at one a week. At the same time the limit for hospital coverage was removed. As a result we put out the bidding this year and the costs for group health insurance decreased this year by six and a-half percent. If we're going to put... if we're going to put a limit on health costs, this is the direction that we're going to have to go. We're not going to be able to allow the providers of health insurance to dictate the amount of... of coverage. We're going to have to put a limit on it. And if we don't, we're going to be in real trouble."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Levin."



Levin: "In explaining my 'aye' vote, as somebody who's been actively involved in the field of Blue Cross, I think that the Department of Personnel has done a terrible job in negotiating on the behalf of state employees, the new Blue Cross contract. One of the provisions that's bad is the psychiatric provision. What this Bill would do would be to restore the option. It doesn't mandate that a state employee take the option for their dependents but it gives them the option of restoring a reasonable amount of psychiatric care. For that reason, I support the override on this Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Schuneman, to explain your vote."

Schuneman: "No, Mr. Speaker. I'd simply like to ask for the right to verify the vote if this Bill receives 107."

Speaker C. Davis: "All right, all right. He asked for the right to verify. Representative... Oh, Majority Leader, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'aye' vote I think that this Roll Call should be a message to the Executive Department. All of us are affected by the insurance contracts negotiated by the Executive with a private insurance carrier. There are arguments back and forth on both sides of this issue, but I think that all of us should remember that all of us are beneficiaries under that contract and that when the Governor begins his negotiations in the next fiscal year, he ought to consult with some of the Members of the Legislature as to what benefit provisions belong in the insurance contracts."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise hesitantly to speak on this not knowing as much as many have spoken, but



to say that I think support of the override should be given for the simple reason that let's face facts and be frank. The reason is this, that it emphasizes the out-patient basis of care. It's important that we put the emphasis there, I believe, to keep people working and to seek these ends and not have to go all the way to the in-patient coverage which is often much more costly and often much more of a burden on people and families in the state. To keep working people working at the same time they're trying to find a means to cope with their problems is most important. The emphasis of this Bill is on that other than...other alternatives and we ought to be giving as many green lights as possible to the Bill for that reason."

Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1850 pass notwithstanding the Governor's veto? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There's 128 'ayes', 28 'noes' and 3 'present'. A verification has been asked. Mr. Clerk. All right, Mr. Schuneman. Representative Schuneman. He asked for a verification."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the Medical Society has won. I withdraw the request for a verification."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for the verification. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 28 'noes', 3 'present'. Having received... this motion having received the Constitutional Three-Fifths Majority prevails and is hereby declared passed. Notwithstanding the veto of the Governor, Senate Bill 1850 1893, all right. Senate Bill 1893. Would you read it, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1893. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Ebbesen, you handling this Senate Bill 1893?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...thank you, Mr. Speaker, for going back to this. This Senate Bill 1893 is transfer of dollars on a lateral shift and it transfers monies within the General Revenue Fund, actually 62 thousand 207 dollars and a student loan fund of a hundred...a little over a hundred and seventy-two thousand."

Speaker C. Davis: "Pardon me. For what purpose does the Gentleman rise? Representative Barnes, did you...do you wish..."

E.M. Barnes: "Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Representative Ebbesen, would you...I'd like to request... would you consider taking this out of the record. There's a Subcommittee meeting of the Joint Subcommittee of Higher Ed in the Appropriations Committee immediately following this Session today...on some issues that were raised in the Appropriations Committee and I was wondering would you consider taking this out of the record at this time and we can do it tomorrow following that Subcommittee meeting tonight?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Representative Barnes, I thought that that Subcommittee which is a Joint Committee of Appropriations and Higher Ed and I am Minority Spokesman of Higher Ed that was to deal with the entire subject of the Scholarship Commission would have no impact on this Bill. But at your request, I'll withdraw until tomorrow."

E.M. Barnes: "I'd appreciate it because there were some questions raised and then we can get right to it tomorrow."

Speaker C. Davis: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker C. Davis: "Senate Bill 1879, Representative Polk request that it be taken back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment, is that it? Second Amendment."



Is there leave? Leave is granted. Return it to Second Reading, Mr. Clerk...for Amendments. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, E.M. Barnes, amends Senate Bill 1879 as amended on page 5 by deleting lines 16, 17 and 18 and so forth."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Barnes on the Amendment."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is merely a technical correction...Amendment. All it does is underline the language that was already in the Bill which in the original version failed to have it correctly underlined. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1879."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any discussion on the adoption of Amendment #3? Representative Polk."

Polk: "Now, Mr. Speaker, this is just a technical Amendment and I would like to get it on the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any objections? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to hear what the technical Amendment is."

Speaker C. Davis: "Huh."

E.M. Barnes: Thank you very much. I thought I explained it. All it does is underline some language in the Bill that was not underlined and should have been. That's all it does."

Polk: "Well, what does it say. I don't have the Amendment in front of me."

E.M. Barnes: "The Amendment...this Amendment merely corrects a technical error in the Bill in Section...as amended on page 5 by deleting lines 16, 17 and 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the same language for unemployment compensation benefits to former state employees, 42 thousand, 7 hundred, that does not change that at all, it simply underlines it. It was not underlined and it has to be because this is new language."



Speaker C. Davis: "The question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye', opposes 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, E.M. Barnes, amends Senate Bill 1879 as amended on page 1, line 30 and so forth."

Speaker C. Davis: "I'll get the gavel this time. Representative Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would yield for just a moment...I...I would like some information. There was an Amendment which was offered by myself in Committee and...fine...what I...for the Committee Members to follow along on that...there was an Amendment that I offered in Committee on...was based on consideration for some forthcoming information from the bureau. Amendment #4, this revised IBES request Amendment by reallocating certain amounts between divisions for personal services and personal benefits. The total amount of the request is 7 million, 8 hun.... 7 thousand, 8 hundred dollars less than Senate Bill 1879 as amended. The request that change on various lines and the total amount of the revision would appear 36....36 million, 3 hundred and 83 thousand, 6 hundred as compared to the original version of 36 million, 391 thousand 4 hundred dollars. I would move the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any further questions on Amendment #4? The question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All in favor let it be known by saying 'aye', opposes 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Dawson, amends Senate Bill 1879 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."



Speaker C. Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this appropriation for 350 dollars for a plaque in the 30th Legislative District which is represented by Bill Collins and myself and Representative Giglio. This was a commitment made by the Governor, but we're unable to find the money for it...to find a plaque so we had to put an Amendment for an appropriation for the 350 dollars."

Speaker C. Davis: "Any discussion on Amendment #5? All in favor let it be known by saying 'aye', 'ayes' have it, opposes...opposes, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker C. Davis: "This Bill goes to Third Reading. They're making ...oh yes, pardon me. Representative Matijevich, I beg your pardon, Sir."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...Mr...Mr...Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker C. Davis: "All right. Will the Gentleman proceed?"

Matijevich: "Well, I'm rising, Mr. Speaker, to object...to object because this probably will be the last day that I will be able to hear Deacon Davis at the podium. I have watched him today and he's really enjoyed it up there. I've been thinking about all of the memories that must be going through his mind while he's at that podium today. And I rise, Mr. Speaker, to join everybody on the floor of this House who's going to rise up with me and say 'thank you, Deacon, for all your good years to the people of the State of Illinois'."

Speaker C. Davis: "I've just been informed that we have one more piece of business to do...Fred Douglas who was a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, born a slave, educated himself, says that it's not the depths from which you



come but it's the heights that you obtain. Naturally, knowing from whence I come, and I wasn't born in Vicksburg, Mississippi, I was born on a farm way out in the country and if it rained it took us all day and all night and sometimes we didn't get there...get into town. Out where I was born I went to school when they laid the crops by and it was all in one room and my greatest delight was when it came time to eat my lunch. That was about all I accomplished in that school. And then my mother brought me into the city and while she worked, I ran around the street like other little urchins and then a group of people came to town, a group of ladies came to town, I'd never seen them before with those long skirts on and those white hoods and hats and gathered up all of the little urchins and I think this school is still there, it was the last time I was down there, they took us in to the....this was my first introduction to a Roman Catholic School. Here I was an African Methodist but it didn't make any difference to them. And there they taught me how to read. And then from then on I went down to Jackson to Tougaloo College. It was an AMA school, AMA, American Missionary Association. They came South immediately after the Civil War and they established those AMA schools, American Missionary Association schools, among them was my school, Tougaloo, Talladega, Fisk and many others. And I can remember the board, lodging and everything in that school was 10 dollars a month. When I tell my grandson this I don't know whether he still believes it or not he looks with surprise at me and how hard it was for me to get the 10 dollars, but this is true. And even when I came to this town, here in Springfield, the young fellows don't understand what I had to go through with. I wasn't quite understood, I know I wasn't. The entire House rose here a few moments ago and applauded me. At that time that could have been



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12-13-78

...there would not have been such a demonstration because when I was elected to come to Springfield I thought that I had really overcome, as Martin Luther King said, 'We shall overcome', I said well, I've overcome all of the obstacles. But I found out when I got here that my troubles had just begun because I didn't know...the Senator who was with me, Senator Wimbish who served quite a while over in the Senate, he had all kinds of reservations and all kinds of confirmation but they weren't worth the paper they were written on. And I still remember the first night Senator Wimbish and I spent in this town. We spent it in the GM&O station because we hadn't become acquainted with natives down here. Naturally when we came the Senator, who was a lawyer, Wimbish was a lawyer and a criminal lawyer had a reservation in Abraham Lincoln Hotel, but when the man looked up and saw him and saw me he said, 'you two boys are together'? He said: 'I know you must not be from Springfield because if you were you'd know better than to come into this hotel'. Well, to make a long story short, he said he'd close it up before he would let any of us stay in there. And a part of that story I don't suppose...I've told it several times, but a part of it I don't suppose that I've ever told you and that was that we had an Attorney General by the name of George Barrett. And after several people had been thrown out, including a school teacher from Chicago, Rachael Shan, and I went to the Attorney General about it. He said that if you get me a good case, I'll prosecute it and he did. It was a case of a young school teacher who came down and all of the...our colleagues was with her, they threw her out and her name was Rachael Shan. And don't you know you she made such a fine witness on that stand that an all-white jury convicted them. And the Judge in that case found (sic) them one dollar and they wound up of course laughing at



us. But it was a conviction. And the Attorney General, ace prosecutor, had secured that conviction. And much of it was due to this fine woman whose husband was an executive in the NAACP in Chicago. But we used that conviction even though it was only a dollar fine when we finally went in to the federal court...when somebody came there from another state on the diversitive (sic) citizenship, we used that conviction...and I suppose they got a hundred or so more continued if they granted them that many, but it was that case that finally did the job on that hotel down there, even with that dollar fine. Because there was something in the statute, I suppose it's still there, about if you continued and insisted and persisted, he would be deemed operating a nuisance and we carried it to the very end. But I...that wasn't the only hotel that did that. That was the first one. But every last one of them downtown did it afterwards. And when I think that I tried to proceed along the least line and that was to go to a Thompson restaurant, a restaurant which was located on Fifth Street and my mother and a lot of her friends and wife and all of them came down and I saw that Thompson restaurant, I said, 'well I know we'll be safe in here because they serve you in Chicago in here'. And we went in there and then we met with the same opposition. And I said, 'lady, we gotta eat someplace in this town, if you object to serving me with all of this food up here on the counter, we'll serve ourselves and pay our bill, if that's the only objection'. And we served ourselves. We told her to have your boss come and get his money. But until this day, he never collected his money for that bill. But I simply recite some of those things to let you know how far I've come. I love this country. I'm a disabled veteran. I didn't have to go to fight in World War I, but I did. And I'm glad I did. It's a great country, no question about it. Because



no man could come from as far and as low. During the depression I walked the streets hungry like everybody else. And who has experienced the hardships I have experienced...and the insults I've had. And to stand on this platform and have one of the most distinguished ladies in here walk up here and say I'm going to have my picture made with you...and I almost trembled when she did. No man, no country on earth, could that happen but here in this country. And while I've had all of those means things done to me and all those mean things said about me...when I was in West Virginia campaigning for John Fitzgerald Kennedy....I guess if I had one, I had a thousand people come to me and say, 'you know what you're doing...this man...down here, this man they said is a Roman Catholic and here you are an African Methodist preacher down here campaigning. You're no preacher, the Pope will be in the White House'. I said no he won't. The Pope can't take care of the business he's got over there where he is. I know he won't be in the White House. But even if he was in the White House, I will never raise my voice against any man's freedom. And I wonder...I suppose you thought sometime I was acting a fool over that ERA but I just couldn't be against it. I cannot be against the freedom of any man because I know what it meant when my freedom was questioned. I'm indeed grateful to you. I appreciate all the things you've said about me and for me and in the few days that are left I hoped I will merit the consideration of all of you. If I've....every last one of you. And I hope I won't let you down and Mr. Speaker you said something about I'll be missed, you've been very kind, you've been fair and I want you to know that even though I'm in Chicago, I'm just as close to you as that telephone out there. And if I can ever be of any service, you please call on me for that service. I love every last one of you and it is my prayer that when you



return to your home you will find it in order and you'll find your families as well as I wish that they could be and will be. Thank you very much. One more piece of business. In my case they sing a song, 'One More River To Cross'...and that's the River Jordan. Representative Terzich has a motion to make. Would you read the motion, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion pursuant to Rules 66A. I move to discharge Committee on Personnel and Pensions from further consideration of Senate Bill 1889, suspend Rule 66B relating to Calendar requirements and advance to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Terzich."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman rep...recognizes Representative Terzich, the Gentleman from Cook."

Terzich: "Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to your motion, if you talk to the guy upstairs you can mention my name to him I can use all the help I can get. But Senate Bill 1889 is the companion Bill of Senate Bill 1888 which was the Appropriation Bill with regard to the pension benefits that we passed increasing the post retirement benefits for state employees from 2 to 3 per cent. Senate Bill 1889 simply provides the funding mechanism for this by adding on an additional 2 per cent which sets the foundation for future funding of the program in accordance with the standards set by the Pension Laws Commission. And I would appreciate your favorable vote on this to move it to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. I do have the...I just speak to Leadership on both sides of the aisle and everything is fine."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman moves to discharge the Committee. I wonder if...oh, Representative Totten, do you wish to explain your vote or something....your recognized."



Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there two motions on the floor at the same time? There were two motions read."

Speaker C. Davis: "No. There's a motion to discharge Committee."

Totten: "O.K."

Speaker C. Davis: "And advance it to Second Reading. That's the motion. Without reference to the Committee, of course. Just a minute, Representative Totten."

Terzich: "Second Reading, Second Legislative Day I understand, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker C. Davis: "Yes, Second Legislative Day. Representative Schneider, do wish to be recognized? All right. The Chair recognizes Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a little leery about these swifty Bills recently. Can you tell me who is going to end up getting benefits under this Bill?"

Terzich: "We passed Senate Bill...or House Bill 1803. What this Bill does...we passed the Appropriation Bill providing those necessary funds to fund the benefits that we passed. With...what this does is set up the funding mechanism. For example, this provides that the 1 per cent contribution which is required for the payouts of this particular benefit it also provides for an additional 2 per cent for the future funding of the normal cost plus interest or the unfunded liability...will not be increased. In other words, this provides the mechanism to pay for those benefits that we passed."

Schneider: "Does this have anything to do with judicial pensions?"

Terzich: "Excuse me?"

Schneider: "Does this have anything to benefits for the Judiciary?"

Terzich: "No, this simply deals with the state employees and also the teacher retirements systems. It has nothing to do with...."



Schneider: "Not Legislators either?"

Terzich: "No."

Schneider: "Not executive branch elected officials?"

Terzich: "The systems that are under this is it provides for the financing costs to the State Employees Retirement System, the State University Retirement System, the State Teachers Retirement System and the Chicago Teachers Retirement System of the increase of annuities provided by Public Act 80-1408 effective immediately."

Schneider: "Is it within the President's guidelines?"

Terzich: "It's within God's guidelines as a matter of fact."

Schneider: "Well God is certainly important than the President Representative Terzich." I thank you for bringing this Bill forward."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Ebbesen, do you wish to be recognized? The question is on the discharge. Anyone else? The question is on the discharge of motion. All in favor will let it be known by voting 'aye', opposes 'no'. It takes 107 votes for this one. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this motion there are 140 'ayes', 1 'nay'. The Committee is discharged. Read the Bill a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1889. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Bill will be held on Second Reading for Amendments tomorrow. It's been read, but it'll be held. All right. Senate Bill, Third Reading, 1884. Read it. Yeah."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1884. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission on Delinquency Prevention and Department of Children and Family Services Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative Peters, you move to suspend



the Rules? Rule 35G." (sic)

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the Appropriated Rule so that House Bill 1884 can now be heard on Third Reading having been moved back to Second and back to Third."

Speaker C. Davis: "The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule 35C so the Bill can be heard. Is there leave? Leave of Attendance Roll Call. Leave...he said...Attendance Roll Call. On the Bill...recognizes Representative Peters."

Peters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that the Bill was adequately debated earlier when the Amendment was added and I would ask the approval of the House for the appropriation of 5.1 million to the Department of Children Services. I believe there is now agreement on both sides of the aisle, although I don't know what the Senate is going to do, Representative Chapman."

Speaker C. Davis: "Is there any discussion? Oh, Representative McGrew, what purpose do you rise? Any discussion. Any discussion anywhere? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1884 pass? Those in favor of passing it will vote 'aye', opposes 'nay'. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, 144 'ayes', 6 'nays' and 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1884 having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Do you have an announcement, Representative McGrew? Representative McGrew; The Chair recognizes Representative McGrew!"

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before you go to the motion of introduction of new Bills I'd like to announce that the Joint Subcommittee of Higher Education and Appropriation will be meeting immediately after adjournment, room D1. The Calendar was incorrect on the Bill number, instead of 1891 it's 1893, even though we're not actually considering that. But I would like to be



recognized when the Chair goes to the introduction and First Reading."

Speaker C. Davis: "Introduction of Bills and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3450, McGrew. A Bill for an Act relating to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3451, McGrew. A Bill for an Act relating to compensation of certain elected and appointed state officials and judges. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker C. Davis: "Representative McGrew, the Chair recognizes "

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Pursuant to Rule 31B, I move that this Bill not be referred to Committee...for immediate consideration...bypass Committee."

Speaker C. Davis: "Just a minute. The Rules require, Representative McGrew, that the Bill go to the Rules Committee. A motion to advance it now is not...in order."

McGrew: "Might I ask the Chair which Rule?"

Speaker C. Davis: "Well, I'll have to get him to look it up for me. But I know that's the rule. It has to go to the Rules Committee, no."

McGrew: "It's been my experience, Mr. Speaker, that there are no rules in this House that cannot be suspended with the agreement of the Membership."

Speaker C. Davis: "Rule 27B which cannot be suspended..under Rule 27B....G...27B cannot be suspended under Rule 27G. Will you take a look at it? Yes, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "27B ends with, 'this may be amended or suspended with an affirmative vote of 107 Members, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker C. Davis: "Do you have the amended Rules in front of you? 27G was added if you've got the amended rules."

McGrew: "27G according to the printout I have say this Rule may be suspended only by an affirmative vote of 107, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker C. Davis: "Keep reading, you haven't read enough."

McGrew: "That's the end of it."



Speaker C. Davis: "This Rule may be suspended or amended only by an affirmative vote of 107 Members, except....see, read the exception. That Subsection B and C of this Rule may not be suspended. This is in the exception. Any further business? Except, do you see where it says except. Representative Taylor, what purpose do you rise?"

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an announcement. The Legislative Investigating Commission were scheduled to meet tonight but due to the fact that the Senators are having a grand party tonight, that meeting will be postponed until further notice."

Speaker C. Davis: "Thank you. Any further business? The Chair recognizes the distinguished Majority Leader from the City of Chicago, my leader, Representative Madigan. My leader."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, are there any further announcements? Any further introduction of Bills? Then I now move that we adjourn until 11:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Speaker C. Davis: "The motion is we adjourn. The House stands adjourn until 11:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	1:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Journal
2		Giorgi	
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bills, 2nd Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1879
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1880
3		(Speaker Redmond	
		(
		(Polk	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
		Barnes	
4		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoxsey	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	
		Hoxsey	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
5		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #6
		Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #6 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Pullen	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
	1:15	Barnes	
6		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	Leave to return S.B. 1886 & 1887 to 2nd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1886, Amendment 1
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
7		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1887, Floor Amendment 1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
8		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1887, Amendment 2



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: December 13, 1978

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond Bradley	Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1819, 3rd Reading
9.		Bradley	
10.		Speaker Redmond	
11-12		Greiman	
13	1:25	Speaker Redmond Cunningham	
14		Speaker Redmond	
15-17		Mugalian	
18		Speaker Redmond Walsh	
19		Speaker Redmond Ewing	
20		Speaker Redmond (Mudd ((Bradley	Question
21		Speaker Redmond Mahar	Yield
22		Bradley Speaker Redmond	
23		Satterthwaite Speaker Redmond	
24		Bradley Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Winchester	
25		Speaker Redmond	
	1:59	Taylor	M.P.Q.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
26		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
27		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoxsey	Explains vote
28		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	
		Speaker Redmond	
29		Barnes, E.M.	
30		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
31		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Spezker Redmond	
		Willer	
32		Speaker Redmond	
		Willer	
		Speaker Redmond	
33		Peters	
	2:14	Flynn	Explains vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
34		Speaker Redmond McMasters Speaker Redmond Beatty	
35		Speaker Redmond Steihl, C.M.	
36		Speaker Redmond Stuffle	
37		Speaker Redmond Neff	
38		Speaker Redmond Yourell Speaker Redmond Kosinski	Explains vote
39		Speaker Redmond Rigney Speaker Redmond Schuneman	
40		Speaker Redmond Davis, C.	
41		Speaker Redmond Duester	
42		Speaker Redmond Campbell	
43		Speaker Redmond McGrew	
	2:34		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
44		Speaker Redmond Dunn, R.	
45		Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Mugalian Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien	Mugalian requests verif. Polls absentees
46		Speaker Davis Mugalian	In the Chair
47		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Davis Ewell	Change to 'aye'
48		Speaker Davis Satterthwaite	Change to 'aye'
49		Speaker Davis	S.B. 1819 passed
50		Bradley Speaker Davis	S.B. 1531 - motion
51.		(Ryan	Yield
52		(Bradley	
	2:56	Speaker Davis Dunn, R. Speaker Davis Friedrich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
53		Speaker Davis Bradley	S.B. ¹⁵ 1831 - motion
		Speaker Davis Totten Bradley	
		Speaker Davis	
54		Bradley	
		Speaker Davis	S.B. ¹⁵ 1831 - motion prevails
		Clerk O'Brien	
55		Ewing	S.B. 1881 - 3rd Reading
		Speaker Davis	
56-57		(Madigan ((Ewing	Question
		Speaker Davis	TOOR
58		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1883
		Speaker Davis Davis	Explains Bill
59		Speaker Davis	
		Pullen	Yield
		Speaker Davis	
		(Pullen ((Davis	Question
	3:16	Speaker Davis	
60		Pullen	Speaks to Bill
		Speaker Davis Kosinski	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
61		Speaker Davis	
		Davis, J.	To close - S.B. 1883
		Speaker Davis	S.B. 1883 passed
62		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1882
		Speaker Davis	
		Ryan	Explains Bill
		Speaker Davis	
		(Byers	Question
		(
		(Ryan	
63		Speaker Davis	S.B. 1882 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1884
		Speaker Davis	
		Peters	Back to 2nd for Amendment
		Speaker Davis	2nd
	3:25	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Davis	
64-65		Chapman	S.B. 1884- Amt. 1, explained
		Speaker Davis	
		Geo-Karis	Yield
		Speaker Davis	
		(Geo-Karis	
		(
66		(Chapman	
67		Geo-Karis	Speaks on Amt.- favors
		Speaker Davis	
		Pullen	Oppose
68		Speaker Davis	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Martin	Yield
		Speaker Davis	
69		(Martin ((Chapman	Question
		Speaker Davis	
		Martin	Oppose
		Speaker Davis	
70-71		Peters	
	3:43	Speaker Davis	
72		Darrow	
		Speaker Davis	
73		Chapman	To close
		Speaker Davis	Amt. 1 - S.B. 1884
		Peters	Explains vote
		Speaker Davis	
74		Peters	Verification
		Speaker Davis	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Affirmative Vote
		Speaker Davis	
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds
		Speaker Davis	
		Luft	'aye'
75		Speaker Davis	
		Clerk O'Brien	
76-77		(Speaker Davis ((Peters	Questions Roll Call



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Davis	Amendment 1 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2
78		Speaker Davis	
		Chapman	
79		Speaker Davis	Amendment adopted, 3rd Rd.
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1885, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Davis	
		Lechowicz	
80	4:06	Speaker Davis	S.B. 1885 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1887, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Davis	
		Friedrich	Asks for suspension of Rules
	4:10	Speaker Redmond	Rules suspended
		Friedrich	Continues on Bill
		Speaker Davis	Bill passed
81		Clerk O'Brien	3rd Reading
		Speaker Davis	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Davis	
82-83		Hanahan	
		Speaker Davis	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Davis	
		(Madigan	
		(
84		(Winchester	
		Speaker Davis	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1888, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Davis	
85		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Davis	
86		Speaker Davis	passed
		Geo-karis	Leave to change to 'aye'
		Speaker Davis	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1892, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Davis	
		Brady	
		Speaker Davis	
87		Walsh	
		Speaker Davis	
88		Stuffle	
		Speaker Davis	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Davis	
89		Totten	
		Speaker Davis	
90		Pullen	
	4:29	Speaker Davis	
		Brady	To close
		Speaker Davis	
		Snyder	Explains vote
		Speaker Davis	
91		Cunningham	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Davis	
		Dunn, J.	
		Speaker Davis	
92		Stuffle	
93		Speaker Davis	S.B. 1892 passed
		Kucharski	S.B. 1850
		Speaker Davis	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Davis	
		Kucharski	Speaks on S.B. 1850
		Speaker Davis	
94-96		(Schuneman ((Kucharski	Yield
		Speaker Davis	
		Kucharski	To close
		Speaker Davis	
		Kucharski	Explains vote
		Speaker Davis	
97		Kane	Urge 'no' vote
		Speaker Davis	
98	4:42	Levin	
		Speaker Davis	
		Schuneman	
		Speaker Davis	
		Madigan	Explains 'aye' vote
		Speaker Davis	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
99		Stuffle	
		Speaker Davis	
		Schuneman	Withdraw request
		Speaker Davis	S.B. 1850 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1893
100		Speaker Davis	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Davis	
		Barnes, E.M.	
101		Speaker Davis	S.B. 1879
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1879, Amt. #3
		Speaker Davis	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Davis	
		Polk	
	4:51	Speaker Davis	
		Mautino	
		Barnes, E.M.	
102		Speaker Davis	Amt. #3 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amt. #4
		Speaker Davis	
		Barnes, E.M.	
		Speaker Davis	Amt. adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amt. 5
103		Speaker Davis	
		Dawson	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Davis	Amt. adopted, 3rd Reading
		Matijevich	P.P.P.
104-108		Speaker Davis	Speech
		Terzich	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1889-reads motion
		Speaker Davis	
		Terzich	Motion
109		Speaker Davis	
		Totten	Questions
		Speaker Davis	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Davis	
110		Schneider	Question
		Terzich	
		Speaker Davis	Motion carries
	5:13	Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1889, 2nd Reading
		Speaker Davis	Held on 2nd
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1884, 3rd Reading
111		Speaker Davis	
		Peters	Move to suspend Rules
		Speaker Davis	Motion granted
		Peters	S.B. 1884, 3rd
		Speaker Davis	Bill passed
112		McGrew	Announcement
		Speaker Davis	
		Clerk O'Brien	Intro & 1st Reading



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Davis	
		McGrew	Rule 31 (b) - Move to suspend
113		Speaker Davis	Must go to Rules Comm.
		Taylor	Announcement
		Speaker Davis	
		Madigan	Move to adjourn
		Speaker Davis	House adjourned



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES