

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order, Members please be in their seats. 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. Marcus Aurelius said: 'Do not consider anything for your interest which makes you break your word, quit your modesty or inclines you to any practice which will not bear the light or look of the world in the face. Let us pray. Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who alone has blessed this world with abundance, opportunity and freedom, we Thy unworthy servants do give out thanks for all these Thy gifts. Enable us, O Lord, so to direct all our actions that we be prudent ever in our custody of the wealth and riches at our disposal; direct our thoughts so we do always have only the noblest of purpose in whatsoever we may endeavour; and, O Lord, shield us from any temptations or desires to compromise our heritage of free choice. Thus being so directed, O heavenly Father, we may serve Thee and the people of this State of Illinois as Members of this House of Representatives with unspoiled, unsoiled and untarnished integrity. This we ask in the Name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll call for attendance. Introduction First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1436, Peters. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1437, Peters. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the



Bill. House Bill 1438, Brady. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1439, Brady. A Bill for an Act in relation to the providing of grants-in-aid to school districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1440, Dave Jones. A Bill for an Act to amend the Names Act to require courts, lawyers and collection agencies to include the middle name or initial. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1441, Mautino. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the record show Representative Walsh is in the Chamber...1:03."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 1442, Von Boeckman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1443, Von Boeckman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1444, Farley. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1445, Johnson-Wikoff. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes held by the State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1446, Bower-Robbins. A Bill for an Act to release an easement and other rights for highway purposes through certain land. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1447, Bower. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes over and through certain land. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1448, Woodyard-Campbell. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes over and through certain land. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1449, Woodyard-Campbell. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes over and through certain land. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1450, Winchester. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for



highway purposes held by the State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1451, Bower-Robbins. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes held by the State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1452, Campbell-Woodyard. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes over certain land and to restore access rights to property adjacent. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1453, Friedrich-Watson. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes over and through certain land. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1454, Campbell-Woodyard. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes over and through certain land. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1455, Robbins-Bower. A Bill for an Act to release an easement for highway purposes over certain land. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1456, Neff. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1457, Stearney. A Bill for an Act to amend the Usury Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1458, Stearney. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1459, Friedland. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1460, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the School Problems Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1461, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Problems Commission Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1462, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1463, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1464, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the...a Bill for an Act



concerning Governmental Tort Immunity. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1465, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1466, Reed. A Bill for an Act to amend the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1467, Reed. A Bill for an Act to amend the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1468, Reed. A Bill for an Act to amend the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1469, Reed. A Bill for an Act to amend the Snowmobile Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1470, Reed. A Bill for an Act to amend the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1471, Mulgalian. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1472, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the Freedom of Information Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1473, Schlickman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 72, Kosinski. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill...Senate Bill 138, Yourell. A Bill for an Act reducing the state Real Estate Transfer Tax and authorize the counties to impose the Real Estate Transfer Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 153, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Bureau of the Budget. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill.. 252, Daniels. A Bill for an Act making... amending Sections of the Real Estate Brokers and Salesman License Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second Reading. House Bills, Second Reading, House Bill 13. Representative Kelly, do you want to move with that one? Out of the record."



95, Representative Deuster. Let's try 95 and see what happens."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 95. A Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Deuster, amends House Bill 95 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, on the Amendment to House Bill 95."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to take this out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record with the request of the Sponsor. 148."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 148. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Deuster, amends House Bill 148 on page 1 by deleting lines 1 through 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster requests that you take it out of the record. 189."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 189. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Home Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 192."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 192."

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

Getty: "On 189, Representative Bowman, I think previously indicated he wanted to have that Bill held on Second."

Speaker Redmond: "Return 189 to the Order of Second Reading. 192."



Clerk Hall: "House Bill 192. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes, shelter care homes, and homes for the aged. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any motions with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz or Lechowicz...on the floor."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2, Pullen, amends House Bill 192 on page 2 by inserting immediately after line 30 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz on the floor? Take 192 out of the record. 1...3...316."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 316. A Bill for an Act in relation for local improvements made by special assessments or special taxes benefiting state property. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Has a fiscal note been furnished?"

Clerk Hall: "Fiscal note has been furnished."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Sponsor desire to have this moved to Third Reading? Congratulations, Sir. Third Reading. 348."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 348. A Bill for an Act to amend the Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No...The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted."

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

Clerk Hall: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris on the floor? You want that Bill moved to Third Reading? Out of the record? Out of the record. 382."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 382. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 383."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 383. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to convey certain real property. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The appraisal has not been filed. 388. Take it out of the record."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 388. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Has there been any motion filed with respect to the amendment?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion...any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris, what's your pleasure on 388?"

Harris: "I want to hold it on Second Reading, Sir, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second Reading with the request of the Sponsor. 413."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 413. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to the amendment #1?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hannig: Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 460."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 460. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was withdrawn. Amendment #2 was ruled out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this out of the record. Representative Bradley on the floor? Will you talk to the Clerk here about the...numbering of the amendments and so forth. This is the one where...461."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 461. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for certain expenses in the Heart of the Illinois fair. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendments 1, 2 and 3?"

Clerk Hall: "Motion. I move to take Amendment #3, John Mati...Matijevich."

Speaker Redmond: "By who? Representative Matijevich...motion to table Amendment #3. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, we've worked that out, so I'll withdraw that."

Speaker Redmond: "...withdrawn. Any other...Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well I think there's a technical problem because Amendment 3 fails to amend the title of the Bill. And I'm just wondering if...we'd want to hold this to correct that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Anything to oblige. I'll hold that."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your decision here? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I think Representative Beatty asked if we'd hold the Bill. Is that right, Representative Beatty?"

Speaker Redmond: "Getty."



Matijevidich: "Getty, I mean."

Speaker Redmond: "They look alike, but..."

Getty: "The Amendment #3 is just technically dead. I think it could be fixed very easily."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Matijevidich: "It's not my amendment though."

Getty: "But you have a motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "Whose Amendment is #3?"

Getty: "I believe it's a Committee amendment..."

Matijevidich: "The Committee..."

Getty: "Representative Matijevidich filed a motion to..."

Speaker Redmond: "He's withdrawn that motion. Whereas we now stand Committee Amendments 1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee and there is no motion filed with respect to any of those amendments."

Getty: "Well, it can be moved to Third, but..."

Matijevidich: "Well, if the amendment is deficient, I will renew my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk, you're an innocent by-stander in all this. I think we all ought to stand up and whistle Yankee Doodle or something, that would be less noisy. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not sure what amendment they're discussing over there at the moment..."

Speaker Redmond: "#3. Amendment #3 in the Committee. Representative Matijevidich had filed a motion to table which he has subsequently withdrawn. Representative Getty is indicating that there's some imperfection with Amendment #3."

Tuerk: "Well as I recall, that amendment was Representative Hoxsey's Amendment, if I'm not mistaken on that. I don't have my file here, but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, in the absence of any motion being filed with respect to a Committee amendment, it seems to



me that there's no action that we can take with respect to Amendment #3."

Tuerk: "Well, in other words, you'd move it on to Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's right. Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "There has been an amendment filed."

Speaker Redmond: "A motion filed?"

Hoxsey: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there another motion filed with respect to Amendment 3? The Clerk advises me that there's no such motion. Representative Matijevich filed one, but he has since withdrawn it. Is Amendment 3 yours in Committee?"

Hoxsey: "Yes, I was...I was going to table Amendment 3."

Speaker Redmond: "Well then...that will solve our dilemma if you will file a motion with respect to Amendment 3."

Hoxsey: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Do we have a motion form here, Mr. Clerk? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, as long as she is the Sponsor of the amendment and I have a motion to table and she agrees, well let's just it move it..."

Speaker Redmond: "O.K. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Amendment #3 is tabled. Any Amend...further amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #4, Kent, amends House Bill 461 as amended by inserting after Section 4 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent. Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #5, Kent, amends House Bill 461 as



amended by deleting Section 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 adds the sum of 20 thousand dollars to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture from the Agriculture Premium Fund to rebuild a fair building in Schuyler County that was destroyed by the snow, the heavy snow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. Please come to order. Is that a reporter? Representative Skinner, is that a reporter? Is that a reporter? He's in the wrong place. Representative Kent."

Kent: "Does Representative Skinner have anything to say on this amendment? or..."

Speaker Redmond: "On Amendment #5, will you...will you explain the amendment again, I couldn't even hear you?"

Kent: "The amendment adds 20 thousand dollars to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture from Agriculture Premium Fund to rebuild a building in the fairgrounds of Schuyler County that was destroyed by snow this winter. I ask for your approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk, the Sponsor of the Bill."

Tuerk: "Well, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Tuerk: "My only technical question...I have no...no disagreement with what you're trying to do. I know in Amendment #1 which was adopted in Committee and maybe the Chairman of the Committee can speak to this issue because it was done prior to my Amendment, which was #2 as I recall, took funds from the Fair and Exhibition Fund rather than the Ag. Premium Fund. And that's a technical question that I ask in...only that."

Kent: "Your fair is an exhibition fair, the Schuyler County Fair is not."

Tuerk: "O.K."



Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has moved for the adoption.

Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not opposing the amendment, I'm just questioning whether it's in proper form. The original Bill in the title makes an appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for certain expenses for the Heart of Illinois fair. Amendment #5 does not amend the title of the Bill to provide for expenses for the Schuyler County fair. And in view of that, I'd ask if the amendment is in order. I'm not opposing it, I just ask for a ruling."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian, come to the Podium, please. The Parliamentarian advises me that it is in order, that on an appropriation Bill it's...the broad title is appropriation and inasmuch as it's an appropriation, he thinks that it is in order. Lousy practice but... The question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries, Amendment 5 is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #6, Hoxsey, amends House Bill 461 as amended by deleting Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #6 corrects the amount of money that was voted out of Committee for Amendment 3. It makes the amount 38 thousand, 3 hundred and 80 dollars to the LaSalle County Fair Association for the restoration of two buildings that went down with the ice and snow. All it is is a correction amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support Representative Hoxsey on this but I'm going to make a point because our Appropriations Committee is often criticized because there are duplicate amendments and duplicate Bills. There's a similar Bill by Representative Breslin that I



believe is on Second Reading and I commend everybody in the district for trying to do the job for their particular district, and Buddy Hoxsey has done a good job, but I don't want anybody to blame our Appropriation Committee when there are these duplicate types of amendments and Bills to help areas of the State of Illinois. I don't care how hard our Committee works, you're going to get this. So I just want to make that point that this is a duplicate that Representative Breslin also has."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Wolf: "I just wanted to check, I just got on the floor and as I recall we passed out 36 thousand 9 hundred and 80 and now you want to increase the amount? Just shake your head."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "The first amendment that I withdrew cleared it.

I tabled the 1st Amendment and made the correction on the figures so that it coordinates what it's suppose to be."

Wolf: "Was there a bid on it when we passed out the 36 thousand?"

Hoxsey: "Yes...yes, but this was wrong..."

Wolf: "The bid was wrong?"

Hoxsey: "Yeah...no, the figure was wrong."

Wolf: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #6. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 567."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 567. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 587."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 587."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 589, out of the record. 672, Kane. Proceed, 672."

Clerk Hall: House Bill 672. A Bill for an Act creating the Illinois State Fair Authority. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendments 1 and 2?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to those amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Any amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 704, out of the record. 708."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 708. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Agriculture from the Agricultural Premium Fund. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 747."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 747. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation and reappropriation amending certain Acts therein. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"



Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 806. I understand that a request for a fiscal note has been filed with respect to 806, we'll take it out of the record. Reading of the Journal. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk Hall: "Journal for Wednesday, March 28, 1979. House met pursuant to adjournment, the Speaker in the Chair, the prayer by Father William Krueger, the House Chaplain, direction of the Speaker, Roll Call was taken to ascertain the attendance of Members as follows: 172 present..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journal #23 of March 27, 24 of March 28 and 25 of March 29, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with and the reading...the Journals be approved. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Journal is approved. On page 10, Consent Calendar, Third Reading, 2nd Day. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 46. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to forceful entry. First... Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 62. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to criminal jurisprudence. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 86. A Bill for an Act in relation to change of venue in criminal cases. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 591. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 592. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 593. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 594. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third



Reading of the Bill. House Bill 595. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 604. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create State University Civil Service System. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 687. A Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 688. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Professional Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 689. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the General Not-For-Profit Corporation Act. Third Reading of Bill. House Bill 716. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 804. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 109 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Consent Calendar, Second Reading, First Day...Second Day."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 550. A Bill for an Act to provide for the feasibility study by the Department of Transportation with the respect to construction of certain bridges. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendment from the floor?"

Continued on Page 17



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading, House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 14. Representative Lee Daniels, 14."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 14. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 21, Representative Ralph Dunn. 21. Representative Neff ...don't...please, sit down. Representative Ralph Dunn. House Bill 21."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 21. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 21 is the Bill that would return the drinking age to 21. And the way the Bill has been amended on Second Reading the 21 year old age..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please, please come to order. The noise is deafening."

Dunn: "You'd think you'd all been drinking. This is House Bill 21 that returns the drinking age to a uniform age throughout the state. It makes it so that no one can consume alcoholic beverages within the state legally unless they're 21 years of age or over. It's a simple Bill and it doesn't...it changes the whole State of Illinois concept of how we should handle a matter that is of statewide importance. I don't know if people are going to vote for it or not, Mr. Speaker, maybe it ought to be on a Consent Calendar. We made a mistake in 1973 by changing the drinking age to 19 for beer and wine and I think that we've all had evidence through the last five years of the mistake that we made and if you've listened to your constituency in the last few weeks, I'm certain that you'll vote as your constituents would want



you to and you'd vote for House Bill 21. My Cosponsors, Representative Bus Yourell and Representative Don Deuster, join me in urging that you vote for House Bill 21 and return the drinking age in the State of Illinois to 21. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevecich."

Matijevecich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make a parliamentary inquiry. It may not be timely now, but at least...so that Epstein can walk around if he's here. I'm going to make the parliamentary inquiry of how many votes this will take for passage because there is an Amendment, I believe, that does preempt the home rule power. And so that we are alerted to how many votes this might take for passage, I think it might be just as well that we're informed of that now. That might hold up some of the lengthy debate that we may have on this Bill. The one vote that we...the one Amendment that we had, Dave, I think preempts the home rule powers."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me 89."

Matijevecich: "All right, I just thought I'd ask."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 21 is a Bill that the people of the State of Illinois, in my opinion, are asking us to enact. It's a Bill to return us, not to something new, but to something old that we've had for many years. For forty years, ever since depression...prohibition, rather, we've had a 21-year-old drinking age here in Illinois. Why did we change it? In the 1970's we had the Vietnam War going on and a lot of our young people were going off to fight and die for our country. In 1971 we lowered the voting age to 18. About the same time as a result of court decisions and statutes as a part of the sex equality movement we...we used to have an age of majority for men at 21 and for women at 18. The court decisions



and the statutes generally lowered the age for men so that we found that at 18 people could fight and die for their country, they could vote, they could marry, they could enter into contracts and the natural conclusion was that if they can do all that, certainly, they can drink alcohol. And so a number of states, not just Illinois alone, made a mistake in 1973. We lowered the drinking age for beer and wine. That was based really on an absurd and improper assumption that beer and wine is harmless. And we know that there's just as much alcohol in wine as there is in the average mixed drink. There's more in beer than in some mixed drinks. And... the results of lowering the drinking age were a number of things which all of us have sensed. We increased and encouraged the use of alcohol by young people. We increased highway accidents, injuries and deaths among young people, teenagers. Last year the Lake County Coroner reported that the typical death in our county was a drunk teenager involved in an automobile accident. Not only have the teenagers been killed, but innocent victims have been killed."

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

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the presiding officer of this Chamber, I would wish and hope that you could bring the place to order. We're talking about a Bill that affects everyone in the State of Illinois. It's been discussed and thoroughly discussed and if you can't get better order here, Mr. Chairman, maybe we ought to adjourn."

Speaker Redmond: "I think your point is well taken. Please come to order. If we don't get better order we're going to clear the floor of everyone except a Member. And then if that doesn't work, we'll take the next course. Please give the Gentleman order."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, our Minority Leader is correct that



this subject has been well discussed on the floor and in the Committee at the Amendment stage. We know what the results have been in addition to the highway fatalities and accidents, we've had vandalism in our communities, we've had what many Mayors call, hooli... hooliganism and public drunkenness on the part of young people. We have college students who not only drink as of...I suppose as some of us did when we were in college, but we have alcoholism and acute alcoholism as a serious problem on our college campuses. We have drinking beer and wine and other forms of alcohol in our high school life, we have the pass through effect. Studies, many have been made..Canada did the same thing, the University of Toronto, the University of Michigan, Chicago Tribune, many, many studies have concluded that, yes, the increased drinking by young people was not entirely caused by lowering the drinking age, but lowering the drinking age substantially contributed to that. What we are doing with House Bill 21 is establishing what will be a uniform standard throughout the State of Illinois. If you look to your sister state to the East, Indiana, the age there is 21. If you look to the South, in Kentucky the age is 21. If you look to the Southwest, in Missouri it's 21. Last year the legislature of Michigan recognized the problem and raised the age. They didn't raise it far enough and the people in a referendum did what I think are people are asking us to do and that is in Michigan they raised the age to 21. And I can tell you as a Representative of a district bordering on Wisconsin, I've been communicating with Wisconsin legislators and never in the history of Wisconsin have they had too many Bills in the hopper at Madison to increase the drinking age. And I think they will take that action and we in Illinois can help encourage them to do that, to help solve the border



problem. This is a good law. For those who are concerned about the college students, I think we can recognize that almost everyone on this...the floor of this House and in this General Assembly went...if they went to college, went to college at a time when the drinking age was 21. It's nothing new. It's something good. It will save lives. It will eliminate the chemical and moral confusion involved in our trying to say in our present law that beer and wine are harmless. We did consider Amendments on Second Reading which were hard fought because many of us have different ideas on how to solve this problem. We have a good Bill that sets the age at 21. I would certainly urge your support for it and I know that any of the three Sponsors of the Bill will be happy to answer any questions that may arise. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you very much. There is still some question in my mind after this Bill has been amended that it would only take 89 votes because we are saying to home rule units that the...regardless of what you think or what you do, it will...the age, if this Bill passes, will be 21 years old for those who would be drinking beer and wine or liquor. Regarding the Bill though, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I supported Representative Jaffe's Bill when we passed it here some years ago. And I still think, and I have great confidence, in the young men and women in Illinois. I really have no feel as the chief Sponsor of this Bill points out, what they do in Iowa, Missouri, Kentucky, and frankly I don't care. But I do care about the young people in Illinois. It's been said on the floor of the House that the youth of today have not accepted the responsibility given to them by allowing them to drink



beer and wine at age 19 and 20. I suggest that the first thing we do, is the first thing we have done in the history of this country at a time of war is to reduce the draft age to age 19. And the young people respond by serving their country. And they accept that responsibility...and many, many of them with a supreme sacrifice. And yet, with this Bill, we're telling those same people, "we don't have confidence in you to drink a glass of beer. We're going to prohibit you from going in and buying a glass of wine. But in time of need, when the country needs you, we'll send you a message from your draft board that you will come and serve in your county., but no, we're going to deny you in Illinois to go...to recognize the fact that you have accepted the responsibility of a 19 and 20 year old". As I said the other day, there is conclusive evidence that those people in our college campuses and universities who are now drinking beer and wine...their peers before them were smoking dope. I would rather have them on the beer and the wine, than I would smoking dope and what comes after that. But for us to be telling the youth of Illinois that they have not accepted that responsibility that we gave them is really quite a shock to me when we can turn it around and say to them, and I don't know, I imagine most of us sitting on the floor of the House have served in one part of the armed forces or another and we know what that means, but to say to them in Illinois, "You have not accepted the responsibility we gave you a few years ago", then speaking for the youth of Illinois, I resent that insinuation that the 19 and 20 year olds, who on many occasions have given and made the supreme sacrifice, that now we say to them, we don't think that you have acted responsible...responsibly with the age limit we gave you some many years ago. For one thing, I don't think we've allowed a long enough period



to really make a determination. And you can take statistics whether they be insurance statistics or whatever the statistics might be and make them say whatever you want to say with those statistics. I'm sure there are many people over 21 that are accident victims on our highway and are caused by alcohol. And so maybe the... entered the Amendment given with tongue-in-cheek the other day suggesting 65 would be the proper age might be something that we ought to consider if we're basing it just on the fact as to how many...how much alcohol is contributed to the accident rates in Illinois. We have a university town in my district and, yes, I'm concerned about that community. But I don't see the young people in that community, at Illinois State University or Illinois Wesleyan University, doing a great deal of damage, nor do I think they've been damaged by having the right to go in and buy a glass of beer legally. This is a step backward as far as I'm concerned and I hope it's defeated. And I think that it should take 107 votes. And I'm sure that there will be a concession later on if it passes without 107 insofar as home rule units are concerned. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I couldn't agree more with everything that the...Representative Bradley has just said. I...I know that he hinted mostly at relative to college students but it isn't just college students. I think that if we're going to say, which we already have said, for 18 year olds that we have enough confidence in them throughout this country, including this state, that they can exercise in intelligent judgment in voting and signing legal documents, making decisions to get married and the whole gamut...I certainly think that we ought to have enough confidence in 19 year olds to not be mandated



by the existing law that they have to indulge in consumption of alcoholic beverages, but enough confidence in them that they will exercise self-discipline if they so desire to drink. And I just think that the existing law that is perhaps, needs a little bit more time. I do not think that this is a good legislative proposal at this time. I just feel as though, like Representative Bradley, I have confidence in the judgment of 19 year olds as I do the 18 year olds. I think this Bill should be defeated and I agree with what he has said. It's a constitutional question and when we erode the home rule powers here for the first time, it seems to me that it should...the parliamentary decision should be that it takes 107 votes. But I certainly would encourage everyone to join with me and defeat this proposal at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan...Hanahan. Representative Thomas Hanahan, the Gentleman from McHenry."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've stood on this floor enough times and heard from various Members...say to me that we're chasing business out of Illinois. Well, I say to you Gentlemen that are worried about the business community of Illinois, that if you pass House Bill 21, you're going to see a lot of business chased out of Illinois. I live about six or seven miles south of the Wisconsin border and for those of you who want to increase the gas tax, I sure hope you're going to...intend to spend some money up there so that you can build four-lane highways with all the kids that are going to be driving back and forth, up to Twin Lakes and Lake Geneva, up to Kanosha and Resine and all the other border towns in Northern Illinois up to Wisconsin. I don't buy the argument that Wisconsin may change their drinking laws. Let's face facts. They've had an 18 year old drinking law since they...1933, I don't think



they're going to change it. All I can see with the passage of this Bill is a change of where the kids are going to spend their money. It'll take it away from Illinois business which we tax at a very high rate and send that business up to Wisconsin, especially in the Northern part of the state. Now if you want to build a four-lane highway to accommodate this so the kids don't kill themselves coming back and forth to the City of Chicago where they'll be going on the weekends and in summer months, all summer long, traipsing up to Wisconsin to drink. You...you guys better put your priorities in order because all we're going to do is encourage highway carnage by making the kids go out of state if they want to drink and have them go further for it. I think that Illinois business communities have been hamstrung long enough with trying to legislate morality. If you traveled a foreign country, whether you traveled to Mexico or Italy or Germany, you'll find that there's no age limit on drinking. And they don't have the teenage problems of drinking. Adam ate the apple of Eve because it was forbidden, not because he happened to like apples. Kids drink at 19 or at 18 or 17 because it's a forbidden fruit. If you took the age limit off entirely, no kid would even care about it because it would be an expenditure of money that he'd probably find a better use for. You keep this false age limit on drinking and you're going to encourage alcoholism among kids who aren't of age so that they could somehow say among their peers that they are violating the older folks acts. I can just tell you, I've got a 16-year-old son that I'd trust drinking beer and wine anytime and I've got a 22-year-old son that is going on 13 mentally when it comes to drinking. So you could say 19 is a proper age, I don't know where you get it. If you say 21 is proper, in my experience, I can't see where it's factual. Kids that



want to have a beer, want to go disco dancing, want to entertain themselves, if you forbid them from entering in to a place that sells alcoholic beverages to 21, all you're doing is encouraging them to violate laws or encouraging them to find their kicks or their highs in another method and probably that would be an alco...in the usage of dope, marijuana and the other kinds of abuses of our body. I can just say to you, look at the experiences of prohibition, don't confuse it. This is our act of prohibition sponsored by people who are against the usage, the rightful usage of alcoholic beverages. There's nothing wrong with a glass of wine. There's nothing wrong with a glass of beer. And if somebody violates it and drinks too much, let that be the punishment, they'll have a good hangover from it. You don't have to put a false age and I'm against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to speak on the merits of the Bill. I spoke on this Bill once before, but I do like to call the attention to...especially the attorneys...Members on this floor. I am rising for a parliamentary inquiry because when you're asking us to vote for House Bill 21 you're not asking us to vote for one Bill, you're asking us to vote for two Bills. The first Bill is the drinking age and the other one is the erosion of the preemption of home rule. I'm afraid of what's going to happen by setting this dangerous precedent of only calling 89 votes to pass this Bill that there are going to be many, many more Bills that's going to preempt home rules. And this is a complete erosion of the home rule...unit and I appeal the ruling of the floor of the Chair on the 89 votes to pass this Bill. I'm not speaking on the merits of the Bill. I already let my...position known on that.



But I am going to demand that we do appeal the ruling of the Chair for 89 votes to 107 votes. I'm afraid of the erosion of the home rule unit."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman is within...Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "May I speak to the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think we ought all to direct our attention to Article VII of the Constitution. And more particularly, Section 7, that deals with home rule. That Section, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, expressly states that 107 votes are required if we, on one hand, tell a unit of local government that it can't do something without, we, the state, doing anything. Or, on the other hand, we tell units of local government in doing something they have go to do it a particular way. That requires 107 votes. But for the legislature to say, 'home rule unit you can't do it, we're going to do it', requires only 89 votes. That's very clear and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this motion is not a good motion and I would oppose it inasmuch as the ruling of the Chair is absolutely correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "What did he move the previous question on, the discussion on the...how many...the parliamentary inquiry on the motion to overrule the Chair or on the discussion of House Bill 21?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, will you respond?"

Hoffman: "Either one or both."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "I'd like to...I'd like an answer on Gene Hoffman's ...for the simple reason that I want to vote for the



Bill and I don't want to vote for the Bill if it's only going to take 89 votes because I am not going to be a part of this erosion that I'm talking about..that I feel is an erosion. Now I would like a ruling on...on the moving of the previous question. What are we voting on...my motion?"

Speaker Redmond: On your motion."

Conti: "On my motion, all right...so I know how to vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on...Representative Conti had moved to repeal the ruling of the Chair which says that the Constitution of the State of Illinois under these circumstances requires about 89 votes. Representative Conti disagrees with that ruling and he has moved that the ruling be appealed. Representative Hoffman has moved the previous question. The question now is on Representative Hoffman's motion to the previous question. And the question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Collins. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sure if I'm right, but I think you put the question as to whether the main question should be put. Is that what we're voting on?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct. Have all voted who wish? The question's...on this question there is 119 'aye' and 7 'no' and the motion carries. We'll now go back to Representative Conti's motion that the ruling of the Chair be overruled. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "A question to clear the air on this situation, Mr. Speaker. I know there are many people on the floor of the House that think that 107 votes should be needed and I'm aware that the Parliamentarian has suggested to you that only 89, I'm wondering if it would be proper to ask for an explanation of why he thinks it only takes 89 before we vote on this motion to overrule or appeal



the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman gave that explanation a minute ago. Will you repeat it Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Section 7 of Article VII provides that 107 votes are required if we tell a home rule unit that it can't do something without the state filling that vacuum and doing something. If we simply prohibit something, period, and don't do anything ourselves at the state level. Or 107 votes are required if we tell a unit of local government how to do something, if we regulate a function. But only 89 votes are required if we tell a unit of local government it can't do something and we do it in its place."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, further..."

Deuster: "Well, I think it was a good explanation but I have in front of me the Constitution. And the Constitution in Article VII, Section 6, lays this out that there are two things we can do. In Subsection G it says by a three-fifths vote, we can limit the power to tax of a home rule unit or some other power which is not exercised by the state. And then Subsection H says, however, by a simple law which only takes 89 votes, we can exercise exclusive jurisdiction over some power that the state is already regulating. And in the case of a drinking age, we have had that regulation for some forty years, so it is a power that...that the state is regulating and now all the state is doing is saying that this power that we've been regulating for low these many years, we are now going to exercise exclusive jurisdiction. And whether a person would agree or disagree with the reasoning of the Constitution, that's what it says and I...it's my understanding that that's the reason for the Parliamentarian's ruling. I would think if anyone..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute...we're getting...far a field



here. The previous question has carried. And there's ...further discussion... Representative Bradley asked for a rationale behind the ruling inasmuch as Mr. Schlickman gave such a lucid explanation and I thought that...I didn't know how I could turn...the Parliamentarian, give him the Speaker's microphone so I asked Mr. Schlickman to do it. So we're now...the question is on Representative Conti's motion. Representative Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I concur with your ...the indication you have from the Chair. But what raises a question then...some of...some of us was not in attendance at the time when this ruling was made. And even in the explanation that I hear from the Representative from Arlington Heights is an indication that there must be a void...a void within the law that we can, ...by exercising the executive authority of the state, move into that void. My question that I put to the Parliamentarian, and the question may be rhetorical, but the question that I would put to that Gentleman, what happens when the law does not exist. There are many communities, many municipalities, many cities around the state that there is no void, the void does not exist. They have acted by their power we delegated to them through home rule to enact ordinances, enact local law that plugged up that void. Now, in fact, what I address to the Chair, Mr. Speaker, into the explanation of the determination for the required prerequisite number of votes, I ask, you are preempting those communities who has already acted as I understand to preempt the law. And I don't have the Constitution in front of me but, as I understand, the preemption law, if you preempt a local unit of government who has already established in law, then it would require a three-fifths majority from this Body."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the order of business ought to be Representative Conti closing on his motion. We are discussing the merits of the ruling that you made and we've got no business doing that. I think we better get on with the closing argument and vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson, what's your problem. The question is on Representative Conti's... whether or not the Chair will be overruled. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I know I'm out of order, but I was going to ask Representative Schlickman...he said that when we tell somebody, 'you can't do it, that we're going to do it in your place', do you mean, Gene, that we're telling kids they can't drink, now we're going to drink all that beer and wine in their place?"

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the Chair be overruled? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 34 'aye' and 107 'no', the Gentleman's motion fails. Representative Yourell, ready for the question? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I think there's a lot of other people who would like to talk to this issue one way or another. I would."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you repeat that, Representative Johnson?"

Johnson: "Yeah, I'm not ready for the Sponsors to close. I think this is an important enough issue that you ought to hear what the Members' opinions are."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I just asked if you were ready for the question and you've answered the..."

Johnson: "No, I'm not ready for the question."

Speaker Redmond: "O.K., then we won't put it. You took the record on this one, didn't you? O.K. Representative



Leinenweber. We're back on...debate on House Bill 21."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Give you some idea as what the plan is, inasmuch as we have a full afternoon of Committee hearings, the sooner we get through with this one... we will recess this House at 5 o'clock at which time we'll come back for rules. But you have Committee... a full afternoon of Committee hearings."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, back on House Bill 21 now that we've got the procedural aspects squared away. I am on the House Executive Committee and we heard two full days of testimony on this particular Bill and it ended up that there weren't really enough votes to get it out and one Member changed his vote in order to give the Membership a chance to consider what, I guess, is a relatively important question. One of the key issues which I thought was very important that the Committee was interested in and that was to quiz the various witnesses of the various organizations, such as the High School Principal's Association and so forth, as to what their view was in enforcing House Bill 21 when and if it becomes law. The question was, if one of your charges, one of your children, one of your minions is arrested for violating House Bill 21 because he has a beer can in his possession, he's 20 years old, will you favor prosecution of this boy or this girl? And our answer uniformly was, no, of course not, because we don't want them to have a record. Now these were the proponents of the Bill that were talking like this. I suggest to you that if we pass this Bill it's going to be a farce. There will be no enforcement of the Bill. The only possible enforcement will be against a liquor license holder who may have his license lifted for a day or two because he permitted some 20 year old to have a beer who he's



probably been serving for the last year. To me, it's ludicrous to pass this bill when people have been drinking at 19 and 20 years of age for several years now...I think it's four years now. If we wanted to keep it at 21, we should never have lowered it. My recollection is that I voted against lowering but that's neither here nor there. The majority of this House and the Senate and the Governor felt that 19 year olds ought to be able to drink beer and wine. And I think it's ludicrous to pass a Bill that's going to come into law that's not going to be enforced. And one final comment, Representative Deuster pointed out that his...the coroner of Lake County, indicated that the average motor vehicle death in Lake County was a white male, 21...20 years of age. The coroner also said that that average traffic fatality in Lake County was also driving a Chevrolet automobile. So I think it makes just as much sense to ban Chevrolet automobiles in Lake County as it does to pass House Bill 21. I think those are ridiculous statistics, which shouldn't hold a hell of a lot of water. I would suggest that we vote 'no' on House Bill 21 and then vote for a Bill which will permit non-home rule units to raise the age limit if they so desire."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request a ruling of the Chair. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your inquiry."

Madigan: "I request a ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. What will the effect...excuse me, what will be the effect of this Bill if finally passed and signed by the Governor upon a prior existing ordinance of a home rule unit?"

Speaker Redmond: "In the judgment of the Parliamentarian, it is beyond our scope. Nothing in the Bill which seeks to address itself to ordinances that have been enacted prior to the effective date of this Bill. The courts



have...would probably be the resort...to try to determine whether or not the ordinances are still in effect or whether this Bill that we pass will automatically vitiate the local ordinances. I think we have just as much chance of guessing what the court is liable to do as we did on what they were going to do with corporate personal property tax. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing the Members an opportunity to speak on this subject. I suppose as I speak here and as the other Members speak to the... full House, most Members of this Body have already made up their mind. They made up their mind and they made commitments before they realized what the facts and the statistics supporting or not supporting this particular piece of legislation were. Because in order to vote for this Bill, you'd not only got to have made a commitment but you've got to ignore some real...hard, cold facts. The first of which is, that there is absolutely no statistical evidence offered by any of the Sponsors of this Bill at any stage or any letter I've had on this Bill in the course of the last two months to support any conclusion, the 19 and 20 year old drinkers of beer and wine are any more dangerous on the roads of Illinois than anyone else. As a matter of fact, the statistics show that Representative Skinner's Amendment should have been passed, that the most dangerous drivers in Illinois, the ones that have abused the alcohol to the greatest extent are the ones between the ages of 28 and 37. So why don't we adopt an Amendment that prohibits them from drinking. Why don't we have... adopt an Amendment that prohibits any particular group from drinking because there's just as much evidence to support that as there is this anachronistic Bill. The second things is, and I think we've got to consider this very closely, is that this is a totally unenforceable



Bill, Representative Leinenweber pointed this out. The Urbana and the Champaign police departments, who are responsible for enforcing this, have both indicated to me that 'We don't want this Bill', that the exercise of the home rule power in Champaign and Urbana is sufficient and...and that it's a totally unenforceable concept, particularly in college towns. And I guess the third thing, you've got to put it in real human terms. Look...look...look at an individual who's in college, 19 or 20 years old, finishes his class and wants to go down to the tavern to have a glass of beer. You're going to make a criminal out of that individual. What about the person who's stationed at Fort Sheridan or Shanute Air Force Base, who's 20 years old and has two or three children and a wife, and wants to take his wife somewhere down in Champaign or Urbana or Waukegan to get a glass of wine, you're going to make a criminal out of that individual. You're going to make criminals of individuals who can vote, who can be drafted and go and fight and die for their country, who can sign contracts, who can get married, you're going to make criminals of all those people. And the net result of that is, Ladies and Gentlemen, those people who we've made criminals of by this piece of legislation are going to look to the 177 Members of this House and the 59 Members of the Senate and say, 'If you can make those kind of Bills, why should we pay any attention to any of the laws you pass'. It's going to create an atmosphere that the Members of this General Assembly are above the people, that we don't have any... semblance of ration... relation to rationality, that the laws on marijuana and all kinds of other things shouldn't be obeyed either because we sit on Mount Olympus and tell you 19 and 20 year olds, who are citizens in every other respect, that you can't have a glass of beer or wine. We've made



attempts to try to make this palatable to have some-
sort of compromise. There's been Amendments offered to
allow home rule units to use their powers, but the
people who normally support home rule, somehow, in this
Bill, want to preempt home rule. We've had Bills that
allow off-premise consumption to really address them-
selves to the problems that Representative Deuster raises
where individuals go in and buy liquor and give it to
the 17 and 18 year olds. But they rejected that
Amendment too. We've had Amendments on college campuses,
on 65 year olds, but all of those are rejected. To a
person...the people who wrote me letters on this Bill,
not only would support this Bill, they'd support a Bill
to raise the increase of the drinking age to 150. They
don't believe in alcohol, period. And that's their
right, but I think when we vote on this Bill, we ought
to realize that all these letters and this great out-
pouring of popular sentiment on this Bill is founded in
a few prohibitionists who want to return back to the
1918 and the 18th Amendment and eliminate alcohol all
together. So I think the Sponsors ought to face this
question foursquare and decide what that's...if that's
what they really want or not. I would simply say to
the Members of this House, before you vote on this, you
ought to realize what you're doing. You're making
criminals of a lot of people who are good citizens of
this state. And I think that when we do that...you're
making a big step and it's a big step backwards, you're
going to eliminate a lot of jobs, you're going to
eliminate a lot of people who defend for the economy,
and not just the owners, but the employees who have made
a legitimate business investment a long time ago and now
along with all the rest of the people of the State of
Illinois are going to be thrown back to a unenforceable,
unworkable situation. And I certainly urge a 'no' vote



on this horrible Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler." Representative Brady, McCourt, please sit down."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House. I support the concept of Representative Bradley and Leinenweber and others that oppose this particular Bill. I have reasons for rising to speak to this Bill today. Three fine young ladies are employed in my home office, they're not 21 years old. They have friends...if they go to the weddings during the summer, if this Bill is passed, they'll be no champaign for these young folks... no. I talked to some of the club managers, they have disco dancing Friday evening and Saturday evening, they require the people that attend these dancings to have an ID card, 19 years old to get in because there is a bar there. That's about the only place they have to go to have this type of entertainment. I questioned these girls that work for me and I said, 'You girls go and drink here every night? No, we want to go to the dance for amusement, but we want to have the right, if we want to do it'. This Bill, in my mind, after talking to a couple of state's attorneys in our area and others, is completely unenforceable. Now, one more thought, the people that come to me and say, 'Hey, I lost my driver's license because I was picked up driving under the influence', there has not been one single person in that 19 to 21 year group that came to me and asked for help. It's been those fellows between the ages of 30 and 60 that come in. I've seen nothing concrete. Statistics have said that this is a good Bill to vote for, and I urge everybody to vote 'no' on this atrocious Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, as I sit here and listen to the discussion on both sides of this, number one, we've totally lost the issue at hand, and



that had to do with the drinking age. But, number 2, I can't tell you the perplexed feelings that I have, and I think many of you, as to the issue of preemption and where we're at on it. I've heard some explanation of how it should be at 89 or 107 votes, I think we've clouded the issue sufficiently on preemption on this, that we've taken away the good or the bad of the Bill. There's several reasons why I think this Bill causes trouble. There's some things about it that I think is good. But on the basis that we've talked about here previously, on the clouded issue of preemption and the way it's been presented, I would urge all of you to vote 'no' today until we can clear up that issue for the satisfaction of the entire Membership. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman. Representative Borchers. You waived. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I would like to answer that statement that if you're old enough to fight, you're old enough to drink. Well let me you that I know something about that. I have been a member of the Third Army Calvary Reconnaissance from Omaha Beach all through the war and I've commanded numbers of men. If there was German machine gun nest to be taken or a dangerous patrol to be made, I would like to have, and I would send 18, 19 and 20-year olds young men to do it because they don't realize, really, what they're getting into. They like the excitement. They like the adventure of it. Now, they carry this over to their drinking and, on those basis, based on the knowledge of what happens to young men, because of their being young men, I certainly intend to vote 'yes' on this Bill. Don't you believe one minute, if they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to drink. There's a hell of a difference."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman.



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

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to continue the dialogue on this very important Bill because anything that I might say, for the most part, would be redundant. All of those who rose and spoke in opposition to House Bill 21 issued the same statements when we discussed nine Amendments to the Bill on previous occasions. Each one of those Amendments that were proposed as you know were defeated with great majority. So anything that would be said today in defense or in opposition to House Bill 21 would, of course, be saying the same things that were said before. It had been suggested why one person in opposition that...the only people who are in favor of House Bill 21 are those who might be, in a name, prohibitionists. And I would suggest to you that the evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. All of the polls that have been conducted by the newspapers and other means in the State of Illinois have shown to be in favor of raising the drinking age across the board in great majorities. In one part of the area that I represent, 89 per cent, in another part, 92. It's been suggested that if we raise the drinking age to 21 that...those who wish to drink will travel to another state with a lower drinking age. The state of Wisconsin was mentioned. I would suggest to you, for those who think that way, that the Committee that considered this legislation in Wisconsin, raised it, passed it out... passed out the Bill to raise the drinking age to 21.



Michigan today is 21. All of the surrounding states to Wisconsin are higher than Wisconsin's age. All of the states surrounding Illinois have either raised their age or are considering raising their age. There have been statements made that perhaps we're making criminals of individuals by passing this legislation. That's to suggest that if we pass a law in the General Assembly that somebody doesn't like that they're going to be made a criminal because they don't obey the law. If the age is 20 in Illinois and if they violate that age limit, they should be prosecuted; if it's 21, the light treatment should be afforded. To make a cop-out for those people who refuse to obey the law, certainly, is not in the best interest of the General Assembly or the people that this General Assembly represents, all 11 million of them. The people of the State of Illinois has spoken loud and clear, they want the age at 21. In 1973, six years ago, we lowered the age and I was a Cosponsor of that legislation, and I know it hasn't worked, you know it hasn't worked. Last night I was at Marine Valley Community College campus and they told me over there and showed tons and tons of whiskey bottles and beer cans that had been littered in the parking area simply because those individuals had demonstrated that they have not reached maturity in order to handle that privilege that we granted them in 1973. The people of Illinois want the drinking age raised to 21, and I think that's our responsibility. And I do urge, now, a 'yes' vote on House Bill 21."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that people ought to take a look at the fiscal note which indicates that the State of Illinois is going to lose 5.7 to 9.3 million



dollars from sales taxes and liquor taxes. Money usually doesn't mean very much around here but it might mean something to somebody. Secondly, I'd like to suggest that given the example of the oil dealer in Peoria who is suggesting that people mail oil cans to the Governor to protest the gas tax, it seems to me likely that some college student may indeed discover that beer cans are lighter than oil cans and easier to mail, and I really wouldn't be surprised if the Governor ended up with more beer cans in his mail bag than he got tea bags."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, the Members of the legislature are seeking to gore another zoic when we don't have to walk behind the plow. Again, we're attempting to do similar things to levy taxes in areas that we don't have to pay. I suggest if we were truly interested in the welfare of humanity in the state, we might have put on an Amendment to prohibit legislators from drinking while in Session. But, again, it's very easy to sit and take away, let's say, some measure of another's right or qualify them by our own standards then it is to judge our own conduct. Gentlemen, this is a bad thing and if we can't stand the responsibility, I don't think we ought to have this type of Bill and I would vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I'm...I'm voting for the Bill. I have a poll which ran 352 to 35, and all of these people want the drinking age raised to 21. Now, if these young people are interested in...going ahead and drinking at 18 and 19 instead of waiting until they're 21, why don't they say something. Why don't they speak out? Why don't they stand up? We have...we have to stand up, we have to vote and we have to try to do what's right. Now, if you feel like that you think that we should pour the



wine and the whiskey and the gin and all these other things to these young people, well, go ahead and do it. This is your right and this is the way you vote today."

Continued



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You know if you'd stop and analyze the arguments of those who oppose this Bill, you'd find they're full of holes. First of all, let me assure you I'm not a prohibitionist. Most of you people realize that. So... but I'm for the Bill. We hear about a huge revenue loss of about 5 and a half million dollars and, on the other hand, we're told that if you pass the law the kids will still get out there and they'll get their alcohol. If they're going to get it, somebody's going to have to buy it for them, so where is the revenue loss? I don't doubt that there will be a revenue loss and I do believe that the youngsters of 19 to 20 will by in far comply with the law. They did before, before 1973 when the age was 21, I think they'll do it again for the most part. We're told that...where are the statistics? We had statistics in Committee. We had statistics but I'll bet you that if we brought those statistics out, you who are opposed would say, 'I don't believe them. Where did you get them? They're no good'. They wouldn't believe it because they don't want the Bill to pass. But as I started to say at the beginning of my talk that most of the arguments that have been made against the 21-year-old Bill are full of holes. There's one thing that is paramount in my mind when I vote for this Bill and that is that we now have a hodgepodge liquor law...liquor permissive drinking age laws. We have as low as 18 in some communities, 19, 20 and 21, we ought to make it universal. I think the people of this state insist that we make it universal. And I think that they believe that 21 is the proper age, they've tried it before, they found it satisfactory and we ought to vote for the Bill and make it law again."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in spite of knowing that a large percentage of the people in my district were interested in having the privilege to drink at 19 and 20, I have refrained from speaking on the House floor on this Bill because I felt that I could use the opportunity back in the district, and I have used that opportunity back in the district, to emphasize to the 19 and 20 year olds in the district that the law as it had been written was being abused, that people under those ages were, in fact, being aided by 19 and 20 year olds to get these drinks illegally. I felt that we would eventually hammer out something here on the House floor that I might be able to support. And I remind you that the Bill is not now as it came out of Committee, with the thorough hearing that it got there. The Bill now instead leaves me in such a state of confusion when I hear on one hand, that we are not preempting home rule, and on the other hand, we don't know what will happen to local ordinances if this Bill passes. I cannot really conscientiously vote either way on this Bill and know what the action of that vote will mean. Certainly, in regard to most of my constituents, I could not support the Bill in its present form. But even for those constituents on the other side of the issue, I cannot conscientiously go back and defend to them a vote in favor of this Bill. And I am forced to vote 'no', partially as Representative Brady indicated, because of the confusion that we will not know what happens in those communities that have local ordinances even if we pass this law. If we, as Legislators, cannot come up with clear definition of the outcome of our action, then I do not believe that we should be perpetrating something like this on our constituents."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."



Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, not only is this interesting, but on the other hand, I would have to say that if you're going to start equating figures, what then is the cost of a life? Some kid of the other neighbor's family or some kid in your family. So if you can come up with a rationale as to just exactly what economic advantages or disadvantages will be had by this, I don't think that you can equate it with life. Number 2, the Waddell-Schaffer mini poll, as of today, for increases the drinking age in the 33rd district, 5 thousand, 6 hundred and 47; no, 8 hundred and 56 and abstaining, 147."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my 'yes' vote on this important issue because the district that I represent, just across from St. Louis, has a great deal of law enforcement problems on weekends in the Metro-East area, particularly because of the lower drinking age which we have in Illinois as compared to Missouri. And a great part of our problems...the reason this Bill...this lower drinking age has not worked in Illinois is because Indiana and Missouri, our two adjoining states, have a higher drinking age. You know, one of the previous Speakers said, 'If a person is old enough to fight, why he is old enough to drink'. Well I can attest to the fact that in our Metro-East they're old enough to fight all right because a great part of our law enforcement problems, the brawls, the stabbings, the peace disturbances, on weekends particularly, are due to our lower drinking age. Our law enforcement facilities are taxed and I think it's time to correct the mistakes that we've made in the past. Michigan has corrected their mistake, Cook County has corrected their mistake, Maine has corrected their mistake and I think that we, in Illinois,



should get in step and raise this back to 21."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the decision we're making today isn't whether young people are going to drink beer and wine or not, it's whether their going to do it illegally or legally at ages 19 and 20. This Bill is really dealing with the nonissue; however, it's quite clear that this legislature is very much concerned with the problem of young people drinking. Obviously, what really influences young people is what adults do. So we need to look to our own personal behavior and also we need, on a state level, to deal more effectively with the problems of alcoholism in the general population. The Illinois State Plan for Health has left alcoholism in the top four priorities for state emphasis. Although this is an extremely high priority ranking, the requested appropriation for alcoholism in the D...MHDD budget, is only 13 per cent of the grant and a mere 3 per cent of the total request. Even though the number of patients served in the community has increased 88 per cent between fiscal '77 and fiscal '78, the appropriation for Community Services was only increased 33.8 per cent for ...since fiscal '77. The programs this state offers through the Department of Public Health and the Department of Mental Health have been sadly hampered by a lack of financial support by this Legislature and by the Executive Branch. It appears to me that if we are really going to deal with this problem, as a Legislature, we need to give a lot more attention to what our state is doing. I'm voting 'no', whether you're voting 'yes' or 'no', I'd hope that your interest in this subject would lead you to give more attention to the problems the state has the opportunity to deal with."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. Representative Conti."



Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and especially the Majority Leader on the other side of the House, I want you to listen to this carefully. I've got an ordinance and I'm home rule unit in Elm Wood Park. We have a drinking age of 21 years of age. Now you're not asking us to vote for a uniformity law here and anyone, especially my good colleague on this side of the aisle, who explained the state statutes so well, and then when the Majority Leader asked the Speaker how the courts would decide on this and he says, 'Who knows how the courts would decide on it'. You're not passing this Bill, you're asking the Attorney General and the Supreme Court to rule on the preemption rules. Now, let me tell you what's going to happen by the ordinances on home rule powers. In order for you to have a liquor license in the State of Illinois, you must have a federal license, you must have a state license, and then you can get your local license. If you don't get that state license, you can't have a local liquor license. If that doesn't include home rule units, I don't know what does. I'm going to look awful silly voting 'no' on this Bill when I'm asking for a uniformity law throughout the State of Illinois. Give me 107 votes on this Bill so that I can salve my conscience and vote 'yes' for this Bill, but until I see 107 votes on there, I'm either voting 'present' or 'no'. And don't let anybody kid you, this does not preempt home rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Leverenz. Dunn.

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to follow up somewhat on the comments of the previous Speaker, I would like to point out that this Bill has been sold to the Membership as something that would provide uniformity throughout the State of Illinois in this area of Legislation. If that is the case, there are a number of home rule municipalities in



the State of Illinois with 19 and 20-year old drinking ordinances in effect, valid, and enforced at the present time which would be wiped out by this legislation if that theory of the effect of this Bill is correct. If that theory is correct, then we have a very serious constitutional problem regarding the powers of home rule units. The question being, can something that a home rule unit does be unwound by a simple Constitutional Majority of the votes in ^a the Legislature? If that is not the implication in the effect, the intended consequence of this legislation, then what we're going to have is the General Assembly of the State of Illinois selling something to the public on the impression that it will create uniformity throughout the State of Illinois when it really will not and we will again have a crazy quilt patchwork of communities in the State of Illinois, some of which have 21 drinking ages and some of which have 19 and 20 year old drinking ages. In the present form, this Bill is not going to do any good at all except create problems as the previous Speaker has indicated. We should all vote 'no'. We should hold this legislative issue in obedience until we find out all the answers to the problems."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are two issues that I've...have listened to that have been raised in this debate. The first issue is that this Bill will in some way reduce vandalism. I don't believe that. The second issue that was raised is that the Bill will in effect cause revenue loss to the State of Illinois and I do believe that. I believe that if we want to reduce vandalism we might better fully fund our educational institution to give our young people a starting chance and I don't believe that we can legislate morality in this Chamber by raising the age to 21. And



for those reasons, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of our previous Speakers has sponsored this legislation, Representative Deuster, mentioned that when all of us went to college, the drinking age was 21 at that time. So the present generation ought to be able to get along with the 21 year old drinking age also. Yes, the drinking age was 21 when we went to college, but the only reason any of us didn't get a drink then was if the line was too long up to the bar. I can tell you one thing, I don't think anyone in this room failed to commit an illegal act by not drinking while they were in college. And so rather than make all these people commit illegal acts, let's continue to make it legal and allow our young people the kind of freedom and liberty that they deserve to have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there have been some strange arguments this Bill and being a country boy, I don't understand all of them. One of the suggest... let me tell you in the first place that 30 per cent of the people in this state already have a 21-year-old drinking law. If...and if this Bill is not passed, you're going to have a hodgepodge of ages around the state where you can drink in one town and can't drink in another, can drink in one and can't drink in another and you're going to have more problems than you have now by far. One of the suggestions made was, 'Well this is going to stop teenage drinking so we should pass this Bill'. Well, we've got 16 year olds drinking now, so why don't we just eliminate the law altogether. We'll make a lot more money because we can sell 16 year olds beer legally that way and bring in all kinds of revenue. Well if the only



object of this Body is to raise revenue, let's just turn it all loose. Let's license prostitution, we can make a few bucks that way. I can think of a dozen things that might bring in a little money if that's all you're interested in. I think we ought to be interested in the young people of this state and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that the issues are quite clear in House Bill 21 as it appeared before this Body before it was amended. But as the item was amended and the ruling of the Chair stating that it does now preempt home rule units. And a number of home rule units have acted upon this measure. And the ruling stating that it takes 89 votes, I for one, will not be part and parcel of passing a Bill with 89 votes that preempts home rule. I would hope that the Membership would listen very carefully because I think that the people of Chicago spoke loud and clear yesterday endorsing the Lady who was running for Mayor and her position of integrity, her competence and her courage. And here we are saying that home rule units...we're going to be preempting by the Membership of the General Assembly by 89 votes. I, for one, have been a very strong supporter of home rule units. I think that the people spoke quite clearly when they adopted the 1970 Constitution. My colleagues from the City of Chicago, my colleagues from the rest of the portion of this state, especially with home rule units, please listen carefully. And in turn, vote your constituency from that area, especially on an important question such as this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was not going to speak on this, but I would like to indicate the fact that my 'aye' vote there is in



very definite response to the overwhelming majority of the people in my district to want the drinking age to be 21 with no exclusions for on-premise drinking. However, I want the record to indicate, and I am a non-home rule municipality, and we have the problems unless this is...statewide. I do not agree with the ruling that 89 votes actually are required. But I must vote 'aye' on this in response to all of the people in my district who definitely want this drinking age...it ought to be raised to 21. But I definitely want to state, I believe it takes 107 votes. I would like to see 107 votes on there anyway, and that would resolve it. But I think that is the issue here on my 'aye' vote. I am in favor of it but I do not agree that it only takes 89 votes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise for the same reason that Representative Lechowicz rose, to speak in opposition to this Bill, not basically on the merits this time, of course I don't think there are very many merits in the Bill, but to speak to my colleagues from the City of Chicago. This Bill has a preemption clause in it, it preempts our home rule. And I think it would be a mistake for us from Chicago, on the first day after we've elected a new Mayor, to pass a Bill with a preemption clause. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time and should this Bill get 89 votes, I would ask that the Roll Call be verified."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, explaining my vote, I happen to be in favor of this matter. I personally believe that if this legislative Body placed this on the next election ballot, the people of the State of Illinois could voice their opinion on this. I believe it would overwhelmingly pass because I think it's the will



of the people, the will we so often ignore down here, that wants this age increased to 21. But I do have to reflect upon comments of one of the prior Speakers from the City of Chicago. I think he's hit the nail on the head. Again, we find ourselves hung up trying to make a rational determination of an important issue on this Godforsaken concept of home rule. This is idiocy, it should have never been accomplished in this state, it's dividing our state again, and I hope that someone has the initiative in this Body of the Legislature to start a Constitutional Amendment to abolish it. I think the ruling of the Chair was incorrect. I think this Bill would have to have 107 votes. And even though I'm voting 'aye' on this matter, I don't feel that 89 votes would accomplish a thing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also intend to join the Sponsors in supporting this proposal. And my reason is that I feel the legislature has been betrayed by those young people below the age of 19 and also by those proprietors of the liquor establishments who has been serving 16 and 17 year olds the liquor. I also join in...in some of the concern that there will be an increase incident of drug abuse. And I'm very concerned and I hope that the proponents of this legislation and its supporters will give as vigorous attention to finding some permanent solution to our increased drug problem, which will happen after this legislation would become law. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, previous Speaker worried about drug abuse. Well, alcohol is a drug. And it is a fact that 6 out of 10 of every Illinois driver that are killed on the highway are teenagers. No one would say that all those deaths could have been eliminated, but it is clear



that many of them may have been prevented. Teenage drinking is a nas...is a growing national problem as pure pressure increases. More and more teenagers are taking their first drink at younger and younger ages. A recent report from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington details the problem all too clearly. That report estimates that there are 3.3 million teenagers with drinking problems in the 14 to 17 year age group. It means that nearly 1 out of 5 young people have a drinking problem before they've reached the legal age of drinking. The number of high school students that are drunk, that have been drunk at least once, is alarming and it's climbing rapidly. Prior to 1966, about 19 per cent of all high school students had been intoxicated at least once. Between '66 and 1975 the figure rose to the 45 per cent figure. In other words, almost half of the high school students have been drunk. The proportion of students getting drunk at least once a month has climbed in that period from 10 to 19 per cent. I believe these figures speak for themselves. It is abundantly clear that teenage drinking is a problem of epidemic proportion. Higher drinking ages are probably not totally the answer, but they are the beginning. It is...drinking age as it is now, alcohol is filtering down to the junior high school and even the elementary level. Raising the drinking age would help eliminate this filter effect and I urge your 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 98 'aye' and 64 'no'. Representative O'Brien has asked for a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Dunn requested a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Hall: Capuzi..."

Speaker Redmond: "According to Hanahan's rules you have to



be in your seat. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Ewing, Flinn, Kucharski, Mautino, McGrew, Nardulli, Schraeder, Stearney, Telcser, Sam Wolf, Younge, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Kucharski, 'aye'. Any other absentee that desires to vote? Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Hall: "Ackerman."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be in your seats. Now, that's Hanahan's rule, you have to be in your seat. Hanahan, you have to be in your seat, according to your rules. Proceed."

Clerk Hall: "Anderson, Balanoff, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Bell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien. Leave Representative O'Brien's microphone open."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of Members...or a lot of people who really don't belong on the floor that are milling around. I think it might be easier if we had an oral verified Roll Call. I think it would save time in the long run."

Speaker Redmond: "I should have done that to begin with, but that wouldn't be very good now. That would take another half hour. Please be in your seats. Representative Marovitz, be in your seat. Representative Schisler. Representative Skinner. These are your rules. Proceed with the..."

Clerk Hall: "Birkinbine."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk Hall: "Bluthardt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I believe you'll find in the rules that a Gentleman is...whose name is called either rises or raises his hand. There's a lot of new Members that we don't



recognize yet."

Speaker Redmond: "It's the Gentleman's suggestion that when ...that when your name is called, please rise and raise your hand so we can see you. And leave Representative O'Brien's microphone off...open."

Clerk Hall: "Borchers, Boucek, Bower, Campbell, Capparelli, Christensen, Collins, Daniels, Darrow, Deuster, Donovan, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Dyer..."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk Hall: "Dyer, Woodyard, Epton, V. Frederick, Friedland, D. Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Goodwin, Griesheimer, Hallock, Hannig, Harris, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Hudson, Huskey, Dave Jones, Keane, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Can't see, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski and Beatty, will you please take your seats, Hanahan can't see. Representative Collins, will you please sit down? McBroom, Hanahan can't see. Boucek, Hanahan can't see through you. Yeah, but he's joining in. Somebody else's fight. Proceed. Proceed."

Clerk Hall: "Kozubowski, Kucharski, Leon, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Margalus, Mautino...excuse me, that's Matula, McBroom, McMaster, Meyer, Malloy, Murphy, Neff, Oblinger, Pechous, Peters, Piel, Polk, Pullen, Rea, Reed, Reilly, Rigney, Robbins, Ronan, Ropp, Ryan, Schlisler, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sharp, Simms, Stanley, E. G. Steel, C.M. Stiehl, Sumner, Swanstom, Terzich, Totten, Van Duyne, Vinson, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Walsh, Willer, Williams, Winchester, J.J. Wolf, and Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, what are we starting at?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count now? 99."

O'Brien: "Garmisa."



Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Garmisa here? Is Representative Garmisa here? Take him off the Roll Call."

O'Brien: "Friedrich."

Speaker Redmond: "They're both here."

O'Brien: "Friedrich."

Speaker Redmond: "They're both here."

O'Brien: "Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

O'Brien: "Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "He was in his chair at the time that he went through...there he is."

O'Brien: "McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here, that's the good looking Gentleman there."

O'Brien: "Matula."

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

O'Brien: "Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? Ronan is here. The fellow without the mustache down there."

O'Brien: "Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk. is he in the Chamber? Remove Representative Polk."

O'Brien: "Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson, he's testing out the Minority Leader's chair."

O'Brien: "Margalus."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

O'Brien: "Margalus."

Speaker Redmond: "Margalus, he is back there? Yeah, he's there...he and Bianco."

O'Brien: "Malloy."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

O'Brien: "Goodwin."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Goodwin here? Representative Polk has returned to the Chamber, put him back on



the Roll Call. Representative Goodwin. Remove him."

O'Brien: "Waddell."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

O'Brien: "Waddell is here?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the back."

O'Brien: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman. He's...next
to Representative DiPrima."

O'Brien: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Redmond: "Piel is there next to J.J. Wolf."

O'Brien: "Ropp."

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

O'Brien: "Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is he? He's in his chair. He's over
here."

O'Brien: "Representative Macdonald."

Speaker Redmond: "Macdonald is here."

O'Brien: "I have no further questions."

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

Corti: "Mr. Speaker, what is the count?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 97 'aye'."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I urge ten Members to join me in making
this 107 so in case there is any litigation as to the
preemption erosion, that it would be on another Bill
instead of this one. I would like to see some of the
red votes make this over 107 votes so that the ordinances
that now in the home rule units will not fall apart. I
would like to change my vote...I'd like to change my
vote from 'present' to 'aye' and have nine other Members
join me, please."

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

Winchester: "Well, before we get in to that motion, Mr.
Speaker, I would like to change my vote from 'aye' to



'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Winchester: "My 'aye' to 'no', I'm sorry."

Conti: "I want 107 votes. I'm right. No, I wanted an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "You requested...you requested permission to be recorded as voting 'aye', Is that correct?"

Conti: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "And Representative Winchester desires to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "No, I'm not changing my vote, I just want to make..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I thought you were seeking recognition."

Johnson: "I am. I suppose...is all one needs for the record that'll go to the Supreme Court, just a Roll Call that shows 89 votes, because I think we ought to do something to make a record of the fact that it's between 89 and 107."

Speaker Redmond: "It was the opinion of the Chair that under the Constitution that 89 votes was all that was required."

Johnson: "I understand that. What I'm asking is, how we embody in the record the fact that there's only 89... 97 votes for it, so that the court can take notice of the fact that it's between that figure and then make its own ruling on the Constitution."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there's...the Roll Call will be journalized and I have read opinions of the Supreme Court, I'll go back to the precedings of the Constitutional Convention so..."

Johnson: "I would request that the Speaker then at the time that the Roll Call is taken, announce and read into the record the total number of 'aye' votes so that it will be easy for the court to...to notice that and...and..."

Speaker Redmond: "I will declare the number of affirmative votes. Anyone else? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative McAuliffe, desires to be recorded as 'aye'."



Anything further? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? What is it? On this question there's 98 'aye', 64 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now I'd like to call the attention of Committee Chairmen whose Committees meet on the First Legislative Day, which in previous weeks has been...oh, pardon me, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a motion for the suspension of the posting requirements for next weeks Committee hearings."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, proceed."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this motion has already been discussed with Representative Ryan, it would be a suspension of Rule 18 which embodies the posting requirements for Committees. And I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the normal Tuesday Committees, which will meet on Monday of next week, must post for next weeks meeting before Thursday at 12, noon, that's tomorrow at 12, noon. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. The normal Tuesday Committees which will meet on Monday of next week must post before tomorrow, Thursday, at noon. The normal Wednesday Committees, which will meet on Tuesday of next week, must post before Friday at noon and the normal Thursday Committees which will meet on Wednesday of next week must post before Friday at noon. Repeating, normal Tuesday Committees which will meet on Monday of next week must post before tomorrow, Thursday, at noon and the normal Wednesday and Thursday Committees which will meet on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week must post before Friday at noon. I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentarian has another correction."

Speaker Redmond: "It takes unanimous consent I understand. Does the Gentleman have leave to put the motion? Hearing



no objection, leave is granted. The Attendance Roll Call will be used on that. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Schraeder is excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "The record will so show. Representative Kozubowski, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, the Cities and Villages Committee will not meet next week, Monday, April 19th...or April 9th. We will not meet April 9th."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I checked with the Major...Minority Leader and the Majority Leader on a motion to suspend the posting rules for House Bill 1029 so that it could be heard in the Judiciary Committee of Representative Katz's Judiciary Committee so that it could be assigned today to a Subcommittee and it could be heard then next week. So we're asking for the suspension only so that that Subcommittee...or that it could be assigned to a Subcommittee and I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, unanimous consent is granted and we'll use the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Bower, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to make an introduction."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bower: "This is very proud day for the people of Southern Illinois. I think that most of us acknowledge the importance of the small business people of this state have played in the economy and the development of our way of life. And two hours ago, here in Springfield, one of my constituents was named as the small businessman of the year for Illinois, a man who is known across Southern Illinois as 'Stan, the tire man', Stan 'Kazaro' of Mount Vernon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, the Clerk advises me he needs about a half an hour for Introductions."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I now move allowing fifteen minutes Perfunctory Session for the Clerk that we recess until 5 P.M. this afternoon to consider the rules."

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

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have the record show that Representative Capuzi is absent today due to illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, the record will so show. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "To the Appropriation I Committee, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know you've had notices but...of our meetings, but one Member told me she didn't get a notice, so I'd like to urge Members of the Appropriation Committee to attend. We're meeting right after adjournment Room 114. We have some very important appropriation matters that have to do with snow removal, funds for handicapped, and some other things...right after adjournment, 114."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Financial Institutions Committee will meet immediately after adjournment. And also that any Members who have Bills assigned to my Committee that they would notify my Clerk, we will here them next Monday. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, the Education Committee will meet immediately upon adjournment in C-1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave of the House to be recorded as 'no' on House Bill 21."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Oh...verified Roll Call, they remind me. Representative Dawson. Dawson."



Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, for a purpose of an announcement. We had a scheduled meeting a 5 o'clock with the Steel Industry in Room D-1 that has been postponed until 7 o'clock this evening."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Human Resources will not meet today. The Calendar is in error. The House Committee on Human Resources will meet tomorrow, Thursday, April 5th, at 2 P.M."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, for purpose of an announcement. The usual Wednesday night meeting of the Republican Members of the Appropriations II Committee at Baur's will not be held tonight. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Judiciary II Committee will be meeting immediately in Room 118. It will be breaking, of course, to be on House floor for 5 o'clock calling of the rules today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have a substantial number of Bills in the Pension and Personnel Committee and I would like to request all Members that have Bills assigned to the Committee contact my secretary to have their Bills posted for next Tuesday."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Laurino. Laurino. Representative Laurino...changed his mind. The question then is on Representative Madigan's motion that the House stand in Perfunctory Session for a half an hour and then recess til 5 o'clock tonight. Representative Laurino...changed his mind again."

Laurino: "I'd like to suspend the posting rules for the Election Committee tomorrow at 2 o'clock for House Bills 90, 224, 324, 570, 601, 642, 683, 822, and House Joint Resolution 24..."



Speaker Redmond: "Have you discussed this with the Minority..."

Laurino: "...Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested permission to waive the posting rule. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used in support of the motion. Now the...Representative Madigan's motion that the House be in Perfunctory Session and then be in recess until 5 o'clock tonight. 5...for rules...5. The question is on the motion. Those in favor...Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you had better clarify the 5 o'clock meeting. That...that's...we're back in Session at 5 o'clock on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "That is...that is correct. We'll be in recess until 5 o'clock at which time we'll come back in regular Session."

Ryan: "Take up the Rules."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Ryan: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried."

Clerk Hall: "Introduction of First Reading of House Bills.
House Bill 1474, Conti. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to meetings. First Reading of the Bill.
House Bill 1475, Swanstrom. A Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill.
House Bill 1476, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to instruments in writing. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1477, Catania-Epton. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1478, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1479, Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend Acts concerning



sheriffs and county supervisors. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1480, Redmond. A Bill for an Act relating to forest preserve districts and counties under 3 million. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1481, Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1482, Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Attorney General and State's Attorneys Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1483, Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Real Estate Brokers Salesmen Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1484, Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Court Reporters Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1485, Kane. A Bill for an Act to create an Act to protect confidentiality of information and records of rape crisis organizations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1486, McBroom. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to plats. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1487, McBroom. A Bill for an Act to amend the Recreation Therapists Registration Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1488, Chapman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Horse Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1489, Friedrich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1490...A Bill... Friedrich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1491, Von Boeckman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1492, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1493, Anderson. A Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Teachers Retirement Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1494, Anderson. A Bill for an Act to create an Act relating to spouse abuse. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1495, Kornowicz. A Bill for an Act to



amend an Act relating to fencing and operating railroads. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1496, Grieman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1497, Yourell. A Bill for an Act appropriating money to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1498, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to provide for the fees of the sheriff and counties of third class. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1499, Conti. A Bill for an Act to amend conflict of interest provisions in the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1500, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1501, Leinenweber. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1502, Leinenweber. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1503, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Administrative Procedure Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1504, Barnes. A Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1505, Taylor. A Bill for an Act to establish an Act concerning termination of parental rights. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1506, Brummer. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1507, Balanoff-Kelly. A Bill for an Act to require that all food products and all items sold by grocery stores except those specifically excluded be clearly marked with numerals showing price in dollars and cents. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1508, Borchers. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1509, Epton-Madigan-Ryan. A Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1510,



Epton. A Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1511, Epton.

A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1512, Epton.

A Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1513, Epton.

A Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1514, Epton.

A for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1515, Skinner.

A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1516, Griesheimer.

A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1517, Griesheimer.

A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Smoking Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1518, John Dunn.

A Bill for an Act to amend Downstate Public Transportation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1519, Bradley-Hanahan-Giorgi.

A Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1520, Hanahan.

A Bill for an Act to amend the State Police Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1521, Hanahan.

A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1522, Hanahan.

A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1523, Mautino-Epton.

A Bill for an Act to amend the title...amends the title to various Sections of the Act concerning workers compensation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1524, Klosak.

A Bill for an Act to amend the conflict of interest Section to the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1525, Redmond.

A Bill for an Act to add Chapter VI to the organization of Probation Services and Unified Code or Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1526, Bower.

A Bill for an Act to authorize any



county and any municipality within the county by Intergovernmental Agreement to establish and operate an airport. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1527, Currie. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1528, Greiman. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1529, McClain. A Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Teachers Retirement System, Article of the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1530, McClain. A Bill for an Act relating to the liability of motor vehicle mechanics and repairmen. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1531, McClain. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the office of State Appellate Defender. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1532, McClain. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1533, McClain. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1534, Schneider. A Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1535, Schneider. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to radiation installations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1536, Braun. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1537, Simms-Giorgi. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1538, Davis. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the Department of Local Government Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1539, Davis. A Bill for an Act to create the Energy(sic) Out-Patient Medical Treatment Center Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1540, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning land titles. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1541, Wikoff. A Bill for an Act



to provide for the organization and maintenance of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1542, Birkenbine. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning townships. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1543, Vinson. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1544, Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to mechanics' liens. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1545, Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1546, Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Joint Committee on Legislative Boards and Commissions. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1547, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1548, Schuneman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1549, Willer. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the Department of Corrections for expanding correctional industries. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1550, Mautino. A Bill for an Act to authorize police officers and the Department of Law Enforcement to organize and bargain collectively. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1551, Ronan. A Bill for an Act...and adds definition to individualized treatment reserve plan. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1552, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1553, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the expenses of the County Problems Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1554, McBroom-Ryan. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1555, Yourell. A Bill for an Act



to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to private employment agencies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1556, Bradley. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1557, Stuffle-Harris. A Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Teachers Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1558, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to private employment agencies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1559, Mahar. A Bill for an Act to amend the Northeastern Illinois Planning Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1560, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Identification and Investigation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1561, Slape-Harris-Winchester. A Bill for an Act to amend the Game Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1562, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1563, Polk. A Bill for an Act to amend the Interest Act Section on Interest Rates for installment purchases of residential real estate. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1564, Polk. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1565, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Park Employees Retirement Fund, Article of the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1566, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Policemens Retirement Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1567, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Municipal Employees Retirement Fund. First Reading of the Bill. (Repeat) House Bill 1567, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Municipal Employees Retirement Fund, Article of the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1568. A Bill for an Act to amend the Cook County Employees Retirement Fund.



First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1569. A Bill for an Act to amend various articles of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1570, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Labors Retirement Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1571, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to provide for the state reimbursement in units of local government and school districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1572, Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend the State University Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1573, Neff. A Bill for an Act to amend the State University Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1574, Neff-Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend the State University Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1575, Neff-Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend the State University Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1576, Jaffe. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1577, McClain. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1578, McClain. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1579, McClain. A Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Teachers Retirement, Article of the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1580, Daniels. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the expenses of the Judicial Inquiry Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1581, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to abolish the difference between 'tresspasser licensing and inditing. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1582, Sandquist-Braun. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1583, Younge. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the Department of Local Government Affairs. First Reading of



the Bill. House Bill 1584, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utility Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1585...House Bill 1585, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1586, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1587, Younge. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1588, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to airport authorities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1589, Younge. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money from the Anti-Pollution Fund to the Environmental Protection Agency. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1590, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend the Small Business Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1591, Younge. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money from the Anti-Pollution Fund to the Environmental Protection Agency. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1592, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1593, Getty. A Bill for an Act to enlarge the Metropolitan Sanitary District. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1594, Getty. A Bill for an Act to regulate the enforcement of parking tickets, process, complaints and summons. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1595, Neff. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the Department of Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1596, Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Use and Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1597. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1598, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1599, Terzich. A Bill for an Act requiring all gasoline



sold in Illinois after July 1, 1980 must contain 10% alcohol. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1600, Leverenz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1601, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Drainage Code and the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1602, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Downstate Policemen's Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1603, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Downstate Firemen's Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1604, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend various Acts to revise references to workmen... to workers. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1605, Richmond. A Bill for an Act to amend the Retailer's Occupation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1606, Richmond. A Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1607, Huskey. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1608, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the Department of Public Health. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1609, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. 1610, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1611, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to authorize research to develop technology related to ethanol blends in gasoline. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1612, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1613, Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1614, C.M. Stiehl. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the St. Louis Metropolitan Area Airport Authority. First Reading of the Bill.



House Bill 1615, Stearney. A Bill for an Act to amend references in and adds the Code of Criminal Procedure to provide for speed in preliminary hearings. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1617, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend the Circuit Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1618, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the confidentiality of medical studies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1619, Bullock. A Bill for an Act to amend the Small Business Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1620, Bullock. A Bill for an Act to amend the Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1621, Campbell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1622, Campbell. A Bill for an Act to create the Nursing Home Inspection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1623, Van Duyne. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pre-Hospital Emergency Medical Services Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1624, John Dunn. A Bill for an Act to regulate the transportation of hazardous materials by railroad. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1624, Dunn. A Bill for an Act to regulate the transportation of hazardous materials by railroads. First Reading of the Bill. (Repeat) House Bill 1625, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to prohibit the employment in this state of aliens who are in the United States illegally. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1626, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1627, Schlickman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1628, Leverenz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1629, Winchester. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning allocation of federal monies within the state. First



Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1630, Friedrich. A Bill for an Act to amend...A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1631, Bradley. A Bill for an Act to provide for compulsory no fault motor vehicle insurance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1632, Stanley-Hallock. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1633, McCourt. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1634, Mahar. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Military and Naval Department. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1635, McAulliff. A Bill for an Act to appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of Local Government Law Enforcement Officers. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1636, Klosak. A Bill for an Act to appropriate for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Racing Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1637, J. David Jones. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Historical Library. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1638, E.G. Steele. A Bill for an Act to appropriate for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Fire Marshall. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1639, Schuneman. A Bill for an Act to make appropriation to the Department of Personnel. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1640. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Illinois Commission on Human Relations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1641, Telcser. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1642, J. David Jones-Oblinger. A Bill for an Act to



an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Fair Agency. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1643, Epton. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Insurance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1644. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1645, Ralph Dunn. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mines and Minerals. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1646, Abramson. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Industrial Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1647, Ryan. A Bill for an Act making... the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Governor. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1648, Mahar. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Emergency Services. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1649, Hallock. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1650, Leverenz. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1651. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Governor's Council on Health and Physical Fitness. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1652, Peters. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1653, J.J. Wolf. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Lieutenant Governor. First Reading of the Bill. House



Bill 1654, Frederick. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the Pollution Control Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1655, Birkenbine. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Industrial Pollution Control Finance Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1656, Macdonald. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1657, Hoxsey. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Conservation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1658, Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1659, Barnes. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1660, McPike-Mautino. A Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1661, Sharp. A Bill for an Act Downstate Teachers Retirement Fund of the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1662, Hoxsey. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1663, Collins. A Bill for an Act to amend the Campaign Disclosure Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1664, Currie. A Bill for an Act to impose specific civil damages liability on persons who transfer a handgun in violation of the law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1665, Currie. A Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1666, Stuffle. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1667, Hannig-Slape. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1668, Hannig. A Bill for an Act to amend the



Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1669, Hannig. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1670, Ropp. A Bill for an Act to amend the Agricultural Co-op Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1671, Hudson. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1672, Bowman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Administrative Review Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1673, Bowman. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to security deposits. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1674, Macdonald. A Bill for an Act prohibiting the denial or discharge of any person from public employment because of membership or nonmembership in a payment or nonpayment of financial support. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1675. A Bill for an Act to appropriate money to the Department of Local Government Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. The House now stands in recess until 5. How about that, Mary."

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hall: "House Resolution 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 173."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 161 by Redmond honors Joel Kagann; 162 by Grieman is talking about Earl's Girls; 163 by Bower admires the Man of the Year, he spoke about it earlier; 164 by Taylor recalls the accident on April 4, 1968 that befell Martin Luther King; Swanstrom's 165 recognizes the 125th anniversary; Kelly's 166 notes the Hall of Fame; 167 by Meyer talks about the happy meteoric rise of the DePaul University Demons; 168 by Wolf talks about a German American National Congress; 169 by Collins notes everybody's friend, Sergeant Albert Apa; 171 by Steczo honor the University of



Illinois' Co-operative Extension program; 172 by Matula calls attention to the owner of Jack Phelan...Chevrolet and 173 by Leverenz awards a boy scout award. And I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk Hall: "House Resolution 170. House Joint Resolution 32."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. Representative Schlickman, the assistant Parliamentarian."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I inquire for myself and perhaps for the benefit of some others, how many Floor Amendments have been filed with respect to the rules...proposed rules?"

Speaker Redmond: "I understand it's 43. 47, I've been advised."

Schlickman: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, has any consideration been given as to a cut off as to Amendments...Floor Amendments to the rules. My recollection is that in previous Sessions, Members have developed ideas with respect to the rules that have come to fruition during the consideration of amendments and we have been into a posture of ad infinitum relative to proposed amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's the intention of the Chair to see if we can't dispose of all of the pending amendments now...today. My memory is in past years there have been efforts made. I can recall...I think I can recall specifically an effort to change the requirement for the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, which I think came quite a long time after the rules had been adopted. Now I may be wrong, but that's my memory. Of course, I suppose you don't have to go to that order of business, but...I mean, do you see it as a problem? I mean, I don't recall in the years that I've been here



that it's come up too frequently. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think what he is saying is that on the day that we considered the amendments to the Resolution that was rules, the permanent rules, that we put a cut-off on that date. And I think it would be in order because we've had a lot of time for anybody to introduce rules, that we move and use the Attendance Roll Call that any amendment not offered at this time not be considered. That's what we did that time, I believe, Gene. Because otherwise we'll be here right into midnight because we would call...the reason we did that, it might have been the last Session, was that we were here one Session when they kept bring them up and we couldn't keep up with it. And I...if Gene wants to make that, I'd support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that any proposed Floor Amendment to the Resolution, whichever number it is, following Amendment #40...what is the latest amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "47."

Schlickman: "47...be assigned to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on the motion? Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I only make one observation in regard to that suggestion. As we move through the amendment that are presently prepared and some are adopted and some may not be adopted in may very well be in the best interest of all of us that we have an opportunity to look subsequent amendment which might deal with some hole that was left in the Rules because of an adoption of a particular amendment. I think that there ought to be some proviso at some way that we could deal with that issue."



Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian suggests that maybe the motion might be amended to provide that without leave of the House. In other words, if the House would see fit to give leave that then...if the House wants to do that, it seems to me that it makes some sense... unanimous consent or..."

Unknown: "Leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, would the Chair rephrase my motion for me?"

Speaker Redmond: "With great reluctance. Well...no...it was suggested that maybe that...the motion as you put it or offered it rather, would have the additional proviso in there that with leave of the House there could be an additional amendment."

Schlickman: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "In the event of a situation like Representative Hoffman talks about."

Schlickman: "Okay, and leave of the House is unanimous consent?"

Speaker Redmond: "If you so specify, you could provide for an extraordinary majority for 89 or whatever you want."

Schlickman: "I would say an 89...Constitutional Majority, that would be my amendment, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "My feeling is the Constitutional Majority should be overrun in the House. The question is on the Gentleman's motion. It should take 89 votes. The question is on the motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. Let the record show that Representative Walsh is in the Chamber...5.. 5:18...5:18. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Could you inform some of those late arrivers what we're voting on?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's a motion to refer all amendments to the Rules after numbers 47, which was the last one we have today to the Rules Committee unless by a 89 vote the House permits it."



Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'aye' and 3 'no'. The motion carries. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 67. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in introducing House Resolution 67 I think it would be helpful to give the background of House Resolution 67. The Speaker solicited suggestions from all of the Members of the House on more than one occasion to make the individual Member's suggestions for improvement on the House Rules. Those several hearings were held at which Members testified and then the Members of the Rules Committee considered all of those proposals. As a result of those proposals that were considered at great length by the Members of the Rules Committee, Republicans as well as Democrats, House Resolution 67 was adopted. Now the Members can look on their desks and they can see a synopsis that says, proposed changes in House Rules, House Resolution 67. And that summarizes all of the changes made in the House Rules. Since the time of filing House Resolution 67, there had been filed as of today, 46 Amendments to the House Rules. Under the motion of Representative Schlickman, the Gentleman from Arlington Heights..."

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

Ryan: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. To save most of this from this agony, I would move that accept Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there objection? You want one Roll Call on this?"

Ryan: "It's all right with me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Katz moved the adoption 1, 2, 3, and 4, Mr. Ryan concurs. Those in favor indicate by saying



'aye', aye, opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 are adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Kane, amends House Resolution 67 in Rule 5, paragraph C and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I'll take the same Roll Call on Amendments 5 through 11."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I'll take the same Roll Call on Amendments 5 through 11."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave for the...Representative Walsh objects."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Those look alike."

Kane: "Amendment #5, 6 and 7 are amendments designed to clean up our desks and get some of the clutter off them and also to give us some sense of what we're doing when we come in to Session during any one day. Amendment #5 takes the Bill books off of our desks that are already beginning to become unruling, and if you start looking at them now you'll know that it is almost impossible to find any Bill that you're looking for and you've only got about half of the Bills introduced so far on our desks. And if you look outside of the Chamber doors you'll find Bill books already piled up on the floor. The Bill books as we have them now are unworkable. You can't get to them, you can't find the amendments, it's almost impossible to know what it is that we are dealing with when we're voting on Bills and on amendments. So this amendment does, Amendment #5, is to say that the only Bills that will come to us on the floor of the House and be distributed on our desks are Bills that have already been voted out of Committee and are here to be acted on the floor of the House. It would also require



that any Committee Amendments that were adopted to those Bills be attached to the Bill, physically, and be distributed with that Bill. So that when we have a Bill that's come out of Committee and has been distributed on our desks, it would have all the Committee Amendments attached to the Bill. It would require no reprinting, but what it would do is give us an opportunity to see the Bills as they come out of Committee, see what the Committee has done to those Bills. And give us a chance to get some of these Bill books off of our desks and give us something to work with. As Bills are introduced they would be printed and distributed to our offices and the only Bills that we would have physically here would be Bills that are out of Committee, with the Committee Amendments already adopted to them and attached to them. I'd urge the favorable...the favorable consideration of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Members of the Rules Committee considered carefully Representative Kane's proposal. It is simply not feasible not possible with the number of Bills that we will have in the next few weeks. The Bills coming out of Committee every day, the number of Bills we have and the number of Pages we have, it was the feeling of the Clerk of the Rules Committee that is simply not practical, not feasible to be able to distribute some Bills to the offices and some Bills here and as the Bills come out of Committee the Clerks go to the offices and bring them up each day. The practical matter is that we will have many Committees operating, they will in the next few weeks be reporting out a number of Bills each day, we do not have the facilities and the processes and the personnel to be able to do this and accordingly, the Rules Committee would recommend a 'no' vote with regard to Amendment #5."



Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "May I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Friedrich: "Representative Kane, this would involve in all Bills that got out of Committee would have two copies, right? One in their office and one here."

Kane: "If all Bills came out of Committee, which they never do, there would be two copies. We would have one in our offices so we wouldn't have to run over to the Bill room to get them if we wanted them and then we would have the Bills out of Committee on our desks."

Friedrich: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not the Amendment that I suggested to the Rules Committee when the Rules Committee met at the beginning of the Session. At that point I suggested that...that Bills with Committee Amendments be reprinted. And that was the suggestion that the Rules Committee turned down. What this simply says is that Committee Amendments, when they are adopted by Committee, will be attached to the printed copy of the Bill and be distributed to our desks. I see absolutely no reason why that cannot be done. Right now the Committee Amendments are brought out on green sheets and are physically inserted on...in these Bill books. It would take less time to attach those amendments to...to the Bills. If any of you have been around in previous Sessions and you have, you know that the Bill books are completely unworkable. And it's a question of whether the Pages are going to do a little bit more work or whether we, as Members, are going to be able to make any sense out of the work that we do during this Session. If you think it's bad now, wait until these Bill books are six feet high and then try to dig



out a Bill. I'd urge favorable consideration of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'...Representative...those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative McGrew, are you seeking recognition?"

McGrew: "Just to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we have before us one of the most reasonable suggestions that has come forth on the handling of the Bill situation. What...in essence what we're saying is that all of this that we now have stacked before us would be needless until such time as a Bill is reported out of Committee. If you would search through the Bill book that's sitting to your left, you'd probably find that two-thirds of the legislation in there will never make it out of the Committee. I think it's a waste of time. Perhaps what we need to do is just say that the Bills are available and not even have distribution to the offices. It...in the long run, this would save money if we would handle it that way. It would get rid of a lot of confusion and I suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 50 'aye' and 68 'no' and the motion failed. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Kane, amends House Bill ...House Resolution 67 in Rule 33, paragraph A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this amendment does in effect is do pretty much the same thing that Representative Schlickman asked to do on the amendment to the Rules. What this says is that we should know in advance when we come in to Session on



any particular day all of the Amendments that we are going to consider that day and that we should not have amendments thrown on our desks in any kind of order, at any time, in order for us to have to vote on them within the next three or four or five minutes. All of you who have tried to follow what is happening in... during a floor Session, during a House Session, you're having amendments thrown at you. We may be debating Amendment #5 when Amendment #13 is thrown on your desk and there is absolutely no way of knowing how to make sense out of that whole package. What this says is that all amendments that we're going to vote on during a day, be on our desks at the beginning of the Session, the beginning of that day. It does increase the number of days that Bills are on Second Reading by one and it requires that for any amendment to be germane, it would be filed in the Clerk's office by six o'clock the night before. This does increase the number...the time that Members have to offer amendments and it also give us some kind of reasonable advance expectation of what it is that we're going to vote on. If we're going to vote intellegently, if we're going to make any sense at all of what we're doing, we ought to have this kind of amendment. And I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 would expand Second Reading to require that the Bills be there for two Legislative Days, requires the filing of amendments by 6 p.m. the day before, with floor distribution one hour before the House convenes. Now as a practical matter in the weeks ahead, we will be dealing with hundreds and hundreds of Bills. We will be dealing with hundreds and hundreds of amendments. We will be dealing with Bills when amendments are filed as the day goes on. We will not be dealing with the



situation where in the preceding day anybody is to know what amendments are going to be filed. There may be new ones filed the next day. So once again, was the feeling of the Rules Committee after carefully considering that kind of proposal, to not be in favor. And accordingly, we would have to vote 'no' on Amendment #6 because it would hold up this speed with which ...and the ability of the Speaker to move the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "With...I would oppose the amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm shocked by the statement of the Member from Cook County. What he is saying is we have to have speed. We need to move quickly. What this amendment says is, let's know what it is that we're voting on. And I think that if it's a question of whether or not we're going to know what we're voting on or whether we're going to move amendments quickly, I think that if we at all pride ourselves on being a deliberative Body, we ought to know what it is we're voting on rather than saying, boy, oh boy, we handled 50 amendments in the last ten minutes and 50 more are coming through in the next ten minutes. I urge a 'no' vote on Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 6. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 47 'aye' and 83 'no' and the motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Kane, amends House Resolution 67 by inserting after Rule 55.1, 55.2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

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



Amendment #7 is similar to Amendment #6. Right now in this part, in the early part of the Session, we're dealing with only green amendments or amendments printed on green paper and amendments printed on white paper. Later on in the Session we're going to be dealing with amendments that are printed on pink paper and blue paper and whatever kind of paper that you think is going to be there. Those amendments are going to come fluttering down on your desks in no order at all, no order at all and you're going to be expected to vote on them in the next five minutes, in the next ten minutes or whatever. Most of those amendments none of us are going to read before we get to vote on them. The only people that are going to have them in any kind of order are the Leadership because the Leadership has the staff and they have full-time Pages keeping boxes on their desks, keeping the amendments in order. They know what we're voting on, we don't. None of us know what we're voting on when it comes to May and June. What I'm saying is, let's have the amendments on our desks before we start, give the rest of us a chance to know what we're doing and I would urge an 'aye' vote on Amendment #7."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The problem with Amendment #7 is that the House would have to be recessed when Members file amendments on Bills. Now as a practical matter, that just isn't feasible. We will be dealing, literally, we're up now to 16 hundred and...17 hundred Bills. Members will be filing amendments all the time. This Bill...this Amendment, Amendment #7, would require that those amendments could not be distributed while the House was in Session. Once again, I very much respect and have sympathy with aims and objective of the Gentleman from Sangamon. Unfortunately, as the House is structured and as the work habits of the Legislature have evolved with the filing of



large numbers of Bills in a relatively short time, this Speaker would be calling recesses all the time. I don't believe that that would be a feasible, a practical way to run the House. As it is, Pages are distributing amendments as we sit and listen to other arguments going on with regard to other Bills. But if we don't do it that way, it means we will be in recess and we will be spending a great deal of our time in recess, which means that that time will have to be made up by night Sessions and other problems. And so accordingly, the Rules Committee would oppose Amendment #7 as not practical and as being dilatory and producing delay in the running of the House.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I would also oppose Amendment #7."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Chairman of the Rules Committee is...is pulling a...drawing a red hearing across our considerations here. What this simply says is that the amendments that the amendments that we are going to be voting on during a day would be distributed before we come in to Session, not during Session. We wouldn't have to have recesses. amendments that aren't filed by the...by the...by the beginning of our Session we wouldn't be able to deal with. And that's basically what we're doing tonight. We passed a motion which said that any additional amendments that are going to be filed would go to Committee. And we ought to be doing that with all of the Bills and Resolutions that we're involved with and simply with the Rules. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #7. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's



33 'aye' and 96 'no' and the the motion failed. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Kane, amends House Resolution 67 and Rule 37, paragraph A, by striking everything after the first sentence and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this amendment does is...gives the Speaker more latitude in the way that he calls Bills during a Session, gives the Speaker the power to move the calendar faster, and it also gives each Member advance notice of what's going to be covered during a days Session. Right now the Speaker calls Bills in about five different orders where he has the authority to cover...call Bills in five different orders and we don't know which one he is going to be using. And all of those orders were put in after or during the time at which Robert Blair was Speaker of the House, in which there was some abuse of the Speaker's power. What this amendment does is restore discretion to the Speaker in the calling of Bills. But it also says, you can call them in any order you want, just let us know ahead of time what you're going to...what you're going to call. It gives us the opportunity of knowing in advance what's going to happen, it also gives the Speaker the authority to move Bills faster because if Bills are taken out of consideration for three or more times then they'll be put on Postponed Consideration. I think that this is a good balance between giving the Speaker the authority to move the House and giving the Members the advance knowledge of what is happening and I would urge the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The problem with the running of the House is that each Member of the House is his own boss, really, and each Member of the House calls his Bill on Second Reading or



Third Reading, largely, when he wants it. The Speaker is on the Podium and is there and frequently you see him move from...up and down the Second Reading call and the Member isn't ready. He has something in the Reference Bureau or another Member has come to him on a problem. Now it would be very nice if that wasn't so. It would be very nice if the Speaker could just dictate all that, if he would say, 'okay, you'll have only two days and that's it', or 'you'll have only have only three days and that's it'. But the practical problem is that Members have come to that Member, other Members have come, and he is trying to respond to them. The Speaker does not believe that the proposed Amendment #8, even though Mr. Kane in good faith does mean to give him more leeway, he does not consider it practical or desirable. And accordingly, he would oppose Amendment #8 as being unduely restrictive of the rights of the Members of the House with regard to the handling of their Bills on Second and Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I would also oppose Amendment #8."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Sponsor of the amendment a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Totten: "Representative Kane, would this prevent the Speaker from ignoring a Member who has a rightful turn at having a Bill or a Constitutional Amendment heard if forty Members join?"

Kane: "What this would do is also give any Member here an avenue of having his or her Bill called within five Legislative Days if that Member was joined by forty other Members asking that a Bill be set to be heard."

Totten: "Would this then prevent...have prevented the Speaker



and the velvet hammer from preventing my Constitutional Amendment from being heard last time if this rule had been adopted?"

Kane: "If you could have found thirty-nine other Members to join with you, yes."

Totten: "Okay, I had the other thirty-nine. I'll speak in favor of the Resol...the amendment to the Rules then and that this is something that is needed. Those of you who were here last Session know how not only myself, but probably other Members were really not afforded their opportunity as Members of this General Assembly to rightfully have matters put on the agenda and heard in their rightful order because of the arbitrary rulings of the chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, does this apply to Constitutional Amendments or Bills only, the Synopsis says it's Bills?"

Kane: "I think the way that it is drafted it would apply to Bills only."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? What would prevent the Speaker from placing on the daily agenda every Bill at the order of Second or Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "His good judgement."

Schlickman: "Thank you. I, too, oppose the amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you closed, Representative Kane? I got lost on the second turn."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this is an exceptable compromise between the power of the Speaker and the rights of the Members and I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 8. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The



Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 31 'aye' and 103 'no' and the motion fails. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Kane, amends House Resolution 67 in Rule 25 by striking the first two sentences and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Bill...what this amendment would do is...Amendment #9 is do away with the continual log jam that we run in to from about the first of April until the end of June. Back about fourteen years ago when the Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly, which was chaired by our able Member from Cook County who is now Chairman of the Rules Committee, had to deal with the problem of the log jam in the last week of June. The answer to the log jam in the last week of June was to set deadlines, deadlines that had to be met by the General Assembly. And what has happened is that as the whole system of deadlines has not worked is that we've created more and more and more deadlines and we now have more and more and more log jams. If you'll look at the back of the proposed Rules, you'll see that you've a whole page of deadlines. A whole page of deadlines that neither you nor I can make much sense of. The effect of deadlines is to make Bills move quickly. If we don't... if we have a Bill in Committee that isn't ready to be heard, it's bumping up against the thirty-day deadline or the forty-five-day deadline and we go the Committee Chairman and we say, 'will you please have my Bill heard' and so the Committee Chairman ends up with posting fifty to a hundred Bills and tries to ram them all through in a day. And then we come in to Session the next week and we have five hundred Bills on our Calendar that we've got to move quickly and none of us know what it is that we're



voting on. So deadlines have not worked. So what I'm suggesting is that let's do away with deadlines, let's give the Rules Committee the control over the number of Bills that come on to the floor of the House and let the Rules Committee set the number of Bills that come out of each Committee, can either increase the flow or decrease the flow depending on whether the Leadership wants us to be in Session or wants to close down a Session. I think that this makes sense. I think that anybody who has looked at the deadline situation knows that deadlines have not worked. And I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #9."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the statement that deadlines have worked reminds me of Winston Churchill's observation that democracy is a lousy form of government, but nobody's ever found a better one. I want to tell you that if didn't have a deadline this week, we would be putting in as many Bills next week as we did this week and as many Bills the following week and Members would be filing Bills up until June 30th and things would be even more totally confused than they will ever get under the deadline system. What Amendment #9 proposes to do is to give the Rules Committee the power to set a quota of the number of Bills that can be produced by any Committee. That would mean that the Rules Committee could go to Representative Pierce and say, 'Representative Pierce, you can report out four Bills this week or five Bills or ten Bills.' That's all very well but whose Bills is he going to report out. Is he going to favor Member X or Member Y or Member Z? He's going to have to make a choice between those Bills. And for that reason we think that it is impractical. The Rules Committee does not want to be in the situation of a Chairman favoring the Bills of his party over another



party of favoring his friends oversomeone else or even the accusation of that. So accordingly, we would oppose Amendment #9. We do not think it is practical to set a quota on the number of Bills that can be reported out by any Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think the problem that we have with this Amendment is that all Bills are not alike. You might on some day be able to pass out six or eight Bills because they only take ten minutes, they're agreed Bills, there's other times when you have a Bill that takes six hours of Committee hearings for one Bill, such as Bill 21 which just passed today, that was six hours in Committee. So I don't see how you can anticipate in advance how long a Bill is going to take in Committee. And I think you're going to foul up the Committees with this amendment. I...I urge you to oppose it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I tend to agree with the motionmaker, except I don't think his amendment is timely. We're already passed the half way mark, I'm assuming we are in this Spring Session. I don't know when we'll adjourn. But I think in some time in the future we ought to give serious consideration to either limiting the number of Bills introduced by a Member, either devising the system that the U.S. Congress has or eliminating the deadlines and let the chips fall where they may. I don't think it is fair to all the Members who are assuming we were going to have a deadline at this Session, so therefore, I will vote against Doug Kane's amendment this time. But I am going to be in favor of something in the future. And I think in the second half of this Eighty-first Session would be a good time to start this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close."



Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what the opponents to this amendment are saying is that the more Bills we have, the faster we have to move... the faster we have to move the Bills and the less we're going to know about what it is that we are voting on. And I think that if we're going to have a choice between spending more time on fewer Bills or just moving Bills faster and faster and faster because they happen to be introduced, I think that if we're going to be any kind of a deliberative Body at all, we're going to have to spend fewer...more time on fewer Bills. And that's the only way that we're going to be able to handle the complexity of legislation and know what it is we're voting on before we vote. Right now we are in the position of having to introduce every Bill that we want to consider in the next two years within the first ninety days of being sworn into Session. That just doesn't make sense. That does not make sense. We ought to have more time to put legislation in proper perspective, do the homework necessary before the Bills are introduced so that we're not forced to introduce Bills within ninety days, get them out of Committee within a hundred and twenty days of being sworn in. That's the way that we get bad legislation, bad results. If any of you have talked to any of your constituents, you know that the Legislature is in bad repute. You know that the General Assembly is in low esteem. The only way that we are going to improve ourselves is to improve our product. The only way we are going to improve our product is to know what it is we're voting on and have a chance at least to read what it is before we...we vote on it. And I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #9."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 9. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The



Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a hund...ll 'aye' and 104 'no' and the motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Kane, amends House Resolution 67 in Rule 27, paragraph G and so forth."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if we're going to keep deadlines, which it looks like we're going to, then there ought to be some vehicle by which the majority of the Members of this House can suspend those deadlines. Under the rules as they're proposed to us in House Resolution 67, once the deadline is passed, the Rules Committee has absolute power over any Bill that is introduced. Even if 107 Members of this House thought that a Bill was good and should be passed and the Rules Committee did not, there would be no way at all of getting that Bill and that legislation considered. And I think that every rule should be allowed to be suspended by a three-fifths majority. If the Members are going to exercise any kind of influence and control then we should be able to discharge a Bill from the Rules Committee, suspend the rules governing the Rules Committee by 107 votes. And this is what this amendment to the House Resolution 67 does. It simply says that once those deadlines have come by and the Rules Committee does not see fit to discharge a Bill, that the House by a vote of 107 Members can discharge a Bill from the Rules Committee. And I think that that's reasonable and I think...and I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #10."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The deadline that is not suspendable is the one with regard to the introduction of Bills. That is a matter that it seems to me that the Gentleman from Sangamon is on both sides of. He wants orderliness and he wants everybody to know about the Bills that have been printed,



but if we permit Members to come in with Bills in April and May and early June, there will be no printed Bills. We will have a situation where members of the public will not know the Bills that are going to be...that are being introduced and they're being heard in Committee. Now we have agreed on introduction date and that date is coming up this week. Everybody knows it. If we start suspending it for one Member, we will have to suspend it for other Members. We will be involved in the problems of not being able to draw a line at which we know that Bills can be printed, it requires a certain amount of time for Bills to be printed, it requires time for notices so that...notice can be given to the public. And once Bills start...continue to be introduced in April and May and into June, we eliminate, really, any possibility of knowing what's going on here. And so we believe that the provisions ought not to be suspendable with regard to Introduction. The Members of the House can suspend the provision with regard to deadlines on Committee action on the floor. We believe that the present provisions have been well thought out by the Rules Committee and we would urge opposition to Amendment #10."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would have to agree with Representative Katz that this would open the whole thing up again. And there has been an effort made to restrict the number of Bills and the deadlines for introducing them and also to limit the number of Bills in the uneven numbered year Session. So I think that this is the only...one of the few controls we have over Introduction of Bills and consideration of Bills. And I think it should be left the way it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seemed to me that when we



were running through this amendment is going to go the way of others. I'd like to go on record as saying that I think the Democratic process demands that 107 Members of this Body ought to be able to decide anything. And if 107 Members of this Body feel that the deadlines should be suspended, then it should be suspended. And I seriously doubt that it would be suspended for any one Member...if 107 Members, an extraordinary majority, was the vote required to suspend this motion. I think we ought to have the ability to control our rules, certainly by an extraordinary majority, and I'm going to support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, absolute power corrupts absolutely, and without this amendment we have given absolute power to the Rules Committee. I personally don't trust any small group of people, even my colleagues, even my elected colleagues, to have absolute power over anything. What do you mean, oh come on? Why should I trust...why should I trust the Rules Committee. Last year they considered an emergency, a Bill which would allow a snowmobile to go over a bridge if no one was on the bridge. Now that's absurd. About...I think my first Session, when I figured out that the Rules Committee didn't always make logical decisions was when the first Bill that they declared an emergency was one about egg handling. I really seems to me that the Membership, 107 of us or even 89 of us, could make a better decision than that. And for that reason I support Representative Kane's Amendment as strongly as I can support anything."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a Member of the Rules Committee, I'm here to tell you that we can't be trusted, he's absolutely right. I...I would submit, and I have for the past few years,



been opposed to the provision that requires an absolute ...an absolute unanimity on the part each Member of this House to suspend a rule. I don't think that's what we're here for and it does, in deed, place far too much power in the hands of very few people. The tendency, of course is for the Rules Committee to be made up of Leadership Members and what we do when we permit the rule to require unanimous consent is we place our faith and we place the faith that the electorate had in placing us here in the hands of those few people and it's absolutely wrong. I would suggest that 89 of us ought to be able to do anything, but I would compromise and say that 107 certainly should be able to do the will of the Members. And I suggest that this is a good amendment and should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hesitate to rise because I don't think we ought to spend our...a whole night on these rules. But I rise because what the last few Gentlemen said sounds logical. However, I feel that all of us feel that we introduce so many Bills, too many Bills, that the one thing we want to stop is after this certain date anymore Bills. I heard the rumor last week that there were about 65 hundred Bills in the Reference Bureau. That's enough Bills. I'll tell you, that's enough. All of us ought to agree to that. Now for any of us to say that after that deadline we can't do what we want to do, you're just crazy. There's all kinds of Bills to amend. You don't need your own Bill. But let's all of us agree, unanimously on this Friday...or whatever date, Friday, that's enough. Close this bigot, that's it...that's enough, unanimous. This amendment is no damn good."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

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



hope that the...the House Members were listening to the Vice-chairman of the Rules Committee when he was speaking. And what did he start out saying? He said, 'If we permit a Member to introduce a Bill.' Where does he get the authority and the power to permit us to introduce a Bill? Right now, the Rules Committee, after the deadline or thirteen Members of the Rules Committee can open up the flood gates. What this amendment says is that 107 ordinary Members also should be able to open up the flood gates for one Bill or two Bills. We're not going to open up the flood gates if we're going to suspend a rule and require 107 votes to suspend the rules. Under the provisions of House Resolution 67 we have given thirteen Members of the Rules Committee absolute authority over any Bill that is introduced after the deadline, after this Friday. I think that if we ordinary mortals and Members of the House, if 107 of us decide that a Bill is important enough to be introduced and to be considered, that that should be sufficient. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #10."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 10. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hanahan: "Just wondering if a verification would now be in order because it seems like an awful lot of votes up there with awful few people here? Maybe you ought to dump that Roll Call or maybe we ought to go through the process of verification, one or the other."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you rise?"

Deuster: "Well I was just going to explain my vote. And...I think many Members don't realize, particularly the new



Members, that the rules that we're adopting will apply not only to this year which a normal Session, but the next year which is an emergen...which is a Session which would generally be limited to budget Bills and those things that the little select group on the Rules Committee determine to be emergencies. And many Members will probably not even introduce Bills next year because they'll figure well, they're not emergencies really, and you'll be surprised at all the ridiculous things that come out next year and that you'll be cussing yourself up and down for having not voted for this amendment. And I think it is only reasonable and fair what Representative Kane is saying, 'yes, we want to limit Bills, yes, we want to invest in the Rules Committee the authority to sort of tighten up and hold the line on what comes out. But certainly if you can convince 107 Members, and we're all elected, we're all paid the same salary and there's no monopoly on wisdom in the Rules Committee, as Representative Walsh as a Member of that Committee pointed out. I think that if there are any new Members, particularly, that have gone through this, change your vote to green because you're going live to rule that day that you didn't accept this opportunity to give the rank and file Members who are just peasants, so to speak, the opportunity to recognize a real emergency and to bring it out on the House floor. And I'd urge more green lights. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there is 67 'aye' and 77 'no'. Representative Hanahan, do you request a verification?"

Hanahan: "Yeah, go ahead."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan requests a verification of the negative Roll Call. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Someone indicated that they thought the scoreboard was locked...cut off. Maybe it would be better to just



take another Roll Call, Mr. Speaker, in order...in the interest of time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "The Vice-chairman...and I agree with him. I would prefer just dumping the Roll Call and everyone in their switch, one time, if it's going to be violated, then we'll ask for a verification. But let's just give it one shot on a decent vote without too many guys there."

Speaker Redmond: "Count the Roll Call. On this question... those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, now I want a verification. Right in front of me...hit these buttons in front of me...Representative Yourell here, Representative Lechowicz here. Mr. Speaker, I asked in good faith for a good Roll Call. We had it until somebody went around and hit them buttons protecting the Leadership instead of protecting the Membership and that's what this amendment is all about, that's the reason why I want a verification. I'm going to verify every vote tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "You're entitled to the verification. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I guess in that case we ought to call the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 68 'aye' and 72 'no'. Representative Hanahan has requested a verification of the negative Roll Call. Representative Friedrich has requested a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Borchers. Capparelli, Capuzi. Chapman. Cullerton. Daniels. Domico. Ewing. Gaines. Garmisa. Harris. Huff. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kosinski. Laurino. McPike. Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike. McPike...desires to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Kosinski, 'no'."



Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "No'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Alexander...is that him back there? Representative Alexander, 'no'. Representative O'Brien, for what purpose...Representative O'Brien desires to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Schoeberlein desires to be recorded as 'no'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Nardulli. Pierce. Richmond. Schisler. Schraeder. Shumpert. Stearney. Telcser. Terzich. Van Duyne. White. Winchester and Younge."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Birchler. Boucek. Bower."

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

Cullerton: "I wish to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'no'. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "You can't verify if all the Members are in the aisle standing up in their seats, I can't read...reach over their heads to see who's here and...if the Members don't raise their hands, I have to put them on...all it does is make dilatory tatics because then I have to call their name and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, Representative Hanahan is absolutely correct. According to Hanahan's rules, the Members must be in their seat and when they're name is called they must rise and identify themselves. So will you please sit down. Representative Hanahan has requested the verification, leave his microphone open. Representative Deuster, please be seated. Representative Walsh, please be seated. The rules are for all of us, Mr. Walsh. No exceptions. Mr. Doorkeeper...oh, Mr. Yourell, will you come there and seat Mr. Walsh? Proceed. That happened once."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brady. Breslin. Bullock. Campbell. Collins."



Conti. Cullerton. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Doyle.
 John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Woodyard. Farley. Flinn.
 Dwight Friedrich. Getty. Georgi. Goodwin. Hallock.
 Hoffman. Katz. Kane. Kempiners. Kent. Kornowicz.
 Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz.
 Leon. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Matijevich.
 McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McMaster. McPike.
 Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Polk.
 Pouncey. Reilly. Rigney. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan.
 Schneider. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Sharp. Simms.
 Slape. Stanley. C.M. Stiehl. Swanstrom. Taylor.
 Vinson. Vitek. Von Boeckman. Williams, Sam Wolf.
 Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Winchester."

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

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

Representative Meyer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "What was the vote?"

Meyer: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Meyer 'no'. Representative Garmisa. Representative Garmisa...record him as 'no'. Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we had changed that before, Representative Alexander. Well, you can't change the light, you haven't even..."

Alexander: "I know, but he didn't call it on the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, okay. Any other changes? Representative Jones."

Jones: "Record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones recorded as 'no'. Any ...questions...Representative Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the back there...I guess. Yeah."



Hanahan: "He's not in his seat though, is he, Sir? Representative Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson. Vinson in the Chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, by the way, what was the count when we started?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? What's the count? 82 'no' and 67 'aye'."

Hanahan: "No, I might as well keep him off, if they are... that way we'll just keep the record straight. Pouncey."

Speaker Redmond: "Taylor Pounce, he's in the back there. He's the little fella back there. That little guy."

Hanahan: "Representative Patrick, Langdon Patrick."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Hanahan: "Langdon Patrick."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there with the 'somber coat'."

Hanahan: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "McBroom?"

Hanahan: "McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative McBroom in the Chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hanahan: "Representative Kozubowski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hanahan: "Representative Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Hanahan: "Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "He's over there. He's right in front of Doctor Ebbesen."



Hanahan: Represent...I didn't hear what you said."

Speaker Redmond: "Right in front of Doctor Ebbesen."

Hanahan: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McBroom has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Polk, he is in the Chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hanahan: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow. He's there."

Hanahan: "Okay, I didn't see...I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: You didn't expect to find him there, he's in his seat."

Hanahan: "You've got to raise your hand or something when I call. Representative. Alright, Representative Beatty."

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

Hanahan: "I see Representative Schoeberlein. Representative Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Hannig."

Hanahan: "Representative Kuchaski."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Hannig."

Hannig: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that I would vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Hanahan: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski. Is he in the Chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Polk has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative White as 'no'."



Hanahan: "I have no other questions, Mr. Speaker. Representative Donovan."

Donovan: "Mine to 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Donovan desires to be recorded as 'no'. Now what's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there is 82 'no' and 65 'yes' and the motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, Kane, amends House Resolution 67 in Rule 68, paragraph D and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #11 has to do with Conference Committee Reports. And any Member who has been around for several Sessions knows what happens with Conference Committee Reports. What House Resolution 67 suggests to the House is that the Conference Committee Reports have to lie on our desks for one day before we are called to vote on them. However, after June 16th, Conference Committee Reports only have to lie on our desks for three hours before we vote on them and after June 28th, the Conference Committee Reports have to be on our desks for only one hour before we vote on them. Now all of you Members know that Conference Committee Reports are important and are crucially important in the last two days of the Session. And House Resolution 67 requires only that those Conference Committee Reports lie on our desks for an hour before we have to vote on them. I suggest that that is not long enough for us to know what it is we're voting on, it doesn't give us time even to read them, much less digest them and make an attempt to understand what it is that they're doing. What Amendment #11 says is that at any time during a Session that a Conference Committee Report has to be on our desks for a day before we...before they're called for a vote. Conference Committee Reports are the last thing that we vote on and they go from there



to the Governor's desk. And I would suggest that they ought to be on our desks for a day to give us a chance to know what's in them before we're required to vote on them. And I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #11."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The problem with proposed Amendment #11, relating to Conference Committees is when Conference Committees report. It isn't a problem now, it's a problem that occurs at the end of June. Now as a practical matter, if we have to require that every Conference Committee Report requires that we stay over another day, which is in effect...that's what this really requires, how will we adjourn July 1st? The fact of the matter is, we will not adjourn July 1st. The fact of the matter is that in the nature of the legislative process as it works here, and I might add in the Congress as well, Conference Committees do come in, they are represented by people on both sides of the aisle, if we had to wait a full day for a report to come in, that means that every time the Conference Committee comes in and there's no agreement and another day goes by. And it would not permit the orderly adjournment of this House by July 1st. Most of the Members of this House have opposed extending the Legislative Session. July 1st has been the deadline. As a result of having a deadline, everybody puts a great deal of pressure on, they do try to push things so that everybody knows, not just the Members of the House, but the members of the public know that there will be no more Bills passed after July 1st. The members of the public like that. They know that that is the end of the Legislative Session. But this kind of amendment in the opinion of the Rules Committee would require us to stay over. It's not compatible with the way the real world of Conference Committees. The requirement that you do have, an hour do read the Conference Committee Report..."



a Member who is interested in them, incidently, also talks to the individual Members of the Conference Committee. It isn't as if the people on the Conference Committees aren't our fellow Legislators, they're not from some other city, they're right here on the floor and if you are following that Bill, you talk to the Members and you know what's going on. So we believe that this amendment, while again well intentioned, would interfere with the actual legislative process and with the orderly adjournment of the House on July 1st. And so we must regretfully oppose Amendment #11."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I would also oppose this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Kane's Amendment. I have lived in this town longer than most of you have served here and you should hear what the people out here say. If you're worried about getting out July 1st, you better worry about all the Bills that you have to do over because you didn't look at them very well the first time. We've all listened to this here and as people who are new in this Assembly, we think we ought to have the opportunity to study things without being asked to vote on them just because somebody else is doing it. I know you said I should talk to somebody on the Conference Committee, I'm not sure I want to take that person's advice. Maybe I want to do my own studying. And I think this is a good Bill for helping us not to pass bad legislation and overlook good legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I believe Representative Oblinger speaks great wisdom. My experience here during three terms is that we ordinary Members have no control whatsoever during about the last ten days to two weeks of Session. This



may not give us back total control, but it will give us back some control. But unfortunately after seeing a majority of us vote to sterilize themselves, plus the rest of us on the last Roll Call, I don't think there's much hope for passage of this amendment. Nevertheless, if you want to protect yourself you ought to be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close. Representative Ewell, pardon me."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, as you look at these Bill books and they mount up, I want to point out to the Membership that this is probably only a...maybe a fourth or perhaps a fifth of the number of Bills that you'll have on your desk. You'll have a pile of green paper at least six inches high and when the pink slips start coming over here, you'll have at least a two inch stack. I have heard of those Members who demand that the public has the right to know that they have...that they have a right to be informed and that they do everything according to due process. Now those Members who are new to the Body will find out that a Conference Committee can entirely rewrite a Bill. You won't be able to find it in your Journal...I mean, you won't be able to find it in your Bill book for the House or the Senate. The entire Bill with the needs requests and deals will be written in one particular Bill. And you will be required to vote on it without even much...without being able to find it, much less read it. Now this is a fine Bill. If you believe that everyone is truly trustworthy and everyone is truly honest and everyone really loves you, but if you are somehow more than a first-grade politician, you'll learn to be a little bit cynical and find out that some people are going to look out for themselves at your expense. And when you have it, don't cry to us and say, 'I didn't know what was happening and you didn't tell us.'"



We're telling you now and we'll only tell you this once or twice more and we'll say, 'Ladies and Gentlemen, you just dealt yourself out of the ball game.' This happens to be a truism, so you may vote as you please and when the deal goes down, don't cry."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we pride ourselves in letting the public know what we're doing. All during the early parts of the Session when it doesn't really matter, we have a six and a-half day posting notice to tell the public what we're going to do. We require that Bills be printed and available before they're even posted for a hearing in Committee. And yet, when it comes down to the final vote, when it comes down to what happens in the last day of the Session when you and I do not have the time to know what is going on, the public doesn't get any notice, even we, as individual Members aren't going to have more than an hour notice. And that's assuming that we're on the floor when those pink slips get dumped on your desk. If you think that you want to have any say at all on the important issues of this Session when they come down for a final vote, you better vote 'aye' on Amendment #11. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 11. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 59 'aye' and 82 'no', the motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, Mugalian, amends House Resolution 67 on page 12, line 7 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment to the Rules would not permit a majority of more than two of



either party on any Committee. And I've worked it out on some hypothetical cases of major or minor Committees and a two vote difference would be a range from 54 to 55 per cent. for the Majority Party...and a 96 to 81 split of the House is 54 per cent, that's about the reasonable spread we can accept...except. Although we had one slightly higher than that, 100 to 77, would be 56 per cent. This...this amendment would prohibit some Speaker in the future from taking advantage of a one or two vote majority and having Committees totally lopsided. And I think it's for the protection of both sides of the aisle and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, the Majority Party and the Minority Party have worked out an accommodation with regard to the question and their respected representation. This is soporiferous and is not in accordance with the agreement that has been reached. In fact, on some Committees the margin is only 1 that the...the Democrats over the Republicans. So there's no reason to have this any more, it doesn't represent the Majority, Minority view and accordingly we would oppose Amendment #12."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe the Speaker in his wisdom has already adjusted the Committees to a better proportion than this."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm almost incredulous. This thing has been in the back room during this entire Session. The Speaker finally capitulated, the Republicans won what they wanted and now the Republicans don't want to have it in the Rules. Now you Democrats are going to have control probably after the next election, do you really trust the next Speaker of the House? Because if you do, you certainly ought to vote against this."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian to close."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Glencoe has just proven that he is a great lawyer and showed us why he is in such great respect, really. He has absolutely no...no argument that makes any sense, so he said, in effect, this is a great rule but let's not put it in writing. And, you know, Herald, my good friend really did a great job with nothing to work with and... he's from a great...from a great school, the University of Chicago...I went there for a while myself. I really can't quite follow the logic where one says, 'this is such a great idea, we've got it, we don't need it in the Rules.' Now there's some kind of a deep hysiological explanation for this response by the Leadership of both sides of the aisle. I've been...I've been speculating about it with some of my friends and we talked about some Freudian possibilities, we're not quite sure what it is. It's saying this is so good, we don't want it in the Rules. If you want to vote that way, that's your privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 12. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 55 'aye' and 81 'no' and the motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, Mugalian, amends House Resolution 67 on page 11, line 28 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment amends a present rule which permits replacement on a Committee because of illness. I think we all know that illness is not usually illness, but some Member of a Committee either can't conveniently be there but he's here and in very good health or that Member doesn't expect to vote



the way the Leadership would like him to vote. My amendment merely makes the rule honest. It says that if a Member in fact is ill, that his replacement may be made by the Speaker but only on the second day of the Member's illness. Now what this is directed at is a form of proxy voting that many of us have said should be abolished and was abolished, so we thought. But we now have proxy voting, but we have to bring in some bodies. I'm sure all of you who shared the frustration that I've had working on a Bill in Committee for weeks, months studying it and then finding out when you're going to vote on it in Committee immediately after the subcommittee has worked on it, you find five strange bodies there who know nothing about the Bill, who have no interest in that Committee, but are there because of marching orders to vote 'yes' for that Bill. Now that makes a mockery of our deliberative process. This amendment takes in account the possibility of a Member's illness and makes sure that that's all we're doing. I urge you in defense of your own...of your own Bills, of our own process and of your own self-respect...and we haven't had...seen to show much these last few Roll Calls that you vote for this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "It is true, as the distinguished Gentleman from Palatine indicated, that we both went to the University of Chicago. We, however, believes that everything has to be ascribed to base human motive and I believe in the goodness of people. Now it never occurs to the Gentleman from Palatine, that with Hanahan's Rule, that if somebody is not present in a Committee it counts as a 'no' vote. And your Bill goes down because there are not enough votes there. To say under those circumstances that the Speaker cannot appoint someone in that place, that the first day that the Committee meets...incidentally,



he says...you notice how the...very clever the way the Gentleman...he did pick up a lot at the University of Chicago, he said here that the Committee...it restricts the replacement to the second day to replace Members ill. Well everybody here knows that it's the first day that counts. The Judiciary II Committee meets today, it doesn't meet again until next week. So by making it the second day, it means that the first day, he can't replace the person. And if there are not enough bodies on the Committee to vote, no matter how good the Bill is, no matter how eloquent the Sponsor is, the Bill cannot be returned out because everybody who is not there is a 'no' vote. And since I do believe that he is our Speaker, that the Members of this House have elected him in open ballot and honorably for several terms now, they've had an opportunity to observe him and I believe that he has not misused and abused the power of the Speaker and this amendment by Mr. Mugalian, Amendment #13, is not in order, is not necessary, is not fair and will not in fact improve the operation of the Committee system in the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, just to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are many times when we have trouble even keeping a forum in Committee and certainly we can't do it if one or more Members are absent because of illness. And I think this amendment should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the third alumni of the University of Chicago, to speak on this amendment to the Rules. I think it's 2 to 1, Representative Katz, at this particular moment. And I'll take that vote along with Representative Mugalian. And I'd like to say this to my Republican colleagues; this amendment right here is the start, if we give this one away, then



we're not going to be able to get anything out of Committee. You know how the Committees are, presented populated, if we can get this amendment on, we might be able to get something out of Committee, we might be able to keep something there which may be more important. This, I think, is the most important amendment we're going to be considering tonight on these Rules. And I strongly urge, along with Representative Mugalian, we adopt Amendment #13."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian to close."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, what would we do without the University of Chicago? The University of Chicago prides itself on being an institution of higher learning and I think it requires its students to do two things; to think logically, which Mr. Katz does most of the time but also not to ignore facts. The University of Chicago Law School has done a lot of work on what we call legal fiction. Now the Rule we're amending assumes that we're talking about Members that are ill. Now Mr. Katz and others have talked about the many, many absences we have on our Committees. Now the fact is, that if you looked at our Journal, you would find that there are no more than three or four or possibly sometimes five Members of this Body who are ever ill at the same time. We have in our Rules a phonyfiction about illness. Now either we ought to change the Rule and say the Committees can be stacked at any time...at...at the will of the Leadership or we'll be honest about it and talk about illness. I don't know how many persons are absent today because of illness, I don't think it's more than two or three. And that's about the average."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Senator Sarunas is also a graduate of the University of Chicago. Would you mind if he said a few words too?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, so we could get this over with, would all the graduates of the University of Chicago raise your hands so we can...so we don't have to go through all that anymore."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, will tell the Chair where the atomic bomb was discovered?"

Matijevich: "Stax Stadium, right underneath, I guess. Only (unintelligible) did it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 13. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Catania to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was born at the University of Chicago and I think everybody should vote 'aye' on this excellent amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 36 'aye', 90 'no', the Gentleman's motion failed. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14, Mugalian, amends House Resolution 67 by deleting line 34 on page 47 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I ask leave to table Amendment #14."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment...14. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, Currie, amends House Resolution 67 on page 38, line 7, by inserting immediately before the period the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "I ask leave to withdraw Amendment 15."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie withdraws Amendment 15. 16."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 16, Walsh, amends House Resolution 67 by striking paragraph S in Rule 4 and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Rule does one simple thing that I'm sure no one can disagree with. It provides that the Rule that permits the Speaker to change the order of business and go to whatever order of business he pleases is subject to the will of the House. That's all it does. All that is required is that the Speaker...if the Speaker makes a ...goes to an order and a sufficient number of Members decide that he should not go to that order and stay with the order he is on or to go to another order, then that is what is done. It's truly a Democratic...amendment and I would urge your support for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Walsh: "It's Republican too."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, they say that a camel is a horse designed by a Committee. I want to tell you that one person has to preside over this House and has to make some decisions with regard to the conduct of the business. The Speaker has done so fairly. If any Member disapproves or disagrees with what he does, they can do with...what a Member did earlier today, appeal the ruling of the Chair. That's a prerogative of everyone. He was elected as the Speaker of the House. Amendment #16 would interfere with kind of discretion he needs to fairly conduct the business of the House. We would oppose Amendment #16."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's...do you want to close or do you...okay, all right."

Walsh: "Everybody else gets a chance to close, Mr. Speaker, I thought maybe..."

Speaker Redmond: "Not that many people spoke against this is all."

Walsh: "...that privilege. I...let me comment that the Gentleman from the University of Chicago seems to think



that we ought to have a dictatorship and that dictatorship ought to be the fellow sitting up in the Chair. Now I have no real strong objection to the fellow sitting up there in the Chair, he really is a lovable chap. Look at him smiling up there, isn't he beautiful? He's terrific. However, for you new Members, I would like to seriously point out that when the going gets tough you won't see a whole lot of him. He'll...he'll be in East St. Louis, he'll be in his office taking a nap, he'll be at the Black Angus, he'll be in Bensonville, he'll be anywhere but up in that Chair and you should see some of the cats he appoints sit there in his place. You bet. All they can recognize is Mike Madigan. If it isn't Mike Madigan seeking recognition, then there's no recognition given. And the...mention was made by the Gentleman from the University of Chicago that you can appeal the ruling of the Chair. Try it with one of those other fellows sitting up there. You just don't have a chance. This reasonable proposal, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All it provides is that we do what we're elected to do. We run and we serve in this House and I urge your 'yes' vote."

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

Katz: "Just wanted to remind the distinguished Gentleman from Oak Park that when he was once in the Speaker's Chair, I did appeal his ruling and won."

Speaker Redmond: "Question...Walsh has already closed. Representative Getty, for what purpose do you rise?"

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to question the form of the amendment. I wonder if Representative Walsh is amending the right Section. He's talking about the order of business Section it seems to me and I think his amendment does not properly speak to that Section. I question whether it is in order."

Speaker Redmond: "Senator Sarunas, will you counsel Representative



Walsh."

Sarunas: "I can give you his answer. I'm told it is the correct Section. It is a Section dealing with priority assistance and...it...that it is indeed the Section that should be amended, Mr. Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "What about Rule 10, the Parliamentary inquired? Did you look at Rule 10 Representative... Senator Sarunas?"

Getty: Mr. Speaker, I submit that it can be done in one of two ways. We did it..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there something wrong with it?"

Getty: "With Rule 10?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there something...no, with your motion or your amendment or..."

Getty: "No, I suggest there's nothing wrong with it."

Speaker Redmond: "Then why do we have to do it one of two ways?"

Getty: "Well, we could amend Rule 10 or we could amend Rule 4-S."

Speaker Redmond: "If we adopt 4-S are we inconsistent with Rule 10?"

Getty: "We are not, Sir, because Rule 4-S as amended, if amended, would provide that the Membership have a vote in whether the Speaker can change the order of business. Rule 10 simply says that the Speaker may change the order of business."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...let's go to the question. The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 16. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. All voted who wish? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote. Again, this amendment sounds so logical. And I've been up there...Bill is called...the Speaker has called me up there and it's the



time when you really find out it's all about...is when you're up there. And let me tell you, many of us were here when Speaker Blair was here and that's why we wrote many of those protections in. But if you don't allow the flexibility of that Chair, I'm telling you, I have more confidence in the Chair running this House than I do in us Members. You've heard that old expression about pogo, we've met the enemy and he is us. We're the problem not that chair. Believe me, give the Speaker the flexibility that he needs. If the Chair does abuse that power...somebody said why didn't I vote for him for Speaker, he knows what that's all about. But believe me, I've always protected the Chair and always said high things of the Speaker personally because I meant them and I thought I included that at the time. But let me tell you that you've got to have that protection. You've got to allow the Speaker to run the House. I don't care who the Speaker is. When any Speaker does abuse that Chair, that we're the majority...always prevails. We did it with Blair, we always prevailed when he really abused it. So don't worry about that part of it. But don't take that flexibility and control that that Chair requires. Because I think in the end, you the Members will be sorry for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 84 'aye' and 69 'no' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #17, Conti, amends House Resolution 67 by inserting after Rule 12-A the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to have leave to table Amendment #17."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti withdraws Amendment 17."



Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #18, Conti, amends..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize I had two in sequence here. I'd like to withdraw 18 also."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti withdraws 18. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, on the basis of Representative Conti's introduction of Amendment 18. I did not, and I'm sure that there are other Members, did not introduce a similar amendment. Now, I...I would like to speak to Amendment 18, Mr. Speaker, and hope that it would be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative, the Sponsor has withdrawn it, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that on the basis of his...having introduced it, I did not introduce a similar amendment. Nor did anyone else who might have thought that it was a good idea and I think that we ought to be heard, Mr. Speaker. We ought to be given an opportunity to vote 'yes' or 'no' on this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman is not speaking to something which is before the Body. You have announced that that matter has been withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Representative Walsh, you may file according to the...to the motion that was carried. Representative Schlickman, there's a way that you can file an amendment to the Rules. Now there is nothing before this Body. Representative Walsh, there is nothing before the Body with respect to Amendment 18. Okay. Representative Walsh on a point of personal privilege."

Walsh: "But...now, for all of you who think this thing is on the square. Let me point out what they have done here. They have required me, because I think this is a good



idea, and I think if you'll all think about it, Amendment #18 is a good idea. Simply read the synopsis and it will tell you what is done and you can observe the abuses, especially those of you on the Democratic side who are serving on two Committees. But let me suggest to you that what they have done to me is they have required me to file a Resolution amending the Rules which will be submitted to the Rules Committee which will not have a chance in the Rules Committee. And then to have that Resolution heard, I will have to suspend the Rules Committee from further consideration of that Resolution which requires 107 votes. If I am heard now on the Resolution, I can have it adopted with a simple majority voting...a majority of those voting. There's a substantial difference. Now I suggest that all of you are going to put in the position that I'm in now unless you're very, very careful. And I'm afraid you've painted yourselves in that box on some of the things you've done earlier this evening. Now in simple fairness, Mr. Speaker, I ask of you that we hear this matter now and not require me to get extraordinary majority."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Walsh has been around here long enough and he knows and all of us know that all he has to do is run out while we're debating this subject get a secretary to type up this amendment, come down, file it, have it a new number and play the same old game. I would think that rather than forcing Representative Walsh to do that, Representative Conti might simply ask that the amendment be considered. You can take a vote up or down, if the Leadership on both sides are against it or whoever is against it, why they can vote it down. But rather than having this situation where Representative Walsh and many other Members have relied upon this printed book that we have of Resolutions that



were going to be considered, the easy way, is for Representative Conti to just present this thing, let's have Walsh explain it, take a vote up or down and so be it. Otherwise, Walsh can go through with this process that I've described that often happens where you have people running up here while we're debating a subject and we have amendments on and on and on into the evening. Let's take care of it. We could do it in thirty seconds."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, that matter is not...before the House. Everyone in the evening is moving on, let's move on to the next one, if you would, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's the ruling of the Chair that inasmuch as the Sponsor of the amendment has withdrawn it, there is no question that I can put. Now there's a way for you to get around it and it only requires 89 votes, it does not require 107. There's no way that I know that we can deviate from...from the Rules of this House. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #19, Campbell, amends House Resolution 67 in Rule 17 by deleting 50% and inserting in lieu thereof 35%."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #19 simply changes from 50% to 35% the minimum number of Members that may call a meeting of their Committee. This refers to Rule 17 where a Chairman fails to call a meeting at the request of a Member. I think it provides protection for every Member of this Body. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has never been the intention of Democratic Committee Chairmen to deny Minority the right to be heard. We have no objection to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."



Katz: "...to this motion."

Friedrich: "There's been a number of things talked about here where they were worried about the rights of Members. And I think if they will read the new Rules, they'll find there are several things in there that add to the rights of Members that weren't there before. And this amendment will even add more rights to Minority Membership on Committees."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the...Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I don't mind rights of anybody, but I just don't like to clutter up verbiage when it's not needed. And I've been here, I guess I'm in my seventh term, and I don't remember when the Majority...even a Majority of Committee ever called a Committee meeting when the Chairman didn't. I think Chairmen of all Committees of always called meetings when they should be called. I can't remember any time. Now maybe it has happened, but that's one thing that has not been abused. Let alone, 50% or 35%. So why put it in the Rules when we don't need it. I see no use for it. Now I can see why the Majority Party wouldn't object because it hasn't been abused. But by the same token, why the hell put it in...because it has not been abused. I see no reason for it. And I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 19. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and 26 'no', the motion carries. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #20, Collins, amends House Resolution 67 by deleting the third sentence of Rule 24 C and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."



Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, This amendment has a technical error in it and I would ask leave to Amend it on its face? If you'll look at the amendment, it says that no Bill or Resolution may called for a vote in Committee without the written approval of the Sponsor. Now that would mean every Bill. The intent of the amendment was that it would not be called in the Sponsor's absence without his written approval. And I would ask that leave that it would be amended on the face."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to amend it on its face? No objection, leave is granted. Read it again now just to make sure that we know...in the absence of the Sponsor is that what it says?"

Collins: "In the absence of the...of the Chief Sponsor of a Bill, it may not be called without the...without his written approval...his or hers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Now in the form that the Gentleman has put it, we have no objection to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich. 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, motion carried and the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #21, Friedrich, amends House Resolution 67 in second sentence of Rule 24 D by deleting a 'Majority' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three-fifths'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well this requires the consent of three-fifths of the Appropriations Committees to permit amendments to amendments. Down in the final days of course when we get in to appropriations, they are...Bills do have to be amended on their face and even Amendments have to be amended as they compromise. And this just sets up the



prov...procedure for doing it and puts some safeguards to make it three-fifths to do it. As far as I know there's no objection to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "We have no objection to Amendment #21."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption...Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I have a question on that amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Barnes: "Am I clear that you're saying that this addresses the situation merely when you have amendment that towards the end of the Session that must be amended on the face in the Committee?"

Friedrich: "Yes."

Barnes: "Is that the intent?"

Friedrich: "Yes, Representative Barnes..."

Barnes: "Let me preference this question...preference this because many times in the Appropriations Committee you have incidents where the staff drafts amendments to a Bill and the amendment becomes the Bill. And are you saying that if a staff...if the staff, if it necessitates, the staff drafting the amendment to a Bill which will strike it all and change it in all proportions, that it will then require a three-fifths vote to amend that version that has been drafted by the staff?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I guess that would be the case. But the intention was that normally, we're talking about dollars, and sometimes the amendment is drafted ahead of the hearing, it call for 2 million dollars, it develops at...1 million, 3 hundred and forty thousand dollars as a proper figure. You can amend it on the face without having to go back and have the whole...offer a new amendment by agreement of three-fifths."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my problem with this and I want



you to listen very carefully to this, my problem with this is that many time, especially in the appropriation process, the staff drafts amendments to Bills and will strike everything after the enacting clause. That amendment then becomes the Bill. Now my question is, to amend that amendment, will it require a three-fifths vote in that Committee? If it does, I'm opposed to it. Because we are sitting up a situation that you could not function in the appropriation process, especially on the amendment... amendatory portion of it...if it's going to require a three-fifths vote to amend...amend an original amendment in that Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "I'd like to tell my counterpart, it's a good amendment because what...under the present rule we take unanimous consent. So this actually lessens what we can do right now. Is that correct, Representative Friedrich? Under the present rule it takes unanimous consent to do this."

Friedrich: "Under the new rule it's a majority and this will move it up to three-fifths instead of the unanimous consent as it is in the old rules. Your right about that."

Matijeich: "So it I think it gives us even a little more flexibility."

Friedrich: "You don't need as many votes. Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "No, I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Barnes...Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, according to the explanation I've received, which was not the answer to the question that I proposed, but if that is the case, I can understand what you're doing. Otherwise, it would create some problems."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you oppose or not oppose the amendment?"



Barnes: "I'm not opposed to the amendment in the form that it has been explained."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 21. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have, motion carried, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #22, Pullen, amends House Resolution 67 by deleting the last sentence of Rule 18 H and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #22 would delete provisions relating to Committee Bills. It has been said that the giraffe must have been created by a Committee. And having seen some Committee Bills, I think this probably is a truism. Committee Bills really are nothing device to get around deadlines. And we all know that whatever we say about pride of authorship, we all have it whether we like to admit it or not. I think Committee Bills have out-lived their usefulness in our very strange device in this General Assembly certainly caused more Bills to be introduced than otherwise would be. If you respect deadlines at all, you should vote for this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Lady from Park Ridge really is...ignores some reality when she says that Committee Bills are only a way to get around deadlines. Nothing could be further from the truth. I wish that she would talk to Representative Timothy Johnson on her side. Is the Judiciary II Bill that came out regarding temporary insanity that? Talk to Mr. Leinenweber, was the Bill H.B. 1500 such a Bill? As a matter of fact, that's what Committees are supposed to do. It would be of no use at all to eliminate a vehicle to permit Members of a Committee to work in a



nonpartisan manner on Bills. We've had some very good Committee Bills that have been the product of both sides, neither Democrat or Republican. And what we have tried to do is to make Committee Bills in a way in which all of the Members may participate. It's happened on a number of our Committees that way and I would very much oppose this...proposed Amendment #22."

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

Pullen: "Well the function of Committees is not to cause Bills, it is to screen them and to polish them and in many cases hopefully to kill them. And I certainly could site many other Committee Bills which were very bad Bills. And I think they probably outweigh the number of Bills the Committees have happened to produce that are good Bills. Let's kill the giraffe. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 22. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 46 'aye' and 21 'no', the Lady's motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #23, Campbell, amends House Resolution 67 in second sentence of Rule 25 A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is consistent with Amendment #19 which simply change from 'Majority' to '35%' of the Members appointed to the Committee as the minimum number that may act to set a Bill or Resolution in the effect that the Chairman fails to do so. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Once again, the Majority has not abused its right on... with regard to Committees. We would have no objection



at all to a Minority having the right to schedule a Bill where a Chairman had not scheduled one when requested to do so."

Speaker Redmond: "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: "Amendment #24, Mahar, amends House Resolution 67 by adding at the end of Rule 30..."

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

Kane: "I want to raise a question on the last amendment on whether or not the...a Minority of 35 could set a Bill for a hearing against the Sponsor's will. That's not the intent, I take it."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe that's what it says though, Mr. Kane. Representative Friedrich. I think that would be the interpretation of it."

Friedrich: "Well, we had a previous rule which said a Bill couldn't be heard in Committee without the Sponsor...in the Sponsor's absence without his..."

Kane: "No, that's a vote. This is setting for a hearing. The other says it can't..."

Friedrich: "You're correct."

Kane: "...A Bill cannot be voted on unless written...what this could do is that a Sponsor may not want a Bill heard and 35% of the Committee could force him to hear the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I think your interpretation is correct. Representative Matijevich."

Kane: "Well, if that's the case, I would like to, you know, make a motion to reconsider...on...and have that matter cleared up."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Gentleman and the people on the floor should



understand that it is no different. It gives the right ...the same right to the 35% that a Chairman now has, no more, no less. It's not different. And so it doesn't give any new powers to the 35% that a Chairman doesn't already have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as long as I can remember since I've been here, I don't know of any particular time that a Chairman called a Bill of a Sponsor unless that Sponsor has requested that for a hearing. And I don't ...this certainly was not the intent of this amendment to let one-third of the Committee or 35% of the Committee to call a Sponsor's Bill if he didn't want it called. And as hell cat says, it doesn't change...it simply changes from 'majority' to '35%' so you have the same situation you had with the 'majority' previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Not really, because before in order to get a majority of the Committee the Chairman would have had to have gone along. You can run into a partisan situation in which you have a Chief Sponsor of one Party that might...the other Minority Party may want the Bill heard even though the Sponsor does not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "As I understand it, we just passed an amendment that a Bill can't be heard without written consent of the Sponsor...if the Sponsor is not there."

Speaker Redmond: "It can't be called for a vote. It can't be called for a vote."

Campbell: "If the Sponsor is not there."

Speaker Redmond: "Cannot be called for a vote."

Campbell: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, I think all the argument is superfluous, even though I have told everybody I don't



think either...we need to reduce anything because it hasn't been abused. But all this I think is superfluous because all we do is change the percentage. That's all it does. In other words, we don't change what the ...the Majority can do now by 50%. So the issue only is, do you want to change 50 to 35? That's the only issue here, really."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, do you persist in your motion to reconsider the vote?"

Kane: "As long it's completely understood that the Sponsor of the Bill has to agree to it. And that the Minority the Minority 35%, is not forcing a Sponsor to hear a Bill. And if that's the understanding..."

Speaker Redmond: "That isn't what the language is, but..."

Kane: "That's not what the language says, that's right. And ...I...if that is not the understanding, then I would persist in my motion reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane...Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just point out to Representative Kane that a Committee Chairman can call a Bill now for a hearing without the Sponsor's consent or, going back to the present rule, 50% of the Committee can have a...can even force a Chairman to have a hearing without the Sponsor's consent. This reduces it to 35 which if you're having trouble getting your Bill set for a hearing, with 35% of the Committee you can get it heard. That's all this does."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Representative Kane, having voted on the prevailing side by which amendment...no, the motion for the adoption of Amendment #23 carried, now moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #23 was...was adopted. Those in favor of Representative Kane's motion indicate by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there's 11 'aye' and 98 'no'. The Gentleman's motion to reconsider fails. Any further amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #14 (sic), Mahar, amends House Resolution 67 by adding at the end of Rule 31 A the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 24."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #24?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has withdrawn Amendment 24.

Representative Bradley is recognized with respect to Amendment #40. Changed my mind. Representative

Kosinski is recognized with respect to Amendment 42."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I wish to withdraw Amendment 42."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman desires to withdraw Amendment #42. What amendment are we on now, 25?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 25, Stiehl, amends House Resolution 67 by adding at the end of Rule 34 D the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #25 simply clarifies the language of a new provision which requires a Bill amended in the title to be returned upon the demand of any Member to the Order of Second Reading, 1st Legislative Day. The intent of the new provision is to give Members a chance to study and amend Bills which at the last minute are converted to new Bills. However, the language as it now exists, would apply to almost 90% of the Bills. And this amendment simply provides that if a Bill is amended by its title and only adds or deletes a Section number of the same Act, it will be excluded."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The suggestion is a good one and we have no objection



to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion. The question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 25. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'aye' have it, the motion carried, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #26, Collins, amends House Resolution 67 in Rule 34 A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #26."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment 26. Amendment 27."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 27, Walsh, amends House Resolution 67 by deleting second paragraph of Rule 37 A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. Representative Walsh withdraws Amendment 27. Amendment 28."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 28, Collins, amends House Resolution 67 by adding at the end of Rule 45 D the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #28, you may recall, is the amendment that would permit the Members prior to the commencement of a vote to request a verified Roll Call vote in lieu of the electrical Roll Call vote. I should say, any ten Members. Upon such demand, the Speaker would order a verified oral Roll Call. I would ask for your favorable consideration of Amendment #28."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, it has always been so that any Member in the House could secure a verification. The Speaker has had the right to decide in the individual instance whether or not he felt time would be saved by preceding with the route of a verified oral Roll Call or by some other route. It has always seemed to me that the Speaker ought to have that prerogative that has not been abused."



I personally believe that...for that reason, that the amendment is not a desirable one. I believe that it ought to be the same alternative that the Speaker now has to precede either by verified oral Roll Call or by verification. Accordingly, my own disposition would be to vote against Amendment #28."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one of those amendments that is designed to protect the minorities again and...that some of the people have been asking for here. I think it should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are other reasons for wanting a verified oral Roll Call than just saving time. That is the reason that the Speaker generally invokes for not giving us a verified oral Roll Call, but we saw an instance earlier today when a Member wanted one and could not get one. I think this is a very good change. I urge you vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on... Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor of this amendment could tell us if this will force the Speaker to call a...an amendatory veto...an amendatorily vetoed Bill if the Speaker refuses to do so. Does that address this...does this address that problem?"

Collins: "No, Mr. Skinner, that's a different problem. This does not require the Speaker to call any matter, but it would require the Speaker to exceed to a request of ten Members to have a verified oral Roll Call on any matter in which the Sponsor thought that there was a need for such a Roll Call."

Skinner: "Well, I'll just sit down and hope that there's something better coming along. Thank you."

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



for the adoption...Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when the issue of a verified Roll Call was brought to us in the House, and I think Tom Hanahan was the one that proposed this...proposed it to us, we all fell for it because we thought it was going to save time. I was one of them that thought, oh, it's a hell of an idea. And I thought it would work. The reverse has happened. It hasn't been a time saving technique. If anything, it's taken longer. Now, if we're talking about the rights of the Members...Members..and that person today happened to be Hanahan, he got his verification. It was ...it was a good verification. It was done. We don't want this House to be dilatory. That's what you're allowing by this amendment. And it could be us Democrats that could be dilatory too, with ten Members, not just you. We can do it too. You know, we've only got a one vote majority and believe me there's going to be times when that one or two votes are going to be on your side. We're not always going to have the 89 votes over here and you know it. Damn it, if I was Governor and I had the job, I'll be damned if I couldn't get 89 votes. I'd get them tomorrow and you know it. So we can use that too, but it's wrong. We don't need. It's dilatory, it's a bad rule and you ought to vote against it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly would disagree with the previous Gentleman. I don't think that this is a time consuming device. As a matter of fact, I think it's one of the better moves that we adopted in our last couple of Sessions. However, it is a protection, not only for the Minority but for all Members. Now we know before we present a Bill whether it's going to be controversial or not. And I think that most Sponsors know, within a few



votes, how many they're going to obtain on their Bill. And we also know that there's always the possibility of fast gavel or an inadvertent gavel or an inadvertent move to the next order of business before the Sponsor of the Bill is recognized. I think that this is a good protection., I think it's a need protection. I think it's one that we can all live with without any problems and I certainly think it is one that should receive your favorable consideration. And I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #28."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 28. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Correct Representative Matijevich, it was the Speaker who had the idea of the verified oral Roll Call. And it didn't make it faster. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's, 82 'aye' and 53 'no' and Gentleman's motion carries and the amendment is adopted. Amendment 29."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 29, Polk, amends House Resolution 67 by deleting line 3 to three lines after item 5 in Rule 53 A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this reinstates a Section that we've always had in the Code. The Rules Committee earlier eliminated it, we're putting it back in. It would allow Allan Dixon, Jerry Cosentino, Roland Burris, Bill Scott, Lieutenant Governor Dave O'Neal to have a Member on the floor to discuss with the Legislators and to assist them as they do in many instances with not only legislation but with other problems that we have in our district. It would allow the Governor to have two people, the rest of the Constitutional officers to have one and I would move 'do pass'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."



Johnson: "Just a couple questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Johnson: "The current rules without this amendment, Representative Polk, as I understand it, would permit Representatives of various Constitutional officers to be on the floor with respect to particular Bills that are up at that time to answer questions and so forth, am I not right? Well, then, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this applies across the board to Democrats, Republicans and so forth. I fail to see that if this...the Members of this Chamber truly believe in separation of powers as among the executive, legislative and judicial branches, why it's necessary that we have a Member...Members of another branch of government on the floor on matters that don't effect them telling us how we ought to vote. I think the integrity of this General Assembly and the integrity of this House dictates that we do our business as Members of the Legislature and the members of other branches of government do their business in their own way. And I think this rule protects that, it still allows for some flexibility with respect to the real world of real Bills that effect that particular Constitutional officer and I would certainly ask a 'no' vote on this attempt to try to change the recommendations of the Rules Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee did not include the right of access to the floor for administrative assistants to the Governor and other state officers because of the feeling that we ought to have less confusion on the floor. It is a matter on which there was a closely divided vote in the Rules Committee. It is up to the Members...#29 and #39 yet to come, 29 gives...restores the privilege for the Governor and for other state officers, 39 restores it only for the Governor. It was



such a closely divided matter in the Rules Committee that it's up to the Members as to what they want."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk to close."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I've found many, many times in the seven years that I've been down here where members from the other Constitutional offices have come by my desk when I've requested them to do so. Not to discuss legislation, but simply to assist me in problems that I have in my district. I've been very successful in my district because of the assistance I've received...from Alan Dixon's office many times and I'm sure of the same from Jerry Cosentino and Roland Burris. And I think they should have the right to be on the floor and to assist us on other matters and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 29. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, just to explain my vote. Today you were quite concerned about the noise level in here and we're add more noise level with more people on the floor. If you notice right now, without the lobbyists and the various distractions we have, the floor...the quorum of the House is in excellent shape and by a 'yes' vote here we're just going to add more people on the floor of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the...it's carried, so never mind."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been here some times when the vote has been very close and we, as Members of the Democratic Party, are hustling to try to maintain our thin majority. And I tell you, to the Members of the Democratic side, it's going to be pretty difficult when the Governor's troupes get over here and start throwing



around those bridges, roads, dams. It's going to be awful tough on us so all of those who believe in party unity I think we ought to start voting with the Speaker and vote 'no' on this because that's an awful temptation to a man."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 35 'no', -the motion carries and the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #30, Polk, amends House Resolution 67 by adding after Rule 55 I the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I with House Amendment 30 had roads and bridges and highways in it as well. I truthfully believe that Representative Johnson was really not opposed to #29, but he was just getting warmed up for #30. He indicated to me he's... he's concerned over this dress code Bill. It's just that the intent of this amendment to say, when a Member of the Illinois General Assembly comes to work he should be attired in a business suit or in a leisure suit. The opportunity to proceed understanding and we all...as we all know that this is a house of business. And I do believe that we should be dressed accordingly. The... although the Senate has it, I certainly don't follow their lead because we would also issue boxing gloves if we were going to do that in relation to the Senate. I do think that the minimum of saying that tie and coat or leisure suits...I have no objections in late at night when someone is taking their coat off or loosening their tie, we've all been here a period of twenty-four hours. But I think the intent when you upon...people from the districts, the constituents come in here and they expect us to be business people. I think we should dress like it."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I...many of us actually like to be called fiscally responsible, we like it when newspapers say we are fiscally responsible. But if we adopt this, instead we'll talk about how we're well tailored. A lot of us like to be creative, but instead we'll be thought of as being well attired and well dressed. Now in my time here I've seen lime suits, I've seen white socks abounding. I have seen orange and peach suits, I've seen stripes and dots, I've seen almost every conceivable thing which offends my delicate, artistic sensitivity. And yet...and yet I never I'm never offended by an open neck or by a shirt, by a wrist. And there's a good reason why we should respond to...and I've seen some wigs by the way that are on crooked, often times they dress a little quickly in the morning and their...you know, just a little off kilter. And so that...you know, that's kind of funny to me, it's even funnier than when a guy has no jacket on. And I think leisure suits are kind of you know, they're passe...you know, you don't see a lot of them anymore...too much anyhow. So, I think what we're doing is we're imposing our own...our own belief on what attire should be. Now many of us come from different kinds of constituency, we represent a lot of different people and there's a good reason why we're different from the Senate. The idea is that we be sensitive, very sensitive to our constituents and that every two years they can keep us in or boot us out and that's being close to the people. Now the Senators, they don't like to be close to the people. And if you know them, you understand why they don't want to be close to the people. Accordingly, I think we should just let our Members come and do their work and do their work...if they want to wear their pajamas, if they want to wear slippers, if they want to



wear anything else. That's what we're here for. My constituents didn't ask me if I had a Brooks Brothers suit, they just said, go down and vote what you believe in. And that's what I'm going to do. I'm going to vote 'no' because I don't believe in a dress code."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Polk who is eluded to what our constituents want us to look like, if the constituents don't like the fact that Representative Schneider wears a sweater here or that sometimes in the summer, 11 o'clock in the morning, I just wear a regular shirt and...and corduroy pants, they can vote against me the next time. We're independently elected officials that come down here to do, as Representative Greiman says, what we think is right for our constituents. And if they have some objection to the particular way we dress, they can evidence that by voting against us the next time. I'm looking around the House Chambers, Representative Polk has...has summarized, not entirely accurately, what House Resolution...the Amendment 30 says. It says the proper mode for dress in the House Chambers shall be as follows: male, coat and tie or leisure suit. I'm looking around and I see Representative McClain, Terry Bedgood from the Governor's office, Roger McAuliffe, I don't know if he's still here or not, Representative Schneider, Representative Kane, Representative Griesheimer, Representative Kucharski, Peters, Leverenz, Murphy, Matijevich, Steeczo, O'Brien, McCourt, Totten and Stuffle, who don't have on their coats and they're in violation of the House rules if this amendment passes. Representative Dunn too. I think that everybody in this...is elected 177 Members of this House are adults. I hope they are, they use good judgement and I've never really seen the...this...this rule or lack of rule, abused. Nobody really comes in here and disgraces us and



I don't think that...that for the majority, if there are majority, to impose this will on a minority is really all that fair. We ought to have a little discretion in running our own lives and I fail to see in the absence of any terrible abuse to this where approximately 30% of the House ought to be ejected by the Housekeeper...or by the Doorkeeper because they don't have a coat on. Or Representative Schneider ought to be ejected because he has a turtleneck on or Representative McAuliffe for the same thing. Nobody looks bad in here, nobody looks sloppy and whose beauty is in the eye of the beholder as Representative Greiman says. And if somebody doesn't like it, then I suppose they can...they can so indicate. But this is really serious business and I really believe that we're all here in the serious business of going about the House's business and...and to impose these kinds of stringent rules with no real...real rational for it just doesn't make a lot of sense. And I would certainly urge everybody to vote 'no' on this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Sponsor would share with us his views on what the women Members of the House should wear? A suit and tie? He has not addressed himself at all to the women and perhaps he feels we have not violated any rules. I was wondering if he would share his ideas."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "This becomes very difficult. If all the Members would be in their seats I could..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, Representative Pullen is objecting to you wondering up and down the aisle. Will you please sit down? Representative Skinner."

Pullen: "No, it's Representative Peters. He comes by and makes remarks just as I'm called on. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman from the 15th



Legislative District is already being required to wear a tie at Saturday morning breakfast meetings in the district because he is a candidate for Congress. And I think Representative Greiman has made enough sacrifice for his political career. I don't think we should be requiring him to wear a tie at these breakfast meetings as well. And...seriously though, I can appreciate the reason that the Sponsor of this amendment has introduced it and I think it certainly will prompt many of us to think about the way the House appears from the gallery. But I also think that it is very important that the House maintain its colorful character. And if it's one thing we do have, it is colorful character. And I think that I would rather have colorful character of the House of Representatives by Representative Greiman having his tie a little bit loose and no jacket on and Representative McAuliffe wearing a turtleneck sweater than by having to vent our personalities by dumping soup on other Members. I don't want to see the House of Representatives following the example of the Senate. I think that we can look to each other and ourselves with pride in how we dress, how we behave and how we are here in this Chamber just as we are. And I urge that you defeat this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "You may."

Oblinger: "Mr. Polk, did you really mean the females address the three things you said; a dress or a skirt or a pantsuit, no top with the skirt? This is going to be interesting."

Polk: "Well, it was pointed out to me as well that I put down in the male, coat and tie or leisure suit and didn't put pants down either. So we can follow whatever...whatever turns you on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."



Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, anyone who thinks this House looks good and dignified the way some of us dress are just kidding themselves. A lot of times we look disgraceful and some of the Members here look disgraceful. But there is a way of curing that other than a rule. If I were in your Chair and I was Speaker, I would announce at the end of Session that anyone that is on this floor without a coat or tie will be the last one I recognize on any Bill. You have the discretion to do that and by that time there may be a...there may be a motion for the previous question. So I would if I were you without the...without a rule, I would let the Members know there are certain...there are certain standards of dress and if people don't come up to it...will be recognized last on each and every time they seek recognition. And I think you'll find their dress improving very, very rapidly. We could even get a coat on Representative Totten."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

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

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

Polk: "May I have leave to let Representative Conti close?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Big deal, thanks. Thanks, Ben. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...if I could get serious for a minute. No, I would be the last one to dictate to anyone how to dress. In fact, in my older years, I find that my children are buying some clothes that I would never think of buying and I've been wearing them too. However, I was embarrassed several times and not only with the Members...the way they were dressed on the floor of the House when we had a gallery full of students, but I also saw Member's wives who just walked out of the



swimming pool coming in here with a halter...or what do they call them, just the halters, you know the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Ask Representative Polk."

Conti: "And, if anything, by introducing this amendment, I've noticed that Glen Schneider and Alan Greiman...the first time I saw them with a coat on last year is when the... calling the ERA Bill. And so far this year, I haven't seen them walk into this Chamber without a house coat. So I think we've accomplished what we started out on this amendment and I think their cognizance in effect that if we don't start looking like the House of Representatives, if we don't start dressing for the people in the gallery and quit acting like clowns and quit dressing like clowns maybe we'll quit acting like clowns. I urge you to vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 13. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ebbesen to explain his dress code."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I...in explaining my vote, I'm led to believe, at least my subconscious mind leads me to believe, that Representative Polk is a front along with Representative Conti for Representative Collins because Collins doesn't like my wardrobe and that's the origin of this amendment."

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

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the Members of this House that I come from the 12th Legislative District and I am replacing Representative Ellis Levin. This amendment does not go far enough in insuring the proper decorum on the House floor and therefore, in voting 'no', I think it's...we should keep in mind that one person could wear a suit every day of the Session and keep just on suit on the whole Session and...thank you, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out to the Membership...that they realize the consequences of this very important action. If this amendment to the Rules is adopted, you know what's going to happen. We'll cut out all of those campaign photographs of Members on the floor with their sleeves rolled up and their coat off and the tie loosened, with a microphone in their hand or the phone in their ear. Now what kind of image do we want to project to our constituents? Do we want to project the hard working legislative image at which case we should take off our coat and roll up our sleeves? Or do we want to project the well-tailored image that Representative Grieman so eloquently spoke about? It seems to me that we have to understand the consequences of our actions unless you want to have all those campaign photographs retaken conformance with the House rules. I think you better defeat this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, we have already been blessed by Representative Terzich and Law Revisions Commission with about 20 or 30 or 50 Bills trying to neuterize (sic) the statute. I would suggest we not give them an additional cause to try to neuterize the House Rules. I suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You know, I think, the Sponsors of this amendment to the Rules forget who the House represents. We ought to be proud and we often brag about the fact that we represent just about every walk of life in the State of Illinois. And therefore, we ought to be free to dress ...representative of those people we do represent. This is the House of Representatives. This is the House that ...of the common man or common person as some of you people would like to refer to, the proletariat. You want



to join me, Harry? You know what bothers me is that I've seen Members come in here right out of...after going out hunting, you know, in their hunting uniforms and that didn't bother me. How about sweaters when you come from a golf course? I think a sweater and a pair of slacks looks a heck of a lot better than leisure suits that I see around here. I can't understand the logic of where you're not...you don't necessarily have to wear a tie with a leisure suit, but if you wear anything else you must wear a tie. That doesn't make much sense to me. What are we going to do? How are we going to enforce this. Are we going to throw Jake Wolf out because he comes in with his hunting suit on? Are you going to throw me out because I'm wearing a sweater? Doesn't make much sense to me. It seems to me that the main thing is that when we come in here we're clean and we're free of B.O. as much as possible. And that's about all that should be required of us and I think we ought to...I'm glad to see that we're getting the red votes up there. Thank you."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the first good news I've heard. When Bluthardt starts talking about golf, Spring can't be far behind."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a resident Beau Brummell I probably ought to comment a few things, one of the items that Representative Conti closed on was the wearing of a house cloth...housecoat. Some people scoffed at that but for some of us who grew up in Berlin and Cicero area, that was fundamental dress for some of the people we lovingly called the 'Bubbles'. And I would think if we wore housecoats around the House, it would be very nice and warm and attractive outfit, however, it might offend the sensibilities. But I have noticed that we have"



not had the experience of little Representatives running into big Representatives and hitting them in their pacemakers. The consequence of the decorum in the Senate ...we've not had the hog calling celebrity come across in to our Chamber, probably because he would not be respected here for his abilities. All of that is part of what the Senate represents as Ed Bluthardt properly suggests. So I think it does do something to the House of Representatives which touches all the elements of the population. It's almost a silly notion to think that we would try to control our dress on the assumption that it would regulate our behavior. My record, as bad as it is for some of you, will not be improved if I wear a tie. I might even have a hard time finding out where you wear it, possibly on your forearm. So, I think a red vote is an appropriate vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I urge a 'no' vote because this is just about the only place I ever go where I feel well dressed in comparison to the people I'm with. So...thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it would be highly inappropriate if I didn't stand up and comment on this because I've had the dubious honor for the last seven years to sit next to this oracle of dress code here, Representative Ben Polk. And to the newer Members I would like to recant some of the things that have gone on in the last seven years sitting next to this Gentleman. Would you believe, before this dapper young man came down to Springfield he didn't even have a mustache. But when he was elected to office he grew this mustache. He was shaved off once during the election and he had to quickly grow it back. But nonetheless, he's had a tremendous impact down here. Shortly thereafter, I grew a mustache,



Don's got a mustache and I think we'll even get Tim Johnson in to one because it might hide his shirt. But this was still the same Ben Polk that I can remember coming in in his levi suit. His levi suit and shoes that looked like alley-oop shoes, they were this long and that high and he walked around clomping and he had a big chain that hung down with one of his many 200 watches that he collected. He was more fun watching than Saturday Night Live. Alright, then this oracle starting changing his...his nature down here because shortly thereafter in his second Session he was appointed ...he was appointed the spokesman on education. And I knew something had happened right away because the shoes disappeared and he got wing tips. And now he's got these wing tip shoes he wears all the time and that's probably what's going to happen next Session. Well now Ben Polk is in Leadership and I noticed he's going to the very conservative suits. Next thing you'll see him going to the same tailor that Harry Leinenweber goes to, God forbid, and he will be so conservative you won't recognize Ben Polk. So with all of this as a background you might say, 'Why does Ben Polk, this clever leader in the Republican party, go along with such an idea?' The truth is leaked out. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we vote for this, we've established a mandatory dress code and we can write off our clothes for tax purposes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think my colleague, Representative Ben Polk, needs some...strong friendship on this issue. And I think it is important that we do have a...certainly a minimum standard in the House of Representatives. I do think that the public is looking upon our image and considers what they see and what they read about, I think if we can do something



about not only having a better dress code but do something about avoiding these late hours. Because that's what we're going to be getting into shortly and we're going to see Members of this House sleeping on the House Floor and we're going to see the news media picking up pictures of us in those positions. I think if we can do something, not only to improve the dress code, but if we can start our Session a little earlier so that we can have eight hour days instead of these late night Sessions we can do a great deal to improve it. Yes, I do think our image is important, especially to the young people who come down here and is going to fill these galleries in the next two months. So I'm very proud to stand with my colleague, Ben Polk, in supporting this proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to quickly explain my vote. I have in numerous occasions been shocked and chagrined by the appearance of my fellow Legislator from DuPage County who serves with me on the Education Committee. And regardless of what Representative Dunn says in terms of the kind of company he keeps, I keep company with the Representative from DuPage and I, frankly, am embarrassed sometimes by his appearance. And I think that if we had a dress code that we could...we could bring his level of decorum and sartorial appearance before the general public to the level where he might be able to win on his own rather than being carried by the Republicans in his district."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of personal privilege, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think Representative Hoffman ought to talk about Ray Hudson like that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk. Representative Tuerk."



Tuerk: Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm voting 'aye' on this amendment. However, I want Representative Dittman to hear what I am about to say because I resent, very strongly, his operations past upon my constituents and my good friend, Representative Walsh, because I want you to know that they always put their hair piece on straight."

Speaker Redmond: "Speak for yourself, John Alden. Representative White. White. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, most Members are thinking about other Members and insulting each other across here. I'm kind of thinking about the Governor. We have a Governor who goes around the state wearing a T-shirt that says, 'I'm a country boy' and I'm impressed by the fact that the amendment here does relate to visitors and as the campaign season approaches, I think, that we ought to protect ourselves from persons who might be inspired to come in here with political T-shirts and this would be very good to insulate ourselves from intruders from the outside who might try to violate our rules. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "The Speaker is following Representative Pierce's suggestion of....I would wonder if the Sponsor would consider sponsoring an amendment which would also make hair cuts tax deductible?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 69 'aye' and 84 'no' and the Gentleman's motion failed. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #31, Simms, amends House Resolution 67 by adding at the end of paragraph 68 D the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw that amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "31 is withdrawn. 32, Representative C.M. Stiehl."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 32, Stiehl."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw this amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl withdraws Amendment
32. 33."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 33, Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
this isn't nearly as colorful as the dress code, but I
can assure you that it's probably one of the more
important amendments that we've addressed ourselves to
today. This proposes that Resolutions proposed in that
...Resolutions proposing amendments, the Illinois
Constitution and amendments to such Resolutions shall
show the changes in existing Constitutional provisions
by underscoring all the new matter and by crossing with
a line all of the matter which is to be admitted or
superseded, same as a Bill. And I think...something that
no one seems to know why we've never done...before and I
think it's a very good ^a amendment. And I move for its
adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "It's a useful suggestion and we would support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion for
the adoption of Amendment 33. Those in favor say 'aye',
opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried, the
amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #34, Pullen, amends House Resolution
67 on page 49 by inserting after line 25 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, the amendment is brief, let me read the
part that would be added. 'The presentation of the
motions to advance a Bill without reference to suspend
Rule 41 or 42 for immediate consideration of a Resolution
or to discharge a Committee from further consideration
of a Bill or Resolution, may go in to the substance of



the Bill or Resolution sufficiently to inform the House of the nature of the matter sought to be brought before it.' Many times we have had the frustrating circumstance when someone has a motion that relates to a Bill, that they are precluded from actually telling the House what the Bill does. And I think that we should be allowing the Members enough information to cast an intelligent vote. And...this far..the debate should be extended on those motions. It is a limited amendment and I urge its adoption and move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, it codifies the best practice and we would support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment 34. 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: "Amendment #35, Telscer, amends House Resolution 67 in paragraph G of Rule 4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this prohibits the Speaker from ruling a Senate Amendment to a House Bill as not germane. And that's all it does. When a House Bill goes over to the Senate and gets an amendment and comes back, it's not...it will not be the prerogative of the Speaker to rule on germaneness."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I heard some eloquent discussion about the fact that the House is the House and that it's different than the Senate. If the Senate does something wrong, it should not prevent the Speaker of the House from doing what's right. This amendment would require the Speaker to accept the procedures of the Senate as regular or even if the issue had never been



ruled on in the Senate. Accordingly, we would oppose that we believe that the Speaker is the Speaker of the House and he ought to be able to control the proceedings of the House and he should not have his hands tied by what may have been done or in fact what may...what may not had been done in the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I whole heartedly oppose this amendment as the Gentleman just spoke...expressed his opposition. I would call to your attention that one of the beautiful things about Illinois is that it is a bicameral system and there is a check and balance within the legislative process. And I don't think that an error committed in one House should be perpetuated by an error in the other House by nonaction. I do think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that when any amendment, whether it be a House Amendment or a Senate Amendment, is presented for our consideration or a Bill that we should be precluded from acting with respect to Robert's Rules of Order and the question of germaneness. And on that account, I vigorously, oppose this amendment and urge a 'no' vote."

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

Friedrich: "Well, I would point out to you, there's certainly nothing...this amendment is adopted. There's nothing to preclude any Member of this House of questioning the germaneness and whether or not the amendment itself should concurred in. That's...that is the prerogative of the whole House and the prerogative of any...any Member to raise that question. What we're doing...what this amendment would do would be take away the...from the Speaker, the prerogative to rule on a Senate Amendment, not the prerogative of the House itself."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."



Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Gentleman's problem can be solved by an appeal from the ruling of the Chair and so this is not necessary."

Speaker Redmond: "That was in fact done."

Bowman: "That's correct...I wanted to refresh the memories of the...Body."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 35. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 25 'aye' and 101 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #36, Walsh, amends House Resolution 67 in Rule 61 A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Representative Simms is handling this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this simply restores the motion in the...to strike the enacting clause which has been a tradition of the House of Representatives. It has only been used a couple of times during my five terms in the Legislature. It's been used very sparingly and it has saved the time of the House of Representatives on those rare occasions. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Rules Committee recommended eliminating this because it deprives a Member of his right to have his Bill heard on Third Reading. What takes place is that somebody attaches a motion that kills the Bill. The feeling of the majority of the Rules Committee was that if a Member has put in a Bill, it's been voted out of Committee, he's entitled to have it heard on the merits. He's entitled to have it debated. He's entitled to have his say and



that it should not be killed in this way that deprives him of the right to have a hearing. If any Member opposes that Bill, they should have a right on Third Reading to oppose it. But to deal it a death wound on Second Reading without giving the Member a chance to be heard we felt was unfair and that is the reason why this was eliminated from the Rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman is absolutely correct but there was a very strong minority in the Rules Committee that wanted to keep this provision within the Rules that has been there, may I say, for as long as I can remember, which is a long time, and I suspect for a long time before that. It is a...a perfectly proper parliamentary procedure to kill a Bill or a measure at the earliest possible moment. There is no sense in debating or thinking about or receiving mail on a measure the majority of whom here do not want. And this simply disposes of that matter before going through the nec... the three readings and having a prolonged debate on Third Reading. Now I submit to you that the Member who is the Spon...the Sponsor of a Bill, against which a motion such as this is filed, has a perfect opportunity to defend that Bill and to discuss that Bill and to tell all of the Membership why he wants it to pass. I see nothing objectional at all in saving the time of the House by deleting the Bill, by getting rid of it at the earliest possible time. I will suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Committees frequently make mistakes. They have done it in the past, they have passed things that have been so obnoxious to the Membership that they wanted to get rid them as quickly as possible. This is the measure by which that is done, there is nothing personal about it, it's just a way of disposing of our business and I think this is a perfectly good amendment and should



be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is perhaps one of the worst amendments to the Rules that we have filed tonite. This has been one of the most undemocratic traditions in our House to have this motion on the books. We, who are elected, and find our Bills going through the entire Committee process, to find them to come to the floor, Bills that should be debated on the merits, whether you vote for them or against them, Bills that should be definitely debated on the merits, and then during the heat of battle to find one of your colleagues to get up and make a motion which takes precedence and which nobody notice of on Second or Third Reading at any time and dispose of that Bill, despite the fact that it's gone through the Committee process and keep that Member from having his...Bill debated on the merits, nothing could be more undemocratic. This...this doesn't stop somebody from still filing an amendment to strike the enacting clause. But this is a motion to strike the enacting clause which takes precedence, which requires no notice and which can be filed or heard on Second or Third Reading at any time. Nothing is...nothing could be worse that happens in this House. I've seen it happen on very important Bills, Bills that the newspaper, the media of this state, felt were important enough to be editorialized on and I've seen other Members get up during the heat of battle and make this motion, give the Members no notice at all, and stop that important issue from being debated on its merits. I think we should be proud that we took this horrible motion out of our Rules and I would vehemently oppose this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor of the Resolution



yield? Inquiry on this. After the motion is filed, how many votes does it take to can a Bill using this system?"

Simms: "A simple majority of those voting on the question."

Griesheimer: "I think we're talking about the Democratic System in operation and the majority vote will can the Bill, is that correct?"

Simms: "That's correct, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "All right, I'd like to speak to this then.

Normally, I would agree with the prior Speaker with regard to his comments, but I would have to say that if the majority of this House, which is the Democratic Process, at any time feels that a piece of legislation has been put in either frivolously or for the purpose contrary to the general intention of the people we are elected to represent, then it deserves to be canned at an early date. I think this is a very wise Bill. It's been very judiciously used in the seven years I've been down here, only effecting one Bill which I believe was the marijuana Bill, which deserved to be canned instanter and I think that this is the type of thing that we have to do if we're going to move the House along."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, I can remember three times...very early when I came down here on abortion, it was used on maybe the marijuana, I guess, it was used on congressional reapportionment. And I can remember when we had the one on congressional reapportionment. All of those who said that this was the silliest rule that we ever had, here they were voting on the motion to strike the enacting clause. You couldn't believe it. Everyone who said this should not be a rule, they were voting on the side to strike the enacting clause. Let me tell you, when a rule has been in a rule...a rule for many, many, many years, there's some logic to it. It...this has not been abused."



There's a lot of kooky things that can happen around here and the majority realizes that something may be frivolous as somebody said over there. I think as long as something isn't abused, leave it in there. And...it's a good thing. I remember that we eliminated a whole day, a whole day, Speaker John Lewis was not a Speaker at the time, and he recognized that we were going to spend a whole day on one Bill and he knew, like we knew, like I knew, that that Bill was going to get four votes...and he had a motion to strike the enacting clause. And sure enough, it would have had four votes. So we killed a whole day to do some other work...by that motion to strike the enacting clause. Leave it in there. It will not be abused, I guarantee you. I'll never use it and probably none of you will. But there may be that one time when it should be used. So I think it's a good amendment and we ought to leave it in there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "We've talked about all the junk Bills that are out on here, those junk Bills that might be disposed of by that device, but we're ignoring one thing. In order for a Bill to be on Second Reading, it has to have passed by ...out of Committee. So that the majority of the Members of the Committee and I guess the Hanahan's Rule, the majority of the sitting Members of the Committee, have to have thought that it a good idea. And I certainly say that any of those Bills that have received a majority of...Members of a Committee...approval, certainly deserve to at least been heard 'yes' or 'no' on the merits of the issue rather than be struck...on a day when maybe not all the Members are here on Second Reading and be undemocratically shelved in that manner. So I certainly urge a 'no' vote on this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would urge the passage



of...of this Bill. Representative Mugallan's prior amendment was, very frankly, defeated. It's possible that a Committee could be loaded up to pass out a very unfavorable Bill that would take up hours of the House of Representatives. And I think of those that have spoke on the issue, those of us that have been here for some time, I think Representative Matijevich made the best point. It has been used so very seldom, but occasionally it can be used to save the time of the House of Representatives. It saved the time of the House that... Representative Lewis at one time. The last time it was used was to defeat the congressional remap, which would have taken two days of House time debating the issue. Leave this motion in the record...in the Rules of the House of Representatives. It has been there for many years, it has saved valuable time. I would urge that this amendment to the Resolution be passed. I urge its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 36. Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since I've been down here I've seen on two occasions when a Bill is...has been stricken by the Members of this House. And one issue was on abortion and one is on marijuana and I think my position is quite clear on both issues. And I think it's very much in bad order to strike any legislation. If it made out of a Committee, then it ought to be voted up or down on its merits and not...not given this here type of a treatment. And I very much...would conclude that this proposal to put back in here the right to strike legislation is just against my grain."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 114 'aye' and 28 'no'. Gentle...motion



prevails and the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #37, Walsh, amends House Resolution 67 by adding at the end of Rule..."

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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I arise for a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your..."

Griesheimer: "As we commenced our business this evening, I recall that there was a vote taken cutting off amendments to these proposed rules. I'm continuing to receive amendments. I'd like to know what the number was we cut off these amendments to the Rules..."

Speaker Redmond: "47. 47. Representative Walsh on Amendment 37. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of a motion if I could, that we move to suspend the provision in the Rules allowing for explanation of vote for the rest of the evening...on Rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you state that Representative Madigan?"

Madigan: "I wish to support the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten has moved that the... explanation of votes be suspended for the rest of the evening. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. Representative Walsh, on 37. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you. That's the first thing I've passed in four years."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...maybe Congress will be better. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, please withdraw Amendments 37 and 38."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh withdraws 37 and 38. Any further amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #39, Mugalian, amends House Resolution 67..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian withdraws 39. 40."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 40, Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well in lieu of the fact that Mr. Walsh withdrew 38, I presume he wants 40 withdrawn. Oh...no...no. We're going to go with #40, Mr. Speaker. Just recalling what happened earlier in the evening, Mr. Walsh."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that alright with you, Representative Walsh? Former Chairman of the Executive Committee... heavy-handed Chairman. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #40 limit...would limit the consideration of proposed changes to the U.S. Constitution. It would limit the consideration of it on one time...on the... Order of Third Reading and it would then be subject to a second vote only on Postponed Consideration during that particular Session. As you'll recall we had some problems a year or so ago with one Constitutional Amendment. We addressed it twice within a two week period. And I think this just puts it into the Rules that we only be...whatever the matter might be concerning the Constitution, it would be simply limiting ourselves to adjusting at one sign...one time plus a...taking it from Postponed Consideration. And I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, this matter did not come before the Rules Committee at all and I am not speaking at all for the Rules Committee. What it does impose is that...with regard to any other matter that comes before the General Assembly, a Member is free to introduce whatever number of Bills that he wants to. And when that Bill is defeated he can still introduce a Bill. We have never restricted Members in this right. This would restrict them with



regard to proposed Amendments relating to Federal Constitutional Amendments and thus would treat differently Amendments relating to Federal Constitutional Amendments than we treat other Bills and Resolutions in the House. And accordingly, I would oppose it, but I am speaking only in my personal capacity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative George Ray Hudson, the Gentleman from DuPage."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wondered if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hudson: "Representative Bradley, I was a little bit confused here as to the time period, the frame of time..."

Bradley: "Where...where are you?"

Hudson: "Well anyway, if you read the Amendment it says, 'A proposed change in the United States Constitution may not be considered more than once in the biennial Session subject to Rule 38, which 38 is our Postponed Consideration.'"

Bradley: "Alright, once in the biennial Session. I'm glad to get that clear because my recollection is that sometime back the Speaker had ruled that the definition of a Session consisted of one day. And I wanted to be very clear that we all understood we were talking about a biennial Session or a two-year period and we were not talking about one day. And that might still be something if we want to...keep in the backs of our mind. I think it's an excellent, an excellent proposal, and I support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grieman."

Grieman: "Yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Grieman: "Do I understand that this applies to just Constitutional Amendments or would it apply, for example, to Resolutions that call for Constitutional Conventions as



well or would we memorialize Congress to call for a Constitutional Convention to change the Federal Constitution?"

Bradley: "I would..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, I assume that it would apply, and as you well know, I have one of those very...Amendments in. And I assume that it would apply to that...this Rule if we adopt it would apply to that particular Resolution when it applies to a particular subject."

Grieman: "Well, okay. On the Amendment, Amendment #40, I think a fair reading of Amendment 40 is that it would not change it as a matter of fact and that you would have Amendments like the DC Amendment that would only be heard once on this. But that requests for memorializing Congress for a Constitutional Convention because that's just the Convention, I mean, they might not propose any change in that...would indeed, not. So what Mr. Bradley is doing is mere...very nearly excluding some Amendments to the Federal Constitution, but leaving those Amendments. I think that perhaps closer to his own heart and maybe not doing this by...by purpose either, leaving them open to many, many, many votes or series of votes. Also, obviously, why do we single out the United State's Constitutional changes, why not Illinois change.... Constitutional changes, why not a myriad of other...of other matters that we consider? Why just the United States Constitution? I have no...I think it's unfair. As a matter of fact, it might, it might be unconstitutional, as a matter of fact. I have a sense that it might very well contravene Article V of the Federal Constitution. I think it's unnecessary, it's inappropriate and it clearly discriminates against some kinds of Constitutional change. I think we should defeat this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Would you consider amending your Amendment on the face to change 'biennial' to 'annual'?"

Bradley: "I have no...I think I'd just as soon leave it the way it is with the biennial..."

Schlickman: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again, I think we ought to be careful about introducing rule change that really are precipitated because of some emotion that we have on a particular issue. If we're going to have a rule change, let's change the rule because of some substance. Because in addition to being a legislative Body, we are a political Body too. We are Democrats and we are Republicans and we will find that there will be a time that we are going to vote for or against a Constitutional change, a U.S. Constitutional ratification because of our political beliefs. And I don't think that we ought to introduce a rule because we are looking at a particular one issue, maybe, that in the future we will find that we are going to disagree with because we didn't think about that at the time. I don't think that you ought to place into the Rules inflexibility, and that's what you're doing by proposing and voting for this rule change. I think you ought to remember your politics. And you're going to find that may be the reason you may vote up or down on a Constitutional change and that can be good or it can be bad. But we don't have to write in that inflexibility because that's what you'll be doing. Therefore, I would urge a 'no' vote without any think...any thought about a particular emotional subject matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

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



the House. In reference to the comment of the Sponsor of the Resolution, it would appear to me that a leading of the language of the Amendment would clearly limit this Amendment to the Rules to provide for Constitutional Amendments because in no other way can we have a proposed change in the United State's Constitution. The calling for a convention does not provide for any change in the Constitution, it merely calls for a Body who might suggest change upon which we would have to vote. Therefore, this Amendment, in my judgement, is limited to Constitutional Amendments only. And on that basis, it seems to me, regardless of politics, to be a wise move on the part of this Body."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Pierce in the Chair."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from McClean, to close, Representative Bradley. Alright. Representative...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Sponsor of this Amendment. He has seen this House abused and abused time and time again over this Constitutional question. And I think he is to be awarded a certificate of merit for his courage coming forth with an Amendment such as this, to prevent this House from being abused by a few Members who wish to push forth their ideas upon the entire Membership and try...and try, try again...if you first don't succeed, try, try again. I urge you to vote with the Sponsor of this Bill. It certainly deserves an 'aye' and thank you, Mr. Bradley, for introducing such a fine Amendment."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in answer to the previous Speaker about somebody pushing something through and...and I know who he's referring to, he's referring to some of us who tried to



act for the Equal Rights Amendment last year. So let's call a spade a spade. But don't forget, we had one call on that, the Bill that Allen Greiman and I had, and we had it...and it was subject to the same rules that any other Amendment to the Constitution or any other Bill on any other subject. And what you're doing now is you're making a different category for Amendments to the Constitution. And I think that's wrong, I think it's also probably unconstitutional, but what...what it's doing, it's saying, you don't have the gumption to stand up and be counted on something...as it is on other cases, you want to make a different rule for this. And I think it's wrong and we should defeat it."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

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

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. All those in support of the motion say 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from McClean, to close."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I might, I would like to accept the suggestion and we amend it on its face. As long as we're in annual Sessions all the time, we would...ask leave of the House to amend by saying 'annual' instead of 'biannual'...'biennial'."

Speaker Pierce: "Do we have unanimous consent? Objections... Representative...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, we just...I thought we adopted a motion to close debate. Now if we amend this thing on its face, do we reopen debate or...are we foreclosed? It seems to me that we have a different motion in front of us."

Speaker Pierce: "There's...there's been an objection. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Speaker, there may be an objection for



unanimous consent, but I think at any time someone can move to amend on its face and it's a majority."

Speaker Pierce: "Parliamentarian tells me it takes unanimous consent and the motion is not in order. The Gentleman has closed."

Schlickman: "He's not...Member of this Body."

Bradley: "To close, Mr. Speaker? Where are we?"

Speaker Pierce: "An Amendment to the Amendment...the Sponsor has closed, you may close."

Bradley: "May I close, Sir?"

Speaker Pierce: "Fine. The Gentleman from McClean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as was suggested in debate that the purpose to bring...."

Speaker Pierce: "Excuse me. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, on a parliamentary inquiry."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. What is the meaning of the term 'considered'? Does that simply mean, introduced on First Reading and is sent to a Committee so that someone unfriendly to an issue like, Right To Life, could introduce it and that constitute consideration?"

Speaker Pierce: "That's not a parliamentary inquiry."

Catania: "What is consideration under our Rules?"

Speaker Pierce: "You had a chance to answer...ask the Sponsor, he's now closing. Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, it very simply...the purpose and the intent of this Amendment to our Rules is so that we won't find ourselves in the same situation we did a year or so ago that tore the House apart, that the Speaker had to go back to a 1933 ruling to bring about a...to make it possible for us to address ourselves to an issue two times within a two week period. And I have a Constitutional



Convention call proposed that may fall underneath this Amendment and I will take my chances on it. If I have an opportunity to call it on the floor of the House on one occasion, put it on Postponed Consideration, that's all I'm asking for. We won't be tearing the House apart, we won't be, as some might say, using dilatory tactics by continuing to bring something up time and time again so that we can go ahead and do what's necessary to run the State of Illinois. And I move the...for the adoption of the...Amendment."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 40. All those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 84 'ayes', 54 'noes' and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #41, Bowman, amends House Resolution 67 on Page 28, line 4 and so forth."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman...on Amendment 41."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's been a long evening and we've had some very difficult measures to consider and very lengthy debates, I think this will be an easy one. I'd just like to read the...."

Speaker Pierce: "Excuse me. The Gentleman...Representative Ackerman, do you have a motion? Parliamentary inquiry? Mr. Ackerson, did you ask for recognition? Alright. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, I wanted to call the Membership's attention to a rule which we already have and which is...it's been a part of the Eightieth General Assembly and now the...promises part of the Eighty-First. It says, 'During regular and special Sessions of the House, no Bill may remain within the control of the Committee on Assignment



for a period exceeding three legislative days. The problem is it doesn't say what happens at the end of the three legislative days. What happens to the control of the Bill? There have been a number of instances...in some instances involving Bills of my own, where the Bills have been held for more than three legislative days and it does make it difficult to schedule Committee hearings and line up witnesses and so forth. So I'm proposing this rule...Amendment to the Rules, rather, to provide for filling that gap. Basically the Amendment would simply provide that at the end of the third legislative day that the Sponsor may then file a demand with the Clerk of the House who shall then transmit it directly to the Assignment Committee and if the Assignment Committee does not act on it promptly that the...the Sponsor can then assign it to the Committee of his choice. So I think that this provides us with an opportunity to give a force, in effect, to a Rule which we have which now has no force in effect. And I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 41. All those in support of the...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, this matter was not before the Rules Committee. I would suggest that a Member of the Committee on Assignment of Bills speak on this, Mr. Madigan or some other Member of the Committee. It was not discussed in our Committee."

Speaker Pierce: "That there are...there are other Members of that Committee?"

Katz: "Yes..."

Speaker Pierce: "Represent...the Gentleman from Cook..."

Katz: "...Republican Member, too."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Madigan, you've been invited to speak on this by the Vice-Chairman of the House Rules Committee."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. I can understand his interests in expediting the work of this particular Committee, but I suggest that he may not be familiar with the mechanical problems of receiving the Bills from the Clerk's office, suggesting changes from the...suggesting assignments from the staff which is a routine function of the Committee to send the Bills to the staff and solicit suggestions from the staff as to Committee Assignment and then to circulate the...the proposed assignments to the Members of the Committee for their review and comment before a decision is finalized and then the Bill is actually assigned to a Committee. I realize that it is the desire of everyone to move ahead expeditiously, but I think that the Gentleman's Amendment is short-sided and it really wouldn't solve the problem. It would simply cause more mechanical problems that exist now to where there's really a very difficult job. I think that we should realize that...taking this week as an example, we will probably receive 1500 to 2000 Bills in the Committee on Assignment of Bills this week, all of which we hope to assign before the end of the week. I don't think that it would be wise for us to add more mechanical problems on to the operations of the Committee. I would, therefore, oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Majority Leader indicates he would yield to a question."

Schlickman: "I understand, Mr. Majority Leader, that the burden of your Committee is great on account of the number of Bills that are introduced and then sent to your



Committee for assignment. It interests me that I had a relatively unimportant Bill...I had a relatively unimportant Bill that the...your Committee, the Committee on Assignment of Bills sent to Labor and Commerce and then subsequently I was told that it was reassigned to Judiciary I. I scheduled it for a hearing and fifteen minutes before the hearing before Judiciary I, I was called by your office and told that the Bill had been reassigned for a second time back to Commerce...or Labor and Commerce. And I'm just wondering, with the great burden that you have, why such great attention on your Committee's part in assigning, reassigning and reassigning?

Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman, I really don't feel that I'm prepared to comment on the...the succession of events that led to the assignment of your Bill. We've already assigned close to 1500 Bills in this particular Session and I really don't feel that I'm equipped to comment on any particular Bill at this time."

Schlickman: "I would simply ask, Mr. Majority Leader, isn't it sufficient that once your Committee sits down and assigns a Bill, that's it, and you go on to other matters, rather than playing politics or being influenced by special interests with respect to a Bill?"

Speaker Pierce: "We're getting at a discourse here. This Gentleman is not prepared..."

Madigan: "Well, I'd just wish to agree with Mr. Schlickman. I think that his comment is correct."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise to support the Amendment. I recall in the last Session, Representative Tipword and I on a Bill of some importance to many people, had a Bill introduced that waited seventeen legislative days to be assigned to a Committee. The Committee on Assignment saw no need to move that Bill to a Committee and we filed a motion to move a Bill to a



standing Committee. At that point...pointing out three day rule was there with regard to assignment within three legislative days, but there were no teeth in the rules whatsoever to require that the Committee actually do what the rules set down...that they should do and that's move the Bill to a Committee within three days. This simply puts some teeth into this operation, I think, and each time I've asked Members this year on the Assignment Committee about Bills they said, 'Well, let us know as quickly as possible where you want your Bill to go because we are going to meet as immediately or as often as possible.' And they've been doing this I think within three legislative days. We've had a crunch already in terms of Bill introductions. So I would support the Amendment as one necessary to put teeth into the rules. If there's a three day rule there, then it ought to be enforced. And it won't be enforced if we go back to the situation that we were in in the last General Assembly."

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

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. That was Representative Waddell. All those in support of the motion say 'aye', opposed. And Representative Watson to explain his vote. Representative Watson. Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, before I close, I think a parliamentary inquiry is appropriate. Namely, what is the posture of the Bill if the Committee on Assignment fails to act in three legislative days? Assuming my motion...assuming my Amendment is defeated, what then would be a...the posture of the Bill following the third legislative day?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Chair does...the Chair is not going to



give a ruling until such time as the...as the situation arises...and we don't give advisory opinions up here. That's a hypothetical question."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, you may recall that you and I were joint chief Sponsors of a House Bill...of House Bill 5 which was in the Committee on Assignment for 5 or 6 weeks. And ...so it's not hypothetical even in this Session. Right now I'm sure there are Bills in the Assignment Committee that have been there longer than three legislative days. I think the Membership is entitled to a response and a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Pierce: "House Bill 5 is still alive, it's still very much alive and...and I think the Gentleman was recognized to close and apparently what's happened in the past is that Bills have not been tabled where action has not been taken in three days."

Bowman: "Is that the ruling of the Chair that Bills will be automatically tabled..."

Speaker Pierce: "That's not a ruling of the chair.. I've never known a Bill to be tabled because the...because the Committee hasn't acted in three days."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to know what's going to happen if this Bill...if this Amendment is defeated. I don't see that we can take a vote without knowing what the consequences of the vote are going to be. And I think it's a legitimate inquiry and I would like a ruling on it."

Speaker Pierce: "Your inquiry is out of order. The Gentleman has closed."

Bowman: "I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 41. All those in favor will say 'aye'. Representative Watson is returning to the floor. The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 41 to House Resolution 67. All those in favor will sign...will vote



'aye', opposed 'nay'. Have all voted? The Clerk will take...no more explanation of votes. The Clerk will take the record. Representative from Cook, Mr. Bowman, on a parliamentary inquiry."

Bowman: "Yes, I'm still seeking a response to the question of what is the consequence if this Amendment is defeated. Therefore, what posture will any Bill that is now...has been in the Assignment Committee more than three days, what is the posture of those Bills?"

Speaker Pierce: "The consequence is that the world will continue on in its ordinary way."

Bowman: "Are you saying that we have no rule then? That the present rule is void?"

Speaker Pierce: "We haven't adopted any rules as yet. On this motion there are 39 'aye' votes, 103 'no' votes, 1 voting 'present' and Amendment 41 is defeated. Are there any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #42 was withdrawn previously. Amendment #43, Katz, amends House Resolution 67 on page 21, line 17 by deleting April 27 inserting lieu thereof May 4."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "This simply conforms the permanent rules to the change made the other day with regard to the temporary rules. The new Committee..."

Speaker Pierce: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman...the Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 43. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #44, Katz, amends House Resolution 67 on page 33, line 12, by deleting 'Appropriation Bill or to' and inserting in lieu thereof."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "This also makes the same change in a deadline date that



was made in the temporary rules when we adopted them last week."

Speaker Pierce: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #44. All those in support will say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Amendment 44 is adopted. Are there any further amendments in House Resolution 67?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #45, Friedrich, amends House Resolution #67 by deleting Rule 32 and so forth."

Speaker Pierce: "Representative Friedrich is recognized."

Friedrich: "Representative Lechowicz is going to handle this."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I thought Representative Lechowicz was going to handle this, but just..."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook is not in the hall and I'm giving you the opportunity to pick up the mantle."

Friedrich: "This revise...this is the subject of the fiscal note which we talked about quite a bit. It revises the Fiscal Judicial and Pension Impact Note Procedure and requires a Sponsor request a fiscal note before the Bill be posted in Committee. The request goes to the Clerk who transmits to the proper agency for the fiscal note and no Bill can be voted on in Committee until the fiscal note has been supplied or before the time has lapsed. There's an amendment to that."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh is recognized."

Walsh: "Yield to a question?"

Speaker Pierce: "Yes, the Gentleman from Marion indicates he'll yield."

Walsh: "Has the question been resolved about what happens to Bills that have been introduced and have not been heard in Committee as yet?"

Friedrich: "Yes, the next amendment would take care of that..."



no, it wouldn't either."

Walsh: "By doing what?"

Friedrich: "Just a minute. No, we're...we're proposing that we suspend the...this particular rule for this Session because the Bills in Committee now would be bogged down for the next two weeks."

Walsh: "You are proposing..."

Friedrich: "We're going to put this in the permanent rules and then we will have to suspend it during...for this period to take of the Bills that are in Committee now."

Walsh: "You are therefore proposing that the...this amendment not be applicable until the next Session of the General Assembly?"

Friedrich: "The Committee portion of it."

Walsh: "The Eighty...is that correct?"

Friedrich: "The Committee portion of it."

Walsh: "The Committee portion of it."

Friedrich: "Well, which says that the Bill can't be heard in Committee until it's...the fiscal note is furnished."

Walsh: "What about Bills that are introduced between now and the last day for introduction...would they...would this amendment apply to them?"

Friedrich: "We'll have to do it for all House Bills because of the lateness in adopting the rules."

Walsh: "So you have another amendment then that would..."

Friedrich: "No, we propose to suspend this rule."

Walsh: "I don't see the language...I don't want to take your time but I don't see the language..."

Friedrich: "It is not in the language, Sir. I say we're... we propose to adopt this rule, but suspend it..."

Walsh: "But to suspend...you propose to adopt it but to suspend its application wherever it applies?"

Friedrich: "That's right for the rest of this..."

Walsh: "Well, okay. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this...this is an absurdity. What we're



proposing to do is to adopt an amendment to our rules and proposing that it not apply to our rules. The Sponsor has said that what we propose to do is to suspend the rules...suspend this rule each and every time its application would come up. And I suggest to you that it is absurd to do at this time. I further suggest that to ...that to adopt this rule would be going contrary to the statutes because the Fiscal Note Act is in the statute and we are complying with the statutes in our use of it. Now I don't think that...I don't think that we can do that. I think we're putting the cart before the horse. If somebody doesn't like the Fiscal Note Act, what they ought to do is offer a Bill and repeal it. What they are attempting to do with this..with this amendment is to repeal the Fiscal Note Act by an amendment to the rule which is just absolutely awry. Now the argument has been put forth that the statutes don't apply to the Legislature and that of course is equally absurd, and I think that our pay raise which you'll find in the statute is evidence enough, but there are very many...several other applications that...that I could refer to. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this amendment proposes to do is to require each Sponsor of a Bill who has a...which maybe...may be subject to the Fiscal Note Act to get a fiscal note before that Bill can be heard in Committee. Now I suggest that whether we do it now, we do it in the Eighty-second General Assembly or we do it ten years from now, that it a ridiculous waste of time and effort and imposes tremendous burdens upon the Clerk. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that every Sponsor knows now if his Bill is subject to the Fiscal Note Act and indeed the Reference Bureau stamps as such usually and he knows that if he is going to get it off Second Reading, he darn well better have a fiscal note because someone may request it and may slow down the Bill. Now in these



times, Mr. Speaker, when the taxpayers are crying for mercy, I don't think this is the time for us to be messing around and making the Fiscal Note Act less strong. I suggest to you that we probably ought to be strengthening it. But to...to do this, to in effect, repeal it through the rules which are by the Sponsor's admission not to take effect for two years is ridiculous and we ought to beat this out of hand."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I share Representative Walsh's concern about the current Bills that are in the Committee because they would stand in a state of being frozen. I rather disagree with his interpretation that we'd be in violation of the statutes. The statutes do call for fiscal notes if they're requested on Second Reading, but I see nothing in the statutes that prevents us from making it in the rules to include that in Committee. And what it does is give the Committee the advantage of being able to determine what the fiscal impact on a particular Bill is. And if Representative Friedrich carries through with his promise to suspend the rule for House Bills for the rest of this Session and not let it apply...and let the new rule apply to Senate Bills only, I would not object to it at all."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is April 4th, we convened sometime in January and I've been having a difficult time since January trying to find a subject in which I could agree with the Gentleman from Cook, the Gentleman across the isle. And finally I have found a subject upon which I can agree with him. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in 1965 this Legislature took a giant step forward in passing the Fiscal Note Act. It's in the revised statutes. Now, Mr. Speaker and



Members of the House, in the meantime, we acknowledged the worthwhileness of that Act enabling us to determine the fiscal implication of a Bill by summarizing that Act and placing it in the rules. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by further amending the rules with respect to the Fiscal Note Act was simply putting the cart before the horse. It seems to me that if there are any amendments to be made to the fiscal note procedure they ought to be made to the Act itself and not to the rules. Otherwise, we have a conflict and there will just be confusion. I respectfully suggest that this amendment to the rules be defeated and if the Gentleman desires to improve the Fiscal Note Act that he file a Bill to do so. And I would join with the Gentleman from Cook, my across the seat aisle mate who on April 4th has finally discovered the truth and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

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

Speaker Pierce: "The Sponsor, Mr. Friedrich, indicates he'll yield for a question."

Skinner: "Have you repealed the rule that...the rule Amendment that Penny Pullen put in last year that the fiscal notes would have to be printed in the digest?"

Friedrich: "No we haven't."

Skinner: "Alright, then they will still be printed in the digest?"

Friedrich: "If...if and when they are requested and ordered, yes."

Skinner: "Alright, well I...I don't know what all the hassle is about on this amendment. It doesn't seem bad to me, it seems like an improvement."

Friedrich: "Well..."

Skinner: "If...if the Members of the Legislature who oppose this want to wait just a little while, the Legislative



Council will have a report out, the...rough copy of which I've read which indicates that the Fiscal Note Act looks like sort of a piece of swiss cheese, at least the way it is applied in the Illinois General Assembly. This seems to me to be a step in the right direction. I certainly think it ought to be added to the statutes. But if we put it in the rules it means we agree upon it. I see no reason to exempt House rules. The first Bill I had...I introduced that required a fiscal note was House Bill 188. the...the Tax Relief Act for Senior Citizens, and I asked for the fiscal note, I got the fiscal note before the Committee hearing. I see no reason any other Sponsor couldn't do the same thing. We're going on a vacation in about two weeks. All one has to do is send a letter to every agency that one has a Bill concerning asking them how much it will cost. I don't...I don't understand what the big deal is. I don't see why we don't support this. I don't think people should be screaming against it."

Speaker Pierce: "I didn't hearing anyone screaming but..."

Representative Friedrich to close."

Friedrich: "Well this...this sets up an orderly procedure to do what the statute requires you to do now. Now the reason that we propose to suspend this rule is that here it is on April the 3rd at...adopt the rules, they should have been adopted a long time ago and we wouldn't have this particular problem. But this way, to go over the procedure as it will be with this amended rule, the Reference Bureau will stamp those Bills which require a fiscal note. When that's done it is the responsibility of the Sponsor to tell the Clerk that he wants to order a fiscal note and the Clerk will do that from the proper agency. Then when the Bill goes to a Committee hearing you'll have the fiscal note then, not when it gets up on Second Reading in the House. Now it's obvious that if



this rule was in force now, it would delay those Bills presently in Committee and that's not the intent. We just want to put it in the permanent rules so that there will be a orderly process for the requesting and the use of fiscal notes as required by the statute."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #45. All those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion to adoption Amendment #45, 30 'aye' votes, 83 voting 'nay' and the amendment is defeated. Amendment 46...next amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 46, Friedrich, amends House Resolution 67 as amended by inserting the following sentence at the end of..."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich. You withdraw Amendment #46? Alright. The Gentelman from Friedrich as moved the...for leave...from Marion to withdraw Amendment #46. Leave. Next amendment Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien "Amendment #47, Hoxsey, amends House Resolution 67 by inserting after the second sentence in Rule 27 the following...so forth."

Speaker Pierce: "The Lady from LaSalle, Ms. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #47 says 'No Member may be the Principal Sponsor or Joint Principal Sponsor of more than ten Bills other than Appropriation Bills in any Calendar year. Bills introduced prior to the adoption of this provision into the House Rules shall not count against the limitation provided herein.' I suggest to you that with 177 Members of this House, if they only introduce ten of their very best pieces of legislation the quality of legislation going out of this General Assembly would be considerably improved. I ask your favorable vote."



Speaker Pierce: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf."

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

Speaker Pierce: "She indicates that she will."

Wolf: "Yes, could you tell me how you would take care of a situation, you introduce a Bill to do a particular thing and you have to put in a series of Bills, possibly twenty or thirty, because you have to amend twenty or thirty different Acts in order to accomplish that goal. How is that going to effect that particular situation?"

Hoxsey: "Are you talking about amendments or Bills?"

Wolf: "No, I'm talking about..."

Hoxsey: "I'm talking about substantive Bills."

Wolf: "I'm talking about a Bill. You want to put a Bill in to do with certain things sometimes you have to put in series of 10, 15, 20 Bills because you have to put in a Bill for the Municipal Code, the School Code for this to accomplish the same thing you have to put in separate Bills."

Hoxsey: "Well..."

Wolf: "I had one once that was a series of 24 Bills. I had one idea and it took 24 Bills to try to do it."

Hoxsey: "I would...I would suggest to you, Mr. Wolf, that with 177 Members that maybe that don't all have ten Bills. Also maybe some of them can be put in in a form of an amendment."

Wolf: "That's what I'm afraid of. They go in as amendments, they never get to Committee and you never discuss them."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I rise in opposition to the Lady's Amendment. I certainly can understand her desire to reduce the work load of the House and to reduce the number of Bills that are considered during each Session of the Legislature. However, I do feel that this would



be an undue infringement upon the right of each individual Member to offer proposals and ideas for our consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, I certainly will respect Representative Hoxsey and what she's trying to do here. I just remember last year I had fifteen Bills from the Department of Transportation on highway easements. That would have been the end of my Session last time if...if I would have had to abide by it. And I don't know how you control this by a specific number. I wish there was a way to do it. We've got sixty-nine hundred and I think everyone here agrees that's too many Bills for any legislative Body to consider in one Session. But how...I think we all know the problem, we don't know the solution. I don't believe this is it."

Speaker Pierce: "Any further discussion. The Chair recognizes the Lady from LaSalle to close."

Hoxsey: "Yes, I simply say that to send out quality legislation out of this General Assembly seems like an obligation. And unless we limit ourselves, I don't see that that's going to get done. We get more pieces of legislation in here and I don't they're any better quality. I ask for your vote."



Speaker Pierce: "The Lady from LaSalle moves the adoption of Amendment 47. All those in support will vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 32 'aye' votes, 88 'no' votes, and Amendment 47 is defeated. Any further amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #48. Ropp."

Speaker Pierce: "With respect to Amendment 48, who is the Sponsor? Mr. Ropp?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Ropp."

Speaker Pierce: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill was introduced...this amendment was introduced a couple of months ago, and it was stated House Bill 67 as an amendment, and when I just found out, today, having received my big series of Resolutions to House...to House Resolution 67, it was not in it. So, I checked up with the Clerk's desk, and it stated that...it gave me that explanation that it was a House Bill rather than a House Rule Amendment. So, I, right away this morning, took it down to the Reference Bureau and had it redrafted, and by the time I got it up again, Representative Schlickman's Amendment was passed, which stopped this at 47, but I did go ahead and introduce it as 40...48 then. I ask leave to consider this, since I initially went through all the proper procedures early enough, and it was just in error in two words, that I would ask for consideration, then I'd go ahead and explain it."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from McLean has asked leave to consider Amendment 48. Is there leave? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I hate to do it to the good Member, but I object. We started with the Rules today when we began this whole show, and when we...when we..."

Speaker Pierce: "This is the only one in this category..."



Matijevich: "So, if I don't object, somebody else will, so..."

Speaker Pierce: "Well, an object... Well, an objection is made by Representative Matijevich, and the Gentleman moves for leave to suspend the Rules. On the motion, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I am the one who made the motion earlier to terminate the consideration this evening of amendments to the Resolution beyond Amendment #47. I was concerned, as was the Gentleman from Lake, as to what had happened in previous sessions. I am advised, number 1, that this is the last amendment. No other amendment has been filed. Number two, I am advised, that the Gentleman had previously had filed this amendment a number of weeks ago, but through an inadvertency on the part of the Reference Bureau, it was designated an amendment to House Bill 67, rather than to House Resolution 67, and that inadvertency was not discovered until after I had made my motion, and I would join with the Gentleman in asking for the leave of the House for consideration of this one amendment."

Speaker Pierce: "Representative from... Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I remove my objection."

Speaker Pierce: "All right. Do we have unanimous consent? All right. Leave is granted pursuant to unanimous consent, and the Gentleman may proceed with the amendment."

Ropp: "All right. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I want to thank you very much. What this does is, after our normal opening procedure by the Speaker and after we have the prayer, we then would have the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States' Flag. It seems to me that this is very appropriate and that we have a number of club groups, civic groups, young people in high schools, in schools throughout the state that are continuing trying to become good citizens, and, certainly, this is a part of it. And,



I think that we, as Members of this House, can show this kind of citizenship that deserves to be shown throughout the state, and I think we can serve as an example in this regard, and I urge your support."

Speaker Pierce: "All right. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer "

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. With all due respect to the Gentleman who is sponsoring this amendment, I would say that I spent twelve years in school pledging allegiance to the Flag every single morning, was happy to do so, and I think it's a fine habit to engrain in our children. I don't know of any other legislative Body that does this. The Congress does not do it, and if...you know, if we adopt this then someone may decide we all want to sing 'America'. When we take our oath of office, when we're sworn in, we swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Illinois and I really think that that is enough to show our patriotism. I don't know what this would prove exactly. I just don't think that we should vote for this, and I, again, say with all due respect for the Gentleman submitting it."

Speaker Pierce: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe this is the greatest Bill, or amendment to a Bill, or to a Rule, or anything that we've had in the two or three years I've been here, and I urge your support. Thank you."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you all think it's so great, why the hell aren't you here when we start? I'm here, and I've pushed about a thousand buttons in violation of the rules, because I know you're going to be here. You're not going to be here. I'm going to be here. Now, it's all right, but the next thing you're going to want to do is have a



band here for me to sing the national anthem, because that's...because you're going to all make all kinds of hay to your conservative friends. Now, it's all right, but, again, it's something that's not needed. You know, we're all Americans. Every one of us. We all uphold the Constitution. Do we have to prove it? I mean, it's all good, but it isn't needed. Believe me, it's not needed. Do you have to tell your constituents that you're going to pledge allegiance to show that you're American? We're all Americans. We don't have to prove it, and I think it's a rule change that isn't needed, and I'm as good American as any one of you. And, not only that, I'm going to be here, and all of you that were clapping say it's a damn good amendment, you're not going to be here."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're all aware that the Gentleman from Lake will be here, and if he's troubled by the need to run the Pledge of Allegiance, I would suggest that his colleague, Representative DiPrima, could teach it to him. The fact that this is not done anywhere else, probably underscores that we are embarking upon something rather unique, original, and, pardon the word, patriotic. I think it's a good idea. I think it's a grand...I think it's a grand change in the rules. I think it would be a symbol. And, John, this might be just the thing that it would take to get me here in the morning."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley."

Stanley: "Yeah, I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from, from Cook has moved the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor will say 'aye'. Opposed. And, the...and the Sponsor will close. The Gentleman from McLean."

Ropp: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representa-



tive Matijevich, you and I will both be here early, and we can say it together, and I think that might be a start. It doesn't take an awful lot of people to develop and to encourage greater patriotism in, not only this state or this chamber, but throughout the country, and I think we continually need more and greater statesmanship and patriotism, which our country certainly justly deserves, and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 48. Mr....The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, do you..."

Ryan: "Well, I was going to suggest that we stand in recess till we can get Colonel DiPrima back before we vote on this, but that might be not in orders."

Speaker Pierce: "I'll say it's not in order. The Gentleman has moved the...The Gentleman from McLean has moved the adoption of Amendment 48. On the question, all those in favor will say 'aye'. Opposed. The Clerk will take a... the record. All those in support will vote 'aye'. Oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 68 Americans voting 'aye', 60 otherwise voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. Representative Marovitz, do you want to say something? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, do you have a parliamentary inquiry?"

Marovitz: "I hate to do this, Mr. Speaker, but I...you know, really, I think there's a lot of votes up there that aren't there, and I'm going to verify the Roll Call, because I think this is absurd, and if you want to take a new Roll Call and dump it and have a fair Roll Call, then I won't verify it."

Speaker Pierce: "All...All right. We will take...I noticed Mr. DiPrima is on the floor. He's recorded as voting, so this is our last amendment of the evening Gentlemen, and the Clerk will take another Roll Call. All in favor vote



'aye'. Opposed will vote 'no'. This is a record vote. Let's not vote any switches that aren't here. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this amendment there's 63 'aye' votes, 64 'no' votes, and the amendment is defeated. Mr. Hudson is...The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I just wanted to explain my vote."

Speaker Pierce: "No, explanation of votes are out of order. We suspended that rule. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman has that right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, you've ruled beyond that order of business, and a new Member ought to understand that he's been given consideration on this matter already. Mr. Speaker, could we move to final adoption?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Clerk, can I announce the result of that vote? The Gentleman can ask for a verification. Representative...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, fair is fair. The Gentleman was trying to get recognition and you gave him a very fast gavel. I'm sure it wasn't on purpose, but you did so. I think you should give him the opportunity..."

Speaker Pierce: "He has the right for a verification, not to explain his vote, though."

Collins: "He wants a poll of the absentees. He was seeking recognition when you announced the result, and..."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman was not on his feet. It's too late for a poll of the absentees, but we can take a verification. The Clerk will verify the affirmative votes. Negative vote. The prevailing side."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Alexander. E. M. Barnes. Jane



Barnes. Beatty. Bowman. Bradley. Brady. Breslin.
 Bullock. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton.
 Currie. Dawson. Deuster. Doyle. John Dunn. Farley.
 Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan.
 Harris. Hoffman. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz.
 Keane. Kornowicz. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Lechowicz.
 Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich.
 McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Murphy. O'Brien.
 Patrick. Pouncey. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schneider.
 Sharp. Steczko. Taylor. Telcser. Van Duyne. Vitek.
 Walsh. White. Willer. Williams. And Sam Wolf."

Speaker Pierce: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from
 Champaign, Mr. Johnson, rise?"

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded on this?"

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

Johnson: "Change me to 'aye'!"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from...for what reason does
 the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Redmond, rise?"

Redmond: "The Gentleman votes 'no'. Mr. Redmond from DuPage.
 Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from St. Clair...The Gentleman
 from DuPage...The Speaker voted 'no'. The Gentleman from
 St. Clair, Representative Flinn, for what reason do you
 arise, Sir?"

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, change me from 'aye' to 'no' then.

Speaker Pierce: "All right. The Gentleman from...The Gentle-
 man changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative
 Flinn. Representative...The Gentleman from Cook, Repre-
 sentative Mahar, for what reason do you arise, Sir?"

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

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

Mahar: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman votes 'aye'. For what reason
 does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian,
 rise?"



Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified as 'no'. I have to leave."

Speaker Pierce: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be verified as 'no'? Leave is granted. The Gentleman from Cook, Re...Please change the acting Speaker from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Pierce from Lake. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, for what reason do you arise, Sir?"

Ropp: "I rise to..."

Speaker Pierce: "Proceed with the verif..."

Ropp: "...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to check some of these who aren't actually here that are voting 'no'."

Speaker Pierce: "All right. We'll be ready for you in a moment. We have some...We have some Gentlemen...Representative...The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Votes 'aye'."

Speaker Pierce: "All right. Representative...The Gentleman from McLean is recognized on his verification of the negative vote."

Ropp: "Okay. Beatry?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman is in his seat. Standing."

Ropp: "Breslin?"

Speaker Pierce: "Is the...Is the Lady from LaSalle in the chamber?"

Ropp: "Garmisa? Okay."

Speaker Pierce: "Remove the Lady from LaSalle. Is the Gentleman from Cook in his seat? I don't see the Gentleman from Cook. He will be removed."

Ropp: "Garmisa? Garmisa?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa, is not in the chamber. He will be removed."

Ropp: "Getty?"

Speaker Pierce: "Garmisa. Garmisa. Now, take him off."

Ropp: "Greiman?"



Speaker Pierce: "Let's go a little slower now. After Garnisa who was your first one?"

Ropp: "Sir? Getty."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook is in his seat. Mr. Getty."

Ropp: "Greiman?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentle...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, in the chamber? All right. Mr. Clerk, there may have...Can you give us the recalls at the beginning of the verification?"

Unknown: "Dilatory."

Speaker Pierce: "What the vote was at the beginning of the verification? Yeah. All right. All right, continue with the verification."

Ropp: "Hanahan?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from McHenry, in the hall. Take him off the record. How does the...How does the count stand now, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hanahan voted 'no'."

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Garnisa's back in the hall. The Clerk will place him...We'll put him back on the record."

Ropp: "Hanahan? Hanahan?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Hanahan has been removed."

Ropp: "Greiman?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Greiman has been removed."

Ropp: "Harris?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Harris? The Gentleman from Marion (sic), Mr. Harris? Remove him from the record. For what reason does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, rise?"

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, even though I say the Pledge of Allegiance in my district office to the flag that I have there, I think that it would be appropriate in the House chamber, too, and I'd like to be changed to 'aye'."

Speaker Pierce: "All right. Mr. Deuster has voted 'aye'."

Ropp: "Did he knock him off?"



Speaker Pierce: "Okay. Lead the Clerk. Greiman has been removed."

Ropp: "Breslin?"

Speaker Pierce: "Breslin has been removed. The Gentleman..."

Ropp: "Greiman? Hanahan?"

Speaker Pierce: "And Hanahan has been removed."

Ropp: "Harris?"

Speaker Pierce: "Harris? And Harris has been removed. For what reason does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, arise?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have my vote, which is presently an 'aye' recorded, changed to a 'no' vote."

Speaker Pierce: "Mrs. Braun will be changed from 'aye' to 'nay'. It's Braun. The Gentleman may proceed with his verification."

Ropp: "Jaffe?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Jaffe in the chamber? The Clerk will remove him from the Roll."

Ropp: "Kozubowski?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski, in the chamber? Clerk will remove him from the Roll."

Ropp: "Lechowicz?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, in the chamber? Clerk will remove him from the Roll."

Ropp: "Leon?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Leon's in his seat as usual."

Ropp: "Pouncey?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Pouncey, is in his seat as usual."

Ropp: "Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Lady from Champaign, Miss Satterthwaite, in the chamber? Remove Representative Satterthwaite."

Ropp: "Van Duyne?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman is in the chamber. Representative Van Duyne is here."

Ropp: "Alexander?"



Speaker Pierce: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Alexander, is on the aisle."

Ropp: "Barnes? Gene Barnes?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, in the chamber? Eugene Barnes. Will...E. Barnes will be removed."

Ropp: "Doyle?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Doyle, in the chamber? He'll be removed. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, arise?"

Ewell: "Would you record me as 'no'?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, votes 'no'. Raymond Ewell."

Ropp: "Stuffle?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman in the hall? The Gentleman from Coles (sic), Mr. Stuffle? Clerk will remove him from the record."

Ropp: "Christensen?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Christensen, in the hall?"

Unknown: "Wait, wait, wait, wait."

Speaker Pierce: "Clerk will remove him from the record."

Unknown: "Stuffle wasn't on, was he? Dan, Stuffle wasn't on, so you can't remove him."

Speaker Pierce: "All right. All right."

Ropp: "Christensen?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Christensen, in the hall."

Ropp: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Pierce: "Remove him from the record."

Ropp: "McGrew?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. McGrew...Mr. McGrew is in his seat."

Ropp: "Leverenz?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Leverenze is in the back of the hall,



waving wildly. Any further...?"

Ropp: "Farley?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Representative from Cook, Mr. Farley, is in the back."

Ropp: "Is that him?"

Speaker Pierce: "In the shadows, and..."

Ropp: "Dunn? John Dunn?"

Speaker Pierce: "John Dunn is in the...in the chamber."

Ropp: "Okay."

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Clerk, how do we stand? The Gentleman is...The Ge...Mr. Dunn is in the chamber. 64 'ayes', 57 'nos', and the Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Anderson. Balanoff."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Proceed Mr. Clerk. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bell. Birchler. Birkinbine. Boucek. Bower. Brummer. Campbell. Collins. Conti. Darrow. Dawson. Deuster. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Woodyard. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hannig. Hoxsey. Hudson. Johnson. Dave Jones. Kelly. Kent. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Mulcahey. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Schlickman. Simms. Skinner. Slape. Stanley. C. M. Stiehl. Sumner. Swanstrom. Tuerk. Vinson. Watson. Winchester. And J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Pierce: "Who...who will verify the Affirmative Roll Call? Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Pierce: "Is the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Pierce: "Remove him from the record."



Marovitz: "Representative Johnson?"

Speaker Pierce: "Tim Johnson? The Gentleman from Champaign in the chamber? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Pierce: "Remove him from the record."

Marovitz: "Representative Dawson?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dawson, in the chamber? He's in the chamber."

Marovitz: "Representative Skinner?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman is in the hall."

Marovitz: "Representative Stanley?"

Speaker Pierce: "Is...Is the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stanley, in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Pierce: "Remove him from the record."

Marovitz: "Representative Reilly?"

Speaker Pierce: "Is...Is the Gentleman from Jackson (sic) in the hall? Jacksonville, in the hall? Morgan. Gentleman from Morgan in the hall? How's he recorded? Reilly. Reilly. Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, is he in the hall?"

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

Speaker Pierce: "Remove him from the record."

Marovitz: "Representative Steele? Everett Steele?"

Speaker Pierce: "Representative Steele. Everett Steele in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

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

Marovitz: "Well, I knew he wasn't here. Representative McBroom?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, in the hall? I don't...Clerk will remove him... How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Pierce: "Remove him from the record."

Marovitz: "Representative Schlickman? I'm sorry."



Representative Macdonald?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Lady is in the front."

Marovitz: "Representative Piel?"

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Piel is in the back."

Marovitz: "Representative Margalus?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook is in the back."

Marovitz: "Representative Ackerman?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman is right in his seat. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom, has returned. How do you wish to vote, Mr. McBroom? He will be restored to the record as an 'aye' vote."

Marovitz: "Is...How is Representative Brady recorded?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, I do not ...How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Marovitz: "I don't challenge him. Hey! Hey! Just wanted to know how he was feeling. Representative Ebbesen?"

Speaker Pierce: "Just as soon as the..."

Marovitz: "Representative Ebbesen?"

Speaker Pierce: "...the verification of that vote, he can leave."

Marovitz: "Representative Ebbesen?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Marovitz: "No, that's Kempiners. You don't look that much alike, though. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Pierce: "Remove him from the record."

Marovitz: "Representative Mahar?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook,...He's in his seat. The Gentleman from...from Kane (sic), Mr. Kempiners, are you seeking recognition?"

Kempiners: "I'm seeking recognition. I represent Kane, but I live in Will. Please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Kempiners, from Will, votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, for what reason do you arise, Mr.



Collins?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest you knock Representative Brady off. The real Speaker has consistently ruled the verification as not completed until you announce the final result."

Speaker Pierce: "Mr. Brady remains on, because that had been completed. Mr. Marovitz, any more?"

Marovitz: "Representative Wolf?"

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman is in his seat."

Marovitz: "Where do we stand right now?"

Speaker Pierce: "We stand with you completing your verification."

Marovitz: "Can the Clerk tell me what the..."

Speaker Pierce: "60 'ayes', 57 'nays' with Mr. Rigney seeking recognition. Mr. Rigney, the Gentleman is recognized to vote 'aye'. If there's nothing further,..."

Marovitz: "God bless America."

Speaker Pierce: "No...no...no further verifications? The... Mr. Clerk. 61 'ayes', 57 'nos', and Amendment 48 is adopted. The Chair recognizes Repre...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, on House...to close on House Resolution 67."

Katz: "Mr. Speak..."

Speaker Pierce: "As amended."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I do now move the adoption of House Resolution 67 as amended."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of House Resolution 67 as amended. All in favor will vote 'aye'. Opposed, 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Someone will vote the Gentleman from Lake 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, for what reason do you arise, Sir?"

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just hope that under these rules there will be liberty and justice for all."



Speaker Pierce: "And equality as well."

Katz: "Touche."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from Cook, who's in a hurry to get out of here, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I've been asked by Representative Watson to express his gratitude to certain anonymous Members."

Speaker Pierce: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Lake, my county chairman, arise? Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "That rule change just changes...puts that in the Order of Business. But, we don't know who's going to pledge allegiance, and Phil Collins said he's going to teach me. Well, I'd just like to have him here everyday and do it then, because that's one way of getting him here. Now, I'm going to be here. You be here out there Phil, and you do it."

Speaker Pierce: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, desires to vote 'aye'. On this motion there are 118 'ayes' 20 'nays', and the House Resolution 67, as amended, is adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to move that we adjourn till...the Clerk needs two minutes. The Gentleman from Cook is recognized to move that we adjourn till 10 a. m."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, are there any further announcements?"

Speaker Pierce: "Are there any further announcements, Committee Chairmen? The Clerk needs two or three minutes to close, and Mr. Madigan is recognized."

Madigan: "Do you have anything to add, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Pierce: "Pardon?"

Madigan: "Do you have anything to add?"

Speaker Pierce: "I recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "I am now allowing time for the Clerk, and now I'll move that we adjourn till 10 a. m. tomorrow morning."



Speaker Pierce: "I consent. All those in favor say 'aye'.

The House stands adjourned subject to a perfunctory session of two minutes till 10 a. m. tomorrow, Thursday."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee reports. Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I wished the following Bills were referred action taken April 4, 1979 reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'Do pass' House Bill 839. Representative Emil Jones, Chairman of the Committee on Insurance wished the following Bills were referred action taken April 4, 1979 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' House Bill 962, 'do pass as amended' House Bill 961. Representative Schneider, Chairman of the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education wished the following Bills were referred action taken April 4, 1979 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do not pass' House Bill 680, 'do pass as amended' House Bill 685, Interim Study House Bill 880 and 169. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 04, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0021	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-0046	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0062	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0086	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0316	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-0382	2ND READING	PAGE	7
HB-0388	2ND READING	PAGE	7
HB-0461	2ND READING	PAGE	8
HB-0550	2ND READING	PAGE	16
HB-0567	2ND READING	PAGE	14
HB-0591	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0592	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0593	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0594	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-0595	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-0604	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-0672	2ND READING	PAGE	14
HB-0687	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-0688	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-0689	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-0708	2ND READING	PAGE	14
HB-0716	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-0747	2ND READING	PAGE	14
HB-0804	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-1436	1ST READING	PAGE	1
HB-1437	1ST READING	PAGE	1
HB-1438	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1439	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1440	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1441	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1442	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1443	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1444	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1445	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1446	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1447	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1448	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1449	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1450	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-1451	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1452	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1453	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1454	1ST READING	PAGE	3

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 04, 1979

HB-1455	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1456	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1457	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1458	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1459	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1460	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1461	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1462	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1463	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1464	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HB-1465	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1466	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1467	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1468	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1469	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1470	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1471	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1472	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1473	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HB-1474	1ST READING	PAGE	63
HB-1475	1ST READING	PAGE	63
HB-1476	1ST READING	PAGE	63
HB-1477	1ST READING	PAGE	63
HB-1478	1ST READING	PAGE	63
HB-1479	1ST READING	PAGE	63
HB-1480	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1481	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1482	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1483	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1484	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1485	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1486	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1487	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1488	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1489	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1490	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1491	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1492	1ST READING	PAGE	64

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 04, 1979

PAGE 3

	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1493	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1494	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1495	1ST READING	PAGE	64
	1ST READING	PAGE	64
HB-1496	1ST READING	PAGE	65
	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1497	1ST READING	PAGE	65
	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1498	1ST READING	PAGE	65
	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1499	1ST READING	PAGE	65
	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1500	1ST READING	PAGE	65
	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1501	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1502	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1503	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1504	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1505	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1506	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1507	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1508	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1509	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1510	1ST READING	PAGE	65
HB-1511	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1512	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1513	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1514	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1515	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1516	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1517	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1518	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1519	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1520	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1521	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1522	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1523	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1524	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1525	1ST READING	PAGE	66
HB-1526	1ST READING	PAGE	66

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 04, 1979

PAGE 4

HB-1527	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1528	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1529	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1530	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1531	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1532	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1533	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1534	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1535	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1536	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1537	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1538	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1539	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1540	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1541	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1542	1ST READING	PAGE	67
HB-1543	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1544	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1545	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1546	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1547	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1548	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1549	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1550	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1551	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1552	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1553	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1554	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1555	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-1556	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1557	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1558	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1559	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1560	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1561	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1562	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1563	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1564	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1565	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1566	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1567	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1568	1ST READING	PAGE	69
HB-1569	1ST READING	PAGE	70

HB-1570	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1571	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1572	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1573	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1574	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1575	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1576	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1577	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1578	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1579	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1580	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1581	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1582	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1583	1ST READING	PAGE	70
HB-1584	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1585	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1586	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1587	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1588	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1589	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1590	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1591	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1592	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1593	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1594	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1595	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1596	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1597	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1598	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1599	1ST READING	PAGE	71
HB-1600	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1601	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1602	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1603	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1604	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1605	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1606	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1607	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1608	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1609	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1610	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1611	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1612	1ST READING	PAGE	72

HB-1613	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1614	1ST READING	PAGE	72
HB-1615	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1617	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1618	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1619	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1620	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1621	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1622	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1623	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1624	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1625	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1626	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1627	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1628	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1629	1ST READING	PAGE	73
HB-1630	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1631	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1632	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1633	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1634	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1635	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1636	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1637	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1638	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1639	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1640	1ST READING	PAGE	74
EB-1641	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1642	1ST READING	PAGE	74
HB-1643	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1644	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1645	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1646	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1647	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1648	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1649	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1650	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1651	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1652	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1653	1ST READING	PAGE	75
HB-1654	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1655	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1656	1ST READING	PAGE	76

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 04, 1979

PAGE 7

HB-1657	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1658	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1659	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1660	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1661	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1662	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1663	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1664	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1665	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1666	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1667	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1668	1ST READING	PAGE	76
HB-1669	1ST READING	PAGE	77
HB-1670	1ST READING	PAGE	77
HB-1671	1ST READING	PAGE	77
HB-1672	1ST READING	PAGE	77
HB-1673	1ST READING	PAGE	77
HB-1674	1ST READING	PAGE	77
HB-1675	1ST READING	PAGE	77
SB-0072	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-0138	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-0153	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-0252	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HR-0067	2ND READING	PAGE	81
	3RD READING	PAGE	202
HR-0170	1ST READING	PAGE	78
HJR-0032	1ST READING	PAGE	78

HR 47
motion pg 78

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 04, 1979

PAGE 8

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
APPROVAL OF JOURNALS	PAGE	15
SUSPEND POSTING REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMITTEE HEARING	PAGE	59
EXCUSED ABSENCE	PAGE	60
EXCUSED ABSENCE	PAGE	61
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	63
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	77
MOTION TO CUT OFF AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 67	PAGE	78
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	204
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	204
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	204