

1.

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: "The House will come to order. Members will please be in their seats. Roll Call for attendance.

Your own switch only. We will be led in prayer by the Clerk, Jack O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Let us pray. Lord, bless this House and all those who serve and work here. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record on the Roll Call. We will be led in prayer by the Reverend.... not the Reverend... Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, Ralph: "What do you want, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Pledge of Allegiance."

Dunn, Ralph: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands. One nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "I just got a message from on high, that the Clerk's prayer was not heard. So we will be led by the Chaplain, Reverend Krueger."

Krueger: "In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. James Madison, the fourth President of the United States said: 'A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who need to be their own governors must arm themselves with power which knowledge gives. Let us pray. Almighty God, the source of all wisdom and knowledge, Who art the giver of all good things and without whom none may live..... none may have life or being; we praise Thee for the most excellent gift of knowledge which though hast bestowed upon those who here serve Thee as Members of this Illinois House of Representatives.



Grant, O Lord, that they may be constant and vigorous in gathering reputable information that will afford them sufficient knowledge to enact such legislation that will be only for the good of the people of this State of Illinois and consonant with Thy most perfect will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, First Reading. You can take me on 937 and 938."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 788, Kane-Donovan. A Bill for an Act to create the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 799, Bowman-Kempiners. A Bill..... new Act requesting the Illinois Economic Fiscal Commission to prepare state data impact notes. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 800, Bowman-Kempiners. A Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 829, Marovitz. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to return.... relating to return of security deposit. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 860, Rea. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Realtor's Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 861, Sharp-Rea. A Bill for an Act in relation to surface coal mining fees and uses of these fees. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 871, Taylor. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 882, McAuliffe. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 950, Taylor. A Bill for an Act to amend the Health and Hospital Governing Commission Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 937, Redmond. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for expense of the General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 938, Redmond. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Speaker of the House and



the President of the Senate. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 967, Kornowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Personal Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 971, Farley. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 841, Matijevich. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the expenses of the State Comptroller. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading.... appears House Bill 447. Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Yes. House Bill 447. A Bill for an Act creating the School District Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly." Requests permission to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: Amendment #2, Reilly. Amends House Bill 447 on page 8, line 19 by deleting 'not less than one-half of'."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, I would withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Reilly. Amends House Bill 447 on page 6, line 16 and 17 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is an Amendment agreed to in Committee by the Majority Leader and myself. This is the School District Income Tax Act that we're dealing with. Amendment #3 simply provides that all of the money collected by the tax would have to go to abate the real property tax. I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Reilly: "Yes."

Skinner: "On whose..... whose property taxes will be reduced?"

Are we going to reduce everybody's property taxes, including business and industry and commerce, or just individuals?"

Reilly: "Just individuals."

Skinner: "All right, I'm happy that you made that explicit because it makes a big difference. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye', opposed, 'no', and the 'ayes' have it. The motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Any other Member with a Bill that.... he wants to return to the Order of Second Reading? What does it do, Cal? Is that a quarrelsome one or is that an easy one? Maybe we better wait until we get a few bodies in here. I don't..... Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "A question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mahar: "Are we.... what's going to happen to priority of call under this new system?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, when we get to Third Reading, we're going to go to priority of call. The Clerk advises me that if we go to priority of call on Second Reading, it's too difficult when they're not in numerical sequence.... it's too difficult to find the Amendments and everything down here in the well. But on Third Reading, we will be on priority of call."

Mahar: "We will be on priority of call with the recommenda-



tions as of yesterday, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I haven't been advised of any results of any recommendations. I think we just have to proceed along the line that..... that....."

Mahar: "Then you say that you're going to be on the priority of call today then, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Until I get... you know, some kind of a list that we're going to do something differently. I don't have any list now. As far as I..... all I have in front of me is this. And it doesn't say anything about short debate or no debate."

Mahar: "Well, I have this. Is this....."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, but that doesn't take into consideration any... any recommendations for addition of further short debate or that no debate recommendation that we have. The point is that we will go.... as soon as we get to Third Order... or to Third Reading, we will go to priority of call according to that."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'm going through here now and trying to figure out what I can take. You're not entirely trustworthy, but.....that's what happened yesterday. Between you and the Minority Leader why....."



Speaker Redmond: "2168 on the Order of Second Reading. Is Daniel on the floor? I guess he's... Take that one out of the record. 2185. Daniels. OK. 2168."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2168. A Bill for an Act to amend the Product Liability Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment number one adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I think that with the short attendance right now, this is a Bill that has some..."

Speaker Redmond: "OK. We'll take it out of the record. Is that your suggestion?"

Daniels: "Well, you know, we're faced with the same problem. If we can get back to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Well. You tell me what to do."

Daniels: "Well let's go ahead."

Speaker Redmond: "2168. Are there any motions with respect to Amendment one?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment number two, Daniels. Amends House Bill 2168 as amended by deleting everything after the enacting clause."

Daniels: "And Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment number two would basically put into House Bill 2168 two very important features of Products Liability namely state of the art defense and a defense of failure to warn. These were discussed in some detail in Committee and it was part of a previous Bill, House Bill 2299, and we've taken out two very important parts of that Bill and incorporated them into two parts into 2168. I would move for the adoption of the same."

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

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Getty: "Representative Daniels, is this a subject matter which



was heard by the Products Liability subcommittee and voted down? Is that correct?"

Daniels: "Well no, it's not correct the way you stated it. This is part of House Bill 2299. Two parts of that encompassing Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is entering the chamber."

Daniels: "And in that Bill there were a series of items listed two of those are state of the art and failure to warn and these are two of those items in House Bill 2299. As you know, that was the manufacturers Bill and the Chamber of Commerce Bill proposed for their comprehensive legislation dealing on the issue of Products Liability. That failed to clear subcommittee by a vote of three to two and was not voted on in the full Committee."

Getty: "So, what you're doing is taking a Bill which was voted out of Committee, 2168, agreed upon by the Committee. You're gutting it and using this as a vehicle to put on a Bill which was not voted out of Committee. Is that correct sir?"

Daniels: "No. What I am doing, correctly stated, is I am taking a portion of House Bill 2299 containing two provisions called state of the art and failure to warn which are backed by the Chamber of Commerce and the Illinois Manufacturers Association out of their comprehensive Bill. I am taking those two provisions and asking that it be placed on House Bill 2168. The reason for that is the motion to discharge was not heard on the last day to get Bills out of Committee and, furthermore; because the chairman of the Committee at that time did not allow a substitution of two republican members. We were operating with four members and that's why I'm doing it in this mechanism, in this manner. I would have preferred to have heard 2299 in Committee and on the motion of discharge, but because of the actions on the day which you're fully aware of, Mr. Getty, I am



forced to do it in this manner."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, if I look at the Amendment which Representative Daniels is proposing, I am suggesting to you that it is out of order and I would question whether it is in proper order and whether it is germane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "I have questioned whether this Amendment is proper as to the form."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian here? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction departing the chamber up here to our left is the Limestone School from Limestone, Illinois. represented by Representative Christensen, McBroom, and myself. And I'm sorry I didn't get to you a little earlier gang, but welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Redmond: "After referring the matter to practically all the lawyers in the House, we've come to the conclusion that the Amendment is in proper form. I think that the title of the Bill is pretty awful, but... Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well Mr. Speaker then on the merits of the proposed Amendment. I would like to call out to the, point out to the Membership that last year very extensive changes in Product Liability Law were undertaken. Those changes and limitations are in effect now. We have not had a sufficient period of time to determine what the totality of those changes in law. This proposed Amendment by Representative Daniels would be the same as that which this House would not pass in the past and which was rejected by the subcommittee and I would suggest to you that in this area, that deals so deeply in the rights of consumers, in the rights of the people of the State of Illinois that we would do very well to go very slowly before taking away substantive rights of people and limiting actions which may be taken. And I would ask you to vote against this proposed Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Beatty: "Mr. Sponsor, would you please describe just what this state of the art defense means as a practical matter?"

Daniels: "State of the art makes it mandatory that a point of show, a feasible alternative to the design which he alleges to be defective."

Beatty: "And if there is no alternative, there would be no chance for a liability to attach to the..."

Daniels: "Correct."

Beatty: "How about the failure of warrant. Just what does this mean?"

Daniels: "I'm sorry I didn't hear your question."

Beatty: "Failure to warrant."

Daniels: "Under Subsection A there is no duty to warn of hazards which are clear to users of ordinary skill and judgment for reason of we might be expected to come in contact with a product. That's basically what that Section says."

Beatty: "So in effect if these two Amendments go on, you're really cutting down the opportunity for individuals who make it injured to recover. This is kind of a pro-business or pro-manufacturer and it's the anti-peoples..."

Daniels: "I don't agree with your conclusions. You may feel that way. I feel that's it's only fair, common sense approach. The Appellate Court rulings in Illinois have been somewhat divergent in the area of state of the art and failure to warn. I think it's a clarification and if you're approach is is this a pro-business Bill. Yes. This Bill is supported by the Chamber of Commerce, by the Illinois Manufacturer Association and, yes, in the area of Product Liability this is some of the relief that they're requesting. And as you know, Representative Beatty, in this area these are just two of the provisions



of an encompassing Bill that failed to clear Committee."

Beatty: "Well, I'm not going into the Committee part of it, but I'm just trying to get some discussion here on the fact that if it's pro-business then it is anti-people in the sense that if someone benefits and someone also loses and so what we're doing here is limiting the opportunity for someone who has been seriously injured to make a recovery from someone. That basically true?"

Daniels: "No..."

Beatty: "Limiting the cause of action."

Daniels: "Well, I don't, as I said earlier, I still don't agree with your conclusions. I don't think it's anti-people. What it is is common sense approach and it clarifies and sets forth in clear language what the law in Illinois is instead of relying merely on court interpretation which is where Products Liability came from in the first place."

Beatty: "Thank you."

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

Vinson: "Yes sir Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd just like to make one little point on this Bill and that's where some people would argue that this kind of a Bill affects the ability of some people to recover. I want them to think about how the present law affects millions of people around this state and around this country. What the present law does is to insure that products sell for more. It encourages the rate of inflation. It encourages higher prices in the market place. What this Bill would do is to provide a cap, bring down the cost of products, slow down the rate of increase and in that sense it's better for the average guy in the street."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in opposition to this amendment. As Representative Getty



had indicated, this Amendment would really subvert the Committee process. This thing went to Subcommittee. It was voted down on a vote of three to two. The sponsor then wanted to have a full hearing before the Committee and he was afforded that opportunity, however; the Committee went into Session and because of the fact that there was an appointment it was not recognized by me, the Sponsor plus the full Republican Membership walked out of that Committee. Then the Democratic Membership sat around all morning taking a Roll Call every half hour and we had full attendance in that Committee by the Democratic Members the Sponsor refused to come back into that Committee and have a hearing on this particular Bill because he knew that it would not pass out of that Committee. Now let me say to you that Representative Beatty is absolutely correct. This is an anti-peoples Amendment and that this is for a big business and against people so I would recommend a no vote on this particular Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just a quick question to the Sponsor of the Amendment. Lee, I know that you've been very active in this area. I remember last Session you put on the Amendment of repose and I found out in listening to Representative Vinson what the Bill is about, but would you, in essence, tell me what the Amendment will do? Briefly."

Daniels: "The... Briefly, the Amendment will add two provisions state of the art or a product formula or design which makes mandatory that a plaintiff show a feasible alternative to the design which he alleges to be defective and the second part of the Amendment is it adds a Section called duty to warn. That would be stating in law that there is no duty to warn of hazards which are cleared to users of ordinary skill and judgment who reasonably might be expected to come into contact



with the product and those two Amendments are provisions of Amendment number two are, I think, very reasonable in their approach and would not, in my opinion, contrary to the statements of some of the previous speakers, hurt or seriously damage an injured workers claim. I think a common sense approach and a reasonable clarification of the law."

Huff: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further? Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen I would like to add my voice to the opposition to this Amendment that has already been heard today. I was a Member of the Subcommittee that considered this Bill over a month ago. At that time, considering all of the evidence presented to us the majority of the Subcommittee decided that the Bill hurt people. That it was not good business legislation and it was not good people legislation and we voted no on it. That... The Sponsor of this Amendment had one month to bring that Bill to the full Committee and never had it called before that Committee. Nor has he requested that this Body discharge that Committee on this Bill. Perhaps it has been changed. I don't know. Regardless, I believe that this Sponsor has not acted in good faith with our Committee and I would ask that you vote no on Amendment number two."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "The Lady well knows that there was a motion to discharge file. The Lady well knows that this isn't House Bill 2299 this is mere provision. The Lady is misrepresenting to this Body. There was a motion to discharge. The reason that we weren't able to hear it in Committee was because her Democrat Membership led by Chairman Jaffe would not allow the substitution of two Republicans on the Committee on that day. The Lady well knows that we had a number of issues discussed on that day and she's misrepresenting to this Body."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes. You know, I think it's interesting that the Sponsor points out that the reason it couldn't be heard is because of two Republicans not being there. There was a full anorum of Democrats there. There was a quorum of Members there and certainly the Bill could be heard without two of the Republicans being there. I'm not even sure who he refers to but I know there was one... an effort to substitute one Member contrary to the rules. The Republican himself did not want to be substituted, did not want to be replaced on the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee, Chairman Jaffe had a letter to that affect from that Republican saying, 'I do not in any circumstance want to be allowed a substitution with regard to my Membership on this Committee.'"

Daniels: "Mr. Chairman."

Brummer: "The parliamentarian of this House ruled differently. He ruled that the substitution was..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Let's bring this thing into order. Representative Ewing."

Brummer: "I think there are some red herrings being thrown here. The fact of the matter is Representative, the Sponsor of the Amendment knows that the Bill would not have come out of Committee and therefore he did not call it. He instructed his Republican colleagues to remain out of that Committee so that he could come before this House Membership and say, 'Well we did not have sufficient Members there to get a fair hearing on the Bill'. All the Democrats were there. It was only his colleagues who walked out of that Committee so that he could present this phony argument on the floor. This Bill is a bad Bill. It was a bad Bill in Committee. It did not get voted out of Committee and ought to be defeated here on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."



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

I rise in support of this motion. It doesn't really matter what's coming from the other side of the aisle. This is just a smoke screen to keep from the improvements that is needed in this program. And if they don't go along with a decent Amendment and some responsible legislation in this area, we're going to continue to have a good issue. And each year we have that issue, we get more votes on this side and one day we'll have enough votes to correct this legislation. So I'd say, let's get on with it. We all hear from our constituents. We know what they want and we know what's right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker on a point of order. To accurately portray this, the Sponsor filed a motion to discharge Committee and has indicated that the motion was not heard. And, of course, their reason for that was not heard was because the Sponsor of the motion did not ask that it be heard because he was not hear when the motions were called and I think that he should portray, actually, what happened and not say that he filed the motion and never..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think the point is on the question of the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of this Amendment.

Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree, that is the point and to the Members of the House I don't think we should have any divergence from the real issue. The real issue is Amendment number two and whether or not this Body wants to attach to House Bill 2168 the contents of Amendment number two. What this Amendment does as stated is add products formula or design commonly called state of the art defense and also duty to warn. Those two provisions are reasonable as stated in the Amendment and would give some reasonable approach to the issue of Products Liability. Now these are merely two provisions



out of the compassing full sweeping Bill that was filed earlier, House Bill 2299, that was tabled previously. These are two areas that the Chamber of Commerce in the Illinois Manufacturers Association and manufacturers throughout this state are crying for in relief in the area of Products Liability. If you need further explanation if this amendment is attached to the Bill, I'd be more than happy to sit down with you and discuss it further. In the mean time, I'm asking for your support. I'm asking for your assistance in helping the manufacturers of this state attack a very, very real problem to them in the area of Products Liability and I'm asking for your help right now and your vote and green support. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The questions on the gentleman's motion for the adoption of amendment two. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers. Representative Borchers, aye. Representative Sandquist, aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question there's 80 aye, 77 aye and 80 no. Representative Daniels." Gentleman desires to poll the absentees. Meantime, Representative Ryan do you desire recognition with respect to something at 11:00? Representative Mahar, pardon me."

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask leave for a Republican Conference at 11:00 in room 118 for 30 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yeah, we would have a Democratic Conference at 11:00 in room 114."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley. Capuzzi. Deuster. John Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Gaines. Dave Jones. Kane. Kozubowski.



McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Richmond. Schisler.

Tuerk. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I'd like a verification of the negative roll."

I mean we could start with removing Giddy Dyer."

Speaker Redmond: "I think probably the best way is to have another Roll Call on this and please vote only your own switch. All you're doing is delaying this procedure."

Daniels: "Well, yeah, I... Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Now the first thing we probably have is better is a Roll Call for Attendance. Well that was a 10:00 one. I think we have an amendment to that. Roll Call for Attendance right now. I hope we do. But I have the 10:00 Roll Call. Roll Call for Attendance. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. quorum is present. Now, question will be on the gentlemen's motion for the adoption. Question is on the gentlemen's motion for the adoption of amendment two to House Bill 2168. Those in favor of the motion vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? I don't know what we have to do to suggest that Representative Giddy Dyer is not in her seat. We'll have to dump this Roll Call and do it again. Now please do not depress any switch but your own. Those in favor of the motion vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 66 aye and 76 aye and 62 no and the motion prevailed.. The amendments adopted. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to verify that Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentlemen request a verification of the affirmative Roll Call."

Getty: "Ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "E.M. Barnes. Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Bradley aye."



Clerk Leone: "Capuzi. Chapman. Christensen. Darrow.
John Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Flinn.
Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa, no. Representative
Flinn, aye."

Clerk Leone: "Harris. Hoffman. Dave Jones. Kane. Kelly.
Kornowicz. Kozubowski. Leverenz. Mautino. McAuliffe.
McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Pechous. Richmond.
Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler, aye. Representative
Darrow, no. Schneider, no. Christensen, no. Represent-
ative Kornowicz, no. Representative Kane, no. Represent-
ative Richmond, no. Harris, no. Representative
Huff for what purpose do you rise?"

Huff: "How am I recorded Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Huff: "Change my aye to no."

Speaker Redmond: "Change it to no. Representative VonBoeck-
man."

VonBoeckman: "Would you change my vote from present to no?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the gentleman from present to no.
Representative Taylor. Representative Younge. Represent-
ative Younge, no. Schraeder, no. We're waiting
to get an accurate count. You weren't here at 10:00
either. You're not on my Roll Call. Representative
Pechous, no. Representative Eugenia Chapman, no.
Representative Stuffle. Stuffle. Stuffle."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Stuffle: "Please change me to voting no."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to no. Representative Pierce."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded? Pierce."

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."



Pierce: "Please change me to no."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to no. Representative Ronan.

Change him from aye to no. Representative Leinenweber.

Change him from no to aye. Representative Donovan, no.

What's the count now, Mr. Clerk? Representative Mautino

desires to be recorded as voting aye. Aye is that

correct? Aye. Representative Leverenz, no. Represent-

tative Barnes, no. Representative McMaster, aye.

I'm sure everybody knows what's in this amendment.

Representative Kelly, no. Representative Ray Ewell, no.

78 aye and 83 no. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Verify the negative."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman request the verification of the

negative Roll Call. Don't forget now according to

Hanahans rules, sit in your seat. Everybody sit down.

Representative Daniels leave his microphone open.

Sit in your own seat. We're honored by that very

distinguished Senator, Terry Bruce. Flies his own

airplane. Proceed with the verification of the negative

Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "Will all the gentlemen standing around

Representative Daniels, please sit down. He can't see."

Johnson please sit down. Daniels can't see through you."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty.

Birchler. Bowman. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Brummer.

Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen.

Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico.

Donovan. Doyle. Ewell. Farley. Garmisa. Getty.

Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris.

Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly.

Kornowicz. Kosinski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon.

Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. McClain.

McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas.

O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Rea.

Richmond. Ronan. Schlickman. Satterthwaite. Schneider.



Schraeder. Sharp. Henry. Slape. Stearney. Steczo.
 Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Vitek. VonVoeckman. White.
 Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones. Vote him aye.

Representative Capuzi, no. Representative Gene Hoffman,
 aye. Welcome aboard. Representative Kucharski, no.
 He told us."

Daniels: "We ready, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. Farley. Represent-
 Farley. Representative Getty, what... for what purpose
 do you rise?"

Getty: "Could we have an announcement of what the score is
 right now."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? Representative Willer,
 no. Not yet. 79 aye and 86 no. Is Representative
 Farley here? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off the Roll Call. Any further
 questions? Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. Giorgi here?
 How's he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Daniels: "Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further?"

Daniels: "Did you take Hanahan off?"

Speaker Redmond: "I took, oh, yeah. I didn't here you on
 Hanahan. Hanahan here? Take him off."

Daniels: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Kornowicz here? Kornowicz."

Daniels: "There he is. There he is."

Speaker Redmond: "There's Representative Kornowicz. Put him
 back on. Giorgi is coming into the House, put him back
 on."

Daniels: "I don't think you took Kornowicz off so you don't
 put him back on. Giorgi is back on." Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz is back there."



Daniels: "Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Marovitz here? How's he recorded? He's in the back. Somebody tie Marovitz to his chair."

Daniels: "McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew is here."

Daniels: "Richmond."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Daniels: "VonBoeckman. OK. I see him."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is..."

Daniels: "Yeah, I see him. And Schneider."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. He's the tall, good-looking fellow. There he is. Raise your hand, Representative Schneider. Schneider."

Daniels: "There he is."

Speaker Redmond: "That's Schneider."

Daniels: "OK. Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "Laurino. How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Speaker Redmond: "Here comes Laurino down the middle aisle."

Daniels: "And anyone else who wants to change their vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Looks like John Dale Robinson. What's the count now? 79 aye and 83 no. The motion fails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."



Speaker Redmond: "I guess maybe we'd better adjourn now for the purpose of a conference. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "We have...with leave of the Chair, we have one other Bill on products liability which we can just table the Amendment.... the Floor Amendment and move that back to Third as well, and we'll have these two Bills...."

Speaker Redmond: "Which one is that?"

Daniels: "2362."

Speaker Redmond: "2362? Is there....."

Daniels: "There's a Floor Amendment which we'll table."

Speaker Redmond: "2362. Any motion with respect to the Committee Amendment? Maybe we'd better wait until we get back so we know what we're doing on that. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before you moved on 2186... I would ask if the Sponsor....."

Speaker Redmond: "You mean 2168?"

Getty: "I'm sorry...2168. If the Sponsor wouldn't join me in then reconsidering the motion by which he had moved to table the Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels..... Daniels."

Daniels: "I didn't table Amendment #1."

Getty: "Oh, I'm sorry. It's in the posture that it moved out of Committee?"

Daniels: "Right. And so would 2362 be in the posture that it came out of Committee. Both would be on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we'll.... to make sure we know what we're doing, we'll take that when we get back. Now Representative Ryan has requested a half an hour for a Republican Conference and Representative Greiman a half an hour for a Democratic Conference. So, we will stand in recess until a quarter till twelve."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Democratic Conference in Room 114 is ready to start. Would Democrat Members please proceed



to Room 114."

RECESS

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 2393, Representative Campbell. House Bill 2393. Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Campbell. Amends House Bill 2393 on page 1, line 15 by adding after the word 'citizenship' the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there wasn't any great problems with this Bill at that time, but we did think that it needed to be tightened up just a little bit. And it provides for more frequent home visits on those cases more likely to involve fraud or change of status. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

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

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Chapman. Amends House Bill 2393 on page 1, line 1 and line 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this clarifies the fact that migrants deal with animal husbandry as well as with food. The Amendment is acceptable to the Sponsor and to the Department. I move adoption."

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

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2185. Ewing? 2185. Will you read the Bill...."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2185. A Bill for an Act to add Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: Amendment #2, Mugalian-Greiman. Amends House Bill 2185 as amended, by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you may know, this Bill affects the present law which requires withholding of income paid to nonresident individuals. I believe that the Sponsor of the major b..... of the Bill has tried to work out some kind of way in which certain inconveniences and problems can be avoided; but at the same time tried to retain the income due to Illinois on income tax. I'm afraid that the Bill, in its present form totally fails to protect the revenues of the State of Illinois. And my Amendment, I think is one that will make this a Bill that everyone can live with and will take care of the ma and pa situations and the situations which might cause some inconvenience and which unless amended, would not be cost effective. This is what the Amendment does. As you know, the present law requires withholding of payments to nonresident individuals on income from capital gains, personal services, royalties, copyrights, prizes and lotteries, and so forth. What this Amendment does is this; as to copyrights and royalties and prizes and awards. It makes no change in the present law. And I think the Sponsor of the Bill would not object to that. It would require withholding at 2 1/2%. As to all other sources of in-



come affected, what this Amendment would do is put in a threshold. It provides that any payments in one calendar year made to an individual for any of these other categories of income, would have no withholding or reporting requirements until that figure reached four thousand dollars. It provides that it amounts in excess of four thousand dollars would then be subject to withholding at the 2 1/2% rate. I think this is an Amendment that solves all the problems, that saves the revenues of Illinois, that gets after tax cheats; and still because of the four thousand dollar threshold takes care of any ma and pa situations or other small different situations that the Sponsor of the Bill was concerned with. And I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're talking about one of the most important pieces of legislation which this House will consider for business and for the business climate in the State of Illinois. I have a great deal of respect for the... my colleague who has proposed this Amendment here, but in this case, he's only 100% wrong. I oppose this Amendment vehemently. In fact, the adoption of this Amendment would kill this Bill. We have worked long and hard to come up with a Bill which will safeguard the revenues of this state, but to propose this Amendment would gut that Bill. It's obvious from this explanation of the Amendment, that he doesn't even understand the problem, let alone the solution. Had he wished to make a solution, he could have proposed his own legislation without trying to gut legislation which has been worked out by a number of different groups in this state. Just one example of how ridiculous this Amendment is. His Amendment would require withholding from the proceeds of cattle brought into this state



and sold at our East St. Louis stockyards. These cattle are raised in Missouri, fed in Missouri. The only connection with the State of Illinois is that they're sold here. With the price of beef today, you know it's easy to go over a \$4,000 sale. We would be withholding 2 1/2% of the gross from the sale of these cattle when in fact.... when we consider their connection with the State of Illinois, they might owe one-tenth of one percent of the net profit. We would prepare with this Amendment a horrendous job for the Department of Revenue to straighten this out, to keep track.... and... we'd spend most of the time re-funding money that had been withheld. I would ask then, that this Amendment be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if Representative Ewing would mind yielding for a question. Would that be possible? I know it's not his Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Skinner: "Would Representative Ewing yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He says he will."

Skinner: "I would like to know if that cattle seller would be liable for the Illinois income tax... if he sold the cattle in Illinois."

Ewing: "He is liable for a tax based on the amount of time and the relationship that those cattle have to the State of Illinois. If you have a three year old steer and then the State of Illinois for one day...they would have one.... nine hundredths of a relationship to the State of Illinois. His liability is only then for that percentage of the profit, but the Amendment here would require a 2 1/2% withholding on the gross."

Skinner: "I understand the point you're making. Now, my second question is; isn't some gross amount of dollars that someone receives in income large enough that the



State of Illinois Department..... well, the State of Illinois, us as policy makers.... shouldn't we assume that if \$100,000 changes hands, that there should be some Illinois state income paid on it?"

Ewing: "Yes, and we do in the Bill. But the problem with the Amendment isn't that we shouldn't have withholding, it's just that he sweeps with one light brush across all of Illinois and you can't do it that way."

Skinner: "Well, what minimums do you have in the Bill?"

Ewing: "We don't have minimums. We have certain areas where withholding is required. We have certain areas where reporting is required."

Skinner: "Well, thank you very much."

Ewing: "I mean you can't do it on a minimum basis because that has no relationship to taxable income. You have to....."

Skinner: "Is there any area where there's neither.... neither reporting or withholding?"

Ewing: "Yes."

Skinner: "What areas are they?"

Ewing: "When you sell cattle."

Skinner: "Just selling cattle?"

Ewing: "No. In this...because of the small amount of tax due, the Bill does not address itself to the livestock and grain interests that cross the border. But it does address itself to any livestock or grain raised or bred or fattened in this state."

Skinner: "Well, you're absolutely right when you started out saying that it was a very complicated Bill. Thank you very much."

Ewing: "It is extremely complicated."

Speaker Redmond: "If Representatives Collins, Anderson, Mahar and Simms will sit down, then I'll see that Representative Friedland is seeking recognition."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of



the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedland: "Mr. Sponsor, is this the Amendment that would assist in garnering income for Illinois from entertainers or sports figures that come in for a one or two shot deal and get away with nothing?"

Mugalian: "Yes. Without this Amendment, Representative Friedland, those people would get off scot-free."

Friedland: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too rise in opposition to this Amendment. Let me tell you, that from 75% to 80% of the cattle that are slaughtered or bought or sold in this state, come from outside the state. Let me ask you; if you were a cattle raiser in the middle part of Missouri, for example, and you had a choice to go to East St. Louis stockyards or to Kansas City.... and East St. Louis was going to charge you 2 1/2% of your gross profit, would you go to Kansas City or East St. Louis? Obviously you'd go to Kansas City. Such an Amendment as this will shut down the national stockyards of East St. Louis, the stockyards in Joliet and other parts of the state.... absolutely shut them down. East St. Louis already is a very much economically depressed area. We cannot afford to lose the thousand dollars. And will the state gain any money? No, they'll lose money. This is the most ludicrous Amendment that I've ever heard of. Now we've tried to sit down with some of the people and talk about something reasonable. Of course, I don't think that Frank Sinatra ought to come to Chicago and leave with a half a million dollars and not pay any tax. I think he should. I don't think any of the rock groups should do the same thing. I think they should. But when people raise cattle and



grain in other states and only come here for sale and resale and we try to take two or... two and one half dollars of the hundred away from them, they're simply not going to be here. Now I think that we should defeat this Amendment and try to pass this Bill on up to Second Reading and get it over to the Senate and try to be reasonable and have a reasonable Amendment to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I too rise to oppose this Amendment. And while the Sponsor is well intentioned, Representative Ewing was exactly right. And as a matter of fact, I would like to correct a misconception that was stated on the floor a minute ago. The base Bill does address the entertainer... the one shot guy that's coming into the state now to take money out of the State of Illinois without paying taxes. 2185, as it exists, contains that provision. Representative Ewing has worked very hard and very long and addressed every category of business in the state that could possibly be addressed to cover either informational or ten ninety-nine coverage or some sort of mandated withholding situation. He's got a very good Bill here. This Amendment would do exactly what the last Speaker the.... the distinguished Representative from downstate, Majority Leader Representative Flinn.... would... would ... said it would do. It will close down the livestock operations on our borders and make it almost impossible for anybody to sell grain or livestock in the State of Illinois. So I would suggest to you that we definitely defeat this Amendment and go on to pass this very good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Mugalian to close. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Usually I can pay attention on the House



floor. And usually, I know who's opt is getting gored and who's in favor of what and what are the mysterious interests behind everything. I like to think I know. I'll be damned if I can figure out why in the world Illinois Legislators would prepare a Bill that makes it so difficult to collect Illinois income tax from out of state investors. I'll be damned if I can figure out why we why we are so concerned with collecting taxes from our own residents but not from people who are out of state. This Bill is drawn in a way to make it difficult; not easy, but difficult to collect taxes. This.... Representative Mugalian and I have offered an Amendment that at least puts everybody into the action, makes everybody liable for that tax who should be, makes everybody with a string to Illinois who ought to pay the taxes. Now Representative.... the Representative from... I suppose from New York City maybe.... I don't know, or maybe from Madison, Wisconsin... well maybe from 'Detroit' I guess, said... said that we have taken care of all the problems. For example, we've taken care of the personal contracts that will come in. As a matter of fact, we haven't; it has to be a written contract. Why a written contract? What do we care if it's a written contract or or it's an oral contract? The IRS says we collect to... from every kind of contract it is, but not us... not in Illinois. We have Legislators that say, 'We only want to withhold on a written contract, not an oral contract.' Real estate investors who leave this state who... who have money coming every month.... every month from Illinois, real estate, they get it passed. Can you imagine to have a Gentleman from New York... I'm sorry, from Pontiac. Mr. Ewing has this Bill, which he says... he says that it affects the effectuates the original concept. To the contrary! His Bill literally guts...literally guts the whole process of nonresident taxation. We



are giving a pass to out-of-state residents and we are not giving a pass to our own people. That's an incredible thing and I just can't figure it out. I'm at a loss. Representative Mugalian and I have presented this Amendment. It makes sense. It's going to collect money due the State of Illinois. It's going to.. not protect tax cheats.... tax cheats from Illinois. And I don't know why in the world we would protect out-of-state tax cheats who are evading Illinois income tax. I ask that we accept this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2185. Those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Robbins to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I... and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I vote 'no' because this is a tax of growth not met and.... on grain and cattle that come into the state. And it will close our markets because a lot of them don't net 2 1/2% on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 30 'aye' and 87 'no' and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Ewing. Amends House Bill 2185 on page 1, line 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 really becomes the basis of this Bill. It was put in after discussions with those who promoted this last Amendment in an effort to tighten up this Bill more to their satisfaction. We've added, by this Amendment, not only those people that come in... entertainers and... on big contracts, but people who are in the car racing and horse racing business. We've added the lottery, which was left out un... by mis- take in the original Bill. And we've tightened up the



reporting on the sale of real estate by out-of-state residents. And I would ask for your approval of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye' and those opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1702."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1702. A Bill for an Act in relation to the disposition of certain state revenues. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On short debate, Second Reading, appears House Bill 1136."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1136. 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: "Representative Skinner. Any motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Skinner. Amends House Bill 1136 on page 5 and so..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 to House Bill 1136 is House Bill 2586 as amended and approved unanimously by the House Revenue Committee. Unfortunately, although we received unanimous consent to post House Bill 2586 in the Revenue Committee....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Skinner: "The...."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Gentleman is referring



to Amendment #3 in what he's saying. I would suggest that he might want to table Amendment #2 or withdraw it and proceed with Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, were you speeding?"

Skinner: "I'm not sure what 2 is."

Speaker Redmond: "Moving the state capital to Crystal Lake."

Skinner: "I'm sorry. Yeah, I do want to table this.... withdraw it, excuse me. We'll figure it out here..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to withdraw Amendment 2? O'kay, any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Skinner. Amends House Bill 1136 as amended by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, this is an Amendment which incorporates House Bill 1136 and House Bill 2586, the latter of which inadvertently went to Interim Study. It seems to me this is the easier way to pull it out. It's the supervisor of assessments reform Bill. I offer it's Amendment... or it's adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Skinner. Amends House Bill 1136 as amended in Section 130.1 and so forth."

Skinner: "Yes, this is Amendment #2 as resurrected. It has to do with the original Bill, 1136 in its unamended form. It says that the sales ratio studies shall be sent to additional assessing officials throughout the state. It was a suggestion made in Committee and it sounded logical. I offer it's adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it and the motion carried. The Amendment is



adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. We have in the Speaker's gallery there... from the Passavant School of Nursing, twenty-three nurses and four teachers from Jacksonville, Illinois. And that's in the 49th District, represented by Representative Gary Hannig, Representative John Sharp and Representative Jim Reilly. The nurses in the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I thought I'd introduce John Sharp to those beautiful young ladies up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner asks leave to have 1136 remain on the Order of Short Debate. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. 2653."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2653. A Bill for an Act to abolish the ad-valorem personal property tax and replace revenues lost with an income tax. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1282. Representative Taylor, where are you? 1644. Oh! Pardon me, I couldn't see you there. 1282."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1282. A BILL for an Act appropriating money to the Health Hospitals Governing Commission of Cook County. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Vinson. Amends House



Bill 1282 as amended, by deleting Section 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Representative Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Appropriations Committee labeled very hard.... labored very hard over this Bill. An Amendment was attached to the Bill in Committee to help deal with the financial problems of downstate hospitals as well as Cook County Hospital and the other hospital under the Governing Commission. That Amendment.... there was no clear explanation in Committee on... as to the basis for deriving the amount included in the Committee. The Sponsor, I think honestly and with integrity, is concerned about the problem. And I think honestly and with integrity, admitted that there was not an adequate time in Committee to deal with the proper figure. As a matter of fact, one of the things we discovered.... the Section amended for downstate hospitals not only covers downstate hospitals, but covers all other Cook County hospitals outside of the Governing Commission. As a consequence, we're dealing with a group... a group of people, potential hospital patients, who cause this deficit.... who cause it for Cook County, who cause it downstate, much larger in number probably than the number who cause it for Cook County Hospital. The intent of my Amendment is to recognize the generosity of this Bill to embrace that spirit of generosity and compassion for the poor and for the hospitals that try to provide care for the poor. And to try and provide a sufficient amount of state resources to guarantee that those people are properly cared for. What I have simply done is to offer an Amendment that would appropriate seventy-four million dollars for the downstate hospitals and all of those Cook County hospitals, Presbyterian, St. Luke's, ect., who are outside of the



Governing Commission. My Amendment can be criticized by some people as taking money out of the State Treasury and I openly admit that. But I think that we have to recognize the plight of these hospitals that try to care for the poor and the plight of the poor. And we have to properly provide the resources to take care of the problem. There is no more pressing concern that the people of this state have and particularly the working poor, who this would go to subsidize, than for health care. Now we have an obligation as a State Legislature to take care of them. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

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

Vinson: "Could you repeat the question, Sir?"

Leverenz: "I have just asked if you would respond to a question."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Leverenz: "You indicated that you would be taking money from the State Treasury, could you give us an iden... some estimate of cost. How much..."

Vinson: "Seventy-four million dollars."

Leverenz: "How many?"

Vinson: "Seventy-four million dollars."

Leverenz: "Seventy-four million dollars?"

Vinson: "A minimal figure to care for these people, Sir."

Leverenz: "And that is approved by the Bureau of the Budget?"

Vinson: "No, it's not approved by the Bureau of the Budget or by the Governor. It's..."

Leverenz: "Why would you..."

Vinson: "...an independent decision we have to make as a legislative Body."

Leverenz: "Why would you do something like that?"

Vinson: "Because I care about these people, and this Legislature has a responsibility to them."



Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose the Amendment. I rise simply on the fact, because Representative Vinson made the statement that he was in the Committee at the time that I accepted the Amendment for thirteen million dollars to the Cook County Hospital to service those persons downstate. At that particular time he said that the Sponsor did not have any rationale for the Amendment. He, too, at that same time, Mr. Speaker, brought the same Amendment that he has here today for 74 million dollars. The Chairman found that the Amendment was incorrectly drafted, and he ruled it out of order. He, too, did not have the time and today he came here and asked this Body to give him 74 million dollars for downstate. I vigorously oppose the Amendment by Representative Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Vinson to close."

Vinson: "I would urge Members on both sides of the aisle to consider this Amendment very carefully. It's an Amendment for equity. It's an Amendment for compassion. It's an Amendment for people, poor working people, that can't afford health care. This will help them, and we have a duty to do that. I urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "At the appropriate point, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to



ask for a poll of the absentees and verify the Negative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 65 'yes', 72 'no'. Poll the absentees. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I'd like to respond very briefly to a couple of comments made by the Sponsor of this Amendment. On the one hand he questioned whether or not the money going to Cook County Hospital should not, in fact, be going to other private hospitals downstate and otherwise. I'm sure the Gentleman understands that private non-for-profit hospitals have added advantage, not the least of which is issuing tax exempt revenue bonds..."

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

Totten: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. That Gentleman moved the previous question. The voting is closed, and we ought to be on a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're right. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you like to introduce Walt Kozubowski to the Membership?"

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you very much. Poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ab..."

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

Schuneman: "Is the Board locked, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we took the record. Yes. When we took...when we call your name, you can indicate how you desire to vote. Actually, in absentees if it follows that procedure, we'll save a lot of time, because if you keep jumping up to get on the Roll Call, why... Representative Katz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Katz: "I want to be verified, Mr. Speaker, if I might have leave."



Speaker Redmond: "Does Representative Katz...may he be verified? Is there any question? Poll of the absentees. Let's..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt."

Speaker Redmond: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley. Conti. Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ebbesen. Epton. Friedland. Gaines. Garmisa. Hallstrom."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley has returned to the floor and desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Proceed. Hallstrom, 'aye'. No, pardon me. Bradley, 'no'. Hallstrom, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hannig. Hannig votes 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder, 'aye'. Schraeder. Wait a minute now. I'm...we're on absentees. Have you concluded the poll of the absentees? Representative Hannig votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hoffman. Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, 'aye'. Representative Friedland, 'aye'. I don't know. Representative... wait till we call you. Have we called you yet, Mr. McCourt? Wait till we call you. What's the last one, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Huskey. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kent."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kozubowski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski. All right."

Kozubowski: "Please record me as 'no'."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Macdonald. McCourt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pechous. Pierce. Rea. Reilly. Richmond.
Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ronan, 'no'. Representative
Reilly, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ropp."

Speaker Redmond: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schuneman."

Speaker Redmond: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Tuerk. Watson. J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "No." Seventy-five 'aye' and 79 'no'. Rep-
resentative Matula, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

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

Walsh: "Same request, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Walsh from 'no' to
'aye'. Representative Birkinbine from 'no' to 'aye'.
Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "From 'no' to 'aye', Mr. Speaker, please."

Speaker Redmond: "From...from 'present' to 'aye'."

Griesheimer: "No, I'm presently voting 'no' according to my
switches here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania. Representative
Catania desires to be recorded as 'no'. Representative
Mahar, 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Kent, 'aye'.
Mahar was 'no'. Kent, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mahar's already voted 'no'."



Speaker Redmond: "Well, he wanted to vote...how'd he want it? 'No' to 'aye', Mahar? 'Aye'. Representative Mahar, 'aye'. Garmisa, 'no'. Representative Pechous, 'no'. Richmond, 'aye'. Representative Gaines, 'no'. Representative Epton, 'no'. Wait till Jack catches up. Representative McGrew, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'No' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? 83 'aye', 76 'no'. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I request a verification of the affirmative votes."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Anderson. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Breslin. Campbell. Capuzi. Christensen. Collins. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Deuster. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Woodyard. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Harris. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Dave Jones. Kempiners. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Neff. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Shuneman. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Vinson. Walsh. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. No further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Rea, 'aye'. Representative Van Duyne,



'aye'. What's the count? Eighty-five 'ayes', 77 'nos'.

Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Taylor?"

Taylor: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Stanley."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. That little fellow over there."

Taylor: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Redmond: "Stuffle. There he is in the middle aisle."

Taylor: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Sitting pretty nearly along side of you."

Taylor: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Taylor: "Representative Davis. Representative Jack Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is it? What was the last one?"

Taylor: "Representative Jack Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Jack Davis...isn't he...where was he verified? The other one I recall is Katz. Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I heard Jack Davis ask Representative Taylor to verify him, but maybe you didn't hear him. He went over to the Senate, and...and said he wanted to go to the Senate. Maybe Representative Taylor didn't remember it, but he asked him that."

Taylor: "Maybe I didn't see him, but my glasses were probably dirty."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I saw him standing along side of Ralph Dunn, but I don't know. Sometimes people take a walk for the wrong reasons. He was not verified as far as I know. He was here at the time he cast the vote. That I do know. Pro...we'll have to remove him if he's not here."

Taylor: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Redmond: "Bianco. Bianco back there? Another one that I know was here at the time of the casting of the vote, but he's not here now, so have to take him off. Representative Donovan, for what purpose do you rise? Change Representative Donovan from 'no' to 'yes'. Now,



proceed with your verification."

Taylor: "Representative Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't see whether Campbell's there, because Representative White and Hoffman are standing up there. Okay, Representative Campbell's there."

Taylor: "Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Redmond: "He's over there in back of Stearney. If Stearney would sit down and Stanley would sit down... proceed."

Taylor: "Representative Matula."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Taylor: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "That's not McBroom. That's Huskey. Is McBroom here? How's McBroom recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Huskey, for what purpose do you rise? He desires to be recorded as 'aye'."

Taylor: "Representative Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer. Representative Davis has returned with his coat on."

Taylor: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Taylor: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Redmond: "He's there."

Taylor: "Representative Wikoff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff's in his seat. Anything further? Representative Hannig."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Hannig recorded?"

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

Hannig: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Representative Flinn, 'aye'. Birchler, 'aye'. Slape, 'aye'. Representative Ebbesen."



Taylor: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Ebbesen? You weren't here. I can tell you."

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

Ebbesen: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman, 'aye'. What's the tally now? Representative Sam Wolf. Record Representative Wolf as 'aye'. Representative Pierce. How do you... Representative Pierce, 'no'. Ninety-three 'aye' and 73 'no'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading." 2229. 2229."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2229. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Ewing, amends House Bill 2229 on page 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Ewing on the floor? The Sponsor says that's a good Amendment. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's a good Amendment. I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved for the adoption of Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment 1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Skinner-Mugalian, amends House Bill 2229 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is the previously discussed



agreed Amendment between you and myself."

Speaker Redmond: "It's a wonderful Amendment. Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand the fiscal note requested has been withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "The request for a fiscal note was withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2098. 2229. 2098, is that what you're calling about, Representative Kempiners? Do you want 2098 now? Is that why you were seeking recognition? Okay, 2098."

Clerk O'Brien: "For Amendment 2? We adopted it. Yeah, it didn't change. We adopted 1 and 2. 1 and 2, adopted. What'd you call, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "I called 2098. Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2098. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the expense of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think we ought to do..."

Clerk O'Brien: "I think I can find another one."

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

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, we're on Second Reading with House Bill 2098."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #2 by Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I wish to withdraw that motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws the motion. Any..."

Kempiners: "A question, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk said that Amendment's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were adopted. I



believe 5 was not adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk, would you...did you hear the question? The question is whether Amendment #5 was adopted in Committee or not. According to the Calendar, it says 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. That's located on page 3 of the Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment...the Bill does not have Amendment #5 in it. There's a note Amendment #5 failed. The Calendar's in error."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Calendar is in error, so it's Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, and the motion has been withdrawn. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Winchester, amends House Bill 2098 as amended on page 21, line 16 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request that Amendment #7 be tabled."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #7. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Winchester, amends House Bill 2098 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #8 adds \$26,000 to the budget for the purpose of hiring a carpenter...or hiring a carpenter for the A. L. 'Bowen' Center. It has none. It has not had one for four years. The painters and other trades are doing the carpenter work, and it's causing a considerable amount of problems. As a matter of fact, it could even result in a strike by the carpenters' union if we don't get a carpenter." I would move for the adoption of Amendment #8, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

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



Winchester: "Yes."

Leverenz: "What...does this have any impact or any change in Amendment 8? Did it relate at all to Amendment 7, and what was Amendment 7 that you tabled?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #7 was withdrawn. Amendment #8, you want to kindly...well, let me get you some attention. Thank you. Kindly explain Amendment #8."

Winchester: "Amendment #8 has no relation to Amendment #7. There will be another Amendment later that will address itself to Amendment #7. Amendment #8 adds \$26,000 to the Department of Mental Health's appropriation for the A. L. 'Bowen' Center for the purpose of hiring one carpenter. We do not have a carpenter at the 'Bowen' Center. I have been approached by several union members of the carpenters' union. Apparently, the... the painters' union and other trade unions are doing the carpenter work, and they feel that they should have a carpenter there, and I agree. And, I would ask for a favorable vote for the adoption of this Amendment."

Leverenz: "Is this in your district?"

Winchester: "That is correct."

Leverenz: "And you feel that there might be a strike happen if you don't get this Amendment?"

Winchester: "Well, I've had at least two letters from the business agents of that union, and they're quite concerned. That could be a possibility, Ted."

Leverenz: "I didn't think you would be that concerned. Thank you very much."

Winchester: "When it comes to my district I am."

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

Barnes: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Yes, this Amendment was discussed, and Representative Winchester, as he indicated, this is one that the Department feels is justified and should be adopted."

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



Kempiners: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have had no indication from the Department or anybody else that this Amendment was justified. If you'd had that communication, fine, but I haven't."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is..."

Kempiners: "Okay, let's accept it. It's \$26,000."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'.
Opposed... Amendment #8 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, Winchester, amends House Bill 2098 on page 21 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #9 adds two hund..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kempiners: "A ruling from the Chair, Mr. Speaker, on Amendments 9 through 17 to determine whether they are technically correct, and, if not, I ask that they be tabled."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Parliamentarian kindly come to the rostrum? Mr. Epstein. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I have two Amendments which I have found are incorrect, and so the two that I've got, and I don't know their numbers, I leave to withdraw my two whatever their numbers are."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll take a look at them, John. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, in order to speed up things here, I believe Representative Kempiners indicated Amendment #9 through 17, and I think if you look at the Bill after the adoption of the first five Amendments, you will rule correctly that Amendment 9 through 17 would be now technically incorrect."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Parliamentarian come to the Speaker's rostrum, please?" Mr. Epstein. John...and Representative Matijevidich withdraws Amendments 11 and 12. Amendments 11 and 12 are withdrawn. Here. So the question is on Amendments 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. The point of order is well taken. The Amendments are not in order, so the Amendments are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #18, Winchester, amends House Bill 2098 as amended on page 20, line 33."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester. Amendment #18."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a good government Amendment. It takes the business administrators classification which is 29,500 and reduces it down to a business manager II at \$16,775, or a net reduction or savings of \$12,725. I would ask for the favorable adoption of Amendment #18."

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

Leverenz: "This is a reduction? I understand this individual in this position as business administrator, and you're taking it down to an administrator II. Is that correct?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Winchester, please."

Winchester: "It's from a business administrator II down to a business manager II, which is a reduction of \$12,725."

Leverenz: "And then this would allow for the money for your carpenter, right? Very good, and I support the Amendment."

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

Kempiners: "Well, I...I think that that's one way of looking at it, but I think it's a...it almost smacks of a personal vendetta, and I don't think that we ought to be cutting a person down like that in order to hire a carpenter. I think if we really need a carpenter, we ought to go ahead and hire him, but not by cutting out someone



else's position where that position is needed, and I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have some concern for the last speaker's statement. I don't believe that's the case in...in this situation at all. We have a man here who simply knows an institution well, is trying to save the state some money, taking an active interest in management, and I think we ought to encourage that. I support the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to close."

Winchester: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I consider this a good government Bill. Not any personal vendetta. I see this as a wasted classification at the 'Anna' state hospital, and I think that the function that this person performs could be done better in the classification of a business manager at 16,000 than instead of a business administrator at \$29,000, and I'm surprised that Representative Totten and the conservative union couldn't support an Amendment such as this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #18 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #19, Steczo, amends House Bill 2098 as amended on page 11, line 35 and so forth."

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

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #19 to House Bill 2098 seeks to address a problem which we find occurring at the Manteno Mental Health Center and at the Tinley Park Mental Health Center. At both places we have...or I have been privy to information regarding premature discharge of patients, and what Amendment #19 seeks to do is to increase the



appropriation for Manteno Mental Health Center by \$1,460,000 and at the Tinley Park Mental Center by \$359,000. I would agree to answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again, we have a Member taking an active interest in a problem. I don't believe we could leave these problems to the bureaucracy. The Legislature has a right and a duty to involve themselves in these things, and I urge for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Kempiners: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the Members of the House would look at what this Amendment does, because it significantly increases the amount of money going to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. And, Ladies and Gentlemen of...Mr. Speaker, could I have some order, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Give the Gentleman some order, please. Would you give the Gentleman some order, please? Please proceed, Sir."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think if the Members would look at this Amendment, they'd find that the personal services and related costs that Manteno Mental Health Center and Tinley Park are being increased, and if they took a look at those two institutions, they would find out that Manteno presently is at its full staffing strength and has a declining resident population and yet we're putting more money into it for more staff. Tinley Park, which is in the process of being phased out, already has a ratio of 2.2 staff people per patient, which is above the recommended 1.6 level. So we're throwing more money into an area where we already have a full staff level, and I would say that this is not a good way to spend the taxpayers' money."



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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, just to echo the Sponsor of this Bill, I can understand...I think I can rationalize with the Gentleman, since one of the institutions lies in this district, but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be adding personal service dollars to an institution that's being phased out...is being closed, and the population that is even remaining there is in the process of being transferred, I think simply does not...does not square off. The fact of life is...is whether we like it or not Tinley Park is being closed. I was one that opposed that last Session, because of some...of the reasons, but that's a fact of life. Now, to add personal service dollars to a facility that's being closed, it seems to me that we could do far greater with our general revenue dollars than putting them at a place where there's no one to care for. I think the...I can understand the Sponsor of the Amendment's good intention for his district, but I don't think this is fiscally sound."

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

Huff: "A point of...a point of information, Mr. Chairman. I have two Amendments to this Bill, and one is #19, the one that could be a mistake, and I'm sure it is."

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

Kempiners: "The Gentleman is correct. He has two Amendments to the Bill, but they're Amendments 20 and 21. Amendment 19, which we're on, is Representative Steczo's."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your inquiry, Mr. Huff?"

Huff: "...Speaker, yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, to close."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. To



issue a response to the recent statements about the closure of the Tinley Park Mental Health Center. Through my discussions with the persons from the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, Tinley Park, yes, is being phased out, but they plan to keep patients there at least until fiscal year 1981. What they have done in their appropriation for this year is to decrease the staffing from 456 to 435. We seek to increase that to 466 to achieve the 2.33 patient-staff ratio which the Department of Mental Health has calculated. In terms of the Manteno Mental Health Center, what we increased...what we attempt to do there is to achieve the 1.6 patient-staff ratio, which the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities has also calculated by adding the additional 127 additional employees. This Amendment, I believe, serves the purpose of trying to correct a problem about dumping people from the mental health centers into the community just to achieve a certain level. That's been the case...that's been the charge. I've heard that particular thing from many staff and maybe to point out an example, the Department has issued quotas as to the number of people that they have to serve. There is a thing in Manteno called a psycho bus where patients are picked up at the back door of the mental health center, are given five dollars, and dumped in uptown Chicago. If that's quality mental health care, then I think it leaves a lot to be desired, and I would respectfully request the adoption of Amendment #19 to House Bill 2098."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #19 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed... 'nos' have it. The Amendment's not adopted. Any further Amendments. The Gentleman wants a Roll Call. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'."



Billy...Bill, vote me 'no'. Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

On this question there are 57 'ayes', 60 'nos'. The

Amendment's not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #20, Huff, amends House Bill 2098 as amended on page 9 by deleting lines 9 and 11."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I'm going to request leave to table Amendments 20 and 21."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendments 20 and 21. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #22, Winchester, amends House Bill 20..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is my double good government Bill for today. This would abolish seven regional offices in the Department of Mental Health. It would reduce their budget by \$2,850,000. It would leave them \$1,450,000 to continue the programs that the regions are presently performing. There is presently 162 regional staff. Seven, as an example, seven administrators making more than \$40,000 apiece. My Bill would cut them from 100...or my Amendment would cut them from 162 to 65, and it would mean that all the responsibilities now being performed by the region would be performed by the central office, where it should have always been performed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a good government Amendment. It's a fiscally conservative Amendment, and it's a compassionate Amendment. What this says is, let's take money out of middle management and put it into front line patient care. Let's get rid of high-priced people that sit and order people around but don't do anything, and let's put it into the



patient care workers who really care for those with mental problems. I urge the adoption of this Amendment." Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk. Mr. Polk. Oh, you had your light on. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I get a little confused when I hear people talking about good government and seeing what the ultimate result of what they proposed to do would be. Basically, what this Amendment would do is, as the Gentleman described it, would be to abolish the seven regional offices. Now, that might have been all right when we didn't have community agencies which were involved in delivering services to people who are...who are being helped by the State of Illinois. But, in addition to the state facilities, we have a number of community agencies in those same regions. Without the regional agencies there would be absolutely no coordination between the services which are provided by the regional...by the state institutions and the community agencies, and the ultimate bottom line figure of what we would arrive at by abolishing these regional offices is that the administrator at each of the state institutions would be king in his own region. He would be making the decisions without any real supervision from the State of Illinois. I think this is a bad concept, and it surprises me that a Member would stand up on the floor of this House and say that this is a good government Bill. If you want to end or to abolish the type of coordination that has to exist between state agencies and community agencies, vote for this Amendment. If you want to make an administrator king of his institution, then vote for this...this particular Amendment, but don't tell me that this is a good government move, because that insults my intelligence, and I would urge a 'no' vote."



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

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I wonder if either Representative Kempiners or Representative Winchester would respond to a question or two?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

McBroom: "Representative Winchester, what you said a minute ago is difficult for me to believe. Did you say there were over sev...there were at least seven that made \$40,000 a year or more? Is that what you said, Representative Winchester?"

Winchester: "True. Yes, to my...for...to the best of my knowledge. Yes."

McBroom: "Representative Winchester, how many other Departments in the state have regions, and subregions, and layers, and layers, and layers of bureaucrats other than the Department of Mental Health? Are you able to answer that?"

Winchester: "Well, to my knowledge there are none."

McBroom: "I...I would certainly do everything I could to encourage a 'yes' vote for Representative Winchester's Amendment. I think it's an excellent Amendment. These subregions have been a haven for bureaucrats as long as most of us have been in politics. I solicit a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor of Amendment #2 (sic) to House Bill 2098 yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Harris: "Representative Winchester, can you tell us where these offices are located?"

Winchester: "Well, I do not have a...a list on all seven of them, but one of them is in the 59th Legislative District in...in Williamson County in the Marion regional office building."



Harris: "How many employees and what's the top salary range?"

Winchester: "There's approximately 167 or 65 to 67 employees in the total program. How many at the Marion regional office building, I'm not sure, but I don't believe it's more than...than 10 to 15." The top salary is about \$40,000, and that's for the administrator alone."

Harris: "Is your point in this Amendment just to whittle away on the bureaucracy somewhat?"

Winchester: "My point is...is that you and I both have committed to fiscal responsibility and to try to save taxpayers' monies, and...and at all times we are saying that there is duplication of services and waste in state government, and they're always coming back to us and saying, 'Where? Where is that waste? Where is that duplication?' I have found waste. I have found duplication, and I think I'm acting responsibly and contrary to other opinions. I think I'm acting on behalf of good government with this Amendment."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "I want to support Representative Winchester in his statements. I know of no agency of our state that is more conducive to having layers and layers on top of layers of personnel with high-ranking titles. If you check them out, you'll find that...that no matter whether their clerk typist or whatever, they're as quickly as possible passed to the highest possible bracket in relation to their income and wages, which is at the expense, of course, of the taxpayers. I feel, from my experience in mental health, that there is indeed a tremendous amount of money being wasted in mental health. For example, we have in our community the Decatur Macon County Mental Health Clinic. It, of course, gets support from the state, but in the whole area, we have had dumped in our community, out of Lincoln, out of other



areas of this state, we've had dumped people into our community, and we have had to pick up and take care of the cost while the state...that is, the mental health group, has failed to compensate by giving us more money to use. They have kept the money, keeping the higher titles, keeping the people on the payroll, at the same time letting us in the local, Macon and Decatur Mental Health Clinic, carry the load. Now, I think it's time, if we're going to do anything at all, to begin to see that they turn the money over to the people that are now carrying the load instead of the mental health company, who have been dumping their responsibility all over the state into Chicago, into Decatur...I suspect into Champaign, and into even right here. Dumping them out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to the Amendment 22, which is on hand..."

Borchers: "Well, it's very obvious what I'm saying. Support...support the Amendment that Representative Winchester wishes to put on. Anybody could tell that if they use a little bit of sense."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz. Mr. Katz, your light is on, Sir. Do you wish to speak on this Amendment?"

Katz: "At that point I had a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Katz: "The question was, you indicated a number of people were drawing over \$40,000 in various mental health facilities. I wondered how many of those people were either physicians or psychologists."

Winchester: "These are administrators of the regional programs. They are not psychologists or doctors or anything else. They're the administrators in a layer of government that I don't think that we need, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Well, sometimes a psychologist can be an administrator, too, or a physician can be one, and I wondered if you



knew what the facts were with regard to that."

Winchester: "No, I can't tell you that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, India has sacred cows; Illinois has some people in mental health, and I think there's a chance to get them off the backs of the taxpayers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr...the Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to close."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've got a little document I'd like read that I wrote last night. The elimination of regional offices will force central office to provide stricter fiscal control over the state institutions. In the past, central offices has failed to maintain up-to-date fiscal knowledge for state institutions. The Department holds the regional offices responsible for this knowledge and to provide oversight for the facilities. However, central office is ultimately responsible and accountable for the dollars and should have all the information. Central office will have to work directly with the institutions during the budget process. Further, central office will be forced to make decisions regarding the allocation of dollars between facilities and community programs in terms of overall network of services. State facility dollars under the regional system have continuously served the fewest people with the greatest portion of the Department's budget, and that's over 70%. Under the current regional system the Department has taken a maintenance of effort budget approach towards community programs. There has been little or no evaluation of community programs with the regions. It is questionable whether a comprehensive service delivery system even exists. However, the client population in community programs continues to grow. The elimination of regions will force the Department to provide upfront evaluation of



community programs and begin development of a meaningful delivery system. The Department has been criticized for the premature release of patients from state-operated facilities. The Department has been cited for dumping patients in the community without insuring that proper services are available and without providing continued follow-up. With the elimination of the regions, the Department will now become responsible for insuring untimely releases do not occur, and, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is probably, and I say again, one of the best good government Bills, and I hope that it's the beginning of all Legislators looking for waste and duplication of services in state government, because if we do more of this we will have dollars that we can rebate and give back to the citizens and the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on a 'do adopt' motion on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'.
Opposed...Amendment #22 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #23, Winchester, amends House Bill 2098 as amended on page 5 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "I would request that the Chair table Amendment #23."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #23. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #24, Mautino, amends House Bill 2098 as amended on page 5..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "If he's not here, I have a question as to whether



it's been distributed, but if he's not here, can we just proceed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Has the Amendment been distributed?"

Unknown: "Yes, it has, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me look at the Amendments. Well, the Gentleman isn't here. The Amendment's withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1644. Page 2 of the Calendar. Mr. Peters. Mr. Winchester. The Clerk will read the Bill, please. 1644."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1644. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 4, and 5 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion to table Amendment #4, Peters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, on the motion to table Committee Amendment #4."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #4 was presented in Committee and added funds for the operation of the children's school in Normal for a full-year's funding for FY '80. It has been the concern of a number of Members of the House as to the need for the continuation of the school, not only based on an economic argument, but that probably is the smallest argument or the least significant, but rather whether this institution can be rationalized in terms of its programs and the programs that it offers. The programs at the school, we are not going to debate. The programs are substantial programs for the...some 90 young people that are involved at the school, but the question goes far beyond the 2.9 million dollar expenditure for the maintenance of this home. The question goes as to the



function of the state and the philosophy that the state should adopt in terms of dealing with and treating the some 25,000 wards that the state has. Out of that total 25,000 population of young people who are wards of the state...in the care of the state, some 90 or 92 are at this school in Normal. It would be, in my judgment, a stretching of argument to say that of 25,000 young people, out of that total huge population of 25,000 people, 92 can only receive the kind of care and treatment that is found at the home in Normal. One of the arguments that has been made against the closing of this home, and it is a sound argument...it was at least in the past, is that the private care agencies were extremely selective in the kind of child they would take into their care and because of that, these hard to place group of kids, anywhere from 50 to 100, were kind of moved about place to place, place to place, and the only place that they could really settle in was at Normal. For those of you that are new, please note that the Department of Children and Family Services, since its inception some 12 or 13 years ago, has had, if my memory serves me, 6 or 7 different directors. Each of these directors has brought with him another philosophy of operation, but I think we have reached a point now with a new director who is forceful, who is solid, who is sound, who makes the argument that it is not...it is not the duty of the state nor should it be the responsibility of the state to institutionalize young children...young men and women, whether they're status offenders or not, whether they're from poor homes or what have you, that should not be the role of the state, but rather what we should do is bend every effort between...between the state and the private agencies to give these young people the kind of care that they should be receiving, and I think those of you who have talked to Director



'Kohler' and have talked to the various institutions know that he has made tremendous progress with the private care agencies in insuring that they will not be as selective as they have been in the past. They have done a tremendous job in the past, but facts are still facts. They have been somewhat selective. They have generally reached agreement that these children would be found places in the private sector, and it's my information from this Department that approximately half of the children, although they're still at Normal, but placements have been already contracted for for approximately half of the young people at Normal. Now this gets very important to those of you that are sincerely interested and concerned about child care. We're talking about a basic philosophy of how we approach this problem, whether we do it on an institutionalized basis, or whether, in fact, we talk about foster care and dealing with private institutions, whether they be church or community, institutions in terms of treating these young kids. It is the decision of the director, and I think an attitude that's shared by a lot of people that the private sector, the community sector, the foster care sector is the way to go, and although the home in Normal had served its function at one time, it is no longer necessary, and we should not have that kind of institution under state auspices. The Child Care Association has indicated in Committee that they are fully prepared to cooperate with the Department. They'll cooperate with the General Assembly in insuring that every young person who needs placement will be placed in the proper kind of setting. I will not get into the economic arguments, Mr. Chairman, because as I...or Mr. Speaker, because as I said, they are the least in terms of our concern for the care. Money will be spent one place or another. Some more money may be spent in one place than the other. We go



to a basic philosophy as to what is best for the Department and what is best for the young people under the... this Department's care... all 25,000 of them. I would sincerely solicit your very deep consideration of the issue raised here and your positive vote in terms of the motion to table. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is my Amendment that was offered in Committee, and it passed on a 13-12 Roll Call. Very much down a...pretty much down a party line. But the Gentleman who's made the motion to table, when he refers to 'We won't discuss the monetary aspect of the...funding the institution.', I think is taking the gut issue out of the debate. When I was called by the Governor's office last January and informed that they had decided to close ISSCS and could I support that decision, I said to the Governor, 'Well, I supported your decision to use the annex at Lincoln State Mental Hospital for a correctional center. If you can show me that it's best for the children to close this institution, then I would possibly find it in my...I might find it possible to support his position.' Director 'Kohler' was hired on January 29th as the Director of the Department of Children and Family Services, and 30 days later he made the announcement that ISSCS would close. In his remark to me in the Committee hearing, when I questioned him what basis and what logic did he use to make his decision to close the institution, he told me he talked with the director, and I said, 'What director?', and he said, 'The Director of the Bureau of the Budget.' So, in fact, what was being said the state, the Governor, and the Department, or the Bureau of the Bureau of the Budget had decided they could save \$800,000



and that was the only reason given for closing the institution. At that same time, the director told us... we... I said, 'What are you going to do with the children?' He said, 'We'll worry about that after we close it. We'll close it, then we'll do something with the children.' Well, then he found out that was not going to sell, so now he's come up with the solution that he has found placements for the children. But one of the children... one of the types of children that he has not found placements for are those children who are 13, or 14, or 15, or 16 years old who are in a class rank of 4th, or 5th, or 6th grade. There is no way you can take a child that age, put it into a 4th, or 5th, or 6th grade level, and expect them to be happy in that class situation. ISSCS, in their peer program, and that's the type of program it is, and let me say to you the place where they are intending to put these children back in private institutions... back in foster homes are places where these children have already failed. They have been in foster homes. They've been in private institutions, and those children have failed in those situations. Now, how can you take those children and put them right back in a situation where they have already failed. They are in a peer program. A peer program is a program that they do everything together in a group with 9 or 10. If they go swimming, they go swimming together. If they go to school, they go to school together. When it's time to go to bed, they turn out the lights and they all go to bed. They stay together. It's a peer program. 90...89 children signed a petition asking this General Assembly to fund that institution, because it's the happiest place they've ever been in their life. We know, and those of you who have been here a while, know what's happened when we have sent children out of the State of Illinois to Texas, to Wisconsin, to



Maine, and if you listen to Paul Harvey about 2 or 3 weeks ago, he referred to the foster children funded by the fed...by HEW sent out of various states...out of the State of California to Jonestown that went right along with the parents...their foster parents when they drank that green stuff. We lost control of them. Now, I'm not suggesting that's going to be done here. I'm just suggesting to you that we have found a place where these children can...can be educated, can be brought along to be able to take their place in society. If they didn't have problems...these severe problems, they wouldn't be where they are. There is no place like it. If we close this one, it's the last institution of child care in the State of Illinois. There isn't any other. For \$800,000 for a savings, I don't believe that's worth it. We can put into that institution, and what this Amendment does, there's...they have a motion to table, is to fund the institution with 110 students. That facility will...at one time had 600 students in that facility, so it can easily take care of...of the...of the children."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Bradley: "And if we put the 110 children in there, and this Department refused to put 32 children in it last fall for the simple reason they didn't...they wanted to have a cost problem at the institution. If they'd have put the 32 children in the...in the institution, we would have been supplying those kind of services at less money than any private institution in the State of Illinois. And my last remark, Mr. Chairman...or Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time given to me by the House. There's another interest in the State of Illinois... have risen their head about this facility, and I kind of resent it that some institutions...some organizations



that stand to gain...that stand to gain to get foster par...or foster children in their homes if this facility is closed. I think it's a terrible, terrible situation and to think for other organizations who are interested in foster children to be contacting Members on the floor of this House to close this facility, so they can stand to gain by receiving more foster children in those facilities. I think it's a crime. It's something that they should be ashamed of, and it's a facility...it's an organization that I have supported on many occasions, but I'll have to give it a long, hard thought before I support them again. I urge and I ask respectfully that the Members of this House fight and vote against this motion to table and support ISSCS, so that they can continue to supply the kind of services that no other institution, and no other facility, no other organization can supply in the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm voting today with Representative Peters, because I believe Representative Peters is right, and I believe Director 'Kohler' is right in the position that they have taken on this particular issue. It's kind of been suggested that this is a new issue, but it was over a year and a half ago that Representative Peters held a press conference and detailed a number of matters regarding Department of Children and Family Services. Some might have taken this as an attack on child welfare in our state, but, as I look carefully at the kind of concerns he had, I was convinced that he cared very deeply about the kind of welfare services we offered for children in our state. And, that when he called for the closing of the Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Children's Home, that it deserved attention, so when the former director asked



me to serve as one of two Legislators on a Committee to study Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Children's Home, I said 'yes' and went down a number of times the winter before last to Bloomington to learn about the Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Children's Home, and I want to say that I think it's a good home. I think the previous speaker got a little carried away when he said it was the only home in the state, but the feeling of the Committee was that they seemed to be doing a good job. However, those of you who have this brochure really need to be straightened out on a couple of matters. One is what the Committee reported. The Committee did not say that this home was necessary. What they said was it was a good home, and they thought that it could be made cross defective. It should be kept open, but the Committee went on to say this...this Committee chaired as is appointed here...here by the eminent Doctor Harold 'Philips', and a number of people representing a variety of interests that if this program could not be made cross defective, that the home should be closed. That was the recommendation of this Committee. I, quite frankly, hoped it would be possible to make it cross defective. We're coming a little late now trying to keep it open, because last year I tried to get a number of individuals interested in dealing with just the matter of the heating cost at Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Children's Home. They told us that the operating cost had an exorbitant of dollar amount for heating 20% of the operating cost at the home was heating, and they said we needed \$60,000 appropriation to redesign and correct the heating system. I tried to find some active leadership on this floor last year to get this \$60,000 appropriation added to the DCFS Bill that somehow or other it just never happened. We're coming in a year too late...a year too late if we want to do



something on this issue. This is, by the way, part of a much broader issue, and that is one of the utilization of state facilities. We need an overall coordinated plan. Not just for DCFS but for all of the different agencies of state government that operate facilities, and we are surely lacking in this plan. Well, I'm... I have a couple of more points to make, so I won't continue on that point. I do want to say that I think that the question asked, 'Where are these children, who are presently at the home, going to go?', is the wrong question, because the average stay for kids at the home is five months, and it's planned to close the home on October 1st. So, under normal circumstances none of these youngsters..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Lady kindly bring her remarks to a close?"

Chapman: "Yes, Sir. Remember that almost none of these youngsters would still be there on October 1st. The question that needs to be asked is, 'Where will children be placed who next year would be placed to ISSCS?', and this is a challenge for all of us. It's a challenge for the private sector, for the Department, and for the Legislature. It's one which I believe we should be prepared to meet and can meet. A wealthy state such as ours can provide adequate services for their children. It is intolerable to me that we have failed to do this. I'd ask that you vote with Mr... 'aye'. Thank you, Mr. Peters. 'Aye', on this, and if you... you do not have a firm view on this matter, that you vote 'present' or that you do not vote, because this is too important an issue to cast a vote on unless you have had time to give it sufficient thought. I'm voting 'yes' with Mr. Peters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous



question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'.
 Opposed...the previous question's been moved. The La...
 the...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to close."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
 think enough has been said on this issue, and I'm sure
 the minds are made up. I would appreciate a positive
 vote on my motion to table. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be
 tabled?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote
 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima, to explain
 his vote. Timer's on."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the veteran organiza-
 tions I wish to oppose this Amendment, which would
 eventually close the school there for the children...
 veterans of children...children of veterans, and I think
 we ought to defeat this Amendment. I also got a letter
 from the League of Women Voters, who are also in favor
 of keeping this place open for the children, and I would
 urge you to vote 'no' against this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to
 explain his vote."

Greiman: "Well, I'm surprised at the Lady from Arlington
 Heights suggesting that it's too late...that we're just
 a year too late. I have found her to be rather determined
 on issues that she cares about, and I'm very surprised
 that she finds it too late for children, but I think
 that if you vote 'yes' here, you are saying that the
 executives can...branch of government can essentially
 have a self-fulfilling prophecy...that the executive
 branch of government can turn its back on the mandates
 of the General Assembly and can just not...can arrange
 things to be so that's it's not cost effective. Now,
 obviously, they could have made this cost effective.
 Obviously, when they turn their backs on bringing new
 students into this school, they are damning it forever



so that it will not be cost effective. This General Assembly, when it mandates something, I think it's the ...for the agency to carry it out. I think this agency has decided they're going to close this..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think there's an interesting point here that we certainly don't want to overlook is if we want to completely make it a break even situation, we can just run up the numbers without any problem. I think the real concern is...is what happens to these young people and whether or not, when we put them into another environment practically from whence they have come, will they in fact leave the situation that they're in and be another kind of a runaway, young person, and I certainly am one who would want to save all the tax dollars we can, and it was my feeling that if, in fact, we close this kind of situation, I hope that we have the same concerns for other programs that some of us think are good and are valid...get the same kind of an appraisal. I think it really boils down to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this facility is located in my district, also. The employees are dedicated employees. It is a workable and constructive program. However, there's a larger question and issue here. I think we all know what we did on the last Bill, and I think we should bear that in mind in dealing with this Bill. Here we're dealing with a director who is an aggressive, responsive director. A director that takes legislative opinions into consideration and that compares...cares about the program he's in charge of running. I think that kind of a director has to be



encouraged when he says that for less money he can provide better care for these kids, and I believe when you refer...when you look at the data and review it carefully, that you find that he is true, that what he is saying is honest and accurate, that speakers have attested to. I believe that there's a fundamental question even more important here, and that's a question of whether we can come to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this motion. I fear that what has happened is that a new director coming into the State of Illinois from another state far distant is totally unaware of the lack of facilities that we have for young people within our state. I am not a person who normally supports institutionalization, but as was pointed out, this is only an average of a five-month day to rehabilitate a young person who has been deemed to be a minor in need of supervision. The people at this institution have had many previous placements that did not work out in the community. Without any assurance we are now forcing them into that kind of placement in the community and depriving them of the program they could have at this institution. The director has good intent, but I think we need to give him the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition to the motion to table this Amendment. I was one of the Members that sat in the Committee that heard testimony from, not only the individuals that work at the facility for the Soldiers and Sailors Children's Home, but in addition to that we had some graduates at that home come in.. There are two points that have not



been brought up. Director 'Kohler' is a new director, and he inherited this decision from an administration that wants to cut back and save money. However, a lot of the children that are in this home are receiving special education programs, and the Illinois Office of Education has no special education program set up for these children should they leave the Sailor's Home. In addition to that, if we let these children leave this home, they'll be placed out of state, and we won't be providing the type of care that they should have in some of those homes that we can't monitor out of state. I would encourage everybody to vote 'no' on this motion to table the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay, Glen. Record me as 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too rise in opposition to the motion. Primarily, because I sat in Committee and listened to the testimony of the...of, not only the director, but the people who wanted to keep the ISSCS open. I must say to you that my greatest fear is that these young people will fall through the crack. At the present time, no arrangements have been made for alternative educational opportunities for them. No arrangements have been made for alternative placement for these young people, and the fact of the matter is, as Mrs. Satterthwaite has pointed out, that until such time as the new director of this Department has had an opportunity to make such arrangements, we are throwing these young people out into the cold, literally, if we allow this facility to...to close, and I beg your negative vote in this...motion. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

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



House. I just rise briefly to explain my vote and to say, in defense of Director 'Kohler', it was quite clear in the Committee hearing that he'd made this decision and that he made it based on policy as Representative Peters stated earlier. The day or two after Director 'Kohler' came to Illinois we had him before our Committee for a background briefing session, and the Members of the Committee will remember that I asked him his view on institutionalization versus care in the community, and he made it quite clear then that his policy as director would be to care for people as best they can in the communities from which they came and that he did not believe in institutionalization. He made it quite clear that while he had consulted with Bob Manderville, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, he had made the decision based on the policy...the policy of this state now for over a dec..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele. Timer's on."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to urge more 'yes' votes on this Amendment. If you're voting 'no', you're voting to continue a program that's costing per child \$32,000 a year. If you're voting 'no', you're voting to continue a program that not only is costing \$32,000 per child, but, in addition, permanent building improvements are needed at this place. They would cost 2½ million dollars. Now, we don't have this kind of money in the State of Illinois. Individualized care is really the best kind of care, which would happen to these fine youngsters. The director feels that it's best. It's in the best interest of the taxpayers of the state, and so I vote...urge more green lights and green votes here in behalf of the children as well as in behalf of the taxpayers of our state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich,



to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think some of you who are voting 'no' may have been deceived like Representative DiPrima was that this is a home for orphans of veterans. The name is very misleading. This has nothing to do with soldiers and sailors of veterans or orphans, and I would repeat that this is a very expensive operation with a small number of children at \$30,000 a year, and I think it's excessive."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape, to explain his vote."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge more of our colleagues here to vote red on this. I think the greatest testimony that we have received for keeping this home open has come...has come from graduates of it and students that are now participants of the program. As a Representative, I'm sure many of you get requests from people who are having trouble with problem children... children who are already in foster homes and are not getting the care, are not getting the attention they need, or are not making the progress they need. But, this home has proven itself that it can help the children of this state. There's been a question brought up about the cost. If the population of the home was up to 110 students when appropriations were meant to cover, well then the cost per student would be down, and I urge everyone to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it seems strange when a director of a Department asks us to cut something, and we refused to do it. You know, I urge a green vote on this, because our people sent us down here from home, and they say cut spending. When we have a mandate from a director who is putting his reputation on this to cut, we say,



'no'. This is crazy. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Stuffle's here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I realize that all of the Members have various interests in this proposed Amendment, but let me say this one thing for Director 'Koehler' over at DCFS, we have finally got a director who intends to make the tough decisions and intends to do what he knows is right for that agency. I have been one of the people here that has been most critical of DCFS when we had people that were try... were not trying to do what was in the best interests of all of the kids and all of the citizens of this state. Now, you have that kind of director there. He's made this decision. It was not an easy decision, but I believe, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we should support that director, because in this case and this instance based on the per capita cost that that facility is..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Sandquist: "Yes...yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to say, if you're really thinking about the kids...if you're really thinking about the kids, you're going to vote 'aye' on this Amendment, because it's been proven time and time again that orphanages and institutions are a thing of the past. That's not the way they get their training. It's got to be in a more individualized setup of a group home or a foster home, and, therefore, I think 'aye' is the right vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all vo... the Gentleman from Macon, your light doesn't work here,



Mr. Borchers, I'm sorry to say. Electrician, would you make sure that this is corrected by tomorrow? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. Timer's son."

Borchers: "To begin with, I've often been to the Normal home...at Soldiers and Sailors home. I know it. Before...before when they used to have children from veterans, we used to take baskets up there for the weekend to have picnics with them. I think you must remember that they are special children involved here who need special help. They do not accommodate themselves very well to this...the shelter home with 4 or 5 others. They're more likely to get into trouble. Now, I've often been to the homes that the Department of Children and Family Services pick. I don't trust all of the judgment of the Department of Children and Family Services. I've seen some pretty sad examples of their home picking. One just not too long ago in Blue Mound, Illinois, where the woman who...woman and man who had the home...or had the child, had the child taken away and I think she's now in the penitentiary because of the way she treated that child."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 'ayes' and 77 'nays'. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, asked for a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees, please."

Clerk Leone: "Ackerman. Dyer. Ebbesen. Getty. Hoffman. Kane. Laurino. Madigan. McMaster. Piel. I'm sorry, Piel's present. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Waddell. And Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? The count remains the same. 85 'ayes' and 77 'nays'. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I'd like to verify the 'aye' votes."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote. Would the Membership kindly be in their own seats, and would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? Kindly leave Mr. Bradley's microphone on. The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Anderson. E. M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birch...Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Boucek. Bower. Preston."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi, seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Capuzi from 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Preston. Campbell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Laurino as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Collins. Conti."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist, seek recognition?"

Sandquist: "I'd like leave to be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted, and Mr. Leinenweber, same request? Leinenweber as well."

Clerk Leone: "Daniels. Darrow. Dawson. Deuster. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Woodyard. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Freidrich. Gaines."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Grossi, wants to be verified. Leave granted. Leave granted."

Clerk Leone: "Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Dave Jones. Keane. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Margalus. Matula. McAuliffe. McClain. McCourt."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster,



wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, would you have the Clerk slow down a touch and have him please raise their hand?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk is going rather slow. Would the Membership kindly raise their hand? Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "McMaster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "When your name is called, raise your hand."

Clerk Leone: "McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian."

Bradley: "Who was the last one?"

Clerk Leone: "Mugalian. Neff. Oblinger. Peters. Polk."

Bradley: "Who?"

Clerk Leone: "Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins.

Ronan. Ryan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schneider.

Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Simms. Skinner. Stanley.

Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Sumner.

Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. Vinson. Walsh. Watson.

Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. And J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Huff, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record him as 'aye'. Mr. Ebbesen, 'aye'. Mr. Waddell, as 'aye'. What's our count, Mr. Clerk? It's 90 'aye', 77 'nay'. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley. Any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Bradley: "Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Bradley: "Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Williams?"

Bradley: "Jack Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, okay. Mr. Williams. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Williams? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Bradley: "Is Wikoff back there? Mr. Wikoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Wikoff. How's the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record." Mr. McBroom,
for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're recorded as 'no'."

McBroom: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record him as 'aye', and put Mr. Williams
back on the Roll Call."

Bradley: "Is McAuliffe over there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "McAuliffe? Yes, he is."

Bradley: "Catania."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hannig?"

Bradley: "Catania. I see her."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, Catania."

Bradley: "Kent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Kent. Is Mrs. Kent in the chamber?
How's the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove her."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this
question there are 89 'ayes', 76 'noes', and the Gentle-
man's motion to table prevails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, Bradley, amends House Bill 1644.
...as amend..."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, as long as we're...the Body seems to
want to save money, we have an opportunity here to cut
the appropriation for the Department of Children and
Family Services and save another \$2,749,100. It would
delete some positions that are in the central offices,
the electric data processing, field offices, and
guardianship positions. If the concensus of the chamber
is to...what we should base our decisions on...on how
to take care of children is by cutting funds, then I



think you'd have to support this Amendment. It would save \$2,749,000 and cut some 192 positions...some of which are to be new, and I would suggest an 'aye' vote and request an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, my thanks to the Members of the House for their vote on the previous motion, and, secondly, just to indicate...and I understand truly Representative Bradley's feelings. What this Amendment does would remove 192 positions in the Department of Children and Family Services, most of which were added in a lot of debate and a lot of consideration by this House for child abuse. Twenty-one jobs would be eliminated in central support services, 15 workers would be eliminated from the child abuse registry, 9 would be removed from the Rockford region, 16 from the Peoria region, 13 from the Aurora region, 71 from the City of Chicago, 7 from the City of Springfield region, 9 from the Champaign region, 20 from the East St. Louis region, 8 from the Marion region, 3 from the guardianship part for a total of 192. If it's the will of the House to make those kind of cuts after we have indicated our support in the past, then that will be the will of the House, but I certainly would solicit your 'no' vote on this Amendment. It is contrary to what we have done here the last four or five months. Thank you."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Minority spokesman on Appropriations II is absolutely correct. This Amendment...this Amendment in its totality would, in fact, reduce that number of child abuse workers that we have strived and worked so hard for in the last couple of years...where all



of the myriad of problems that we've had in this state relative to child abuse and neglect-related matters. All of you...all of you cutting across districts, across Sections. No matter what part of the state you are from here is an Amendment, if you will, to reduce the amount of money necessary...necessary to give vital service...vital service to try to address this serious...serious problem of child abuse in this state, and I urge you to vote 'no' relative to Amendment #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, to close."

Bradley: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Very briefly, we just gave this Department some 300 new positions about two to three months ago, and these...this money is for another 192 new positions, again making a total of almost 500 new positions in one Department in less than a six-month period. It's just unbelievable that they would be willing to ask for these many...this...this kind of labor resource and ask the state to fund it when we just got done saving \$800,000. I urge an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Marco...Marco, 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 5 'ayes', 104 'noes', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski. Kosinski, please."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for purposes of an announcement. You know the quote, fabulous close, quote gridiron dinner and show presented by the Illinois Legislative Correspondence Association is tonight at 6:30 at the



Forum Thirty. Now, in addition to their reporting inabilities, they have two other problems. One, no tickets will be sold at the door, so it is important that you get them now from any reporter. Two, they must shortly tell the Forum Thirty how many will attend to insure food for all, so please make arrangements at once. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "If anyone needs tickets, see Roman Kosinski. The...House Bill 2427. 2427."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2427. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Capitol Development Board for permanent improvements, grants, and related purposes. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 29 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions? Kindly correct the Board. It's on Second Reading, please. Thank you."

Clerk Leone: "Motion to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 2427. Matijevich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the...the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on his motion to table Amendment #2. Mr. Matijevich, please.'"

Matijevich: "Yes...yes, Mr. Speaker, this has been cleared with the House Sponsor. It restores \$67,000 in architectural and engineering funding for certain projects. We've discussed this, and we find it justified, and I would support the motion to table. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House table Committee Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the motion prevails. Any further motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #21 by Representative Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, on a



motion to table Committee Amendment #21."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, \$300,000 is added for funding for demolition of a DMH facility. In order for this to be accomplished legally there must have been approval for this by the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board. The Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board has been established by the General Assembly to help us in cutting down the cost of health care to control development, to provide...now, I'm sorry, I'm just not in...in place here yet. The...the Department...to reduce unnecessary capital construction. All private and public health facilities must apply for permission to this Board, often called the Certificate of Need Board, that we have established. However, in instance after instance after instance our administration has failed to even apply much less get the approval from this Board. The Amendments which I am offering are speaking to this problem of illegal actions by state government. Why should the state comply? With...why shouldn't comply if we are going to expect private hospitals and private nursing homes to comply with this standard? So, I would ask you to support me until we can assure that the state is acting legally in compliance with state law in relation to certificate of need..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of order, Mrs. Chapman. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I think she's speaking to the wrong Amendment. Either that or she's very confused about this one."

Chapman: "No, Mr. Totten, not only must you have approval to build, you also must have approval to demolish. This is in the state law."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to continue, Mrs. Chapman?"

Chapman: "No, I would ask for your support on...on this motion, please."



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

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose the Lady's motion to table. What the Lady is attempting to do is to take \$300,000 out of the Bill which BOB inadvertently forgot to include when they originally drafted the Bill. Amendment #21 simply added \$300,000 so that the Department could demolish some buildings which are no longer being used. Now, I feel confident in saying that if the Department of Mental Health, at some point in time this fiscal year, has to appear before the Board, which the Lady refers to, I am confident that they will, in fact, do so. I don't see the point in not giving them the money. So that let's...let's assume they appear before the Board in August or September and they get approval in November or December that they couldn't go ahead and start the demolition without having to come back to the General Assembly, perhaps one year later, and ask for the money; when with the rising inflationary costs which we're facing, it'll cost the taxpayers even more money than the \$300,000. I agree with the Lady that the state should obey the law, and the Department of Mental Health ought to appear before any Board or agency that is necessary to demolish the buildings, but I really see no logic in keeping the money out of the budget, which would only create a longer time lapse and longer time delay and cost the state many, many more dollars, which I know the Sponsor of this motion does not want to happen. I know she's a fiscally responsible Member and is deeply concerned about protecting the taxpayers' money."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "May I please ask the Sponsor exactly what buildings are being proposed? One or the other of you. What buildings are going to be demolished if the Amendment:



is left standing? I don't know whether..."

Telcser: "Representative, the list is back in Representative Totten's office if you want to wait."

Pullen: "Wonderful."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, why don't we send somebody to get it, and I'm sure we can...there's only 47 Amendments that are on the Bill right now to be offered, so we'll have plenty of time to respond to your question, ma'am. Mr. Totten, can you respond to it now? All right. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to close."

Chapman: "Well, I'm...I'm glad Representative Telcser has so much confidence in the Department of Mental Health. I'm afraid I can't join him in that. Representative Telcser believes that if we tell them not to spend the money but appropriate it, that they really won't spend the money, but I'd like to point out that they went right ahead at Jacksonville on a 1.3 million dollar modernization project. Spent 1.3 million dollars illegally without applying for or receiving approval from the Illinois House Facilities Planning Board. If they do receive approval should they decide to operate legally on this matter, they can come back to us when we're back in Session in October, and I'm sure it will be possible to speed a supplementary Bill right through the House and the Senate. Please vote 'yes'."

Telcser: "Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, that's between a rock and a hard place, but Mr. Totten has the answer to your question, Mrs. Pullen. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The list of the buildings to be demolished by the \$300,000 includes the following at the Dixon Developmental Center: a dairy barn, a calf shed, a horse barn, a barn, a farmhouse, an old acute hospital, an a children's center. At the Alton Mental Health



Center it includes a nurses' home and a spruce. At the Chicago Reed Mental Health Center it includes Ward CW-18, Ward CW-19, and a diagnostic building. At the Jacksonville Mental Health and Developmental Center it includes a two-car garage, an old power plant, a carpenter shop, a greenhouse, a storage building, and an old fire station. The only thing wrong with this Amendment is it does not abolish the rest of the state buildings in the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House table Amendment #21?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. 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 are 22 'ayes', 81 'noes', 1 recorded as 'present', and the Lady's motion does not prevail. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction. We're very fortunate today to have in the gallery behind us on the Democratic side Mr. Bill Boyd and Al Rooter. They are Rotarians from Downers Grove and with them they have 35 exchange students from 19 different countries, who are here today to observe us in the action of the State of Illinois. If they would stand, please, so we could recognize them?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #26 by Representative Mahar."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Tabling Amendment #26 restores 1.4 million dollars to the Bill, and these funds are going to be used for the conversion of the Tinley Park Mental Health Center. Now, this is being done in conjunction with



the village of Tinley Park. Now, I might say that the money will be used to remodel and redo three of the halls plus some of the cottages. 'Munolsa' Hall, a particular hall that is going to be used by the village of Tinley Park, will be remodelled by \$254,000 of the village's money and will be used jointly by the village and by the Department of Mental Health. Now, there's been a question in regard to this Amendment...two points. I think one is to how the money is going to be used, and the other one is the...the question of the future of the employees. Now, the Tinley Park...the Department of Mental Health has stated categorically that they are not going to lay off people at this facility. As a matter of fact, they have several options. One is that they can continue to work at the facility or work at HOW. Another is that they can be transferred to IIDD, and I understand that many of them live in that vicinity, and the third is, of course, that many of them are going to the Oak Park Hospital which is only about two or three miles away. So, there's no question about the fact that every individual has been guaranteed that they will not lose their job, and I have personal concerns about that, because many of these people I know and I would not support any effort to lay these people off. I would urge an 'aye' vote on the motion to table Amendment #26."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support the Gentleman's motion for a couple of reasons. Although I don't claim to be completely familiar with the Department of Mental Health's alleged decision regarding Tinley Park, let me make two points. Number one, it is my understanding that the Department, if in fact their plans...the rumors are true, will keep people at Tinley Park who are bedridden or who are



non-ambulatory, and it seems to me that that would be a foolish use of nice grounds and outdoor area which ought to be used by patients who are, in fact, ambulatory. But, my principal concern and, therefore, my support for Representative Mahar's motion, is this: uptown is located in my district. The Members of the Legislature who serve with me in this Body are as familiar as I am with the severe problems the Department of Mental Health is caused by the dumping of mental patients in my district...in the community of uptown in particular. By accelerating and forcing the Department of Mental Health to, in fact, make their final decision regarding Tinley Park that is to remove more ambulatory patients as was alluded to earlier this afternoon simply compounds the problem which we have in my district up in the north side of Chicago. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the people who reside in my district are doing everything possible to maintain that area in the north side of Chicago as a viable community in which to raise families, in which to maintain property values, and to help the City of Chicago survive as a livable city. I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the continual dumping of more and more patients from various social agencies into one community only, the community of uptown, is serving to make the life harder and harder for those fine citizens and those fine block clubs on the north side of Chicago who are trying desperately to maintain the north side and my district as a good place to live. And that, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is simply my personal reason for supporting Representative Mahar's motion, and I hope the Members of the House will join me in supporting Representative in this motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House. Amendment 26 was offered in Committee by me. It deletes approximately 3.3 million dollars from House Bill 2427. Now, let me give you the background as to what is now happening. Those of you familiar with Tinley Park recognize it as a very nice facility with very adequate grounds. It currently houses MI patients. It houses MI patients that make use of these grounds... ambulatory patients that have freedom to walk around as they may choose at various times during the day on the grounds. The Department of Mental Health is transferring these MI patients into Chicago to the IIDD facility. They are transferring the developmentally disabled at the IIDD facility to Tinley Park. They're transferring non-ambulatory patients out to Tinley Park, and they're transferring ambulatory patients into IIDD. Now, that in itself makes no sense, but in the process of doing this they're going to spend 3.3 million dollars to rehabilitate one facility for DD patients that is currently housing MI patients and rehabilitate another facility that is currently housing DD patients for MI patients. So, they're just switching the two around and spending 3.3 million dollars in the process. Now, behind all of this is the Department of Mental Health's stated policy to phase out Tinley Park, so in the meantime we're going to spend 3 million dollars to phase out Tinley Park which makes absolutely no sense. The Sponsor of this Bill has been talking about the fiscal responsibility, and the Sponsor of this Amendment has been talking about the concern about the employees that work there. I think the only...really the only responsible thing is to face up to the situation. We're not talking about jobs. We're talking about a completely ridiculous public policy of spending 3 million dollars, public money before we transfer these facilities into private hands, and we're talking about putting MI patients



into a facility where there is no place for them to have access to open grounds that they now have. The entire policy makes no sense...absolutely no sense, so the Amendment I offer simply deleted the 313 million dollars, and the motion to table restores 3 million dollars which are absolutely unnecessary and unneeded. I hope you will oppose the motion to table."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose the motion to table. I think that Representative McPike is correct, and I think that Representative Telcser put his hands on the...the issue that underscores this whole debate...is one that he was unfamiliar with it. I'm unfamiliar with it also. I found out that when this item was discovered on the Capitol Development Board's budget, the question was put forth, what was it for? And, there was no answer forthcoming. Another thing that I am distressed about is Director Vito's very cavalier attitude towards like those like myself who represent the district that has been earmarked as the receiving center for the majority of the people coming from Tinley Park. I talked with the directors of these medical centers, and they tell me they know nothing about it. I don't know what the fiscal impact will be in terms accommodating these patients, and I think it is absolutely silly to take ambulatory patients, who have the adequate grounds upon which to...and then bring them back to Chicago where we have limited space. I move...I oppose this motion, and I hope everyone else will, too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, to close."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Tinley Park, over the years, has been constantly under-utilized as an MI facility, and in the four-year



plan that was adopted a year ago, this is one attempt to properly take care of the patients and to save some money. Now, I...I'm not the one who can say which patient should be transferred here or there or wherever. I think that should be up to the Department. I think they know best, and this is a plan which they have joined together with the local area in order to solve the problems that we've had in the past, and we've had a lot of problems in Tinley Park over the last five or six years, and by joining in with the village they're going to be able to solve some of these problems. They're going to be able to remodel some of these homes to be used for state facilities and some for private providers. In addition, the municipality is putting in \$254,000 for one building to be used jointly with the village of the public safety building and also with the state. Now this, I think, is going to be an asset to everybody concerned. I think this is a good move. I think the money needs to be restored in order to continue the progress, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on the motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House table Committee Amendment #26?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think Representative McPike and others have pretty much clarified the issue. It's a very simple choice you make here today. The choice is to whether or not you want to subsidize the free enterprise system. The patients are now being moved out. I think that if you want to save the state's money, you're going to cast a 'no' vote. If you're concerned about the patients, perhaps we can deal with that on another Amendment or another Bill, but this is a bad Bill, and the motion is a bad motion. I'm sorry, and it should be defeated, and I'm urging you to vote 'no'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to explain his vote on Timer's on."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are now going through the process by which many of the state institutions went through during the last six or seven years. I've watched this same thing happen in the Dixon Developmental Center in Lee County. We have put money into the Capitol Development program and increasing the funding for those buildings, etc. for qualification of...of the residents and the physicians at that place, and then they go ahead and start to move patients around to private care facilities and outreach facilities. Now, we spent about 13 million dollars over the last 10 years at Dixon, and I think we're on the same process at Tinley Park, and what we have to show for it will be very little. We have the qualified personnel at the institutions. I think what we're doing is absolutely wrong. If we're going to put this money back into Tinley Park, you're going to find that you're then going to be selling properties like you did at Bartonville and in other...in East Peoria and other areas of the state, and you're going to build a monumental thing and pump millions of dollars, once again, into a private care facility, and I don't think that's the posture this General Assembly wants to take. I would hope that there would be enough 'no' votes, at least from the central part of the State of Illinois, so that we have some concerns for the institutions that are now within our district and serve this thing, not only the mentally disabled but all citizens who need that type of care."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Mautino: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich,



to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Matijevich: "Very quickly, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen from the House. Last...one of those last Bills when Jerry Bradley had that Bill for the veterans' school, I heard eloquently from the other side of the aisle that we talk about spending...we talk about spending, but when we can do something about it, we don't. The Committee acted responsibly. It's been said that they're going to, in effect, phase out Tinley Park. It makes no sense at all that we put in new money. I went along with the Sponsor of the Bill on tabling one of the Amend...Committee Amendments, because I thought it was responsible. This is not a responsible motion. All we're going to do is waste money. I can understand the fact that we're...we may be going overboard in de-institutionalizing, but the policy has been made, and I think the Committee acted responsibly, and you who talk about spending should uphold the Committee when they have acted in that responsible manner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to point out that this is one additional project that the Department of Mental Health is involved in where they have not received the approval as required by law from the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue, ma'am. Oh, is that...? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'ayes', 73 'noes', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Any further motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #27 by Representative Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, on a motion to table Committee Amendment #27."



Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it isn't only the Department of Mental Health that is failing to observe the law in their construction projects. In this case it is the Department of Veterans Affairs, which has been contacted by the Certificate of Need Board and informed that they must comply. The...the letter which we have on May 12, 1978 says, 'Very clearly it's been brought to my attention that your office is currently involved in developing feasibility studies for long-term care facilities to be located in Illinois'. It further states that they are required, if this project is owned or operated by the State of Illinois, to comply with the review required by law under this state certificate of need program. In...in spite of this letter dated May 12, 1978 and in spite of the law which is very clear in its wording, the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs is pursuing construction requests, not only at Quincy but also at Manteno. I ask you to vote 'yes' on my motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For all of those people who have been voting with Jeanne...voting against her, please don't feel sorry for her because she's lost the last couple of times and now give her a vote. This Amendment added \$260,000 to the Capitol Development Board for rehabilitation...remodelling at the Illinois Veterans' home in Quincy. The issue that Mrs. Chapman is talking about is regarding the Certificate of Need law. On that date...May 12th, the Certificate of Need Board did send a letter to the Illinois Department of Veterans Affairs indicating that they believed that the Department of Veterans Affairs should comply with the law. On May 31, 1977, Walt Kesselman, then the Assistant Director, sent a letter to the coordinator of that project, Dr. John Copner (C-O-P-N-E-R) of the State



Planning and Development Agency stating that it was the Department's view that the Department did not have to comply with the Certificate of Need and that the statute was unclear as to public facilities. Just like on other matters where you've defeated Mrs. Chapman on this issue, I would again ask you to defeat her on this, since that the only...that's the only issue that she has raised. Don't feel sorry for her. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment. You know, when a fire comes to a home like the veterans' home, I feel it is best to repair that damage, and most of this Amendment goes to repair the damage of a serious fire that they had at the veterans' home just this last month, and so I would urge you to say 'no' to this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to close."

Chapman: "I'd like to read the wording of the law to the Members of the House, so you can decide for yourself if this is unclear or not. Hospitals, nursing homes, or ambulatory surgical treatment centers maintained by the state or any Department or agency thereof. I believe the wording is very clear, and that it is very clear that this Department is acting in violation of state law."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the Lady's motion to table Amendment #27 prevail?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Gene, 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 19 'ayes', 91 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present', and the Lady's motion does not prevail. It's lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further motions. Floor Amendment #30,



Harris, amends House Bill 2427 as amended by Amendment #8 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #30 allocates \$230,000 from the Capitol Development Board funding to Rend Lake College. This Amendment is for funding for rehabilitation of the heating and cooling system at the said college. Since there is an Amendment for other work while a contractor is there, this would make it much more simpler for one contract to be let at the same time, same contractor be on the site, and it would probably save, by estimation, 75 to 85 thousand dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #30 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...Amendment #30 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #31, Bower-Robbins, amends House Bill 2427 by inserting after the last sentence in Section 24 the following and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Bower on the floor? The Gentleman from Effingham? Is Mr. Robbins want to proceed with the Amendment?"

Robbins: "Since we've been...since we've been taking money away, this Amendment adds a little money. It seem that in the...in the junior college system that they have to replace a deficient faulty heating and ventilating and renovating an air-conditioning system, and at the eastern Illinois Lincoln Trail College, the sum that's needed for this is \$370,000. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the reason that this appropriation is necessary is upon the advice and counsel of the architects at the Capitol



Development Board who helped in the designing and consultation of this facility. Inadequate heating and air-conditioning devices were installed...ones that would have been much better used in the southern United States, and it has just been inadequate for our Illinois climates, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #31 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed... Amendment 31 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #32, Robbins-Bower, amends House Bill 2427 by..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "This Amendment free...appropriates \$100,000 for replacement of a defective gym floor which was caused by defects in the original construction. This is at the Olney Central College part of the Illinois Eastern Community College."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #32 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...Amendment 32 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #33, Yourell, amends House Bill..."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill Amendment #33 deals with 1.7 million dollars in Capital Development funds to reimburse Community College District #524, Moraine Valley Community College, for the remainder of the state's share of the construction costs of a general classroom building. According to the Board of Higher Education, Moraine Valley's enrollment is sufficient to justify the need for this additional space, and to date the state has provided 7...57.6 of the cost of this project."



The state is required by law to supply 75% of the total project cost. Funding of this project is recommended in the Board of Higher Education's fiscal '80 capital plan, and it received a priority number of 79 out of 99 recommended projects, and I move for the adoption of House Amendment #33 to House Bill 2427."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "I...I rise to support this Amendment, strange as it may seem."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment 33 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...Amendment 33 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #34, Chapman, amends House Bill 2427..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman. Withdraw the Amendment. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #35, Anderson, a Bill for an (sic)..."

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

Anderson: "Withdrawn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #35. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #36, Winchester-Richmond, amends House Bill 2427 as amended by inserting after the last sentence in Section 27..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Withdraw the Amendment. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #37, Telcser, amends House Bill 2427..."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment 37 is a technical change. This would...we originally put in the Bill 300 beds for the...for the Stateville facility when actually there should only be 150 beds, and this



Amendment: corrects that language."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves any discussion?"

The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #37. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Amendment 37 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #38, Anderson-Mautino, amends House Bill 2427..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Anderson, the Gentleman from LaSalle."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment 35 adds the sum of \$988,000 or whatever is necessary. It's appropriated from the Capital Development Fund for District 513, Illinois Valley Community College..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Sir. I believe you're explaining Amendment #35. We're on Amendment 38. Oh."

Anderson: "Yes, it's the same thing. There was a technical mistake. Amendment 38..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Anderson: "...adds 988,000 for a roof problem we're having at IVCC. I appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? No thank you. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #38 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed... Amendment 38 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #39, Sandquist..."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #39 appropriates the sum of 8 million dollars or so much thereof as may be necessary from the Capital Development Fund to the Secretary of State for public library construction grants. This is for the construction of...of up to 25% of the libraries and for the one new research center in Chicago up to 50% of the construction costs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #39 be adopted?' All in favor signify



by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...Amendment #...the question is, 'Shall Amendment #39 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes', 42 'noes'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #40, Wikoff, amends House Bill 2427 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 22 the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to withdraw Amendment #40. It's got a technical error in it, and Amendment #42 replaces it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #40. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #41, Harris, amends House Bill 2427 as amended by inserting..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Harris. The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #41. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #42, Wikoff, amends House Bill 2427 as amended by inserting immediately after Section..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman. Amendment #42 appropriates 15 million dollars to the School Construction Fund...in school construction funds to the Capital Development Board for construction projects in school districts with a population of less than 500,000. There's some 10...11 schools here. The one specifically I'm interested in is the Mahomet School District which got caught in a bind in the refusal of the corporate personal property tax. It amounts to about a third of their assessed valuation. They have a contract let for a 6 million dollar school and can't sell the bonds for it."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #42 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'."

Wikoff: "Aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Opposed...Amendment #42 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #43, Chapman-Willer, amends House Bill 2427 as amended on page 7..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment eliminates the funding from the Bill where the agencies have not applied for their Certificate of Need from the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board as required by law which this General Assembly has approved. It eliminates funding for Alton Mental Health Center, Dixon, Lincoln, Illinois Veterans' Home at Quincy, and reduces the amounts for Elgin and Howe where the dollar amounts asked for are beyond the approval granted by the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board. It provides a net reduction of \$4,800,400. Please vote 'yes'."

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

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I really don't know what the Sponsor has in mind of this motion. It disturbs me that the Sponsor wants to take money from mental health facilities in Alton, Dixon, Elgin, Tinley Park, and Lincoln, but perhaps what disturbs me more than anything else is that she wants to take funds away from the Illinois Veterans' Home, and that, I think, is something every of the House ought to be very, very much aware of...that the Illinois Veterans' Home along with the other mental health facilities would be on the short end of the stick if Amendment #43 is adopted. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that any state agency will comply with whatever law is on the books



that may be necessary to get permits or permission to construct or to demolish a building or to remodel it or what have you, but I, for one, do not want to stand here and shortchange, not only these mental health facilities but the Illinois Veterans' Home in particular."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to close."

Chapman: "In closing, Mr. Telcser, I'd like to pose a question.

As the Sponsor of this Bill, which you are putting forth ...calling for violations of state law again, and again, and again, I wonder if you are planning to check with the state agencies to see when and if and how they intend to comply with state law."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #43 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...The 'noes' have it. The Amendment's lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #44, Willer, amends House Bill 2427 as amended on page 13."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, House Amendment 44 is certainly a fiscally responsible Amendment. It deletes \$650,000 in the Capital Development Funds for planning the conversion of 6 buildings at the Manteno Mental Health Center into a veterans' nursing care facility. Now, nobody denies there's going to be an increase in the needs for beds for veterans in nursing facilities in the years to come, and we certainly should be thinking of it. This is about the worst possible way to go about it. The...we should be expanding the Quincy facilities where we already have a veterans' nursing home and hospital. 50%...50% of the beds there in the residential part are now empty. Every report we have had, every staff report that has been made has shown that this is where we should be thinking of expanding our facilities for veterans. The Auditor



General just, in 1978, issued a feasibility study on the use of vacant state-owned mental health facilities. I would like to hear what...you to hear what he has to say about Manteno. With respect to Manteno, the report recommended that no decision be made on converting a portion of the center into a nursing care facility for DVA until it is determined that this is the optimum use of the facility. The report further cited the fact that the proposed conversion will utilize only one-third of Manteno's buildings, thereby leaving a lot more empty buildings that probably could not be used for anything. We would need more administrative costs if we convert Manteno. The administration is already there at Quincy, and this building when it's finally built would cost between 10 and 11 million dollars. We are constantly talking about saving the taxpayers money. Here is a grandiose plan to expand Manteno into a brand new...brand new hospital for veterans. We have the existing facilities at Quincy. They should be expanded. I urge you support this Amendment. I would remind you also that no plan was submitted just like the other facilities mentioned by Representative Chapman. Now, when there is a law, and the state facilities Departments keep breaking that law, you'd better be sure action will be taken by the Attorney General or some...the newspapers are full of it already. We cannot allow our co-Departments to defy a law that's on the books that we, ourselves, are responsible for. I urge you to support this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Illinois Veterans' Home at Quincy is a wonderful place for veterans to live, and it is a shame that these rooms are vacant when they could be fixed up, just as I've said before. They



could be made available for those that are wanting to come there. I, too, believe that the money should be spent in the facility that we have now and not start a new one until we have the other one up to par."

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

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen...Gentlemen of the House, four years ago I passed a Bill amounting to three million dollars to build a nursing home up in the northern part of this state to take care of the veterans...retired veterans up in the northern part of the state. And, at that time, we were slow in setting up the program, and we had been promised 6 million dollars from the Veterans Administration plus the property on which this nursing home was to be built. Now, we have this program on the road, and this money is being allocated to set up a program to work this problem out and probably next year we'll appropriate more money to set the machinery in motion to make this a nursing home to serve the northern part of the state, and I ask that you oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gent...the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman. Mrs. Chapman, please."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Auditor General did a study at the request of this House last year, and this is what he had to say about Manteno Mental Health Center, 'No decision should be made on the conversion of part of the Manteno Mental Health Center into a nursing care facility for the Department of Veterans' Affairs until it can be determined if this is the optimum use of Manteno'. This conversion would utilize only one-third of Manteno's vacant buildings, and by the way, there are 24 vacant residential buildings out of the 41 located at Manteno, and reduce the likelihood of further use of vacant buildings there. This is a good Amendment and should be supported."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #44 be...
 I'm sorry. I thought she closed for you. All right.
 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose the Lady's Amendment. Let me simply say that I...I think I have an idea of what the Lady has in mind, and let me simply respond by saying that the use of the Manteno facility, as a veterans facility, I think makes for a very compatible use of the two types of services that would be offered at Manteno. It makes sense to me that there could be some Department of Mental Health patients on one portion of those grounds and in other portions or other buildings there could be some veterans who are there being cared for. The veterans would be served, would be close to a metropolitan area, their families could come and visit them without too much hardship. I would think that that location revolves itself around the huge population center in the northern part of the state, and I, therefore, conclude that the use of the Manteno facility for a veterans service operation is a well thought out use. To use that facility for any other purpose in conjunction with mental health patients, I think may or may not be feasible. So, that...for those reasons, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose Amendment #44."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to close."

Willer: "Yes, I don't think the Gentleman knows what I have in mind at all. He didn't hear me. What I have in mind is saving the taxpayers of Illinois money. As far as beds being needed, there are 34,000. I repeat, 34,000 beds that are empty now in public and private nursing home facilities. We have a lot of beds that are available right now. This is madness as far as I'm concerned to consider spending 10 to 11 million dollars



for a brand new veterans nursing home when we could...do ...expand at Quincy; use what we have, and expand upon it for far less. Now, if you really mean it by keeping your word to the taxpayers and your voters that you're going to spend the money wisely, you will not oppose this Amendment. You will support it. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #44 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed... 'noes'... a Roll Call has been requested. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #44 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Marco, 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The clerk will take the record. On this question there are 35 'ayes', 76 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present', and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #45, VonBoeckman, amends House Bill 2427."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I'm sorry, this is an explanation. He is on his way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take...take it out of the record temporarily. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #46, Vinson, amends House Bill 2427 as amended by inserting after the last sentence in Section 26..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is probably the cheapest Amendment that adds money to this Bill that we'll have a chance to consider. It spends the small figure of \$150,000 to rehabilitate a very important historic site near the ISU campus, and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is,



'Shall Amendment #46 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...the question is...all in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #46 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #47, Rigney, amends House Bill 2427 as amended by inserting after the last sentence in Section 24.6 the following and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #47 is \$3,468,296 for Highland Junior College in Freeport. It's for reimbursement to Highland Community College for permanent improvements as provided by statute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know the Sponsor is taking a position that he can accept all Amendments, because they're going to be vetoed out anyhow. However, I think it ought to be symbolic that a Bill that failed even to get a motion in Committee, and I called for the motion about three times, because I thought at least Mr. Rigney had one Republican friend in the Committee. However, it was motionless and quiet, and nobody said a word, and I think since he couldn't get a motion from the Committee, not even from one of his fellow Republican colleagues, that we shouldn't put this Amendment on on the CDB Bill, and I would urge its defeat."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney, to close."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think...I hate to differ with the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee that provided us with such a kind hearing that day, that perhaps that was not the day or the time to be offering this Amendment. But, let's be honest about it. We owe this to Highland Community College under the formula



that's provided by statute. It's that simple. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #47 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed... Amendment's not adopted. Any further Amendments? The Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. Fine, you'll get it. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #47 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Marco, vote me 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 37 'ayes', 64 'noes'. The Amendment's defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was off the floor when Amendment 41 was passed. I'd like to take it out of the record for a few minutes if I could."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What was that?" The Amendment's out of the record. It's on Third Reading."

Harris: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2676. Wait a minute."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2676. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record. The Gentleman's not on the floor. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Marovitz: "Just for the purpose of a brief announcement. I was asked by Chief Justice Goldenhersch to remind people that if they found five or ten minutes free, that the Supreme Court of the United...of Illinois is having a reception for Illinois Legislators from 2 to 5 right across the street, and if you have a few minutes, they



...all the Chief...all the Justices are there and would like to see Members of the House and the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I appreciate that announcement, but I would just kindly like to remind the Membership of the floor we've got some other Amendments that we're going to have to be considering, and I'd like to have the Membership, if at all possible, remain on the floor. They're critical Amendments. I hope we'll be through here by 7 o'clock. House Bill 2362."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2362. A Bill for an Act to amend the statute of limitations. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Daniels, amends House Bill 2362 as amended..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdrew Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Third Reading. On 2362.

On the Calendar on Third Reading is House Bill 501.

The Lady from...excuse me. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, seek recognition?"

O'Brien: "Is it possible to have the Chair bring up House Bill 2703? It's on the Calendar on Second Reading. We've been bouncing around on that page all day."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'll be right back to you, Danny. On the Calendar on Third Reading is Senate Bill 501...House Bill 501. The Lady from St. Claire, Mrs. Younge. Just wait a minute. The Lady asks...Mrs. Younge, is that your Bill? 501?"

Younge: "Yes."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks leave to bring that Bill back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, House Bill 501 on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Younge, amends House Bill 501 as amended in Section 1A-3 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Claire, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill and rather than the Capital Development Board guaranteeing the bonds of school districts that are unable to do so, this Amendment would change the Bill to read that the Capital Development Board would make a study and an inquiry into the difficulties local school districts throughout the state are encountering in attempting to sell their bonds and to obtain funds as a result of the sale of their bonds. This Amendment has been agreed to by the Capital Development Board people, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #2?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Same category on House Bills, Third Reading is House Bill 1925. The Lady asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objection? Hearing none, House Bill 1925, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Correct the board. 1925."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Younge, amends House Bill 1925 as amended by changing \$25,000 to \$48,702."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Claire, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment would change the figure here from 25,000 to 48,000. This is an



appropriation to the Office of the Fire Marshal for equipment and gear for firemen on an emergency basis when the municipality is unable to provide that equipment and gear, and I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Back on the Calendar on Third Reading. House Bill 1830 on Short Debate, Third Reading. 2185. I'm sorry. 1830. Who? Is Mr. Stearney on the floor? Mr. Stearney. Take it out of the record. House Bill 1742. It's on Third Reading. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, asks leave to bring that Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #... Amendment #2 amends House Bill 1742 on page 6, line 17. Representative Hoxsey's Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey. Amendment #2."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment simply increases the formula for the percentage for the Strayer-Haig schools 50 to 65%. The cost of this to serve 228 schools in Illinois would be approximately 2.2 million dollars. I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield to a question? Representative Hoxsey, I didn't hear all you said. Is this the same as..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he..."

Stuffle: "Is this..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute."

Stuffle: "...the same Amendment that you offered the other day to go to 65% from 50. on the add on?"

Hoxsey: "Yes, that's exactly right, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Okay, to speak to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker and Members. The Amendment does help some 229 Strayer-Haig districts. I would, as I did the other day, indicate that I think there are better Amendments forthcoming. Amendments that would give more money to the Strayer-Haig districts and recognize their needs, not only with some additional changes in the resource equalizer formula that would bring some of these districts on board with that formula from 1973, but also add to the add on that Representative Hoxsey is presenting here. And, I think that the additions by other Amendments would be better and more substantial than this particular Amendment for the Strayer-Haig districts."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to indicate to you that I'm willing to accept the Amendment of Representative Hoxsey today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...Amendment's defeated. Any further...Roll Call? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle. Does not want to explain his vote? Have all voted who wish? Marco, give Laurino 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Madigan, 'no', as well please. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 68 'ayes', 72 'noes', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Anderson, amends House Bill 1742 on page 10."

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

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Anderson. Would the Parliamentarian come up to the rostrum?"

Anderson: "Mr. Speak..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue."

Anderson: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 allows the state guaranteed amount per pupil in the resource equalizer formula to adjust upward or downward depending on the appropriation, and it eliminates the need to prorate if the appropriation is insufficient. Proration is more beneficial to the wealthier districts than the poor districts. Adjusting the guaranteed per pupil is fair to all districts. If additional funds are available in the appropriation, the guaranteed per pupil and the resource equalizer can adjust upward in order to distribute the full appropriation without additional legislative action. What this means, if you're a poorer district and get a larger amount of state money, if you take say 90% of 90%, you're...you know, you're losing, because you're getting \$81. And, if you're a wealthier district and you're getting say \$10, you take 90% of that and you're losing \$1. So, this is beneficial for the poorer districts."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. On its face at first blush this looks like a good Amendment, because it says if we don't have the appropriation necessary to provide money at whatever the guarantee per student is in the resource equalizer formula, that the guarantee would be reduced. Let's say we have a \$13.63 guarantee, and the money is only there to meet all the factors plus that



one. To go to 13.59 there would be a reduction in the guarantee for each district student under the resource equalizer. On the other hand, if we should appropriate more money than is necessary for the formula and have the 13.63 guarantee or whatever, that we would then float upward to the appropriation level. I see some flaws with that, although the idea is not so bad. The flaws are these: number one, doing that would not help those 229 Strayer-Haig districts that we just talked about in the last Amendment and that other Amendments would address, because the guarantee does not touch those 229 of 1,013 districts. Secondly, if we're to say that we believe there's X amount of money to be appropriated, and we think at a given time that an amount of money should be used for schools, and there is an overage in our appropriation, I think then that the formula should stand as it is until we've had a second chance as a legislative Body to make budgetary decisions and policy decisions with regard to the formula. And for those reasons I would have to urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment, because what we could be faced with with this automatic change in the formula is if the Governor decides to reduce the appropriation to fund the formula, he could do so without amending the formula itself. This would allow an automatic changing of the formula regardless of what the Legislature wanted, and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment. It's very bad."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to close."

Anderson: "It's very true that this does not affect the Strayer-Haig districts, but if you're a poor district,



this Amendment is to your advantage. You're going to get more state money with it. Don't...don't be fooled. Ninety percent of the students in the State of Illinois are in resource equalizer districts, so I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Wants a Roll Call? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Vote me 'no', please. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's no question but what this method of...of apportioning state aid is better than the proration, and this is what we're trying to get at is something that's fairer and more equitable."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 55 'ayes', 75 'noes'. The Amendment's defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2092. Same request by Mr. Hoffman to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. That's located on page 25 of the Calendar. Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 2092 is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Hoffman, amends House Bill 2092 by deleting everything after line 6 and so forth."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment to 2092 makes a provision to cover a situation where a district like Mahomet, for example, which has...whose assessed valuation has dropped below the level by which they can issue bonds, and they've already passed a referendum, this will make



a provision to cover them as we move into dealing with the issue of bonded indebtedness or the removal of bonded indebtedness limitations, and that's all this Amendment does."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on Amendment #1? The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Representative Schneider and I were trying to listen to that discussion, and as Representative Hoffman mumbled through it, we found some difficulty understanding the effect. If you would repeat it, we would appreciate it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hoffman, please, to explain Amendment #1 on 2092."

Hoffman: "Yes, this particular Amendment affects districts such as Mahomet, which we've had some discussions about, who have passed referendums, but due to the loss of the corporate personal property tax, have gone below the limit, and the bonding companies refuse to issue... refuse to issue the bonds, because their assessed valuation is now below the 6...12%. And, what this does is allow them to use referendum that they've already passed to...to deal with that issue, and that's all it does."

Stuffle: "So this just provides for the calling of a referendum and the issuance of notice, and in addition to the limitations set forth otherwise in the Bill?"

Hoffman: "And allows them, in a sense, grandfathers in referendums that they have already passed. Say they pass, for example...okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stuffle, are you completed? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed...Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2185. House



Bill 2185 appears on the Calendar on Third Reading, I believe. It's on the Short Debate. Is it on Second Reading? 2185 was moved from Second to Third today, and I believe there was an error in one of the Amendments, and Mr. Ewing asked leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of a corrective Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? Bring the Bill back to Second Reading. 2185. Mr. Ewing, you want to...the Bill's on Second Reading."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the status of this Bill...there was an Amendment put on in the Committee, and then this afternoon on the floor, we considered Amendment #2 which was not adopted and Amendment #3 which was adopted. With the adoption of Amendment #3 we should really table the Committee Amendment which was put on, because they just don't mesh up, and I would like to move at this time that we table Committee Amendment 1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Committee Amendment #1. Any objection? We'll use the Attendance Roll Call to table Committee Amendment #1."

Ewing: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put the Bill back to Third Reading. 216... 2185. House Bill 1016. I believe it's on Third Reading. Yeah, well I called it. You weren't on the floor. Mr. McPike. The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objection? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second Reading. Yes, Sir. Mr. Walsh, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Walsh: "Well, this is a Bill in which I have some interest, and I am not going to object to it being brought back, but to inquire of the Sponsor for what reason he is offering another Amendment to this. I thought we had discussed it and gone over it very carefully."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, well we'll get to that. Jack,



would you kindly put the Bill back on Second Hearing like I stated? Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is Amendment #18. We have adopted Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 16. Enrolling and Engrossing called to my attention that a few of the Amendments were in conflict in a few words. A few words were repetitious. Once one Amendment was adopted the following Amendment became slightly repetitious, so Amendment 18 simply sums up all the Amendments adopted and puts them into the proper language. I recognize that Representative Walsh will oppose the Bill as amended, but this Amendment does not, in itself, change the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Clerk, he asked that the Legislative Reference Bureau do this, because they couldn't work the Amendments together. Okay. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #18 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #18 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Same request for House Bill 2104. Mr. Schneider asks leave to have the Bill brought back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, 2104 is on Second Reading."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are going to offer another Amendment which would take care of the problems in one, so I'd move that we table that Amendment as adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House table Amendment #1 which was adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...was that adopted by a voice or a Roll Call? Oh, it was a Committee



Amendment? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'.
Opposed...Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments
or motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Schneider, amends House
Bill 2104 on page 1 by deleting line 1 through 3 and
so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook...DuPage, Mr.
Schneider."

Schneider: "All right. Now, Mr. Speaker, what this Amendment
will do is just eliminate...rather just add one voting
Member to the Board of Higher Education rather than
to all the appropriate university Boards, and I would
move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall
Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by
saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...Amendment #2 is adopted.
Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Katz-Currie, amends House
Bill 2104..."

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

Katz: "Amendment #3, Mr. Speaker, would provide that the
Governor shall appoint to the Board of Higher Education
one person who will be the president of an Illinois
private college or university. I would move the
adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from
DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that I have
no problems with that Amendment and would accept its
adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be
adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'.
Opposed...Amendment 3 is adopted. Any further Amend-
ments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1387. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Pullen, amends House Bill 1387 on page 1 by deleting line 1 through 5 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I should move to table Committee Amendment #1 first. It is technically deficient, and that's why I'm offering..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves to table Committee Amendment #1 because of a technical error. What? Yeah, okay. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Pullen, amends House Bill 1387 on page 1 by deleting line 1 through 5 and so forth."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment which changes some Section numbering problems and also adds an effective date to the Bill to make the effective date July 1, 1980. I move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signi...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty. Getty, please."

Getty: "I...I saw the word, repeal, in there. Is...is that what this Amendment does?"

Pullen: "The original Bill would repeal, and this Amendment refrains the...rephrases the Committee Amendment which changed it from total repeal to some repealing and some amending and renumbering. This Amendment essentially renumbers some Sections that we did not have numbered properly in the Committee Amendment."

Getty: "So, this Amendment is purely technical?"

Pullen: Yes, except that it changes the effective date to



July 1, 1980 in addition."

Getty: "All right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted.. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2104. Did we? How about 1830? Is Mr. Stearney back on the floor? ...still on the floor? Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is...the Gentleman asks leave of the House to bring House Bill 1830 back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Stearney, amends House Bill 1830 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

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

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 to House Bill 1830 would add a Section 503 to the...to the Bill. I know of no opposition. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Would it be asking too much to know something a little more than the Section number? What does this Section do? I mean, I'm sure it's going to pass, but I'm curious."

Stearney: "It deals...it deals with the Marital Property Act."

Skinner: "What does it do with it? Give it all to the wife?"

Stearney: "No."

Skinner: "Give it all to the husband?"

Stearney: "No."

Skinner: "What's the split?"

Stearney: "Well, there's no split. It's for the court to



decide. It's discretionary. We couldn't...we couldn't write an Act that..."

Skinner: "But, Representative, what if we don't trust the courts, in spite of their tea this afternoon?"

Stearney: "Well, I can...I can suggest to you, Mr. Skinner, that the Act is in worse shape right now than it would be if amended."

Skinner: "Well, it may or may not be."

Stearney: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any furth...the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Daniels: "All right. Ron, would you explain the Amendment to us in layman's terms?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stearney, please."

Stearney: "Well, the Amendment deals with the marital property Section of the present Divorce Act, and it would make some changes in that Act relating to marital property."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Just to support the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment... Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed..."

Stearney: "The 'ayes' have it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, I'm afraid not. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to explain his vote."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, in this situation what my colleague is trying to do is simply, where there is some disagreement as to the property settlements between litigants in divorce action where an agreement cannot be reached,



then it allows the court to make the judicial determination, although there are some who may hesitate to leave it to the court. Unfortunately, if we fail to do that, you'll have nothing but endless litigation. The Amendment is a good one, and it's only right that Representative Stearney should occasionally come up with a good Amendment, and I would vote its approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 32 'noes', 7 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar in the same category is House Bill 2569. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections the Bill's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment number one, McPike. Amends House Bill 2569 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me explain some of the general provisions of Amendment number one, because it is, in effect, the Bill as it applies to the corporate personal property tax replacement. Under the Amendment, the corporations will be at the three percent level, estates and trusts at one and half percent, partnerships at one and a half percent, utilities besides the income tax will have a three quarters of percent invested capital. This will generate approximately \$533,000,000 in revenues. There is no cap on the gross. The distribution of this is set for as soon as possible after September 30, 1979 with quarterly distributions. The tax itself will start August 1, 1979. The allocations will be based on 1978 collections which is approximately 51.5% for Cook County and 48.5% for downstate. The long-term debt requirement specify priority usage for a proportional amount of debt service formally financed by the corporate personal property tax. It is a complex piece of legislation and I think we can address in detail on Third Reading, but at this time I would offer Amendment number one to House Bill 2569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "How much more in income tax are you charging corporations than Representative Ryan's and Representative Ewing's Bill would?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McPike please."

McPike: "It's my understanding that House Bill 2700 is at two percent and this is at three percent."

Skinner: "So you're going to raise corporation taxes by 50% more than the Republican Bill, is that correct?"

McPike: "Well, Cal, you can play with the figures any way you wish. What we're trying to do is replace a revenue loss and it's our estimate that three percent corporate income tax is the amount required to replace revenue loss as required by the Constitution."

Skinner: "The press release indicates from Representative Redmond, Diane Monk offered..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, excuse me Mr. Skinner. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins what purpose seek recognition?"

Collins: "Well Mr. Speaker I don't think this Amendment has been distributed. Nobody over here can find it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes it has."

Collins: "Well now, would you check that Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I did."

Collins: "Well, then did... I believe it's being distributed now, Mr. Speaker. I just had it laid on my desk just now. So it has not been distributed yet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it's been distributed, Sir. I don't know, maybe your Pages are getting a little slower. Mr. Skinner, please continue."

Skinner: "Yes. In the press release Diane Monk did for the Speaker, it says that you're keying your figures into collections. Could you define collections?"

McPike: "Yes, collections are defined as that amount of revenue collected by various, various units of local government. School district, park districts, etc... Based on our nearest estimates for 1978."

Skinner: "For 1978. That's strange. The press release says you're betting on the come and indeed this Bill that the rate of three percent for corporations is based on the amount that maybe collected in 1980."



McPike: "That's not correct."

Skinner: "Well then I really guess we ought to have time to read the Amendment instead of just reading the press release which I thought was very informative. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

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

I rise because of the last Gentleman's remark when he seemed to indicated to the Members of this body that the democrats for some reason are imposing a burden on corporations that the Republican's aren't imposing a burden. I would tell you that you ought to look at the Constitution of the State of Illinois, because I hear so much talk about replacing revenue that have been corrected. Show me in the Constitution where it says revenues that have been collected. What the Constitution says, revenues that have been lost. That's what it says and let me tell you. You know, I've heard about statutory rape, but for all these years the tax payers have had statutory rape that's what you're going to have now by that Ryan Bill. Statutory rape of the tax payers. Now let me tell you, that the corporation for years and years...and I've heard it said on this floor, I've heard it said all over, that those who have invisible property have been really cheating the public. They have been cheating the public because their property, personal property has not been visible. The ones that have been visible are those like the steel industry. Those like the retail merchants. So don't tell me that we Democrats are placing an undue burden on the corporations because for years and years the corporations in the State of Illinois have in my mind been criminally, criminally, as far as I'm concerned, taking away revenues that belong to local government and I don't care if it were four percent. I'd be for it, because they just



haven't been paying their due share to the local government and this is our time Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature, to show the taxpayers, to show local governments, that it's about time we give them the revenue that has been robbed. That's what the Constitution says, replace the revenue that's lost. Says nothing about collected. Show me where it says collected. Lost. You who defend the corporation should understand that you have no reason to defend them because they've cheated the public. They've cheated the taxpayers and I, therefore; say support the McPike Amendment and get back at them for all this cheating that they've done. They ought to end up in jail for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor of the Amendment would yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Dunn: "Representative McPike, how much money will this raise by your three percent figure? Do you have that?"

McPike: "Yes, as I indicated in my opening remarks we're expecting to raise approximately \$533,000,000. Every one percent income tax on corporation generates approximately \$130,000,000."

Dunn: "Then this would raise as much as the taxes that were collected or the taxes that were extended?"

McPike: "Taxes collected."

Dunn: "I was under the opinion that this would be hundred, about 430,000,000 or 440,000,000 that's been lost and so I would think that probably the three percent is too high. If I might speak to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Dunn: "I know that we're going to have a lot of arguments about this Bill and about the other Bills that are coming along McPike about McPike, about the extension of taxes and how much we can collect and how much we should



dig the corporations for and I think that the 3% that's offered here is at least one percent too high. And I just wanted to make that observation in response to Representative Matijevich's comments too. We don't collect taxes if we extend them and don't collect them they're not collected or they're not lost. The ones that are lost are what we actually collect and that's about 430,000,000 as I understand it. Thank you."

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

Stuffle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members. Somewhere between some of the remarks today are the facts I think. The fact is that if we put the burden, as Representative Matijevich said, on the corporations to the level that it should be we'd be talking about extension because that is exactly what the tax liability was with the corporate personal property tax and the assessments there on. And in fact many Members worked on this Amendment to provide that we would use figures from the Department of Local Government Affairs and projections from the Economic and Fiscal Commission to take a look at '78 collections. Collections if you will, not extensions. I hear on one hand that two percent is enough that three percent is too high. In reality, I think we're giving the corporations a break. They did not pay their way. To argue that it would go down to two percent is to say, in effect, that we should go back to where they were avoiding their tax liability and to where they weren't paying their Bills. What this Amendment does is to take DLGA April '78 projections for tax collections in Cook County and tax collections in downstate Illinois to break the pie in two halves to give Cook County its share of the statewide collections, downstate its share and factor in seven percent growth for two years. In contrast what the other Bill which others have alluded to on the Republican side



would do it to short those taxing districts \$46,000,000 to begin with even from the '78 estimates of collections. Beyond that the \$46,000,000 loss would just be a beginning. Representative Matijevec was absolutely right. We're talking about replacement of lost revenue, not how much the corporations could steal or beat us out of. Beyond that there is no growth in Representative Ryan's Bill and Representative Ewing's Bill. This is a fair approach and a good approach, a compromise down, if you will from other Bills. It is not an attempt to sulk business by any means. It is an attempt in no way to give anyone a windfall but to build into a formula some fair and equitable basis to give money back to taxing districts that they've really lost. Not to talk about some phony issue about how much the corporations have been able to beat us out of. We're not talking about the little taxpayer here, the individual. We're talking about the people who've already been shirking their duty, who've failed to pay their Bills. And if they were individual taxpayers they'd be behind bars. They wouldn't be beating the rap in some tax court or beating the rap by jewing down the assessor and if you'll pardon that ethnic term. I urge a vote on this Bill in the affirmative on this Bill and the affirmative on this Amendment for those reasons."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You have just seen a big smoke screen thrown up. They want to talk about the corporation tax. We know the corporations are going to pay the tax, that's what the Constitution says and that's what we're here to do. That's not the gimmic in this thing. The gimmic is the distribution. What you're trying to do and I've talked to people and I think that I have confidence in and they tell me it takes two percent to replace the taxes that have been collected. If that's true then, what we're trying to do



here is to reward Chicago for all the years they've failed to collect taxes from the corporations up there. Now if they were so concerned about collecting taxes in the past why haven't they done it. Now are we suppose to reward them at the expense of the downstate schools for something they haven't done for forty years? When you replace something, you've got to replace something that was not something that might have been and that's what we're trying to do on this side of the aisle."

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

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a point of personal privilege I hesitate to interrupt the activity of this House, but I resent it greatly when any Members of this Legislature or any individual would use an ethnic term in trying to buy or sell a Bill. My colleague is a capable individual. He knows better to use the language. He apologized. I don't except his apology and I would simply remind you in the future I won't be quite as kind when I suggest that he refrain from those type of remarks."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a Sponsor of one of the other major proposals for replacement of the corporate personal property tax, I believe that Representative McPike has every right to put his Bill in the shape which he would like. Therefore, I would not oppose his amendment in this case. I do believe that there is some disagreement on figures and on how much will be raised by this proposal. But that we can debate at a later time. I feel that one of the prior speakers though was talking about rape of the taxpayers and I wish that he would listen to me about rape of the taxpayers. What you can do with your Bill is rape downstate business. That may not interest you very much. It does me. But we've been paying per-



sonal property tax right along as we should have over the years and to have a higher rate of tax so that we can replace it and put the money somewhere else for those businesses who weren't paying is rape, but it's not rape of the taxpayers, it's rape of those businesses that have been carrying their share of the burden."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

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

Is there an awful lot of rhetoric today about upstate and downstate and about trying to raise more money than is presently being raised with the corporate personal property tax. The amount of money or the amount of revenue that is expected to be raised by the taxes included in Amendment number one is \$533,000,000. Now if you look at the projections put out by the Department of Local Government Affairs, their projections for collections on the corporate personal property tax in 1980 when this tax will be in effect during its first year, their projections for collections, not extensions, collections statewide, is 532.7 million dollars. That's within 300,000 of the projection revenues in the taxes levied in this Amendment. So in terms of replacement we're replacing the amount of taxes expected to be collected and these are figures put out by the Department of Local Government Affairs and we are replacing collections in the same year that this tax will go into effect. Now, as far as distribution is concerned, you heard a lot of rhetoric about downstate is going to have to pay and that we're supporting Cook County. I think that the record of the downstate Members from this side of the aisle is that we have been very careful to protect downstate. And if any of you will take a look at the distribution formula in this Amendment, you will see that downstate is not going to be supporting the extensions of the corporate personal property tax in Cook County. Extensions that were extended but not



collected. And the way we have done that is by dividing the revenue expected to be collected into two parts. One part for Cook County and one part for downstate. And the part for Cook County is 51.65% of the total revenues collected and the part for downstate is 48.35%. And where did we get that distribution and that split of the part. That is the exact percentage split of the part for collections of the corporate personal property tax, collections now not extensions, collections in 1978 the last full year that we have any kind of figures for it. And again, those are figures supplied by the Department of Local Government Affairs. And so we are not trying to collect more money from the corporations than they would have paid otherwise, and we are not shipping any money from downstate to Cook County and we're not going to be shipping any money from Cook County to downstate. What this Amendment does is fairly replace the personal property tax. It's fair in terms of replacing the entire revenue and no more than the entire revenue and it's fair in that it protects downstate. It protects Cook County and it protects our local units of government and it protects the taxpayers around the state. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment number one to House Bill 2569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we're making arguments that should be on Third Reading and therefore I move to previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved to previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' aye, oppose. Previous question been moved. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike to close."

McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are some of us on the floor that think



that there is such a thing in our society today as a free lunch. I think what we're addressing ourselves here today and tomorrow when we speak to these Bills is the fact that there is no such thing as a free lunch, that someone must pay. Or what we have tried to do is to look to see who has paid in the past and who will pay in the future. The Department of Local Government Affairs estimates the revenues for 1978 a statewide collection at 500... I'm sorry. For 1980, of \$533,000,000. And they estimate extensions for 1980 of \$803,000,000. Now we're not trying to fool anyone. We're not going after \$803,000,000 in this and trying to put an excess burden on industry. We're \$270,000,000 short of projected extensions. But what we have tried to do is say, 'Who has paid in the past,' and that is industry, and whether or not they should pay in the future. For if they don't, we all know who will and that is the individual property owner when he pays his or her real estate property taxes year after year. If industry doesn't pick up their fair share of the burden, and that is the same burden that they have had in the past, then the home owner indeed will. Now you can say what Representative Skinner said, that this is a tax increase for business, but it simply isn't true. The fact remains that the three percent level industry will not be paying anymore of a fair share than what they have in the past. It's an equitable tax for industry and it allows the home owner to continue to pay at the same rate that he has in previous years. Your other choice, if there is no such thing as a free lunch, is to apply a lower rate to industry and put the burden on the individual taxpayer. I think that will be your choice when we go to Third Reading to vote on these Bills. Who will pay the Bill? I think it's up to us to decide and what we are trying to say by this Amendment in this Bill is that industry shall continue



to pay their equitable share in Illinois. I move for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 2569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114... On this question there's 120 'ayes', 21 'nays'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stuffle: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I made a remark which was unintended a few moments ago, as I indicated in a debate on the last Amendment, and I wish to tender an apology to Representative Epton, my good friend, and anyone else it may have offended. Because, as I said, it was unintended, as I pointed out earlier, and I tender that apology at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would... Mr. Christensen, are you in your chair? Mr. Christensen? Would you kindly shut off Mr. Van Dyne's speaking request light? Thank you. House Bill 2562. It's on the Order of Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no... I move the Bill back to Third Reading. On 2569. 2562. The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, 2562."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Brummer, amends House Bill 2562 on page 1, line 12 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. 2562 is a Bill to impose a limit on the level of appropri-



ations from the general fund. Amendment #2 is in the nature of a technical Amendment. There was some question that arose about the exact definition of general fund. In Amendment #2 we defined the general fund as it is defined in the appropriations process and in the Comptroller's office and used in the financing of the operation of state government. We also defined what is meant by the average percentage increase in Illinois personal income over the most recent five years. This is in the nature of a technical Amendment, and I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 513. I'll try. 1542? Okay. 513. The Gent...Mr. Stuffle requests leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. The Gentle... Any objections? Hearing none, 513 is on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Clerk O'Brien: Amendment #2, Stuffle-Kane-Madigan, amends House Bill 513 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I got it."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Amendment #2 will effectively become the Bill, House Bill 513, which, as you know, is an Amendment to the school aid formula. Amendment #2 would provide equity, I believe, for each type of school district in the State of Illinois. It is sponsored by myself, Representative Kane, and Representative Madigan. It provides for the various elements at what I believe and others believe to be a reasonable amount of appropriation necessary this year to include in the school aid formula. It includes,



by way of explanation, provisions to increase the guarantee per student in the State of Illinois under the resource equalizer, provisions to phase in the so-called elimination of the high tax rates necessary or access; if you will, over a three-year period for each type of school district in the State of Illinois, and it also provides elimination of the double O adjustment. In other words, the provision now in the law that reduces aid, in effect, has nearly wiped out many of the school districts in this state. It would do that over a two-year period. It also provides some provisions for the Strayer-Haig districts, the 229 districts in this state that Representative Hoxsey and others have tried to help through other Amendments. This Amendment goes farther than those provisions. It provides for a 75% add on to the already calculated aid in those 229 odd districts, and I would move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We may announce...pronounce to the Membership of the House that we have a former expert in the field of education, the former Representative Charles Claybough. Charlie, welcome back. Sounds like old home week, doesn't it? Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #2 on 513?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Kane, amends House Bill 513 as..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #2 (sic) does to House Bill 513 is repeal Section 18.4 of the school code effective July 1, 1981. It was part of the Bill on 2272. It was approved at that time, and it's simply adding this repeal onto House Bill 513, and I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #2 (sic)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall



the House adopt Amendment #3?' Do you want to correct the board, please? Tony. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2201. It's on the Calendar. Third Reading. The Gentleman requests to bring it back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, 2201 is on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, on 2201. Did you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, on Second Reading?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2201. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Common School Fund to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr... The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is a simple Amendment. It just raises the State Board of Education's amount for distributing the Common School Fund from one billion, 423 million to 1 billion, 434 million, 451 thousand. It matches the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mike, Amendment #2 is Mr. Peters' Amendment, I believe. I believe the Gentleman is right there. Fine. Your Amendment is #3, Mike. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, on Amendment #2."

Peters: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is an Amendment which we began to debate one day last week, and, as indicated in our conversation, it's not a final decision on our part nor, I'm sure, on the part of any of the Members of the House here, but it's an attempt to bring the level of the funding for the formula here in line with the 80 million new dollars for education, which the Governor



has allotted. Again, this would bring the formula...or this would bring the...the number down to 1 billion, 365 million or a general reduction here of 58 million, 400 thousand dollars. This would bring it down to the Governor's level. A level which we understand is a level which we would like all to go up from and think it's a lot easier to go up than it is to start high and to come down. I'm sure, Representative McClain, you understand our reasoning for this. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I also point out that this Bill was on Second Reading. You did not ask leave to bring it back from Third. It was my error. On the...on the Amendment, the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We would oppose this Amendment. We think it's easier to negotiate from a reasonable figure rather than a figure that's 22 million dollars below the estimated expenditures for this year. I'd like to point out to the Membership that the available revenue balance for the State of Illinois is in excellent shape. On May 17, 1979 the revenue balance for the State of Illinois was 430,226,000. The same day last year, 1978, it was 172,653,000, and the same day in 1977 it was 104,683,000. So, compared to last year we're some \$280,000,000 above last year's expenditures...or last year's revenue balance on May 17, 1979. We think it's inappropriate to have the amount reduced to Mr. Peters' number. We would oppose this Amendment. Also, I have a subsequent Amendment which would match up now with House Bill 513, Mr. Stuffle's Bill, which would then appropriate the formula. So, we would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to close."

Peters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's obviously a difference in strategy as to how to proceed in reaching an adequate



funding level for education. I would ask the Members to consider the position that we would like our Members to be in, and that is one of voting for a level which would recognize the fiscal condition of the state, and would be one of fiscal restraint, and knowing full well that, in terms of negotiation in the Senate and possibly the Conference Committees, that we could then move up depending on what new revenue estimates are. At this particular time I would respectfully solicit an 'aye' vote on Amendment 2 to House Bill 2201. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #2?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to explain his vote. Marco, vote me 'no'."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the Amendment of Representative Peters. It's surprising to me that the Gentleman from Adams has brought forth...is opposing this Amendment and is attempting to proceed with Amendment #3. Even though we do have a rather healthy available balance, it appears to me and to many Legislators, and I believe even to the Member who spoke from Adams that much of this money should be returned to the taxpayers in the form of tax relief rather than be put...rather than go into a budget that, even at the Governor's level, is some 80 million dollars over last year's request. We ought to recognize in this General Assembly that education is a declining need in the total budget and ought not to be increased at incrementally... I'll try another word. At...accelerated is a good word. At acc...at accelerated levels as the Gentleman proposes. With a limited pie there are other needs..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 82 'ayes', 88 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."



Peters: "If I might request, Mr. Speaker, to poll the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk.

While we're waiting for the Roll Call, Mr. Mahar. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Unknown: "Do you want it verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, come on. Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd ask leave to suspend the appropriate Rule to move Senate Bill 943 from Committee to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. This is a supplemental appropriation for the military and naval in order for them to get paid..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of order being raised by Mr. Matijevich. What's your point, Sir?"

Matijevich: "Point of order. Two points of order. One, we're in the middle of a Roll Call. Probably three points of order. Two, you haven't cleared that yet with me. I told you to see my staff. They haven't come back to me, and three, I never saw so many Supplementals come over from the Senate as this year, and I'm sick and tired of it. I've been working very closely, and Jake Wolf has cooperated. We both have worked closely, and I know Pete Peters has and Gene Barnes have worked real closely. You don't see many of the House Bills as Supplemental Bills, but there's so many Bills coming over, Supplementals from the Senate, and I'm about sick and tired of it, and I don't want to see anymore of it. I mean, here we are talking about a responsible budget in this fiscal year, and all we get are these Supplementals that are emergencies. Who are we kidding? Now, my point of order, it isn't timely in the first place, and I'm about to the point where I don't want to even approve any of these so-called emergencies, and I know my Republican colleague will agree with me on this, too,



who worked on these appropriation Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Representative Matijevich, I was just..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, just take it out of the ord... just take it out of the record. Objections have been raised. I would strongly advise you to talk to the Chairman and the Spokesman of the respective Appropriations Committee in conjunction with Leadership. All right. The Clerk will poll the absentees on House Bill 2201, Amendment #2."

Clerk Leone: "Borchers. Darrow. Dyer. Hoffman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hoffman. Kindly record him as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Tuerk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's it, Mr. Peters. Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if we may verify the Roll Call, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 83 'ayes' and 88 'noes'. The Gentleman asks for a verification. The Gentleman's request is in order. The Clerk will kindly verify the Negative Roll Call. The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have permission to be verified, please? Leave to be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Slape. No objection. That's fine. Please proceed to verify the negative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Balanoff. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan."



Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew.
 McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas. O'Brien.
 Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Rea. Richmond.
 Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder.
 Sharp. Henry. Slape. Steczko. Stuffle. Taylor.
 Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White.
 Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell.
 Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, on
 the...on the Negative Roll Call."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I might correct the count. It's now
 83, 88."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Tony?" That is correct.
 83, 88."

Peters: "Thank you, Sir. Mrs. Currie."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Peters: "Okay. Mr. Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dawson. Is the Gentleman in the
 chamber? Mr. Dawson. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the rec...off the Roll Call."

Peters: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Doyle's in his chair."

Peters: "Mr...Mr. Mautino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mautino's by the aisle."

Peters: "Leverenz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leverenz is back there."

Peters: "Farley. I can't see, in fact, that far."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. Mr. Farley. I'm sorry, I
 can't... Mr. Van Duyne, would you kindly... Is Mr...?
 I can't see if Mr. Farley's there. How's the Gentleman
 recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Farley. Remove him from the Roll
 Call."



Peters: "Mr. Flinn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Flinn is there."

Peters: "Mr. Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa's in his chair."

Peters: "Mr. Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Giorgi's back there."

Peters: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Emil Jones? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Jones? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Representative Laurino. I'm sorry. I see him. Okay. Representative McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McGrew's back there."

Peters: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Richmond? Is Representative Richmond in the chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's back. Kindly remove Mr. Richmond.

Put Emil Jones back on and Mr. Farley and VonBoeckman."

Peters: "I didn't get to VonBoeckman yet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Dawson back, too."

Peters: "Okay. Schisler. Representative Schisler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schisler's back there."

Peters: "Representative Terzich I see and VonBoeckman is there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Peters: "And Representative Wolf. Sam Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sam Wolf is back there."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Mr. Flinn back on, too. I think he was there. He wasn't removed."

Peters: "Mr. McClain. Oh, no, McClain is there. I'm sorry.

Marovitz. I'm sorry. The last one. Marovitz?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here."



Peters: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson,
for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "How am I...how am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tony, how's Mr. Johnson recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Johnson: "Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'aye'. Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "How...how am I recorded, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "'Present', I guess."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Gaines as 'aye'. Mr.
Peters."

Peters: "White. I'm sorry. Representative White."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's in his seat."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mulcahey, for what purpose do you
seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How's the Gentleman recorded, Tony?
Mulcahey?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're recorded as 'no'. Mr. Johnson,
for what purpose do you seek..."

Johnson: "Can I be verified? I've got to make a call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We haven't gotten to the 'ayes' yet. We
have to see what the...what the count is. What's the
count, Mr. Clerk? No, he voted as 'aye'. He changed.
What's our count? On this question there are 85 'aye',
88 'nay', and the Gentleman's motion is lost. Any
further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, McClain, amends House Bill 2201
as amended by deleting..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentle-



men of the House. Amendment #3 is a simple Amendment. It raises the Bill as it originally was brought into the House by the State Board of Education from 1,423,000,000 to 1,434,451,000. This amount of money matches up with House Bill 513, which is Representative Stuffle's Bill, on a matching formula on the distribution of those common school dollars. I again repeat to the Membership so you know why we... Well, let me give you a little basis if I can. We did nothing to the school aid formula common school fund dollars this year. It would take 88 million dollars less to fund a formula. The Governor came in with an increase of 81 million dollars. The State Board of Education came in with a sum of money 92 million above the Governor's. What we're doing is compromising those two figures and coming in in between somewhere the Governor's amount and the State Board of Education's amount. I again repeat to you that we're at 208...80 million dollars above the available balance...cash balance in the State Treasury now as compared to a year ago on May 17, 1978, and because of that we feel like the schools are...should get this kind of increase. I'd ask for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Sponsor of this Amendment would tell us whether he's taking all of what he projects to be the increase for education? Is he taking every dime, leaving nothing for an increase in the...the welfare or for senior citizens?"

McClain: "No, Cal, as you know, it's our view that we have some tax relief proposals the Democratic party wishes to propose, also. And we've taken all of that in line, so that we're not jeopardizing our other programs."

Skinner: "How much increase is this? How many million?"



McClain: "I'm sorry."

Skinner: "How many million increase?"

McClain: "This is about 50 million dollars above the Governor's recommendation to us."

Skinner: "And how much to do you think the Governor...or the Bureau of the Budget is underestimating revenues or overestimating expenditures? What is the net?"

McClain: "Director Mandeville claimed in Senate Committee last week or two weeks ago that projected cash balance at the end of the year will be a hundred million dollars over what he had projected at the beginning of the year."

Skinner: "One hundred million dollars over?"

McClain: "That's correct."

Skinner: "And you're taking 75% of that for education?"

McClain: "No."

Skinner: "Well, if you're taking 75 million more than is in the budget, and there's going to be a hundred million dollar net increase in the money available, it would seem to me that if one divides 75 million by 100 million, one gets 75% of the total going to education. How is my logic flawed?"

McClain: "...This is 50 million. This is 50 million."

Skinner: "Oh, this is 50 million. You're taking 50% for schools then?"

McClain: "That's right. I think that's fair."

Skinner: "Thank you for the answers."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just...just to point out for Representative Skinner's clarification and others that what this Amendment will do will add on additional funds to the Bill as introduced by Representative McClain and from our point of view brings this Bill now 73 million dollars total over the 80 million dollars that the Governor has already put in, and we haven't gotten to the grant items



yet, so 73 million on this Bill alone is an awful lot of money. And even if we find that there is some 100 million dollars of revenue additional in the state, we've got to assume that that revenue must go for those kinds of programs that are one-time programs. There is no guarantee that we are going to have that same amount of money or that same amount of revenue next time. So, if we are talking about a one-time grant to public aid or a one-time grant to senior citizens, that money could then be discussed in those terms. But, in terms of putting it in the formula, we lock ourselves in and I would ask those Members who are concerned about the fiscal status of the state to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 'ayes', 76 'noes', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, McClain-Schneider-Madigan..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain. McClain, please."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave I'd like to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #4. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar is House Bill 2649 on the Order of Third Reading, page 32. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, requests the Bill be brought back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 2649 is on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2649. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for grant in aids and the ordinary and



contingent expenses of the State Board of Education."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner... or Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #13 becomes House Bill #2649, and for those Members it's a ...it's a lengthy Amendment, and I have to apologize that it's 31 pages. For those Members who have a lot of questions on it..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. What...? Excuse me. What Amendment are you talking about?"

Hanahan: "Amendment #13."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, there's Amendment #12 before that..."

Hanahan: "Whose Amendment is that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "...according... Mr. Peters. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, on Amendment #12."

Peters: "Our figures are technically out... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment is added again to the Bill introduced here by Representative Hanahan for the categorical branch mandated and unmandated in an attempt to reduce those particular line items so that we can again proceed with some negotiation. And it's the same basic...the same arguments as I made on the last Bill, but at least for the purpose of the record, let me indicate to you that what this Amendment does is makes the following reductions: it makes a 1 million dollar reduction in adult education from 10.7 to 9.7, it reduces private tuition from 8.2 to 4.2 for a 4 million dollar reduction, it reduces high impact employment from 2 million to 1 million for a 1 million dollar reduction, transportation by 6½ million, special ed by 7, school foods by a million, vocational education by 1 million, it reduces the line item for desegregation assistance from 15 million to 5 million for a 10 million dollar reduction, and vocational education equipment from 5 to 3 for a 2 million reduction or



for a total reduction of 33 million, 500 thousand dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, on the Amendment."

Skinner: "Question for Tom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, on the Amendment."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose Amendment #12, and I wish Representative Peters would just take it out of the record. We've got a much better Amendment coming up that will do some of the things that he's advocating here, but it won't be fooling around with that vote again, Representative Peters, so you know you shouldn't...you should be ashamed of yourself. Even your Governor couldn't get away with that veto last time. I'd suggest that on Amendment #12 the problem is is that in order to accomplish this total reduction of 33 million, not too much foresight was put into it and just a broad axe approach took place, and I specifically refer to the even-odd amounts that just went down the road and just cutting willy-nilly onto the Bill. If you look at Amendment #13 that will be coming up, I think this will offer the House of Representatives a better posture for the future grants in aid for the coming year for education. If you...you know, just take the moment to reflect that this Bill still has to pass the Senate and to reduce the Bill as it is presently before you, 33 million, 500 thousand dollars, I think it'd be a mistake at this time, especially in view of the fact that the Senate certainly will look at this view very close...at this Bill very closely, and so we have in Amendment #13 coming up a more nice cutting type of Amendment that will accomplish some of the things Representative Peters and some of the conservatives want. But, at this time, I have to oppose Amendment #12."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to close."

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just to indicate to the Members of the House, we did not attempt to go by this on a willy-nilly basis. What we did try and do is reach kind of a halfway point between what was suggested by the Illinois Office of Education and what...then what was suggested by that same office taking the Governor's dollars and allocating them, and we try to hit kind of a middle course by giving a little and taking a little to hit a...a middle kind of ground for this reduction of 33 million, 500 thousand dollars. Over and above that, we try to go to those programs that did cause us problems on the House floor before. You might remember one of those programs was bilingual education. That already has been taken care of. At least to this point, but we did attempt to do that in regard to others to remove that kind of a problem at least from this stage of the Bill, and again I would solicit the support of the Membership for this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 65 'ayes', 86 'noes', 1 recorded as 'present', and the Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #13, Hanahan, amends House..."

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

Hanahan: "Okay, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill is going to ask for a reduction of the total amount that's presently before us of 47,418,300 dollars. That should tickle the cockles of the hearts of a few people that want...that think too much money is going into education. This is a good one, right... This is accomplished, and I'd like to go through the list with



those Members who would specifically know what's in this 31-page Amendment, and there's 14 categories that we cut, and if you would take the few seconds it will take to go down the line, those of you who haven't got an analysis of it, because it's just come out on the desk, I'll go through the budget in showing what the cut is on each of the 14 categories. The #1 category reduction is in operations. In operations we're going to reduce \$132,700 from the request of the Office of Education. The original request was of 14 million... No, the original request was of \$14,775,000. As the Bill is now amended, it will be 14 million, 642.8 thousand dollars. Item #2... Item #3 is the adult education reduction of one million, two hundred and twenty-two thousand, three hundred dollars. It would reflect in the Bill presently in adult education an amount of \$9,500,000. In gifted education a four million dollar reduction from the present eight million dollar request, and that would leave the line item at four million dollars. An increase of one million over last year. In gifted education in the service centers it would be a reduction to four... of four hundred and seventy thousand dollars and amount to equal seven hundred and fifty thousand or a hundred and twenty thousand dollar increase of last year. There's a sixteen million, three hundred thousand dollar... bilingual downstate... sixteen thousand, three hundred dollars in the bilingual downstate apportionment to have an amount of 2 million, eight hundred dollars... two million, eight hundred thousand dollars, excuse me."

Speaker Lechowicz : "Any discussion?"

Hanahan: "In the textbooks, a five million, two hundred thousand dollar reduction. A ninety thousand dollar reduction in truance. A one million, five hundred thousand dollar reduction in the high impact training.



A five hundred thousand dollar reduction in in-district... inter-district incentives. A ten million dollar reduction in desegregation. A four million dollar reduction in vocational material. A hundred and sixty-two thousand, seven hundred dollar reduction in the deaf-blind center. A six million, two hundred and twenty-five thousand deduction in the private tuition. A two million, eight hundred thousand reduction in extraordinary services. A one million dollar reduction in special ed personnel. Five hundred thousand dollar reduction in orphanage tuition. Three million, five hundred thousand reduction in regular transportation, and five million, four hundred and ninety-nine thousand, three hundred dollars reduction in special ed transportation. A six hundred thousand dollar reduction in school foods, and Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Amendment #13 to House Bill 2649."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Amendment, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sure this is a minor oversight, but I don't see a total down here at the bottom anywhere. Could the...could the Sponsor give us a clue as to how much this total Bill cost?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan. What's the total reduction of Amendment #13?"

Skinner: "No, no, no."

Hanahan: "The total reduction..."

Skinner: "Total amount of money being spent."

Hanahan: "Forty-seven million. All right, now there are three categories that...Mr. Skinner, so that you understand that the Bill is just not one Bill. There's three separate categories. GRF, General Revenue Funds, mandated comes to a total of two hundred and seventy-five million, nine hundred thousand dollars. For the general revenue fund operations and other grants,



eighty-seven million, eight hundred and fifty-two thousand dollars, and for the federal operations and grants, which is federal money and not state money, two...two million...two billion, fifty-eight million, and thirty-seven thousand dollars."

Skinner: "Well, don't you think..."

Hanahan: "It's a little Bill."

Skinner: "...that could be put in here someplace? I don't see it."

Hanahan: "Pardon me."

Skinner: "I'm looking at page 30, and I don't see two billion dollars in here."

Hanahan: "There is not a total for the whole Bill, because we got three separate and distinct areas of the Bill."

Skinner: "Well, I'd even settle for three figures I could add up. I don't even see that."

Hanahan: "Well, you'd have to add them all up, Mr. Skinner, because that's...that's how the figures add up after you get your tape...your little computer out. You'll add them all up, and that's what it will come to."

Skinner: "I'm sorry, but I don't have a computer with a tape, and I'm sure it would take it. Can you tell me what on earth seven thousand dollars is doing in here that... for training waste water treatment plant operators? Why is that on the Office of Education budget? Why not..."

Hanahan: "What page are you referring to, Sir?"

Skinner: "Page 30. Right above where the final figure ought to be for the total."

Hanahan: "This is a federal funded project. It...the federal government is giving us eight thousand, eight hundred thousand...thousand dollars for exactly the...the language that's in the Bill. We have not control. It's whether we want to accept it or not."

Skinner: "No, no, no."



Hanahan: "And this is the money that's sent. If we want to use the money, we must provide it...for it in the appropriation process."

Skinner: "I'm not talking about potable water. I'm talking about waste treatment...waste water treatment plant operators. Why doesn't this go through the EPA?"

Hanahan: "Because I imagine the Office of Education must have a grant program for the federal funding of this project."

Skinner: "It sounds like a dumb place to put it."

Hanahan: "It's a job training project that they...the federal government is giving \$8,800 for."

Skinner: "Now, can you tell me in the area service centers... What in the devil is an area service center?"

Hanahan: "For the gifted, are you talking about?"

Skinner: "Page 23. Something called an area service center is going to get \$750,000 for doing something or other for gifted children. What's an area service center?"

Hanahan: "In the education of gifted children, a training center is where they train and provide the materials for that special...specialized training for the gifted educa...education needs of this state. There are 9 centers or...nine centers around the state."

Skinner: "Is there any money in this Bill for a McHenry County vocational high school?"

Hanahan: "Vocational what?"

Skinner: "High school. You know, the one that was defeated four to one a couple of years ago."

Hanahan: "No."

Skinner: "Not one dime?"

Hanahan: "Well, you can't...you can't put it off like that. First of all, the citizens of the community must provide that incentive through its own tax referendum for that, and..."

Skinner: "Yeah, we'd beat that."

Hanahan: "...there would be matching funds if that ever took place, certainly."



Skinner: "How about planning money?"

Hanahan: "No."

Skinner: "Not a...there's not going to be anybody..."

Hanahan: "None at all."

Skinner: "...on the payroll going around..."

Hanahan: "No."

Skinner: "...trying to convince people to raise peoples' taxes?"

Hanahan: "No."

Skinner: "Right?"

Hanahan: "Right."

Skinner: "How long are you going to leave this on Second Reading?"

Hanahan: "About as fast as the Speaker will move it to Third."

Skinner: "Well, doesn't that...doesn't that strike you as... as about unfair as the way the RTA Bill was handled or the way the transportation package is going to be handled?"

Hanahan: "Well, I can't say that, because I...I recognize fully the legislative process. We'll take this Bill into the Senate, and probably we will not see it again for another 30 days. I...I'm..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The..."

Hanahan: "I'm used to handling this Bill, and I could assure you that on June 30th we'll be grappling with it probably."

Skinner: "Well, I'd like to grapple with the bilingual education part on page 24, but I need time to make an Amendment."

Hanahan: "Well, let me put it this way, Sir."

Skinner: "I think I can..."

Hanahan: "On the bilingual portion of this Bill we spent \$130,000, last year's budget, for a study on bilingual education, and I have assured my colleagues that... both that are in favor of bilingual education and those that are seriously opposed to bilingual education,



that that study will be made available within the next week or two. We couldn't get it any faster. When that study comes out, the Senate will then study that report and make a determination on what bilingual levels will be appropriated next year, and until then everything we do as individuals is only on heresay or on...unbiased opinions instead of on evidence that has been brought forth in this study."

Skinner: "I don't know. My opinion's based on someone who was raised in Hawaii, and from his ex...from his broad experience in Hawaii the native Hawaiians that were educated separately didn't rise as far on the socio-economic ladder as did the native Hawaiians who went to regular schools."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman..."

Skinner: "Would you be willing to hold this Bill on Second Reading until the study is ready, so that we can make a judgment in the House. I'm not a Senator."

Hanahan: "No, because we're going to have plenty of time on the...when the Bill comes back from the Senate. There won't be any rush on the Bill."

Skinner: "Well, there seems to be a rush right here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Williamson..."

Hanahan: "I just want to get the Bill out of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... The previous question's been moved. Mr. Hanahan moves the adoption of Amendment #13. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Cut it out. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'ayes', 11 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2650. It's on the Calendar on Third Reading. Page 32. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, asks leave to bring that Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, 2650. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Peters, amends House Bill 2650 as amended on page 1 by deleting line 12 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

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

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, not to prolong this. We will attempt on Representative Schneider's Bill to do the same thing that we attempted on Representative McClain's Bill, and that's by this Amendment to reduce the total by \$45,329,000. The same arguments I made on Representative McClain's Bill will be the same here. Hopefully... hopefully the votes... hopefully the votes will not be the same, and this Amendment will be adopted. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "For the same reason that Representative McClain argued I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Kindly record me as 'no'. 'No', please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes', 84 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Schneider..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. What this Amendment does, again, is to bring into



identical dollar amounts those numbers consistent with Representative McClain's Bill. I should, by the way, point out that the four Bills I offer are offered with an eye toward allowing the Membership and others to evaluate programs and to look at the ways in which money is delivered as services for our children. That is the intention of the four Bill package that I've introduced. Consequently, what you will find as you...we progress through the four Bills is that they will be identical in their numbers to those of Representatives McClain and Represent...Hanahan. So, the numbers are identical. It...I offer it as an Amendment to be adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The quest... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, again, for the same reasons we made the arguments on Representative McClain's Bill for those who are concerned about the fiscal situation and coming to some proper agreement, I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Wally, get me over there, will you? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 79 'ayes', 73 'nays'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Sch... House Bill 2651. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, asked that House Bill 2651, which is on Third Reading, page 33 of the Calendar, be brought back for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, the House Bill...2651 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Peters, amends..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the figures are identical to those of Representative Hanahan, I would like leave to hear 2651, 2690 and 91 at the same time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, that's fine. Any objection? Hearing none, the Clerk will read 2690 and 91. Bring it back to Second Reading."

Clerk Leone: "26..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "90."

Clerk Leone: "...90. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. 2691. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Peters, amends House Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who? Well, let's... We'd better go back to 2651, if you got any other Amendments. All right. We'd better do them one at a time. 2651."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 3, Peters, amends House Bill 2651..."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by Representative Schneider and to save some time of the House, and since he's been so cooperative, we'll withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Schneider..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Amendment #4 brings the figures for GRF mandated into, again, conformity with the Hanahan proposals. Roughly, those categories effected represent 11%... almost a 12% increase over last year. It is a reduction from my original Bill of 295 million to about 275 million. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Just to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we would support Representative Schneider in this gallant move on his part."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2690. It's on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Schneider, amends House Bill 26..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Same explanation, Mr. Speaker, again to break out what represents about a 15% increase depending on how you look at it...new money. It reduces it from my Bill from 97 million, 162 to 87,310. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House...shall Amendment #3 be adopted to 2690?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2691. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Schneider..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Brings that final group of grants from the federal government into compliance. Also, IFA dollars. I would ask its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Any opposed? Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1816. Mr. Brummer, it's located on Third Reading, page 21. The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, 1816. Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Mugalian, amends House Bill 1816 on page 1, line 1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Yes, there he is. Take your time, Dick. Take your time. Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #2. Hearing no objections, the Amendment's withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Schuneman, amends House Bill 1816 as amended by deleting..."

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

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1816 is the Bill that would establish a rating law for insurance in the State of Illinois, and there are various approaches to this problem. One of which is contained in the Sponsor's Bill. I'm offering an alternative to that approach for those of you who may be familiar with this subject or have heard about the subject. The State of California has a rating plan which has been in effect in that state since about 1947. It is truly an open competition rating plan. Insurance companies are kept under control by the competition that exists in the marketplace. The State of Illinois has a similar situation right now, and most independent authorities on the subject of insurance pricing point to the State of California and the State of Illinois as being good examples of the



open competition system of pricing insurance for consumers. I offer Amendment #3, which is the California rating plan, for the State of Illinois, and I would solicit your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

First, I would like to point out that this Amendment is identical to a Bill filed by the Sponsor which the Sponsor never called for a hearing in the Insurance Committee and, in fact, he asked that it be put in Interim Study, and that's where it's at at the present time. If we would like to proceed with his Bill toward a hearing in Committee with regard to that and toward consideration of the House floor, I have no objection to his pursuing that goal. However, I do object to his deleting everything after the enacting clause with regard to a Bill that I have worked on for three years and deleting everything after the enacting clause and substituting a Bill which...which he had previously introduced and did not call for hearing and...and requested that it be submitted to Interim Study. The ...1816, as it exists, is the work product of...of several years of study. I feel that it is basically in the condition that I, as the Sponsor, want it. There have been various changes and concessions made with regard to it, and I would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, to close."

Schuneman: "Yes, well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, as the Gentleman knows, his...his statement is not exactly accurately according to the facts. The only hearings that were heard on...that were held on these Bills were not held in Springfield. The subcommittee was transported to Chicago where we were treated to a procession of neighborhood groups who were complaining



about insurance availability and rates in their particular neighborhoods. Now, I realize that that there are instances in the state and especially in the City of Chicago where there are problems with insurance marketing, but what we're supposed to be doing here, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen is passing a law that will affect the entire State of Illinois, not just a certain segment of the State of Illinois. And, when the Insurance Committee met here in Springfield, all other suggestions as far as insurance rating were summarily dismissed, and it was obvious that the only two Bills that were going to be passed out were Representative Marovitz's Bills and Representative Brummer's Bill, so I offer to you an alternative which I think is a very realistic alternative, and for most of you downstate I call your particular attention to this Amendment, because this is the Amendment that, in the long run, will work to our advantage and not sell out the rest of the state to the City of Chicago, and I would urge adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to explain his vote."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I realize that the possibility or the probability of this Amendment passing is rather forlorn, but I do think that it's appropriate at this time to mention the fact that the Illinois Insurance Study Commission, the National Insurance Conference of Insurance Legislators, and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners have all agreed that of all the rating procedures, probably the worst possible is that involving a commission-type Bill. As a matter of fact, it's been pointed out that Illinois is the only state in the Union which has open



rating as we...some of us would like to see it. I should also point out that there are only two states in the Union that have this type of rating...have a commission Bill, and in both of those states they are trying to remove it. I certainly have no quarrel with the Sponsor of this Bill and the work he's put into it. I don't question his sincerity, but by the same..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 87 'noes', and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Brummer, amends House Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Amendment #4 provides that the...the Board should annually review the rates and rating systems of all the companies covered under this Article, and if the Board finds from that annual review that probable cause exists to believe that a company's rates or rating systems violates the standards set forth in...in that Article, then the Board should order a full hearing with regard to the rates. The purpose of this Amendment was to...to lend some incentive to the Board to require that they periodically examine the rates so that the rates aren't merely filed and left there with no one ever examining to determine if they violate the standards with regard to the excessive rates, inadequate rates, or unfairly discriminatory rates. This Amendment is really in the nature of a clean-up Amendment. There...the Bill originally, I think, provided the authority to the Board to do this, but this makes that clear. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Kindly record me as 'aye', please. Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'ayes', no 'nays'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2165. Mr. Marovitz asks...oh, it's on Second Reading, page 3.

Read the Bill. 2165."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2165. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which one, Tony? Take your time.

According to the Clerk there were no Committee Amendments, but the Amendment's were misnumbered, so we're going to start off with Amendment #2."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Schuneman, amends House Bill 2165 on page 1..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, on Amendment #2."

Schuneman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again this is the California rating plan that we voted on just a few minutes ago on Representative Brummer's Bill, and I submit to you, once again, that the forces of open competition are the best way to control rates in the State of Illinois. There have been studies by the Department of Insurance which show this to be correct, and the Insurance Laws Study Commission, as mentioned by Representative Epton earlier, paid for an independent study and they..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich, on a point of order."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order under



Robert's rules. This Body has just decided that matter on this previous Bill, and, therefore, this Amendment is dilatory, and I ask you to rule on that point of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, your point is well taken and you... take the Amendment out of the rec... The Gentleman from Whiteside."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think this procedure is any different than one we see on the House on a very regular basis, and I...I would respectfully ask for a Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has raised a point of order, and the Gentleman's order...point is well taken. You want...take...take the... Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Sam Wolf, amends House Bill 2165 on page 1, line..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #3 to House Bill 2165 makes a number of changes in House Bill 2165. The main purpose of which is to eliminate the creation of a state insurance Commission and the provision for mandating a state-wide risk classification system. It does retain to those counties of one million or more a minimum criteria evaluation rating system. Which criteria it will not include the age of the property, geographic location, or prior action by another insurer. I don't believe, nor do the Sponsors of this Amendment believe, that a state-wide risk classification system contemplated by this Bill would serve the best interest of all the people of the state, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3... I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Kane... The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane. Your light wasn't on, Sir."



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Does this establish a state-wide rate, or does this remove a state-wide rate?"

Wolf: "It removes a state-wide rate."

Kane: "And on what ba...on what geographical territory would rating be allowed under this Amendment?"

Wolf: "The only territory that it would be...that it could be retained would be in counties of one million or more."

Kane: "And what would be the regulation in the rest of the state?"

Wolf: "The rest of the state would remain as it is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, O'Brien, amends House Bill 2165 on page 1, line 2 by inserting..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien. O'Brien, please."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that House Bill 2165 is in the shape that we want it in right now, so I would move to table Amendments #4 and Amendment #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendments 4 and 5. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar is House Bill 548. Second Reading. Page 2. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr... The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce. 548. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 548. A Bill for an Act abolishing ad valorem personal property tax and replaces revenue loss with new taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Schneider, amends House Bill 548..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Mugalian, amends House Bill 548..."

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

Amendment #3."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 548, in its present form, would reclassify as personal property all machinery and equipment including that permanently attached to real estate, which has been legally assessed and taxed as part of real estate in prior years. This elim...this Amendment would eliminate that, although it would still prevent reclassification of property after this Act becomes in effect that was previously classified as personally. It can prevent that from being reclassified as real estate. I urge its adoption. This would put the Bill in the shape that I...I personally would like to see it in."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Kane, amends House Bill 548 as amended on page 9..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, Amendment #4. 548."

Kane: "I withdraw my Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #4. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar is House Bill 2766. Third Reading, I believe. The Gentleman



from...Mr. Madigan, requests leave to bring House Bill 2766 from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, 2766. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Madigan, amends House Bill 2766 as amended by deleting everything after..."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment is technical in nature. The Bill currently provides tax relief in the form of a tax credit. The Amendment would change that to an exemption on the assessed valuation. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman... House Bill 2767. It's on Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, requests to bring that Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, the Bill's on Second Reading. Any...any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Madigan, amends House Bill 27..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Mr. Madigan, please."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is technical in nature. The Bill was originally drafted amended at the wrong Section of the statute. This Amendment will correct that error. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."



Skinner: "On page 3. What you're adding appears to be what the position of the county treasurer, Rosewell, at the present time, that he will not issue a certificate of purchase to anyone who has any interest in the property on which he is bidding either directly or indirectly. Is that what this is attempting to do?"

Madigan: "The language speaks in terms of an affidavit, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "All right. But, he's trying to make sure that someone who's a friend of the owner or a business associate can't get title?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Skinner: "All right. And, then on number...on five you're apparently attempting to limit windfall profits on the part of somebody that would pick up on multi-family building of more than four units, but you make it effective as of January 1, '78. It would seem to me that the problem could exist with the current scavenger sale, and you might want to make this Bill effective immediately and, perhaps, convince the treasurer not to issue anything that might prevent the protection you're building in from being law...well, from being evaded by happening before it would take effect. I think it's a good idea. I just don't think it takes effect soon enough."

Madigan: "Well, we thought that we ought to provide some time for the local officials to acquaint themselves with the Bill and to reestablish the procedures in their office to handle the applications that might be filed."

Skinner: "Well, that, of course, is your choice. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye' Opposed... Amendment #1 is adopted... Any further Amendments?"



Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading House Bill 1816? I believe it's on Third Reading. Somebody came up... Is that one done? 1816? What about 2145? Forget about it? 2145?"

Mr. Camp... All right. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, requests to bring House Bill 2145 from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, 2145 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Motion to move to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 2145. Campbell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Enrolling and Engrossing found some technical errors in Amendment #1, and I would now move to table that Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is that a Committee Amendment?"

Campbell: "It's my Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, okay. Any discussion? The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Campbell, amends House Bill 2145 on page 1, lines 7, 11, 16, and 32 by inserting immediately after..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, on Amendment #3."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment simply puts back in the same substantive language and also with the technical changes corrected, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 2741. I believe that's Mr. Dawson. The Gentleman asks leave to bring that Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of... Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, can you tell me what order you're following here now. We've been going along with this for some time, and the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hey, George."

Ryan: "...And then you skipped over 2700 several times."

Speaker Lechowicz: "To the best of my..."

Ryan: "And..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What I did is we prepared a list up here upon request..."

Ryan: "Who is 'we'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right here. When they come up to me and ask me to get their Bills from Third to Second, and all we do is take down their numbers."

Ryan: "Where does 2700 come in there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right after 2741."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's not on this list. First of all, we've got to get leave to have 2741 brought back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection... Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, Younge, amends House Bill 2741 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge, on the...Amendment #5."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2741 is the minimum wage law, and Amendment #5 would include in the minimum wage domestic workers who make...work more than 8 hours in one week, and who receive more than \$50 in one calendar quarter. The Amendment has been drafted in such a way as to take out casual babysitters or people who live in on the place,



and we're talking here about a group of women, domestics, who work long hours and who...most of them are the only head of their family, and they are entitled to the minimum wage, and I ask for your support to this Amendment."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. Too often we forget about those people that can't help themselves, and this is specifically a case that we're bringing into the attention of the House. People that really are at the bottom of the economic ladder right now needing your help. They don't have the opportunity to belong to unions, and associations, bar associations, and every other kind of groups that could help people. These are people that are poor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, on a point of order."

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it seems that earlier this afternoon you ruled as dilatory an Amendment which duplicated one this House earlier had rejected, and it seems to me that the House has rejected this Amendment on another Bill, and I would ask for your ruling on that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Parliamentarian, it's not the same Amendment. Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, if the Gentleman would wait, I'd like to explain..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Kempiners. What?"

Hanahan: "...the reas..."

Kempiners: "That's all right. I'd just like to speak on the Amendment then when he's..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Fine. Please proceed, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "The reason for this Amendment is because they have... the citizens that we're specifically speaking about..."



those people who work as domestics are at the bottom of the economic ladder. They don't have organizations and unions to speak in their behalf. They're seeking your help here and now, and this is really the time to...to stand up for the little person...the person that hasn't got a lobbyist. They don't have any of the high-priced help and lawyers to speak for them. They only have to turn to you and your conscience on whether or not these people deserve a chance to have an ability to earn a minimum wage. There is no other place for them to turn except to your conscience at this moment. I urge you to consider that these people who desperately need some help in these high inflationary times of having to have to seek out a living and trying to provide for their family and for themselves a very basic minimum wage. And, for those that will argue that this is a cause of inflation, let me tell you something. There is no conclusive proof anywhere by any economist worth a salt that would ever put the blame on inflation on a poor person trying to seek out a very basic living. I suggest very strongly that working people, the domestics that are not looking for welfare, not looking for a handout, not looking for some way of getting around and ripping off people, but the desire to earn a decent wage, need your help and at this time this Amendment will either tinge at your conscience and tug at your heart strings enough to make you vote for a minimum wage for domestics who desperately need your help, and I urge your support."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kempiners: "To what extent does this Amendment go? Does it include, as the Amendment did earlier this week, casual babysitting?"



Younger: "The Amendment has been specifically amended to exclude casual babysitting personnel. Babysitters are not included in this Amendment."

Kempiners: "All right. I've got a copy of the Amendment now, and this would cover any person who receives wages from one employer in excess of \$50 in a calendar quarter. Is that correct?"

Younger: "That's correct."

Kempiners: "Okay, so what would be the extent of this Amendment with regard to, for example, withholding and, for example, with other fringe benefits or government requirements for somebody who might come in, say, one afternoon a week?"

Younger: "Day workers already are included under the federal Bills requiring those kinds of things, so that isn't an issue here. A person who has a day worker already is supposed to be doing this. All we're talking about here is giving a person who works more than eight hours a week the minimum wage. All we're talking about here is giving a person who...who makes \$50 or more per quarter the minimum wage. We're not talking about babysitters. We're not talking about people who live in. We're just talking about these women who work long hours keeping our children, cooking our food, cleaning our homes. We're talking about the people who have worked the hardest in this society, who have served us, and who...who are the basis on which we can leave our homes and come work in the various places. We're talking about the people who..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kempiners, are you completed?"

Kempiners: "No, I would like to address the Bill...or the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Kempiners: "I'd like to...I understand the reason for the introduction of this Amendment, because I think all of



us would like to see a person earn a decent wage for the work they do; and I, for one, my family employs such a woman to do work in an afternoon. And, quite frankly, I think that she earns much more than the \$2.30 minimum wage you proposed in this Amendment. But, what I am afraid, and I think what's going to happen is that you're going to have more and more of this type of thing putting a pressure on people who...who do hire somebody part-time. You are actually going to scare these people from hiring them part-time, because they're going to worry about breaking the law. They're going to worry about making these types of reports, and they're just not going to want to do it, and what you're going to find is that these women that you're trying to protect are not going to have the work to do, because you're going to make it too burdensome for people to hire them. And, I think that you ought to take a look at that, because I, for one, if I had to start getting into these things and making reports and that, I wouldn't do it. I'd just, you know, would not hire the person to do it, and I think in the long run you're defeating your own purpose."

Younge: "Well, I think not, because anybody that does day work and works as hard as those people work is entitled to at least the minimum wage. And, anybody who pays them less than the minimum wage is simply exploiting that person. It's using their services at a slavery level, and the least we ought to do is to give them the minimum wage. These people pay one-third of their salaries for..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, ma'am. I... Excuse me, ma'am. You'll have an opportunity to close. I don't believe that it was a question. It was his... He just wanted to put his viewpoint into the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones."



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. The previous question... All those... 'Aye'. All those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to close."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are hard working women who are entitled to at least the minimum wage. These are women who prefer to work rather than going on welfare, and they have served our society, and they serve each of us, and I think that we are entitled... we ought to give them the minimum wage, and I ask for your support based on that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would Mr. Eslick come up to the Speaker's podium, please? Mr. Don Eslick. Thank you. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Johnson: "It's unfortunate that the previous question was moved, because I had a question of the Sponsor, but I think everybody ought to address themselves to this before the green votes go too high. And, that is, typically in a situation where someone's a domestic worker they also have a lot of other benefits. They have free food, they have free lodging, they have a number of other benefits that go into that situation. Now, I didn't have a chance to ask the Sponsor that... whether that was considered as part of the minimum wage base, but if it isn't, this is an absurd Amendment, because we're talking about a situation where people have a number of other benefits that certainly ought to be included so that they get a set off against the minimum wage. And, I think to intrude ourselves in this level of a domestic relationship is wrong, and



it just makes a very bad Bill even worse."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Katz" (sic), Mr. [unclear]
The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote.
The timer's on."

Katz: "Yes, I...I think that the problem with this kind of [unclear]
Amendment is the very high rate of teen-age unemployment
in Illinois and throughout the United States. The fact
of the matter is that teen-age unemployment has been
rising very rapidly. In some communities it's up to
60% in some groups. I think that in the end we defeat
our own purposes when we make it so that jobs that are
now, in many instances used by teenagers and furnish
employment for teenagers, will be less likely to
furnish employment for teenagers. As the Amendment is
drafted, it would not only cover people who work full-
time in domestic jobs, but it would cover young people
who help with the dishes and do yard work if it's more
than eight hours a week, as I read the Amendment.
Accordingly, I think it's a mistake, and I would not
be able to support it, because of its effect in en-
couraging teen-age unemployment in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "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 are 92 'ayes', 62
'noes', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's
adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. No. House Bill 2700.
Just wait a minute, Harold. Mr. Ewing requests that
the Bill, which is on Third Reading, be brought back to
Second for the purpose of an Amend... Oh, is it on
Second? All right. House Bill 2700 on Second Reading.
The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2700. A Bill for an Act to amend
the State Revenue Sharing Act, Illinois Income Tax



Act, Messages Tax Act, Gas Revenue Tax Act, Public Utilities Revenues Act, and Revenue Act of 1939. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee. Motion to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 2700. Getty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, on the motion to table. 2700, Gentlemen."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to withdraw that motion to table."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws the motion to table. Any...any additional motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Ewing, amends House Bill 2700 as amended on page 7 of Amendment 1, line 28..."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment, and it is not substantive. It's just a different technical matter that's in the Bill, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would he respond to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Yes, you said it was technical. I was sort of sorry that Representative Getty withdrew that motion. However, I...I think the policy is going to be that both sides of the aisle go with their best and what they think is best, but in Amendment #2 do you do anything to the language in Committee Amendment #1 which allows corporations to, in effect, dodge taxes wherein those properties that are fixed to real property which the courts have always said are real property, now will be personal property...do you change that in any way?"

Ewing: "No."

Matijevich: "Well, I guess I got carried away a little while ago when I talked about raping the taxpayers, and really that was my frustration over the language in



that Amendment, and as long as we've had...withdrawn that motion to table, that clause in itself, as far as I'm concerned, is enough to beat 27...2700. And, as long as you keep it in there, every taxpayer in the State of Illinois is going to hear about it by the time I'm through."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty. Your light's on, Sir."

Getty: "Well, I just...I just thought, I think like Representative Matijevich, that we ought to bring to the Body's attention the fact that there's a raise from 1% to 1.25%, and so that it is more than technical. I'm not going to oppose the Amendment, but I just thought that ought to be clear."

Ewing: "Representative, that...that was a mistake in the first Bill, and we have... All the publicity has been out at 1.25. It's nothing that is under the covers or that we're trying to hide, but it does bring it into technical compliance with what we said it was."

Getty: "All right.. I understand."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All opposed... All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2703."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2703. A Bill for an Act in relation to the prevention of litter...littering providing penalties therefore. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Bri... Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Terzich, amends House Bill..."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is similar to Amendment #1 by deleting line 5 which puts it in the same posture as the distilled beverages, and I would move for adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Bowman, amends House Bill 2703..."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the...the Bill in its original form simply provides for a...a new tax which would be used to clean up litter. It seems to me that this really misses the point, and so I've offered Amendment #3 for the consideration of this Body. Amendment #3 would add a... the...a mandatory deposit on...on beverage containers. This deposit would encourage, not only the return of containers by the purchasers, but would encourage the ...the scavenging of these containers all over the state. I would point out that the Bill in its original form provides for the establishment of litter-free areas whereas the...which would not entirely cover the state, whereas this Amendment would provide for scavenging all over the state. So, I urge the support of...the Membership to support this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. This Amendment..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Monroe. Let's give the Gentleman some attention, please."

Flinn: "This Amendment is another attempt to take unfair advantage of the Sponsor's Bill. This identical Amendment was offered in the House Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Committee and was only able to muster up three or four votes when there was a full quorum there. It got soundly defeated. It's been defeated before on the House, and it's...and all it amounts to is a waste of time for the people on the floor of the House, and I think there ought to be very little discretion. Let's show them what we think of wasting our time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "So, I'd just like to respond to the last speaker. I think what he's really referring to are attempts in other instances where the Sponsors of Amendments strike everything after the enacting clause and substitute their Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Flinn: "I don't recall mentioning his name or asking him any questions."

Bowman: "I'm closing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, he's closing, Sir."

Flinn: "Oh, is he closing?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Bowman: "Yeah, I'm the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, please proceed."

Bowman: "What we do is, as we leave the Bill intact and simply add to it, I think what we're doing here is providing a kind of a two-pronged approach. The Gentleman was correct about the Committee action; but that was only a one-prong approach, and I think by providing a two-



prong approach that we're suggesting here, we get more ...more bang for the bucks; so I urge the support of the Membership."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to explain his vote. Mr. O'Brien, please."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment, quite frankly, is a little bit more than the bottle Bill was. I, quite frankly, am in favor of the bottle Bill, but I cannot vote for this Amendment. This Bill without this Amendment is an agreed Bill that was put together by the industry. It is their answer to the bottle Bill. It provides for some form of taxation to keep...clean up litter on our highways. Simply, the Amendment to this Bill would be a double taxation. Not only would the consumer have to pay for the deposits on the bottles, but in addition to that the Amendment would lead then, industry, as a...as it is taxed by the original Litter Reduction Act. So, therefore, I have..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish?"

O'Brien: "...to vote 'present' on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I support this Amendment. The only way you're ever going to get a litter tax, and I say this to the Sponsor of the Bill, Mr. O'Brien. Also, to Mr. Flinn, who's so agitated now. The only way you're ever going to get a litter tax is to push the bottle Bill, because as soon as the bottle Bill was defeated in Committee and then put into Interim Study Calendar, all the big business boys took off from Springfield, and they're letting...they're letting the litter tax die. I told Representative Macdonald this is just what would happen when the bottle Bill was



defeated, good bye to all the big bottlers, can manufacturers, brewers. You won't see them around Springfield anymore buying dinners or cocktails. They're gone, because the only reason they were pushing...only reason they were pushing this litter tax Bill, House Bill 2703, was in order to stop the bottle Bill. Now, the bottle Bill is out of Interim Study. They'll walk away from this Bill. O'Brien will never pass this Bill, and so the Amendment is good, because it will get those guys back here again..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

O'Brien: "My...my name was mentioned in debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of personal privilege."

O'Brien: "Point of personal privilege. I would just like to indicate to the previous speaker that when I accepted this Bill, I accepted this Bill in good faith. The Bill was put together by Representative Mike Brady before he left. In my estimation, it is a sincere answer on the part of the industry to come up with a litter reduction Bill that will provide some relief for the citizens of the State of Illinois. I would support and did support, and I would like to remind Representative Pierce that I was one of the lone 42 people that voted for his bottle Bill. I'm voting 'present' on this, and I would encourage Representative Pierce and the rest of the Members that the appropriate time without this Amendment, to support me so that we can pass this Bill and at least have some relief."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment. It is true that this Amendment, in Bill form, received a very thorough and clear hearing in the House Committee on



Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources, but I do think that it would be appropriate for the full House of Representatives, not only to consider this proposal at the Amendment stage, but to adopt this Amendment on the Bill and then to consider the question of a bottled Bill on Third Reading. There certainly would be nothing inappropriate about it, and I would suggest to you that it would provide us with a very thorough and informative debate on Third Reading concerning this very controversial proposal."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 35 'ayes', 120 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present', and the Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar is House Bill 2730. It's located on page 33. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, requests to bring that Bill back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, 2730 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #... There's a motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Bullock."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to table Amendment #1 and ask leave of the Body. We want to put some clarifying language on the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I don't know...I don't know what he...what he's asked us to do. I don't know what the Amendment does, I don't know what the clarifying language is. What are we doing here? It's a lousy explanation. I want to know what we're doing."



Bullock: "Representative Johnson, both sides of the aisle have spoken to the Chairman of the Committee and the staff of the Committee, and there's no difficulty with this motion."

Johnson: "Well, I'm not a Member of that, and I'm not privy to that. I'm just one Member. I want to know what you're doing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has had a motion to table Amendment #1."

Johnson: "Well, what is Amendment #1?"

Bullock: "Amendment #1 was nothing more than some technical language regarding local government debt limit. We'd like to table that Amendment, and I think Amendments #2 and 3 will probably answer your question."

Johnson: "Simply, that's what we're asking."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Bullock, amends House Bill 2730..."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 addresses an issue that we're all concerned about which is short-term borrowing implications for units of local government and special districts that have been affected by a decrease in the valuation due to abolition of the corporate personal property tax. I certainly would ask the Body to join with me in supporting this Amendment, and we've discussed it with both sides of the aisle. I don't think there's anyone that stands in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Bullock, amends House Bill 2730..."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 addresses a problem that's unique to downstate in terms of long-term borrowing implications due to the school districts of Chicago and other school districts in southern Illinois that need some additional revenue. I think that this, too, has been discussed with both sides of the aisle, and I don't know of any objections. I'd ask for acceptance of Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "I hate to be impertinent, but could you tell us what the Amendment does?"

Bullock: "What..."

Johnson: "The first Amendment you said was a..."

Bullock: "Yeah."

Johnson: "...technical Amendment."

Bullock: "Amendment #..."

Johnson: "It was a four-page Amendment that we tabled. I want to know what 3 does."

Bullock: "Representative Johnson, I'd be glad to explain it..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe he didn't explain the Amendment. Kindly explain the Amendment again, Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Quite simply, Amendment #3, Representative Johnson, increases the bonding indebtedness for special districts from 75% to 85%. I think you're quite familiar with the problem that's occurred as a result of the abolition of the corporate property tax. Quite simply, that's all it does. It raises 10% the bonding indebtedness for those units."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Downstate Illinois, is that correct?"

Bullock: "Yes."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Why...why do we need to increase it 10%? This seems like a day when we're...we're calling on government to limit spending and bonding indebtedness and everything else. Why do we want to give another 10% leash?"

Bullock: "As you know, we lost sizable revenue due to the abolition of the corporate property tax. The...the base has declined. Representative Johnson, what we'd hoped to do here with this Bill is to allow those units to extend the entitlement and to collect needed funds so they can open the schools in September. Quite simply, that's all the Amendment does. We're not trying to pull anything on you."

Johnson: "Well, let me...let me speak to the Amendment then, Mr. Speaker. The...the question of the corporate personal property tax is irrelevant to this Amendment. There's legislation pending. There's a Committee that's come up with a replacement, or there's a number of proposals for replacements, so that's not really germane. Representative Totten and others have proposed legislation and, in some cases, Constitutional Amendments among other things to limit the bonded indebtedness leash to local government and state government. All we're doing here by this quote, unquote, simple Amendment, is increasing by 10% or really more than that, I suppose, based on the 75% base, how far or how much leash we're going to give to local government to increase their bonded indebtedness. I don't think that's what the citizens of Illinois want. That's not what they said last November when they voted on the Thompson proposition. That's not what they're saying all around the country. They're asking us at the state level, and they're asking local officials to limit spending, limit what they're doing insofar as incurrence of debt, and this Amendment flies in the very face of what we were



told last November, and what we're going to be told a year from this November unless we quit acting in this way. I urge a "no" vote on this Amendment and ask for a Roll Call."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment and respectfully disagree with the previous speaker. This Bill is not...it is not an attempt to increase dramatically the overall amount of money available to local governmental units. This Bill is designed to meet an immediate problem caused by the abolition and invalidation of the personal property tax by the Supreme Court. Up to this point in time...up to this point in time, all local governmental units in the state had been required to engage in short-term borrowing every year normally through the vehicle of tax anticipation warrants. Those borrowings were predicated upon the total assessed valuation which supported those local governmental units. Now, because of the invalidation of the personal property tax, that base of support for the borrowing has been reduced in the amount of the invalidation of the personal property tax formally collected by those local governmental units. Given that...given the quickness of the invalidation by the Supreme Court, governmental units all over the State of Illinois will face a serious...very serious cash flow problem. This Bill is designed to allow them to increase their borrowing to meet that immediate cash flow problem. It is not designed to allow governments to borrow at the...at the whim of the governing authority of those units. It is only designed to meet an immediate problem that will face all of the units that you are concerned with.

I would recommend an "aye" vote on the Amendment."

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



Kosinski. Forget it. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question? The distinguished Majority Leader just pointed out that this seemed to be a temporary financial problem, and my question is this, does this Amendment have a limitation on it? I know that we have just had a court decision that eliminated the personal property tax, and that until we replace it, why there may be a cash flow problem. But, I don't think that's going to go on forever until the year 2000. Is it? So, my question is does this Amendment have a time limit or...?"

Bullock: "Represent...Representative Deuster, in answer to your three questions, it does not have a time limit on it. Secondly, it addresses the short-term borrowing problem. Thirdly, it's to provide interim financing between the actual levy of a tax and the tax collection, which carries us back to a situation in 1928 when there was reassessment and a working cash fund was created or a vis-a-vis revolving fund, and monies coming into that fund; as you know, cannot be used for purposes other than which they were levied which is to retire the bond."

Deuster: "If I might ask you, as Sponsor? Do you concede and agree that this is a temporary problem, and we should not pass a law that's going to be on here forever?"

Bullock: "I...I think, Representative Deuster, that what you say is correct."

Deuster: "Well, would you be willing to hold this on Second Reading and to have an Amendment to, say put a five-year or a three-year or whatever appropriate time is on..."

Bullock: "Well, I think...put that on in the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, we'll do that in the Senate. We'll try to do it."



Bullock: "I think that we probably could concede. I'd like to move the Bill along..."

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

Bullock: "...today if possible."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... The previous question's been moved. Mr. Bullock moves the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. 'Aye'... 'aye', please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 7... What? I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I sit on my butt here all day, and I ask once to be recognized, and you fail to recognize me. That happened last...the other day, too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Eddie, it has been my..."

Bluthardt: "You say what you want."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...apology. I'm sorry. I didn't see your light flashing."

Bluthardt: "My light was flashing before that Gentleman moved the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is true."

Bluthardt: "I think that we ought to look into this Amendment a lot more than we have. We hear about local government being affected by it, but all I can see is the school districts being affected by it. I don't know why the school districts need an extra 10 or 15% in working cash fund money or to issue notes. Not when they're allowed to eliminate their working cash fund and put it into the corporate fund and then reissue bonds, and reestablish the working cash fund. I don't know why the



it's necessary now to raise this thing up another 10 or 15%. I think it's wrong, and we ought to defeat the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Let's take another Roll Call. We'll dump the other one in all fairness. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Is that being fair enough, Eddie? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this...on this question there are 77 'ayes', 73 'noes'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "First, I would li...I just want to verify the Affirmative...Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, asked to poll the absentees. The what? I'm sure they'll have plenty of Tab for you, Cal. All right."

Clerk O'Brien: "The absentees. Borchers. Bowman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bowman wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Cullerton."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Cullerton as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Darrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Flinn. Dwight Friedrich. Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Marovitz wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino. McGrew. Meyer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Meyer is 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Molloy. Mugalian. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Stearney. Tuerk. Walsh. Williams. And Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What are we starting out with, Jack? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Change him from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Katz from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Grossi. Kindly record Mr. Grossi from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'."



Anyone else want to be recognized at this time? Okay. What's our count now, Jack? It's 81 to 73. The Gentleman persist with his verification? Proceed to verify the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. McClain. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schneider. Henry. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."
Johnson: "Mrs. Alexander."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's all this important. I'd just as soon switch and wait all night for an insignificant Roll Call, and I'll vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Schraeder as 'aye'. Mr. Mautino as 'aye'. Mr. Sharp as 'aye'. Mr. Mulcahey, you are 'aye'. Please proceed."

Johnson: "Alexander."

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

Johnson: "Birchler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there."

Johnson: "Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli? How's the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there."

Johnson: "DiPrima. He's here now. He wasn't. Domico."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Domico? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Domico. Kindly remove him."

Johnson: "John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Dunn? John Dunn. Is the Gentleman
in the chamber? Dunn. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley. I've just seen him. There he is."

Johnson: "Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa's in his chair."

Johnson: "Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He was just here." Hanahan? Put John
Dunn back on."

Johnson: "Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan. Mr. Hanahan. How's the
Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hey, Ropp, tell him to get out of there,
will you? Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Emil Jones. Mr. Emil Jones. How's the
Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "Kane. Well, wait a minute. Did...?"

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

Johnson: "Kane, not Keane. Kane. Kane."

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



Johnson: "Okay. All right. Kozubowski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Johnson: "Leon."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leon is here."

Johnson: "You say he's here? Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. He's here."

Johnson: "Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly put Emil Jones back on. He just...
back in the chamber. Mr. Marovitz. There he is.
Right here. Right in front."

Johnson: "McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McClain? Mr. McClain. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Johnson: "McPike."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McPike. Mr. McPike. Where do you see him? Well, tell him to get in here. Take him off the record. There he is. Put him back on. Mr. McPike."

Johnson: "O'Brien."

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

Johnson: "Patrick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Langdon Patrick? He's back there."

Johnson: "Richmond."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Johnson: "Oh, okay. Ronan. Ronan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Johnson: "Where is he?"

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

Johnson: "Schisler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there."

Johnson: "Slape."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Slape. He's there."

Johnson: "Steczo. He's here. Okay. All right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Flinn as 'aye'."



Johnson: "Taylor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right here."

Johnson: "Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Terzich. Is Mr. Terzich on the floor?
How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record. What? Put
Hanahan back on. John Dunn. Put him back on. Take...
Do you have anymore, Sir?"

Johnson: "Yeah, I do. VonBoeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there."

Johnson: "White."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jesse White? He's here."

Johnson: "And Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yourell? I...Jim, excuse me for a second.
Dick Kelly. Is Mr. Yourell there? How's the Gentleman
recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record. What's our
count? On this question there are 80 'ayes' and 71
'noes', and the Amendment is adopted. Any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Oh, the Gentleman from
Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Bluthardt: "...I want to... And Members of the House, I want
to apologize for my outburst. Now, I certainly wouldn't
have persisted in a verification when it was quite
obvious the Amendment had been adopted. I assure you
I had nothing to do with that, but I do want to point
out that if I had had an opportunity to be recognized
while debate was on...while my light was on, this would
never have come about, I'm quite sure. Because I



merely wanted to ask a few questions to clarify the purpose and the intent of the Amendment. If we were not...if we wouldn't be so quick to move the previous question, I think we might save the half hour or so that we just wasted. Again, I apologize to the Members of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave of the House to place House Bills 694, 695, and 696 in Interim Study."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to put House Bills 694, 95, and 96 in Interim Study. The Gentleman asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call. No objections. The Attendance Roll Call will be used, and 694, 95, and 96 will be placed in Interim Study. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, for the purpose of an announcement."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the leave of the House to temporarily suspend the provisions of Rule 22, so that the Rules Committee may have a very, very brief meeting in the Speaker's office while the House continues in Session." The Gentleman with..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from...the Gentleman asks leave of the House to have the Rules Committee reconvene in the Speaker's office at this time. I'm going to call the Bill next. Is...? For the purpose of approving a no debate list, is there any objection? Hearing none, the Rules Committee will kindly reconvene in the Speaker's office now. The next Bill is House Bill 2204. I believe it's on Third Reading. They want to bring it back for the purpose of an Amendment. Mr... 2204, Jack. 2204. Okay. The Gentleman asks leave to have the Bill placed on Second Reading. Hearing no objections, Second Reading. Kindly correct the board. Second Reading.



The Gentleman from Du...DuPage, Mr. Sch... Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Hoffman, amends House Bill 2204 on page 2..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm handling this for Representative Hoffman. I think there was some opposition to the extension of the program to be 20 years from its original 8. What he wants to do is restore it to 8, and deal with the objections from that point of view, and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ryan. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Who's the Sponsor of this Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hoffman, but Mr. Hoffman came up to me and asked to have this Bill brought back from Third to Second, and he asked if Mr. Schneider would handle the Bill for him. And, that's what he's doing. This is an accommodation to Mr. Hoffman."

Ryan: "Okay, that's fine. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2427. Oh, wait. Mr. Telcser asked leave to bring that Bill back from Third. I'm telling you. Mr. Telcser asked leave to bring that Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objection, House Bill 2427 is back on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris, on the Amendment."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Let him... let him read the Amendment."



Clerk Leone: "Amendment 45, VonBoeckman, amends House Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, no, no, no, no. Mr. Harris' is first, I believe. No, come on. What's your Amendment number, Mr. Harris?"

Harris: "Four, one...four, one."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Forty-one? Okay, fine. Amendment #41. The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #41 is adopted from what this House adopted last Session. House Joint Resolution 1008. It's for \$100,000 for planning an expansion of the State Office Building in region 5 located in Marion, Illinois, which services 27 counties throughout the state. I'd ask for a...a favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #41... Correct the board...be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #41 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #45, VonBoeckman, amends House Bill 2427..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, my Amendment 45 appropriates \$150,000 for construction and improvements related to the development of the Rock Island Trail. I ask support for this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ropp: "Might I ask the Sponsor how many times he intends to take care of that trail this year?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, we got to put it on the Capital Development Board, so they can appropriate the money for it."

Ropp: "I thought you've already done that once."

VonBoeckman: "No."



Ropp: "You put it on the Department of Conservation. Aren't they going to spend it?"

VonBoeckman: "It all depends. Well, I want to make..."

Ropp: "Well, I think once is enough."

VonBoeckman: "I just want to make sure that we have enough money..."

Ropp: "Well, I think you..."

VonBoeckman: "...to finish the..."

Ropp: "...you've probably done that at least once, and I don't see that there's any need to add to the total dollars to a program when you've already taken care of it once. It seems like it's very unnecessary. It's really not needed at this point."

VonBoeckman: "Well, we got to remember, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was the problem that existed in 1975 that cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois \$250,000 down the drain, because we had to stop construction, and I think it's high time we finish this controversial issue."

Ropp: "Well, it might not be a bad idea to prevent spending another 150 from going down the drain."

VonBoeckman: "I don't think so."

Ropp: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. White. His light's on. You want to shut it off? Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, I wanted to speak on the Amendment if Representative VonBoeckman is finished. He seemed to be in the middle of a sentence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. I didn't understand you."

Bowman: "I say I wanted to speak on the Amendment, if Mr... Repres..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Bowman: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, I think this is a good Amendment. Regrettably, the Department of Conservation has been failing to get around to doing something about this. I think that if we...if we give them the money..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."

Bowman: "...then they probably won't do it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could you tell me what arrangements have been made on this Bill since the Sponsor's not on the floor? Could you tell me what...?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The arrangements were, to my understanding, in fact...well, he's in the Rules Committee...can come right out and verify it that he agreed to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of Mr. Harris' Amendment, and that was the last I knew about it."

Ryan: "And that was the arrangement? It was to go back for only the Harris Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "As far as Mr. VonBoeckman, I don't know a thing about it. They were adopted, I believe. Do you recall, the Amendments were taken out temporarily because the Gentlemen were not on the floor? Mr. Harris was in the Senate discussing another Bill, and he came back on the floor, and he spoke to the Sponsor, Mr. Telcser. And, he agreed to bring that Bill back."

Ryan: "Well, that's what I say. The Sponsor's not on the floor, and I don't know whether he's got an agreement with Mr. VonBoeckman or not. I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sure Mr. VonBoeckman can answer the question. I just knew about Mr. Harris. Mr. VonBoeckman, did you talk to the Sponsor about this Bill, because initially when it was called, you were not on the floor, and the Amendment was taken out of the record."

VonBoeckman: "I regret I was celebrating Sparky Garmisa's



birthday today, and we was over in his office having ice cream and cake, and I was unaware that it was taking place, but..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you discuss the...this Amendment?"

VonBoeckman: "No, I didn't discuss it with Mr. Telcser, but he know...he knew it was going on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, no. This Amendment was...initially it was called earlier, Sir. And, unfortunately, you were not in the chamber at the time. The Amendment was withdrawn, because of the...you weren't here to move its adoption. The Bill was then moved to Third Reading. It has been brought from Third to Second to accommodate Mr. Harris, and our question to you is did you discuss this...?"

VonBoeckman: "No, I didn't discuss this with Mr. Harris."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, in all fairness, he's also in the Rules Committee at the present time. I wish that...if we...if you persist, I guess we'll have to get Mr. Telcser out on the floor. What do you want to do, Jim?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, I want to go with it either up or down. One of the ways."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, if you'll give us thirty seconds, we're going to check with the Representative to see if he has any objections to the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay, fine."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I understand this same Amendment went on the conservation Bill last night...exact same Amendment. You ought to rule this dilatory, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I tend to agree with the Minority Leader. Yesterday we...I mentioned to Bill Kempiners, take your choice...one place or the other but not two places, since we do have it in one place, I hate to tell my good friend, VonBoeckman, that..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, under the circumstances I table Amendment #45."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #45. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar in the area of... Is it Third Reading, Gene?... Appears House Bill 2357. The Gentleman asked leave to bring this Bill back for a technical corrective Amendment from Third to Second. Is there any objection? Hearing none, bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, E. M. Barnes, amends House Bill 2357 on page 1 by deleting lines 14 through 17."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is purely a technical Amendment which corrects a drafting error by the Reference Bureau, and I would move the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House... Pardon me. House Bill 2491. It's on Short Debate. Third Reading. Beatty requests that the Bill be brought back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, House Bill 2491. Second Reading. Any Amendments from the floor? Beatty, that's you. You got that, Tony? 2491. Any Amendments from the floor? It's on Short Debate. Third Reading. Back to Second."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2491. Amendment #1, Beatty, amends House Bill 2491 on page 1, lines 1 and 5 and so forth."

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

Beatty: "This Amendment allows certain Members, in place of the one-state unit, to extend the time for which to apply for military credit for getting credit under a pension system. This is approved by the trustees of the pension system, and it allows them to get credit for those years in military service. In the past, other members of this...of the same group had been allowed and certain members failed to apply for it within the time, and this is merely extending the time they will pay in certain funds to...for the years of service in the military."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

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

Beatty: "Yes."

Wolf: "Is this just merely an extension of time in which to apply, or is this similar to Bills we've had in the past where they're trying to claim credit for prior military service before entering the system?"

Beatty: "You're correct. It does give them... It allows them to get credit for any kind of military service along with any other governmental service if they may not have applied for it. But, other members in this same system have been able to do this until the cut off time. This merely gives additional people the chance of...approximately 150 people that may be qualified for this."

Wolf: "Okay, I think you misunderstood me. The way it is now, you have...you can receive and purchase credit for interrupted service. In other words, you have to be a Member of the...of the system first, and then if you're called to military duty, you know, you get that."

Beatty: "This is not the same thing. This allows them to get



credit along with any governmental service or the military service. This was previously done in this particular unit of government, and it's limited to one unit of government in the State of Illinois, and they... the other people that are calling plays have already had this credit, and this is for an additional few people. 150 at the most."

Wolf: "Oh, then it's not prior..."

Beatty: "No, it's not."

Wolf: "...said trying to get Bills through every year to gain military credit for something you might've done 30 years ago before you ever had the job."

Beatty: "Well, you've asked the question three times. This is that proof. It allows them for any military service, whether prior or interrupted."

Wolf: "Well, nobody else has ever gotten that before."

Beatty: "Well, they've got in this unit of government."

Wolf: "Which unit of government?"

Beatty: "This is with the State of Illinois. Where are we? They gave me the wrong Amendment. The state university retirement. University of Illinois. State university retirement."

Wolf: "We have...we have a misunderstanding. It is not what I said it was."

Beatty: "All right. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentlemen req... The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor vote... All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Beatty, amends House Bill 2491 as amend..."

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

Beatty: "This is an Amendment which allows certain judges in the system to be treated similarly to other judges who obtained credit for service as associate...assistants



of a probate judge in Cook County. Some judges applied early, and they got only a portion of the time of credit, and, subsequently, the law was changed and the judges were allowed day for day service, and this is to benefit those judges that did not receive the benefits, who had... Where they would get day for day service as assistants to a probate judge. In other words, they would be treated equally with the other judges who have the same type of service who are getting the day for day credit. Trying to make the situation equitable for these few judges."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "...question. May I ask a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will yield."

McCourt: "Is this the same Bill that we had in Personnel and Pensions Committee that we put in Interim Study? This Amendment?"

Beatty: "This Amendment didn't go to Interim Study. It was defeated."

McCourt: "Oh, it was defeated. I think that's...the same thing should happen on this Amendment."

Beatty: "But, this is actually a Bill to treat...give these judges some fairness. Those other judges worked in the same capacity as assistants to a probate judge, and they got day for day credit, and there's a few judges... five of them from Cook County, who would like to get credit for...the same as the other judges in the system, and I think it's a matter of equity for them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes', 48 'noes'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "Is that a reflection or is the Speaker voting?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, he's not voting."

Skinner: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And the...and the Amendment's adopted."

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1542. I believe it's on Third Reading. Is it...? Whose Bill is that, Tony? Who? Oh, Birkinbine. The Gentleman asked leave to bring the Bill back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Birkinbine, amends House Bill 1542 on page 1, line 20 by inserting after the period the following."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is designed to preclude the possibility that people in an unincorporated area, who have been in a special fire protection district that then becomes annexed into a municipality, would end up being taxed twice for the same service. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "One more."

Kane: "How does it prevent them from being taxed twice? We've already addressed this issue once."

Birkinbine: "By automatically disconnecting from the township fire protection taxing district. This taxing district is different than your normal special fire protection district in that it does not include the purchase of any equipment, and it does not have people on staff."



Kane: "So, they automatically deannex from the fire protection district and go into the municipality?"

Birkinbine: "When they become annexed by that municipality.

Yes. That municipality that provides fire protection."

Kane: "Okay. Didn't we do this once already on another Bill?"

Birkinbine: "A similar Bill Mr. Williams passed. This matches it and was done at his request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Benefit who?"

Birkinbine: "Representative Williams."

Kane: "Thank you. Good Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "Would there be any bonding problem if bonds had been issued and then you had an automatic disannexation of that..."

Birkinbine: "No, that wouldn't apply in a district such as this, because no bonding would be involved in... This particular fire protection taxing district is simply one that would allow a township to arrange for fire protection provided by a village or municipality to unincorporated areas within that township. It does not involve the purchase of equipment. It does not involve people staffing the fire protection district, so no bonds would've been floated."

Getty: "Well, wouldn't they have had pre... What I'm getting at is wouldn't they have had pre-existing bonding authority?"

Birkinbine: "I don't think so. No."

Getty: "Fire protection districts have bonding authority."

Birkinbine: "But not this kind...not this particular district."

Getty: "Why?"

Birkinbine: "It's totally unnecessary."

Getty: "But they have the authority, and if this Amendment were to go on, then you would have a share of that



indebtedness that would never be serviced by the dis-
annexed part."

Birkinbine: "No, I bring your attention to the Bill. There
is..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Maybe Mr. McMaster can shed
some light on this."

Birkinbine: "There is nothing they can bond for."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mike, this is to take care of an area where the
people, as individuals within the township, are purchasing
fire protection by contracts. In order to allow them
to have a tax deductible thing, this would be more or
less in place of a taxing district that levies the
tax to pay for that contract. It is not...does not
enable them to become bonded, or it's not the same
type of a fire protection district as we have downstate.
All they are doing is levying the money to pay for what
the fire protection is that they are purchasing, and
that is...has nothing to do with bonding. They have
never been eligible for bonding."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Getty, are you completed?"

Getty: "With that understanding then, I have no objection to
the...to the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be
adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'.
Opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amend-
ments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar on page
3 is House Bill 2735. Second Reading. Yes, Sir. The
Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side
I would like to move reconsideration of the vote by
which Amendment #1 to House Bill 2491 was adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Where's that at?"



Wolf: "That was the one we just voted on a few minutes ago."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, wait. We're...we're on another order of business right now. I'll get back to you."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2735. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Retailers Occupation Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 adopted in Committee. Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, White, amends House Bill 2735 as amended in each of the first two paragraphs and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White. Is the Gentleman still here? Mr. White. Jesse White. I hope not. He wanted his Bill called. Mr. White. Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd ask leave to handle the Amendment for Representative White. It's a technical Amendment to merely clear up the fact that when we...in the Bill it erroneously said 5% sales tax. It would correct that. There is no such thing. It's a 5% retailers occupational tax, and with leave of the House I'd ask leave to handle it and to move for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman asked leave, leave being granted, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Now, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I now would like to renew that motion that we reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 to House Bill 2491 was adopted. I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "If I raise a point of order, he can do that if



we get the Bill back to Second Reading, but the Bill's on Third Reading now, and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point's well taken, Sir. The Bill's on Third Reading, Jake. Mr. Beatty. Mr. Telcser, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a point to the Members that are still remaining. A number of Bills are on the...are now coming up on the so-called agreed Bill list, which, I understand, will be heard at a time certain on Friday. I would like to make the point that some of the Bills which are on the agreed Bill list are now being amended, and the Amendments could very well substantively change those Bills. I would suggest that the Members, on their own initiative, look very carefully at the agreed Bill list which will be, if it has not already been, distributed to you. The Amendments were adopted today, and I think this is Representative Wolf's concern, do maturely offer the Bills between the time they were first put on the agreed Bill list and the time they may be voted on Friday."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I also point out your point is extremely well taken, Mr. Telcser, and that all...any six Members can take the Bill off from the agreed Bill list."

Telcser: "Right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "So, kindly review the agreed Bill list. If you have any objection to any of the Bills, especially if they've been amended since then and there's some objection to the Amendment, it can be removed by a proper procedure. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did you say we should have an agreed Bill on our desk? The list?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes. No, no. No, no. You will have it...I'm sure that as soon as the Rules Committee comes out... That's what they're meeting on now, ma'am. And as..."



Sumner: "Thank you. I just thought I heard you say we should have it on our desk, and I didn't have one. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It will be forthcoming, ma'am. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, for what purpose do you seek recognition? And, if the Rules Committee is completed, I would appreciate it if you would return to the floor. According to my interpretation of the Calendar, we should be completed for today. We would like to get out of here."

Kane: "This inquiry on the agreed Bill list, will that agreed Bill list, when it gets on our desk, have a description of the Bill along with all of the Amendments adopted, or will there be just a simple number and a short synopsis?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the... I believe you...you can have it both ways, Doug, from what I remember from the LAS program. And, I would strongly recommend that it have the Bill in a synopsis form, and the Amendments should also be listed, and I know it will have the Committee vote as the Bill was adopted in Committee and possibly if there's any Amendments on the floor, there should be a synopsis of the Amendments."

Kane: "Yeah, I would recommend that...that...including all of the Amendments that we've just adopted to any of those Bills on that list, that when that list comes to us, it include as much information as possible. I know it's in the computers, and if it's in the computers and available to the Leadership, it should be available to all of the Members, also."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The same list will be available to everybody. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser." Telcser, please."

Telcser: "Let me just add that the Members will have until 5 o'clock tomorrow to have their objections filed with the Clerk. If you don't by 5 o'clock tomorrow, have six



Members take the Bill off the agreed list, then you're ...you lose. You're only going to have tomorrow. Maybe the list will be on your desk tomorrow morning. I don't know myself yet, but you'll have till 5:00'clock tomorrow afternoon within which time to have six Members, if you want, get together and knock the Bill off. So, tomorrow will be a busy day. Just like many Member...many Members are... All of us like to take care of our own Bills. Certainly, I feel that way, and I know all of you do, and the temptation to slip our Bills onto the agreed Bill list is indeed a difficult one to resist."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Telcser, I believe the term 'agreed Bill list' is a misnomer, because..."

Telcser: "I agree. You're right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Because of the fact that the Bills will be listed, but each Bill will be taken upon individually, and there will be no debate. I mean, as far as the Bill itself will be explained by the Sponsor and there will be no debate. Now, if you have...if you want to have debate, you just have six people object to the Bill being on that type of a list. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I take it then since we're adjourning now, that the list will be available on our desks first thing in the morning with the full description of both the Bill and the Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane, I would hope that you would ask that question...I...from my understanding from what I recall what they stated to me yesterday, that's the case, but when Mr. Katz returns on the floor, you can ask what they finally decided in the Rules Committee this afternoon..."

Kane: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...and I was not there. Mr. Katz, for a report of the Rules Committee. It's my understanding that the Chairman of the...vice-Chairman or whatever



his title is. The Rules Committee is in the process of having the report typed, so it can be presented to you, Gentlemen on the floor, so... Do have any other questions, Doug? Or do you want to wait till Harold gets on the floor? Are there any announcements. Now, I would hope that the Membership would kindly just stay here momentarily, so we can adopt a Rules Committee report and go through that order of business next. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Rules Committee has just finished a meeting in the Speaker's office. The Rules Committee unanimously adopted certain procedures to enable the House to complete its business during the current week. They will, first of all, have a no debate Calendar. The Chairman and the Minority Spokesman of the various Committees have, as you know, been working on that, and that list of Bills will be distributed to you probably yet this evening, and in the morning in complete form that will show every Bill that is proposed for the no debate Calendar. You will have until 5 p. m. tomorrow. Any six Members or the Sponsor can remove any Bill that is on the no debate Calendar by simply filing the necessary form that will be at the Clerk's desk tomorrow. All other Bills will go on the Short Debate Calendar. Also, any Bill that has been removed by the six Members or the Sponsor from the no debate Calendar, will go on the Short Debate Calendar. The Short Debate Calendar will operate as it always operates, which includes the right of ten Members of the House to remove a Bill from the Short Debate Calendar to have it on the regular Calendar precisely as it has been operating. By Thursday you will know all of the Bills that will be heard on Friday on the no debate Calendar. On the no debate Calendar you will have a print out of all of



Bills in front of you. There will be a separate Roll Call on each of the Bills, and you will be permitted, of course, to vote. There will not be presentations by the Sponsor. There will not be opposition statements. There will not be explanation of votes with regards to the no debate Calendar. The Speaker on Friday, May 25 will be setting the exact hour at which the no debate Bills will be heard. All of the Members will then learn on Friday exactly the time in which that will take place. There is presented a...a Resolution from the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules sets the Bills on the attached list as a special order of business on Friday, May 25, 1979 at the call of the Chair. Consideration of these Bills on Third Reading shall not be subject to debate or explanation of votes. The Bills hereby said are subject to removal by the Sponsor or by any six Members, by written objection filed with the Clerk by 5 p. m. Wednesday, May 23. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is clear to any Member. If there are questions, we would certainly try to answer them. This is being done so that every Member will have an opportunity to have his or her Bills considered during the current week."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane...the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Just a brief question, Harold, on the print out of the no debate Bills. Will that print out include a full synopsis of the Bill and a full synopsis of all the Amendments including the Amendments that were adopted today?"

Katz: "It is my understanding that the answer to that question is 'yes', Representative Kane, that you will be given a print out of all of the Bills on the no debate Calendar that will include all Amendments adopted up to this time."



Kane: "And will that be in the order...?"

Katz: "Each Member will be given that."

Kane: "And that will be in the order in which the Bills will be called?"

Katz: "Well, on the no debate Calendar they will be called in a numerical order. When matters are heard on Short Debate, they will be called in order of priority."

Kane: "And the list on the no debate Calendar will be given to us in numerical order, also?"

Katz: "Yes, it will be given to you in numerical order. That is correct, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "By Committee."

Katz: "Now, excuse me. You..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevidch, for what pur...?"

Matijevidch: "Mr. Speaker, would it be possible for us to adjourn, and those who have questions for Harold to come over here? Most of us...I think we can wing it through this thing pretty good, and those that have questions just come over here after we adjourn. He'll be here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson, do you per... The Gentleman from..."

Johnson: "I don't have any questions. I understand the procedure. I just want to comment that when we're talking about getting a list tomorrow morning and have ...going through hundreds of Bills by 5 o'clock and expected to register our opposition to the...to the agreement between the spokesman and the Chairman, that we're going to get a lot of junk legislation through here, and I would just as soon see Bills die as I would this kind of irresponsible way of putting Bills through. I know that we're going to do it. It's already been agreed upon. There's no reason to vote against it. The people wonder why we get lousy legislation. The



reason is because we get an agreed list like this, and 99% of the people don't have any idea how they vote.

There won't even be an explanation by the Sponsor. You look up, and if there's more greens than reds, you vote that way and otherwise you vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, no, no, no."

Johnson: "And, I think it's a rip. I think it's a lousy agreement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, there will be an explanation by the Sponsor, Sir. The Gentleman from... Oh, I'm sorry. The Rules Committee rejected that, I guess. I wasn't there. Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Why don't we have an opportunity for...for at least the Sponsor of the Bill to explain what it does. You know that we can't read 900 Bills in five hours. 200 or 500 or whatever it is. We can't read them. We're going to be voting on things completely blind. Unless they're in our particular Committee, we won't have any idea what they are, and they're going to pass out of here...some law. And, then we're going to get letters on why we passed this crummy legislation, and that's the reason. Why can't we at least have the Sponsor explain what the Bill does?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz."

Katz: "That matter was considered by the Rules Committee. One of the Members made the point that the Rules Committee adopted really, and that point was that if the Sponsor is permitted to make statements, that there...the Sponsor will make overstatements, and somebody will want to be heard on what the Sponsor has said. And, once you permit someone to speak, it is really, as a practical matter, difficult if not impossible to preclude other people from speaking. The amount of time that's involved, Representative Johnson, precludes that. Now, you will have a complete print out of the Bill. People



will not be voting blind. They will have, in front of them, a complete print-out of the Bills. If at all possible, I hope that we will have the list available even yet if we wait around today. Not the print out. That will come in the morning, but the list of all of the Bills are here, and anyone, if they wanted to, could take them home with the Digest. Tomorrow you will have your Digest. You will have all of the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "...Bills, and you can go through them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Maybe we could settle part of this concern by asking Mr. Katz just how many Bills are on that list. For instance, Tim, in our Counties and Townships Committee we only put about 7 Bills on that no debate list out of something in the neighborhood of 30. Tim, you're not even listening. How many, Harold?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz."

Katz: "200...270 Bills."

McMaster: "In other words, approximately 10...a little bit over 10 or 12 per Committee?"

Katz: "I believe that's how it would figure out, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "So, I really don't think it's that enormous number or long list that, perhaps, Tim thought it was."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner...Sumner. Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that Representative McMaster answered my question. I was wondering how many Bills we would get and how many we'd have to read in the morning and go through, because that is quite a few. But, this is better than thinking we had 500 of them. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Chairman Katz; we have on our Calendar, special order of business at 3 o'clock on



Wednesday with special Bills. Are they being put on these lists, or on the no debate, or where are they being put?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz."

Katz: "They are not. Those Bills will be fully heard."

Oblinger: "Thank you."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want you to know that the Committee has my complete cooperation. I'm proud of this procedure. I think it's a lot better than what we're going to see with the concurrences on the last few days, and this is a great idea, and I want to congratulate them."

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

Anderson: "Yeah, Representative Katz, when will the Short Debate start? The Third Reading, Short Debate?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tomorrow morning, hopefully."

Anderson: "And what about those Bills that are knocked off to no debate? Will they go back in in the priority?"

Katz: "Yes, they will go back in the priority on the Short Debate Calendar. It was the unanimous recommendation of the Rules Committee that the Short Debate begin immediately, Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "So, that'll start tomorrow morning?"

Katz: "Well, it...I assume it was the view...I assume we will not be in Session very long, but actually the unanimous view of the Rules Committee was to start it immediately."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the Rules Committee...should the motion prevail?' Is that correct?"

Katz: "Yes. I...I have...I've already stated one..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Cut it short, Harold."

Katz: "...recommendation of the Rules Committee. The report of the Rules Committee. Now, we have a...Now, Mr. Speaker, we would move that Rule 55F and 56B be suspended



and that all Bills on Third Reading be placed on Short Debate subject to Rule 91E." That means that Bills can be knocked off of the Short Debate Calendar in the same manner that we have..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Objections have been raised. All those in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Kindly record Mr. Conti as 'aye'. Conti as 'aye'. 'Aye', please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 8 'noes'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Anything else, Mr. Katz? I don't know."

Katz: "Nothing further from the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz, I believe you wanted to call House Bill 675. Mr. Katz, please."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to... I'm going to be handling that at the...for Mr. Brady, who is no longer here, and I wanted to bring that back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment that was distributed today. It is an Amendment that sets forth things regarding continuing education for accountants, and it picks up some language in the Indiana law that has worked well. I would like to bring it back to Second Reading and adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's objection been raised."

Katz: "Yes, well I would... I don't know what the basis of the objection to bringing the Bill back... I'm the chief Sponsor of the Bill. I wanted to bring it back to Second Reading."

Conti: "Not according to my Digest, you're not the chief



Sponsor. Bill Brady is, and I don't see anything... I didn't see anything in writing, and I didn't hear anybody make an announcement that you're taking over that Bill."

Katz: "Well, I believe that the Clerk has the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you have a statement from Mr. Brady that Mr. Katz is the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yeah, we have a change of Sponsor filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "By whom? Has it been signed by Mr. Brady?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I'll have to check upstairs to see..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Well..."

Conti: "I object until I find out."

Katz: "Excuse me. Mr. Conti, it is not signed by Mr. Brady. I really thought it was a matter that Mr....the Members would...bearing in mind that Mr. Brady is...is out, there would be no question if he..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Objections have been raised."

Conti: "I will not persist in it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. I agree."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, providing ten minutes for a Perfunctory Session, I move that we adjourn to 9:30 a. m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House stand adjourned till 9:30 a. m. tomorrow morning giving ...giving the Clerk ten minutes perfunctory. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed... The House stands adjourned till 9:30 tomorrow morning giving 10 minutes for the Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, and Mr. Speaker. I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles and passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit. Senate Bills #1263, 293, 294, 304, 431, 459, 529, 573, 593, 617,



625, 626, 627, 628, 632, 636, 637, 638, 644, 687, 693, 700, 710, 711, 712, 713, 715, 716, 717, 755, 760, 762, 770, 7...796, 797, 798, 801, 802, 809, 854, 857, 862, 886, 893, 909, 918, 930, 933, 955, 957, 964, 966, 990, 1029, 1030, 1049, 1068, 1089, 1099, 1108, 1109, 1113, 1114, 1115, 1116, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1142, 1145, 1157, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1167, 1171, 1182, 1183, 1184, 1190, 1203, 1220, 1228, 1232, 1242, 1245, 1247, 1268, 1274, 1276, 1334, 1341, 1344, 1354, 1368, 1378, 1393, 1411, 1424, 1426, 1433, 975, 977, 983, 991, 994, 1003, 1011, 1019, 1034, 1041, 1045, 1069, 1070, 1085, 1086, 1096, 1097, 1101, 1102, 1104, 1107, 1110, 1120, 1128, 1134, 1137, 1140, 1146, 1150, 1173, 1176, 1178, 1196, 1200, 1202, 1204, 1205, 1207, 1208, 1211, 1212, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1223, 1224, 1226, 1227, 1229, 1239, 1241, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1265, 1270, 1277, 1281, 1284, 1287, 1289, 1309, 1310, 1316. Also, House... Senate Joint Resolution 50 passed by the Senate May 22, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Special order of business. The following Bills will be hereby set for special order of business on the subject of product liability on Friday, May 25, 1979 at the hour of 2 p. m. House Bill 2168, 2362, and 2658. Dated May 22, 1979. William A. Redmond, Speaker of the House. Senate Bills First Reading. Senate Bill 412, Preston. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 737, McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend the Funeral and Burial Fund Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 807, Beatty. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 811, Beatty. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 814, Preston. A Bill for an Act relating to disclosure of beneficiaries of land trusts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 853, Schisler. A Bill



for an Act to amend Sections of the Department of Children and Family Services Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 858, Richmond. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Director of the Department of Administrative Services to sell and convey state-owned property in Hurst, Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 910, Totten-Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. The lists of the... What do we call it? No debate, are now available at the Clerk's desk. The no debate lists are now available at the Clerk's desk. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 22, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0447	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-0501	2ND READING	PAGE	110
	MOTIONS	PAGE	110
HB-0510	2ND READING	PAGE	110
HB-0513	2ND READING	PAGE	135
	MOTIONS	PAGE	135
HB-0548	2ND READING	PAGE	167
HB-0694	MOTIONS	PAGE	197
HB-0695	MOTIONS	PAGE	197
HB-0696	MOTIONS	PAGE	197
HB-1016	2ND READING	PAGE	117
	MOTIONS	PAGE	117
HB-1136	2ND READING	PAGE	31
HB-1282	2ND READING	PAGE	33
HB-1387	2ND READING	PAGE	120
	MOTIONS	PAGE	120
HB-1542	2ND READING	PAGE	207
	MOTIONS	PAGE	207
HB-1644	2ND READING	PAGE	60
HB-1702	2ND READING	PAGE	31
HB-1742	2ND READING	PAGE	111
	MOTIONS	PAGE	111
HB-1816	2ND READING	PAGE	161
	MOTIONS	PAGE	161
HB-1830	2ND READING	PAGE	121
	MOTIONS	PAGE	121
HB-1925	2ND READING	PAGE	110
	MOTIONS	PAGE	110
HB-2092	2ND READING	PAGE	115
	MOTIONS	PAGE	115
HB-2098	2ND READING	PAGE	44
HB-2104	2ND READING	PAGE	118
	MOTIONS	PAGE	118
HB-2145	2ND READING	PAGE	171
	MOTIONS	PAGE	171
HB-2165	2ND READING	PAGE	165
HB-2168	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-2185	2ND READING	PAGE	23
	2ND READING	PAGE	117
	MOTIONS	PAGE	117
HB-2201	2ND READING	PAGE	137
	MOTIONS	PAGE	137
HB-2204	2ND READING	PAGE	198

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 22, 1979

PAGE 2

	MOTIONS	PAGE	198
HB-2229	2ND READING	PAGE	43
HB-2357	2ND READING	PAGE	203
	MOTIONS	PAGE	203
HB-2362	2ND READING	PAGE	109
HB-2393	2ND READING	PAGE	22
HB-2427	2ND READING	PAGE	82
	2ND READING	PAGE	198
	MOTIONS	PAGE	198
HB-2491	2ND READING	PAGE	203
	MOTIONS	PAGE	203
HB-2562	2ND READING	PAGE	134
	MOTIONS	PAGE	134
HB-2569	2ND READING	PAGE	124
	MOTIONS	PAGE	124
HB-2649	2ND READING	PAGE	147
	MOTIONS	PAGE	147
HB-2650	2ND READING	PAGE	157
	MOTIONS	PAGE	157
HB-2651	2ND READING	PAGE	158
	MOTIONS	PAGE	158
HB-2653	2ND READING	PAGE	33
HB-2690	2ND READING	PAGE	158
	MOTIONS	PAGE	158
HB-2691	2ND READING	PAGE	158
	MOTIONS	PAGE	158
HB-2700	2ND READING	PAGE	178
	MOTIONS	PAGE	178
HB-2703	2ND READING	PAGE	180
HB-2730	2ND READING	PAGE	185
	MOTIONS	PAGE	185
HB-2735	2ND READING	PAGE	210
HB-2741	2ND READING	PAGE	172
	MOTIONS	PAGE	172
HB-2766	2ND READING	PAGE	169
	MOTIONS	PAGE	169
SB-0412	1ST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0737	1ST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0788	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0799	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0800	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0807	1ST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0811	1ST READING	PAGE	222

HB2767 →

169

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 22, 1979

PAGE 3

SB-0814	1ST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0829	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0841	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0853	1ST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0858	1ST READING	PAGE	222
SB-0860	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0861	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0871	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0882	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0910	1ST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0937	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0938	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0950	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-0967	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0971	1ST READING	PAGE	3

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 22, 1979

PAGE 4

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
RECESS	PAGE	21
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	221
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	221
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	221