

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. St. Francis de Sales said: If we say but little, it is easy to add. But having said too much is hard to withdraw and never can it be done so quickly as to hinder the harm of our excess. Let us pray. Almighty God, we give our prayers...praise and prayer to Thee this day as we serve the State of Illinois as Members of this House of Representatives. Direct us, Oh Lord, that all that we may say and all that we may do will be free from impetuosity and result from learned and scholarly thinking; that having thus spoken our words will carry value and importance in the enactment of legislation which is both pleasing to Thee and for the good of those whom we do serve; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of Allegiance."

All: "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: "Roll call for attendance."

Unknown: "The Speaker called. He's my leader."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I understand with 107 of the House and the necessary Majority in the Senate we could move the Capitol. Now, I have a proposition for this House. The Senate is opposed..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Proposition."

Kosinski: "The Senate has told me to bundle these Bills carefully so they can.....them easily were we to

agree to pass one Senate Bill for every House Bill the Senate passes, possibly our efforts would be left in vain."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the roll, Mr. Clerk. Request for change of votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Henry requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3558. Does he have leave? Representative Abramson requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1656. Does he have leave? Representative Daniels requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3114. Does he have leave?"

lb.

Does he have leave?"

Clerk O'Brien: "...Representative Skinner requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1646. Does he have leave? Representative Mahar requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2856. Does he have leave? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1652. Does she have leave? Representative Patrick requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2856. Does he have leave? Representative Yourell requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2856. Does he have leave? Representative Swanstrom requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2856. Does he have leave? Representative Karpel requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2898.

(continued)



Does he have leave? Representative Donovan requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2898. Does he have leave? Representative Grossi requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2963. Does he have leave? Representative Shuneman requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3140. Does he have leave? Representative Sandquist requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3333. Does he have leave? Representative Boucek requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3507. Does he have leave? Representative White requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3527. Does he have leave? Representative Hallstrom requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3527. Does she have leave? Representative Ewing requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3549. Does he have leave? Representative Reed requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3558 and 3559. Does she have leave? Representative Leverenz requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3558. Does he have leave? Representative VonBoeckman requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3558. Does he have leave? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3404. Does she have leave? Representative Peters requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3281. Does he have leave? Representative Kelly requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3281. Does he have leave? Representative Bower requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3368. Does he have leave? Representative Dwight Friedrich requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3368. Does he have leave? Representative Bell requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3426. Does he have leave? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'present' on House Bill 3314. Does she have leave? Representative Wikoff requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3281. Does he have leave? Representative McClain requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3281. Does he have leave? Representative Satterthwaite requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2866. Does she have leave? Representative Watson requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3272.



Does he have leave? Representative Dave Jones requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3246. Does he have leave? Representative Breslin requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3209. Does she have leave? Representative Cullerton requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2935. Does he have leave? Representative Karpziel requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2926. Does she have leave? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3127. Does she have leave? Representative Mautino requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3071. Does he have leave? Representative Stearney requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3218. Does he have leave? Representative Conti requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2914. Does he have leave? Representative Alexander requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3215. Does she have leave? Representative Keane requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3204. Does he have leave? Representative Daniels requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3404. Does he have leave? Representative Ewing requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3204. Does he have leave?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms is in the chamber."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Younger requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3217. Does she have leave? Representative Younger requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3204. Does she have leave? Representative Winchester requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3204. Does he have leave? Representative Hallock requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3204. Does he have leave? Representative Hudson requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3204. Does he have leave? Representative Piel requests to vote 'yes' on House Bill 3204. Does he have leave? Representative Stanley requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3204. Does he have leave? Representative Winchester requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2793. Does he have leave? Representative Hallstrom requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2793."



Speaker Redmond: "You're out of order."

Clerk O'Brien: "Does she have leave? Representative DiPrima requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 24. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections..."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't hear you."

Unknown: "...Would object."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't hear you. Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1497, Pierce, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Inheritance Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1538, Kornowicz, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1609, J.J. Wolf, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois Legislative Council, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1612, Ryan, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the office of the Governor, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1614, Vinson, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Civil Service Commission, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1619, Dave Jones, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Illinois Hist...Historical Library, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1621, Epton, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Insurance, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1629, Abramson, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Fire Marshal, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1635, Robbins, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Agriculture, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1638, Stanley, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Health Finance Authority, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1639,



Peters, a Bill for an Act to provide appropriations to certain agencies, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1664, Telscer, a Bill for an Act making certain reappropriations to the Capital Development Board, Secretary of State, and Southern Illinois University, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1677, Preston, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1694, Younge, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1739, Ryan, a Bill for an Act in relation to the comprehension of worker's for job related injuries and diseases, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1740, Ryan, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance and self-insurance for worker's related...worker related injuries and diseases, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Any Member that has a noncontroversial Bill that they want called, will you please come up here and give it to Tom Ohler. We'll try to accommodate you as best we can. The first one in that category is House Bill 3491. Representative Mahar is recognized. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3491 is an annexation to the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. This Bill passed through the House and was signed by the Governor last term. It was found that the legal description was wrong, and we had to come back and do it over again. There are no opponents. The MSD has no objections, and we would like to move this Bill on in order for the construction to start. I would urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3491, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to enlarge the corporate limits to



the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago,
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have
all voted who wish? Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I would like to...ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mugalian: "...About a possible annexation of a portion of land...
Is this the Metropolitan Sanitary District?"

Mahar: "Yes, Sir."

Mugalian: "And does it affect any property in my district?"

Mahar: "It affects no property except ^{the} single parcel in
my district that involves the country club. No other
parcels. That was taken out of this..."

Mugalian: "Thank you very much, Representative Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will
take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye',
and no 'nay', and the Bill having received the
Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.
2932. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2932, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Mobile Home Landlord and Tenants Act,
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill in its origin
does nothing but correct two legislative oversights
that got into the new Mobile Home, Landlord, and
Tenant Act last year pertaining to the wording of the
original Bill which is now the statute protecting
entry into mobile homes, and it was a matter of form
to change it. After the Bill was introduced, the mobile
home industry asked for a clarification with regard
to the sale of mobile homes, and the first House
Amendment...Floor Amendment #1 was placed on there to
clarify that subject, and that particular Amendment
has been adopted and endorsed by the mobile home industry



or the manufactured housing industry in the State of Illinois, and I also obviously agree with it. The second Amendment merely broadens the scope with regard to the enforcement of the provision through the Attorney General's office. I would move the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is...the question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye', and one 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3195."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3195, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3195 just brings up to date...or it includes in those that can be reimbursed under the certified Illinois assessing Officers certificates, those people who are a Member of the Board of Review..."

Speaker Redmond: "...God Bless"

Keane: "...Board of Appeal, or their employees I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye', and two 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2731. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2731, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Motor Fuel Tax Law, First...Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2731 is precisely as described



in the digest. It is my backyard still or my farm still Bill. What it does is exempt those...Well, let me just read precisely the language: 'The tax imposed by this Act, that is the Motor Fuel Tax, shall not apply to alcohol manufacturing, manufactured and used by individuals solely for his or her own use as a motor fuel. I would contend this would benefit the still owners...'

Speaker Redmond: "The last time I looked the press box was up in the front of the chamber. Representative Peters and Representative Casey, the last time I looked the press box was up here. I don't know whether you are entitled to go in there, but I know Mr. 'Serati' is. Proceed."

Skinner: "It will benefit those people who are...who have enough initiative to build their own stills. It will benefit the Revenue Department by keeping the revenueurs out of every backyard, and I think it will benefit the country in the long run because it will give an incentive to those people that can...who can produce their own motor fuel to do so. If there are any questions I would hap...be happy to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "A question of the Sponsor. Representative Skinner, I see a mechanical problem. What about the gasahol blend where you've got 10% alcohol and 90% gasoline. How do you decide how much tax you're going to charge at the pumps?"

Skinner: "Well, we are exempting them. Any alcohol that is sold would not be exempt. It would have to be used for one own...for one's own use."

Friedrich: "Not for a blend then, but to pump."

Skinner: "Well, if it were...if it were blended, for example, if a farmer blended alcohol with gasoline, the farmer would be paying motor fuel tax on the gasoline that was used on the road, but he would not be paying tax on the



alcohol that is used on the road."

Friedrich: Well, this is only for home...homemade alcohol."

Skinner: "Yes, it is."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boucek. Representative Walsh is in the chamber. Bou..."

Boucek: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Boucek: "Will this allow you to bootleg? Does a manufacture for your own use...would you be bootlegging?"

Skinner: "Well, if you were, you would be in violation of the federal law. The...the Treasury Department requires a permit and a bond for anyone who produces alcohol, and one may now get an experimental license to produce alcohol, but it is regulated by the federal government. You can't...I mean, the law says you cannot drink it, and from most of the stills I've seen, I don't think one would want to drink it."

Boucek: "As I read our analysis here it says that it provides that the 7½% motor fuel tax should not apply to alcohol manufactured and used by an individual solely for his or her own use..."

Skinner: "As a motor fuel is the rest of the language. If one drank it, one would be subject to the gallonage tax of...that the State Department of Revenue levies. It would only be exempt if it were used as a motor fuel."

Boucek: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye', and one 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3383."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3383, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Mental Health and Developmental Disability



Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was in Transportation Committee. It has to do with the transportation of mental health patients, people who... we closed our hospital in East Moline. We transferred all of our patients to Galesburg. It is necessary to determine who has the authority to transport those patients. We worked this out with the Sheriff's Association. We had two Amendments to clarify from another to a more secure. I know no...I know of...I don't know of any opposition to the Bill. I move 'do pass'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "In our area I know the sheriffs are in opposition to it because they tell me that they are required to take a patient all the way from eastern Illinois to Alton, or from central Illinois to Alton. When they get there they may or may not admit them, and then they have to bring them back at no recovery. It takes two people half of a day to do this or more. They are not compensated for anything except the mileage and they feel that this would be...work a real hardship on some of these little counties that are...would have to have two men out of their department for a half a day at a time and sometimes to no avail, and probably without sufficient reimbursement."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Polk: "Absolutely."

Getty: "Ben, have you done something to control it so that it... by one of your Amendments so that they would not recover more than actual costs?"



Polk: "What we did in the Bill was say that there is no cost factor set in the Bill whatsoever. It is to be negotiated between the county sheriffs and the Department of Mental Health."

Getty: "Could a situation develop where somebody would get a windfall?"

Polk: "Pardon me."

Getty: "Could a situation develop where someone could get a windfall? Shouldn't there be some restriction here?"

Polk: "Oh, no. Oh, no. No...no, this is an agreement between the Sheriff's Department and the Department of Mental Health. We didn't put a flat 18¢ reimbursement per mile or 20¢ per mile not knowing what the cost is going to be, and the Sheriff's Association, as I indicated, told me that that's the way they wanted it so they can negotiate. We understand that there were 20 patients that had to be moved last...they prognosticated 20 patients. I don't see this to be any major thing."

Getty: "Wouldn't we be safer if it were amended in the Senate to say that the reimbursement should not be more than..."

Polk: "I would be welcome if it gets out of Rules, which I doubt if it does. I would be welcome to any Amendment to clean it up. It's not..."

Getty: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Representative Wolf."

Wolf:S. "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Wolf:^S: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Yes."

Wolf:^S: "This Bill...does it still only apply to counties of 500,000 or more."

Polk: "Five hundred thousand and under. Yes."

Wolf:S. "Did you say under or more?"

Polk: "Under...under."



Wolf:^S "That isn't what the synopsis says."

Polk: "Well, that's what my synopsis says. That's the intent."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Mr. Wolf?"

Wolf:^S "Thank you."

Polk: "Lake, Will, and St. Clair would be...also be included."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Mr. Wolf? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Question of the Sponsor. I...what...what are you doing that is different now. Presently the sheriff has to provide that transportation...our sheriff does to the mental facilities, and it takes a lot of time."

Polk: "If you'll read the statutes, Jerry, you'll find it says peace officer. It does not delineate that it is the sheriff. It says peace officer, and in our community since this is new to us, we just had a closing. They were calling upon the Moline Police Department, the Rock Island Police Department, the East Moline Police Department, and there was no agreement with the...with the peace officers. So they came to me, the sheriff came to me and said, 'To eliminate this, I will be glad to assume the responsibility if you spell it out and if we get reimbursed. It was his request...'"

Bradley: "What is the reimbursement again?"

Polk: "Again, that has to be worked out individually between the Department of Mental Health and the local sheriff's department."

Bradley: "But this says now the sheriff will...will provide this transportation."

Polk: "That is correct. It was at the request of..."

Bradley: "The sheriff...the Sheriff's Association wants this?"

Polk: "Yes, they asked for this. My local sheriff came to me and asked for it."

Bradley: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye', and four 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3540. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3540, a Bill for an Act in relation to state housing emergencies, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the noncontroversial of a two Bill package. This ...basically all this Bill does is define on the 3539. Forty would bring into what the emergency crisis is. It defines the seasonal construction rate, and it basically defines what the seasonal quarter is, and gives these definitions so IDA can go along with 3539. This is the noncontroversial of the two Bills. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all...anyone in opposition? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye', and no 'nay', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3007."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3007, a Bill for an Act in relation to state funds and appropriations thereto, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3007 is a combined product of the House Republican and Democratic staff. It is another part of our attempt to tighten up legislative control over the spending by the various executive agencies. The primary features of the Bill are, first of all that, when we appropriate money for a specific purpose and a special line item, a requirement that the agency spend all of the money out of that



line item so that we can track what they are actually doing and what the new program actually costs, and another provision of the Bill was a sort of modified federal funds Bill that simply says the comptroller must notify the leadership when he sets up a nonappropriated account that we at least again can track what is happening even if we can't get the Governor to sign a Bill giving us control over what's happening. I would be glad to answer any questions, otherwise I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Once again, any Member that has a real noncontroversial Bill, if you'll give the Bill to Tom Ohler here we'll try to accommodate you. Representative Schraeder. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the attention of the Membership. We have former Director of Labor, Ken 'Holland' with us for today, and I would like to have a nice round of applause for him."

Speaker Redmond: "3211...3211."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3211, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3211 does two things. First it makes it clear that before a taxpayer can go to court to object to his taxes, he must pay those taxes prior to the county collector's filing his annual application for judgement. Number two, it also makes it clear that in order to pay under protest, the taxpayer must pay the second installment payment under protest. That was an Amendment #2 that



Representative Skinner and myself filed to this Bill, and it makes it clear that Amendment #1...the first installment doesn't require a protest form, but the second installment does, and that will re...do for protesting an entire years taxes. That's all the Bill does, and I ask...it passed unanimously out of Committee, and I ask for support for House Bill 3211."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "There was some noise back here. I was wondering if the Speaker would very briefly reiterate that. Did you say that is cause...it requires that only the second installment be paid under protest or that both installments need to be paid under protest?"

Pierce: "No, Sir. It makes it clear just the second need to be paid under protest. The first in some counties is an estimate like in Lake and Cook. You can pay the first general installment if you..."

Brummer: "Well, is our analysis correct? It says that last year we enacted legislation which made it clear that both of them had to be paid under protest."

Pierce: "Well, it confused things. This year by this Amendment we make it clear only the second need be paid."

Brummer: "And last year made it clear that only...that only the first and second need to be paid."

Pierce: "Yes, you are correct as usual."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question? How will this affect the procedure in Cook County?"

Pierce: "In Cook County the procedure will be much the same as it has been. In Cook County, the first installment, as you know, Representative Lechowicz, is an estimate only. So the taxpayer has no way of knowing whether his taxes will be higher or lower for the year. So in Cook County traditionally, the first installment has not been paid under protest since we've gone to the



estimated system. Only the second installment is paid under protest, and that protest form is good for both installments. That wasn't true in the old days before they had the early estimated payment. It will...the other thing in the Bill is in order to go to court, the taxpayer will have to pay his taxes in full prior to the end of November when the county collector traditionally files his annual application for judgment. Under law we passed last year, it was unclear whether he lost that right if he didn't make his...each installment payment on the exact day due. That had never been in the case prior to last year's Bill that we paid. Now we make it clear he must pay his taxes in full before he files in court, but he has until...he would have until about the end of November say of this year, to pay in full his 1979 taxes. He would have to pay all interest due, and we just passed a Bill to raise that interest from one and a half percent per month from one percent per month."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...just for the record, the...presently it is not an estimate as far as the tax Bill that...the first installment is received by the county taxpayers. It is one half of last year's full tax. And what I am questioning, would this delay...would the person still have to pay his first installment taxes or could he hold off paying taxes till October under House Bill 3211?"

Pierce: "Under House...under House Bill 3211 he can do...he can... he can fail to pay his taxes until the end of October, but of course, he will be subject to the one and a half per month interest, and if my...if I count right, that is about 18% per annum rate which is a fairly healthy rate under the Bill that we passed here the other day."

Lechowicz: "Well, it didn't pass the Senate, and it hasn't been signed into law, so you know, you're going under a



different type of a premise. So actually, under House Bill 3211, the person would not have to pay his first installment on time. It could be postponed till October if he paid a penalty one percent per month under the current law. Is that correct?"

Pierce: "Yes, that is true, and that could be done now except now he would lose his right to object in court if he... if he was one day late. If he paid that installment one day late he would lose his right on that entire estimated installment which is due about February 1, I believe, or March 1. He would lose his entire right to go to court. All this says is that if he paid prior to the action of the county treasurer for judgment, he could...he could still go to court. He has the right now not to pay his taxes and only pay one percent interest."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Sponsor to take this Bill temporarily out of the record so I will be able to check a few items in Cook County?"

Pierce: "Yes, when I asked it to be called you were still back in your office. I didn't know you'd be coming out so fast. I'll take it out of the record."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 2960."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2960, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Spaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2960 is a Bill sponsored by myself and Representative Giorgi. It amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidential...Confidentiality Act that required disclosure of the location of a person receiving mental health or developmental disability services for whom a warrant for an arrest has been issued. An Amendment which has been worked



out with law enforcement, with the Medical Society, and with the Department of Mental Health, and I appreciate Representative Getty preparing and drafting the Amendment. It also includes that in a case where a...a criminal offense has transpired at a mental institution that they must indicate the whereabouts only of the location of that individual. It received a 13 to 0 vote in Committee. I would solicit...solicit a positive vote from the House for the passage of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'aye', and two 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2985. Representative Richmond, don't go away."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record? Take that one out of the record. 2841."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2841, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning counties, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2841 allows the state Water Survey the Institute of Natural Resources to monitor and evaluate all weather modification programs in the state. It had an Amendment which takes off the second part of the Bill to comply with the sunset law. What this does is to give modification of all weather to the water survey of the Institute of Natural Resources. Sometimes in the past we have had droughts in parts of the state, especially the southern part of the state, where they do have growth of a lot of corn and soybeans,



and it has been proven that weather modification can and has been successful. There is legislation similar to this in two other states, and it has been highly successful. Since we are the number one state in the growth of corn, and soybeans, and the exportation of the same, this is just another guarantee and insurance policy to see that we remain so."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye', and three 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Anyone else that has a noncontroversial matter? 2985."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2985, a Bill for an Act relating to the state parks, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very simple Bill, and what it does is amend the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Civil Administrative Code to exempt disabled residents ..disabled veterans from fees assessed by state parks for the use of the parks and their facilities. Now that means not boat rental or anything of that nature but overnight camping fee, or if there is a fee to get in the gate. This would exempt those dependants...I mean those disabled veterans who are disabled 40% or more. And...that is basically what this Bill does."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before you stampede into this Bill, I think there is an Amendment on it which would require the state to reimburse for property taxes in this Bill, and I think possibly there is some more explanation that needs to be



made before this Bill flies out of here. I would sure suggest a yellow or some 'no' votes on that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond...Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you very much. There is an Amendment placed on it too, which incidentally is going to be taken off in the Senate, but the...the Amendment would...it addresses one problem in one district, and that is... it states that any state park that has over 7,000 acres, that they would make an adjustment with that county for the loss of...of property tax. It is not my Amendment. It has been placed on the Bill, and it has been agreed that we will take that off when it gets to the Senate. I would like...I would hope we could move it over there and then it will be removed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "I...I am certain that the Sponsor's assurances are very well given, and that he will take it off in the Senate... maybe they'll even kill the whole Bill, Bruce."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is no free lunch. The Department of Conservation has estimated that this costs 10%...10% of the total fees in revenue that comes in from camping. Ladies and Gentlemen, you can't maintain parks without spending money. We can't continue to give away service and expect the remaining people to use the park for the same...same amount of money for upkeep. I mean, quite frankly, you know, we've got to draw the line, and... I don't think there is one person in this room that feels that we spend enough money on state parks. For that reason I believe that this Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. Representative Collins...try Representative Leinenweber's."

Leinenweber: "I really don't want to say anything, Mr. Speaker, but if you insist..."



Speaker Redmond: "No, let Representative Collins..."

Collins: "No, nobody wants to hear you, Harry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just heard a figure that 10% of state revenues that... state parks would be derived from disabled veterans, well, I find that hard to believe. As a matter of fact, that sounds like a ludicrous figure. We're talking about people with 40 to 100% disability being admitted to state parks for camping, and I would guess that this would be a drop in the bucket of revenues of the Department of Conservation, but even if you accepted the 10% figure, when you talk about people who have gone to the defense of their country, and have come back disabled to the extent where they are only 60 to no percent viable, well, I think we ought them a lot more than letting them camp in our state parks. Now I've talked to Representative Richmond about the Amendment. The Amendment is not his. He didn't want it on the Bill, and he has already indicated that he will...that he will have it taken off in the Senate. As a matter of fact, he expressed a willingness to take it back and do it in the House, but the Amendment is not available. We have his assurance that it will be taken off in the Senate, but I think the main thrust of this Bill to allow disabled veterans to camp in our state parks is not only reasonable, it is something that we more than owe these people, and I would...I would ask the Members of this House, support this Bill. Support it and...with the assurance that the Amendment that was put on in Committee will be taken off in the Senate. Representative Richmond has already stated that. You know his word is good, and it shall be done. The Bill is an excellent Bill that should be supported, and let's put enough green lights up there to pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "~~Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? Does this Bill~~



apply only to Illinois disabled veterans or all veterans from Indiana, Ohio, anybody else that may want to use our parks?"

Richmond: "Illinois veterans. It says resident disabled veterans 40% or more disabled. We already give them...the 100% disabled veterans this same privilege, and now this would include those from 40% on up. The Bill originally included all disabled veterans, but the numbers from 10% to 40% is a very high figure. The Department of Conservation said that that would make it very difficult. So therefore, 40% seemed like a pretty good point to take off from. Incidentally, the cost of this Bill is...has been grossly exaggerated. I have a letter here from David Kenney, the Director of the Department, and he estimates at the very outside it would cost \$35,000 a year. The 10% is not...that... doesn't come into it at all. It has been estimated camping will be increased in fiscal 1980 by 10%. I think maybe that's where Representative Meyer got the 10% figure."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, talking about a benefit for disabled veterans is kind of like talking against motherhood. But I would tell you this, the problem is that not with the disabled veteran, but all you've got to do is get a disabled veteran to front for you, and you've got free parking in the state park. He brings in 15 people who use all the facilities of the state park, the electricity, the garbage pick-up, the policing, and the whole thing. The state is doing it for free. Now this happened with senior citizens, and all you had to do was get grandpa to get you a parking place, and everybody took a free ride. Well, I think Representative Mahar certainly expressed it. If we're going to have good state parks, you've



got to have income in them, and I...as sympathetic as I am with disabled veterans, certainly we haven't ignored them through the years, but if you start doing this parking and camping sites are certainly used by more than one person. The disabled veteran doesn't go by himself. He can take the whole family and all his friends and still go free. Now if we want state parks, we better not be making all these exemptions, because somebody's going to have to pay for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was exactly the point of explanation of my vote. I am going to vote... I'm already voting for the Bill, but I think in Representative Richmond's exercise of duty with Amendment #2 in the Senate, he also ought to clarify that because I am presuming that he means in this Bill 'and their dependents', that means when grandpa goes there, he's taking his grandson and his granddaughter. He's not taking half of the town, and I really do believe that that part of it should be clarified, Bruce."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: ^{J.J.} "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I thought this was defeated until our distinguished Minority Leader got up and started talking for the Bill. Let me just point out a few things. If you've got a 40% disability, that is not making you incapable of working. This also includes, as I understand it, their dependents as well. The Recreation Council just had a trip to Kentucky Lake State Park this weekend, and let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is amazing what they have done with their facilities. They have developed their facilities which is something Illinois hasn't done, and this takes dollars. If we're going to be chipping away and giving exemptions to everybody like we did with the senior citizens that pull in with their \$50,000 campers and want to get a free



campsite, then we're crazy. You ought to be voting against this. It takes money to develop, to make Illinois a place of tourism, develop southern Illinois and the other places here, and that takes dollars. I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Skinner: "Just last year we passed a Bill that would not allow senior citizens to have free camping on weekends. The argument was made that the senior citizens could go any time of the week. Now I don't know where that argument fits with veterans or not who are as disabled as they would have to be under this Bill to qualify, but it is something that it seems to me ought to be considered. It is a lot easier to draw the type of limits that we did for senior citizens ahead of time than it is to come back and take the right away once it is given. The second part of this Bill that not many people have mentioned is what I consider...well, an inappropriate diversion of state revenue to those counties which have 7,000 or more acres of state parks. My county has major acreage in state parks, but I don't think we've got 7,000 acres. So what this means is southern Illinois counties with large acreage will end up getting tax revenue in...or state revenue in place of local taxes, and the northern Illinois counties which have major state parks...major use, major value, will end up getting nothing, and that does not seem fair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my vote, unlike the earlier speaker, there are not that many disabled veterans in the state that would fit within the 40 to 90% disability. The figures are very low. As a past employee of the Department of Conservation, I happen to know that there are many, many times, in fact, most of the time except on heavy weekends, on



Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, special events of that type that the state parks are fully utilized. I feel that we should support this Bill, and that there are not that many and will not be that type of lose from the state revenues that has been projected. So I would certainly encourage some more green votes up there."

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

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This would only effect 22,000 people. Only 22,000 people in the State of Illinois, and on Armistice Day, Veterans Day, we always honor those who we're trying to give a parking privilege, walking in here for a five dollar fee, a veteran, someone who has served your country, and if we can't have more votes than that up there, there is something wrong. A veteran who has fought for his country who wouldn't have a disability if he hadn't been in service, and all we're asking is give him a park privilege, let's have some green votes up there for someone who will really appreciate them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, actually the numbers of disabled veterans are not...is not excessive. Another thing, there is quite an attrition amongst disabled veterans. They don't seem to last too long. The fact is, the other day, I might mention that I had a sudden attack you might say, and I am supposed to eat more bananas. If you want to bring me bananas, you're...I'll accept them. Anyway, I do think this is something we should vote for because a disabled veteran has got that way because he was hurt either in combat or going into combat, or on military maneuvers or some other government business, and this is a very little thing to reward him by if he so wants to go to a



park and enjoy life as he can, why I think we should help him a little bit. So I say let's have more green votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I can get the attention of the House Members. Here it is May 22, and I was informed by my staff this morning that we are over \$300,000,000 already over the budget, and we haven't even considered any of the appropriation Bills yet or any of the Senators Bills. So just keep that in mind every time you are trying to give away something. Three hundred million dollars over the budget as of this date."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye', and 15 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 29...2994, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering..."

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

Schlickman: "...If that Bill was non-controversial, what are the controversial Bills today going to be like?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Members are the ones that identify them as non-controversial. God help us if they were up here picking the non-controversial ones out. 2994."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2994, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to license and regulate grain dealers, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #1 really makes up the Bill in terms of House Bill 2994. And what this does, it makes the license for the feedmill operator, in fact, it eliminates the license but still requires a registration with the Department of Agriculture. This affects approximately 50 small feedmill operators in the state. This Amendment came



about and was worked out by the Department of Agriculture, the grain dealers, Livestock Association, the...and feed dealers, and the problem came to us from the small farmers and the small feed mill operators. This would only apply to those under \$100,000 and most of them average some place between 35 and 50,000 a year. I would ask for a favorable vote on this, and with leave of the House I would also ask for Representative Winchester to close when the time comes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "...The Sponsor yield for a question? What is the position of the Illinois Farm Bureau on this Bill now?"

Rea: "The Illinois Farm Bureau did testify against it. They had a meeting yesterday of the Board, and in terms...they have opposed it, but I...I feel that this has been mainly due to the large farmers and the large grain dealers, and this is certainly for the small farmers and the small feed mill operators."

Ewing: "So they have not changed their position on the Bill?"

Rea: "This is correct. In terms of...now let me explain also in terms of the Board that met yesterday, I can tell you though that in terms of many of the Farm Bureau County Organizations throughout the state that they do not necessarily agree with what the Board... action have taken."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just would like to point out a couple of things. First of all, the Sponsor yesterday of this nature indicated that the Farm Bureau was reconsidering their stand. He has now made it clear to all of us that they may have tried to reconsider it, but they didn't. A fact that any of can keep in mind while we vote. I would also point out a second fact that a couple of years ago when we passed the grain dealers' legislation, we did...did a great deal to put a number of grain dealers and small trucker farmer-dealers out of business, I think,



incorrectly. Another good example of how government regulation...over-regulation can kill the goose. We put out of business those dealers which no longer... which were not causing the problems. They weren't the dealers that were going broke and sticking the farmers with big losses. And we passed the Bill to regulate the biggies, and we put the little ones out. I think that there is probably some merit to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was one of the Sponsors of the legislation that Representative Ewing refers to a couple of years ago. It was legislation that was needed and ^{was} needed urgently and quickly, and as you know, sometimes there are bugs that have to be worked out later on, and this happens to be one of those bugs in that legislation that we're trying to correct. I also want to mention that with the Farm Bureau... many Farm Bureaus and throughout the State of Illinois support this legislation, but the Farm Bureau in Bloomington has taken a position that they are not in support of it, but remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, it was the Farm Bureau that urged us to vote for the farmland tax assessment which has got us all in a lot of trouble with as much as 200 to 400% increases. So I sometimes think that they make mistakes when it comes to good legislation. I think this is important legislation. It affects about 50...50 dealers in the State of Illinois. It is important to them, and I would urge a favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ropp: "Representative Rea, can you tell me now whether or not, or what amount of protection a farmer has who has grain in



these particular grain operation that are...that we're concerned with. What protection does he have if that particular operation goes broke?"

Rea: "Most of these operations are the cash flow type operation.

At the present time they are registered the same as incidental grain dealers license which makes them much more restrictive, and there is required now of them under the present law a \$10,000 bond."

Ropp: "Okay, does the Department of Agriculture have any responsibility or any liability if any of these particular operations are in financial trouble?"

Rea: "The only responsibility that the Department of Agriculture would have would be that there would be the reporting that would be required by the feed mill operators at the end of the year, and they would... the Department of Agriculture then, would in fact have a responsibility if they find that there is more... they meet...they ever reach the \$100,000 or more than are requiring them to make application for the incidental grain dealers license."

Ropp: "Then thirdly right quick, what is the estimated registration fee going to cost for being registered. Do you have any idea?"

Rea: "No, I don't."

Ropp: "Okay. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to speak on behalf of this Bill. It is a situation which may cause some problems, but down through the years, these smaller operators have not caused a real problem. They are providing a service to the farmer in that particular area. Most of them are small grinding operations, and should they provide any financial trouble, I am sure it's providing a greater service by not having to be licensed and than the inconvenience and the added costs that we currently find ourselves involved with. So I urge support of this. I know it is not in total support by a lot of people, but I think it is



a good piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "What is the position of the Illinois Department of Agriculture with regard to this legislation as amended?"

Rea: "The Illinois Department of Agriculture along with the Grain Dealers Association..."

Brummer: "No, the Illinois Department of Agriculture."

Rea: "Okay. They worked out the..."

Brummer: "What is their position?"

Rea: "...Jointly, and they said that this is something they can live with."

Brummer: "Are they in support of this?"

Rea: "They have not taken...taken a position. They..."

Brummer: "Okay, that's what I wanted to know."

Rea: "They did take a position on the first one."

Brummer: "With regard to the enforcement provisions of the... for violation, what is the penalty written into the Bill if someone is violating the provisions?"

Rea: "In violation of what...what provision now? In terms of the...you mean if they reach 100,000?"

Brummer: "Yes."

Rea: "Well, if they meet the \$100,000, then they are required... they would be required to...to apply for the incidental feed grain dealers license the same as anybody else that would go out here and try to..."

Brummer: "Okay, I think the pro...the Bill provides for an audit for the purpose of determining whether they meet the sales level. Is that right by the Department of Agriculture?"

Rea: "The Department of Agriculture will require that, of course, that they...they register with the Department on farms prescribed by the Department annually within 90 days at the close of the year stating the dollar value of their purchases from producers during that year, their business locations, and other information deemed necessary by the Department to verify that they're



eligible...they have this eligibility for exemption."

Brummer: "Yeah, does the Department have the authority to come in and do auditing to determine whether the farms provided...are completed by the incidental grain dealer are accurate? I mean do they have some authority to come in and do auditing to determine if in fact they are purchasing more than \$100,000 worth of grain a year?"

Rea: "It is my understanding that they do have that authority."

Brummer: "Okay, when can they come in? I think you indicated..."

Rea: "As I understand it..."

Brummer: "...Ninety days after the close of the year?"

Rea: "Or if they determine at any time that this person might be in violation and might be hitting the 100,000."

Brummer: "The form is required 90 days after the close of the year. Is that right?"

Rea: "That is true, but if they..."

Brummer: "So someone could be...have purchased \$1,000,000 worth of grain during the year, but they don't file the form until 90 days after the end of the year."

Rea: "Well, that would be no different than someone out here that is starting up an operation in terms of buying grain, and if they did not apply for an incidental grain dealer's license..."

Brummer: "I would agree with you here..."

Rea: "...With the same penalties."

Brummer: "That's why I think it is crucial that it is clear that the Department of Agriculture has the authority to come in any time to do auditing and not wait until 90 days after the close of the year. That they have the authority to come in immediately or any time that they feel advisable to do the auditing to determine if they are in fact incidental grain dealers that would be exempt under the provisions of this Bill."

Rea: "It is my understanding that any time it is advisable for them to come in they would have that authorization to do so."



Brummer: "Okay, thank you."

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

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, for a question. Now I understand that the Department of Agriculture does have the right to come in and to audit at any time throughout the year, but I am still not clear what their authority is having conducted that audit. If there is no license to pull, what is the means for correcting what they are doing or putting them out of business or putting them into a holding pattern for a period of time until they correct some of these practices. What is the authority of the Department in this area?"

Rea: "They...they are, of course, required to...to register. They would not have the license but to register. In terms of...so there would not be any, you know, license to pull. The only requirement or the penalty there would be that if they would meet the requirement for incidental grain dealer's license and of having to apply."

Rigney: "Well now, for instance,..."

Rea: "And it would be required, of course, to...the registration, I assume, could be pulled which then would, I guess, would not make them eligible for a feed milling operation."

Rigney: "Well, for instance, in other Sections of the law for the legitimate grain dealer, if they are found to be in a speculative position, their license could be rescinded for this purpose. If they are engaged, for instance, in 'price later' contracting in violations of Sections of that Act, there is a means here again for the Department to immediately take some corrective action, but I'm not sure what the leverage is as far as the Department is concerned to protect the individual farmer out here for one of these operations that might be violating some other Section of the Act that the legitimate grain dealer cannot do."

Rea: "The only...the only thing I can say to that is that, you



know, in terms of the registration, and that they would no longer, if they were not meeting their requirements set forth by the Department of Agriculture in terms of reporting that they would...could no longer be registered as a feed milling operation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on this good Bill."

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

Winchester: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we're talking about here are the small feed mill dealers, less than \$100,000 in operations, average about 50 in the state, on the average of about \$36,000 a year is what they do. They buy the grain from the grain elevators or from the farmers direct. They grind it. They make it into feed or they sell it as corn or other types of grain to people who have maybe one or two horses, or a pig, or a cow, a small operation. All told, it is just a small operation, Mr. Speaker. They are small businessmen, and because of legislation that I sponsored a couple of years ago, we put them in a real serious bind and caused them a lot of undue over-regulation and expense, and we're just simply coming back now and trying to correct that problem. I think it is a good piece of legislation. I'm of the opinion the Department of Agriculture does support it. Maybe they've changed their position, I don't know. The Farm Bureau, I don't think they've had enough time to really make their decision, but I can't help but think that it was the Farm Bureau that lead us down the primrose pass...path when they encouraged us to vote for the farm land assessment legislation a couple of years ago. So I would ask for a favorable vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor...the question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Schlickman, do you have an observation? Have all voted who wish? Do you have the same observation? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'aye', and 28 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Kent: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am so pleased this morning that we have international visitors from Nigeria. They are from the Parliament there, and Mr. 'Domogen' is the Speaker. Mr. 'Boacher' is the Clerk. Mr. 'Curote' is a Member of the Nigerian Parliament. Welcome them please."

'Domogen': "Mr. Speaker, the Leaders of the House, the Representatives, we are Members of one...of the states..from Nigeria. In Nigeria we have 19 states, and we have the unicameral system in the state, and the bicameral system in the federal. And we recently adopted the ...this system of presidential government in October of last year. So we feel it is wise for us to come down to the United States which has been practicing this system for a long time, to see how the system works, and really we are delighted by seeing the system in various states how they...before coming to this state we had been in four states by the way we are oppertuned to see three of the states in...in Session. So, this is the fourth state which we have the chance...opportunity to see... we will see what is really happening on the floor of the House, and likely we may need some.....we may likely ask some questions from some of the Members when they are in their offices if they will give us a chance. Thank you very much for giving us the chance and presenting us on the...before the...this House. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for Attendance. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 99, Hanahan. House



Resolution 788, Wikoff; 792, E.G. Steele; 794, Keane;
796, Redmond-Getty; 789, John Dunn."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Hanahan's Senate Joint Resolution 99 honors a golden anniversary. 788 by Wikoff records the record of the Fighting Illini basketball team. 792 by Steele asks the Commerce to monitor the scrap industry. 794 by Keane notes the 50th year of a religious member. 796 by Redmond-Getty asks for a suit of probation and court services, and 789 by Dunn honors an outstanding woman. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 795, DiPrima, respects the memory of Fred F. Emich, Sr. House Resolution 799, Collins, respects the memory of Forbes Edward Jordan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Death Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions...or the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Death Resolutions are adopted. 2918. Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2918, a Bill for an Act to affect the revision of several laws in relation to the election of local public officials in conformity of the statutory consolidation of elections, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2918, the synopsis and the digest are accurate. It amends numerous Acts and deletes provi-



sions governing conduct and timing of election of officers, units of local government, school districts, in order to form to the three consolidation of election Bills that we passed that are now law that will be in effect December 1, 1980. It is just a technical confirmation of the different statues, and I move for a favorable Roll Call on 2918."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye', and two 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On priority of call. Page one, priority of call, House Bill 3034. Representative Stearney... okay. 3288, huh? Well, we can still do them, but...you don't want to. Why didn't you tell me? 3288."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3288,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2861...Representative Piel, for what purpose do you rise?"

Piel: "Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were on priority of call, and we didn't get completely finished with it. I think it would be only fair, I mean these Bills...we started the same spot the last two days. I think it would only be fair to the Members who have a Bill down the list a ways, you know, to go there."

Speaker Redmond: "That's according to the rules."

Piel: "..."

Speaker Redmond: "And we're trying very hard to accommodate the Members. We would appreciate letting us go ahead here. It is alright. This is according to the rules. 2861, Representative Schraeder...out of the record. We'll get to you. If we keep taking them out of the record, we'll get to you. 3377...Elementary and Secondary Education...the Chairman of the Committee. Is he here? Who's the Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3377,..."



Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3196...Representative Beatty on the floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "3196...out of the record. 2762, Representative Yourell. Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2762, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to public libraries, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill that is the major revision of the district library law. We've had much discussion on this Bill relative to the Amendment. The Amendments were discussed in great detail. The Amendment #3 became the Bill, and what it does is for the first time codify the election laws in the State of Illinois, and it is, of course, recommended by the Illinois Library Association, the... Illinois Municipal League has no objections to the Bill since the Amendments were placed to it, and I would hope for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative... Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Briefly, what are the substantive changes, if any?"

Yourell: "What we've done with the Bill is take care of... the validity and effective dates of ordinances that affect the district library law. Ordinances are effective immediately upon enactment except as otherwise specified. The Amendment, which is a Bill of course, retains the current language which states that ordinances must be posted or published within 20 days of the enactment are effective upon posting. The validity of ordinances upon 'fair posts' is not addressed in the current statute, and we put that in...Section 2 sets forth the set of procedures for establishing library districts."



Amendment #3 that we discussed at some length allows for the inclusion of a municipality, township, or county with library services already being provided upon a petition of a Library Board, and most importantly what it does is it provides library service to about 20 areas in the state that presently do not have that service."

Schlickman: "Did you imply that ordinances can be effective without publication?"

Yourell: "I didn't hear you, Sir."

Schlickman: "Did you imply that ordinances can be effective...?"

Yourell: "No,..."

Schlickman: "...Prior to publication?"

Yourell: "No, I did not. No, I did not."

Schlickman: "Publication still is required for effectiveness of an ordinance?"

Yourell: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "Do you in any way affect the present law with respect to the automatic disconnection from a district when there is annexation to a municipality providing library services?"

Yourell: "It provides for that in the Bill, and that was one of the problems we had and was taken care of in Amendment #3...for annexation...by petition...yes."

Schlickman: "Does the present law...does the present law law providing for automatic disconnection upon annexation to a municipality remain?"

Yourell: "I'm not sure of that. Perhaps Representative Anderson knows the answer to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Schlickman: "Well, no. I need an answer to this, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know whether or not the present law providing for automatic disconnection upon annexation to a municipality providing library service remains, or if it has been in any way affected or repealed."

Yourell: "The Amendment...Amendment #3 would not allow village, city, township, or county libraries to be taken over by



districts unless there is a direct approval by the voters."

Schlickman: "That, I think, is a different situation from the one I am propounding. Well, apparently we don't know the answer. Does this Bill increase indebtedness...limits of indebtedness for library..districts"

Yourell: "NO."

Schlickman: "Amendment #1 had. Is that correct?"

Yourell: "Pardon me."

Schlickman: "Amendment #1 had removed the debt limit of five percent for districts. Was that repealed or recinded by your Amendment #3?"

Yourell: "I believe that was taken care of in Amendment #3. I think Representative Birkinbine whose Amendment #4 which he withdrew was agreed to in Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman..."

Schlickman: "Well, I'm still waiting for an answer, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not..."

Speaker Redmond: "Alright...alright...Representative Yourell."

Schlickman: "...The exhibition of Amendment #1 to removing the debt limit of five percent for library districts is in the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The decibel level is now 80."

Yourell: "There is...Mr. Speaker, I am reading Amendment #1, and I don't see that in Amendment #1, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, does House Bill 2762 as it has been amended on the floor, in any way, affect present debt limitations by library districts..."

Yourell: "No, Sir."

Schlickman: "...Or does it in any way affect tax rates?"

Yourell: "No, Sir."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Yourell: "I have the answer to your annexation question if you want."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "I think...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House. I think the only Section that affects tax rates that it allows new library districts formed since 1977 to levy for the loss of personal property tax."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, Representative Schlickman was concerned about the annexation question. And I can read you the language. Provides that territory with no residents may be annexed by ordinance and back door objection. Current law states that propositions for annexing territory can't be put to an election more than once every three years. This Amendment provides no more than once a year. No addition...of course, no additional expenses incurred because of the consolidation of election laws that will be effective December 1, 1980 permits the annexation of unserved territory and municipality, and that is the area we're talking about, the 20% that is not presently served now by any library, municipal, city, or district library in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Mr. Mahar? Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, would the Speaker,,,Speaker yield...Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Macdonald: "Can...Representative Yourell, can you tell me what relation Amendment #2 which exempts railroad companies from paying taxes on any annexed right-of-way has to do with this Bill?"

Yourell: "Well, this was an area of concern that we addressed in the hearings that we held on the Bill and in the Subcommittee hearings, and it was felt that this was absolutely necessary, as you can read Amendment #2... it removes the provision that railroad right-of-way may be annexed to the district by ordinance for the purpose of establishing...continuing with adjacent territory. We addressed that. The Municipal League had questions about that, and this is the Municipal League's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Railroad property is not assessed by the local



assessor. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask a couple of questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huskey: "The noise level is so high back here, Mr. Speaker,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Most of it is coming from back there, too."

Huskey: "...These questions probably have been answered, but I just...I just want to ask. Representative Yourell, previously there have been a referendum in order...in the existing library to convert to a library district. Now on this Bill it gives them a backdoor referendum and removes the...removes the mandatory referendum. Am I right?"

Yourell: "No, that is not correct. Representative Birkinbine's Amendment put in a full referendum."

Huskey: "Alright now, on the annexation of school districts. Are you changing that from a mandatory to a backdoor referendum?"

Yourell: "This has nothing to do with school districts."

Huskey: "If it is school district property it includes?"

Yourell: "This has nothing to do with school district property."

Huskey: "Okay, that's..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My name was mentioned with regard to this. You may remember that I put on three Amendments yesterday. In spite of that fact, those three Amendments took care of some objections I have. I have yet to find anybody who can tell me why this Bill is needed. I amended it to make it less onerous, but I would appreciate from anybody a why behind this Bill. It did originally do some bad things, and I think most of those got changed with the Amendments, but the only reason for the existence of this Bill in the first place that I can gather is that it is going to make the Illinois Library Association a stronger lobbying force. If anybody can tell me why this whole thing is needed, it would be the



first time I have gotten an answer."

Yourell: "Well, I think...Mr. Speaker, I think I can suggest why the Bill is needed. I have already referred to it in my previous remarks. What the Bill primarily does is to provide library service to 20% of the population of the State of Illinois which is presently unserved. It will...it will improve an 'antiquated' statute and will provide for commonality of provisions with the local Library Act. This Bill has the support of the Secretary of State who is, as you know, the State Librarian. This Bill has been under consideration since 1973. Different Committees appointed by the Library Association with the help of the Secretary of State and with his counsel, and that primarily is what the Bill does. It codifies the Library Act and provides means for 20% of the population of the State of Illinois to receive library services which they presently do not have."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye', and 15 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3196, Representative Beatty."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3196, a Bill for an Act...a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is proposed by the Chicago Municipal Employees Retirement Fund, and its purpose is to ease up the restrictions relative to illegitimate children taking a child's benefit when the parent passes away. The present law is arbitrary. There is a case court pending...case court pending and probably tomorrow morning the judge is going to rule that the statute is unconstitutional."



The wording of that statute is similar to that which we previously had in the Probate Act dealing with illegitimate children and is being replaced with the language that would say that an illegitimate child would be entitled to an annuity if he establishes by court proceeding that the person is the father or if he brings in clear and convincing proof of the paternity. This is a relaxation of the standard. It is more fair to illegitimate children. There is an impact statement showing that there really is no cost to this. Now, there are two Amendments that were put on recently, and those are not in any way anything that I don't think anyone would oppose, but we never know. One Amendment indicates that the retirement fund may loan securities to security dealers...the term that they can be loaned is for a year. They would be fully secured in cash. This would enable security dealers to make deliveries of stocks and bonds. The retirement fund would be paid for this. They would be fully secured during the time of the loan, and the other Amendment would enable the downstate teachers' retirement system to accept bids from Blue Cross and Blue Shield because there is a minor change in the language. At present there is some question as to whether Blue Cross and Blue Shield could bid for the contract. So this is a Bill. I would be glad to answer any questions. I would ask for a favorable Roll."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Satterthwaite...question."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Beatty, are you acquainted with my House Bill 2941 which changes the blood testing evidence?"

Beatty: "Yes, ma'am."

Satterthwaite: "Would you say that you're Bill could be effective in terms of that establishment of fraternity without a change in the blood testing procedures as my Bill



requires?"

Beatty: "Well, your Bill will make it easier for someone to establish paternity, and it would give the child evidence, if in fact that child...if there was paternity... it would be additional consideration."

Satterthwaite: "But what I'm saying is if my Bill does not pass, could your Bill still require that that evidence be submitted?"

Beatty: "Well, whatever evidence would be required would be up to the Board...the statutory change. This Bill that I'm proposing isn't..."

Satterthwaite: "This would not be a court decision. This would just be the Board of the...of the..."

Beatty: "Well, it could be two ways. If there is a...finding of paternity in the court, that would be one consideration, or if there was other evidence presented to the Board, and they felt that there was paternity could then award an annuity. This is a relaxation..."

Satterthwaite: "The Board could make the decision in your Bill."

Beatty: "That is correct. Yes."

Satterthwaite: "I think it is a good change, and I hope that we can also get my Bill passed because I think that would be an additional route for establishing this paternity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Beatty: "Yes."

McCourt: "On Amendment #1 wherein it permits the loaning of securities, can you explain that a little better?"

Beatty: "Yes, the Retirement Board may lend securities as...on the terms that they are agreeable between them and a security dealer, and the agreement would provide that they shall...the funds shall retain the right to receive and collect from the borrower all dividends, interest rights, and other benefits that the security



would be entitled to and which the fund would otherwise be entitled to to borrow...will give as collateral to the funds cash equivalent to the value of that security, and if the security goes up during the time that the borrower has it, additional security will be given, and the...the term the most time that can be consumed is a year during which these securities can be loaned. The fund has been told that they can loan securities and make money for the fund. They feel...they have substantial sums involved in stocks and bonds and if a broker could have those, he could make delivery. Sometimes people won't buy unless they know they can get delivery. They want the stock or bonds in hand. This would enable them to borrow the security, use that, the fund meanwhile would have cash as security for it. There was no risk... there is no risk to the fund, and they are going to get everything they are entitled to plus they are going to earn money, and I think it is a good opportunity to make some money."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?" The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 'aye', and eight 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative DiPrima. May I present to the House the freshman Representative from Chicago, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know, today we are having our Poppy Day program, and we'll start the proceedings by having a reading of the Citizens' Creed in conjunction with the Pledge of Allegiance by Gordon Ropp. As you know, Gordon Ropp is the Representative that introduced the Resolution mandating us to recite the Pledge of Allegiance every morning for which I commend him highly. Proceed, Repre-



sentative Ropp. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Representative DiPrima. For God and Country, we the citizens of the United States of America believe that our Creator provided this blessed country for us as our home and inspired our forefathers to author and enact the Constitution of the United States of America delineating the Americanism and the powers of government officials. The greatest instrument ever derived by man for the protection of God-given freedoms of the individual. A Constitutional Republic whose government officials are selected and elected by the citizens eligible to vote. A perfect Union of 50 states established on those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and Americanism for which American patriots have sacrificed their lives and fortunes. It is our responsibility and duty to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America and to obey its laws, to assist in the selection and election of honest, intelligent, conscientious patriots as government officials, to respect our flag, to love our country, and protect it from all enemies. God Bless the United States of America. Now kindly join me in the Pledge of Allegiance. 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."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Representative Ropp...Ropp. I'll get it yet. Alright, now we will hear Susan Catania recite 'In Flander's Field the Poppies Grow'. Susan Catania."

Catania: "In Flander's field, the poppies grow between the crosses row on row that mark our place. And in the sky the lark still bravely singing, flies, scarce heard amid the guns below. We are the dead. Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved, and were loved, and now we lie in Flander's fields. Take up our quarrel with the foe. To you from failing hands we throw



the torch, be yours..to hold it high. If ye break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flander's field."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Susan. Now we'll hear from Representative Barbra Currie, sweetheart of Sigma Chi, and all of us, and she will sing a World War I song entitled 'Trees'."

Currie: "'Trees', by Joyce Kilmer. I think that I shall never see a poem lovely as a tree. A tree whose hungry mouth is pressed against the earth's sweet flowing breast, a tree that looks at God all day and lifts her leafy arms to pray, a tree that may in summer wear a nest of robins in her hair, upon whose bos om snow has lain, who intimately lives with rain. Poems are made by fools like me, but only God can make a tree."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Barbara. We're going to hear now from Bill Mahar who has little verse in remembrance of the deceased veterans and the wounded veterans. Bill Mahar."

Mahar: "In 1962 President John F. Kennedy was reminded during a public address of the old verse scrolled on a sentry box more than 300 years ago. God and the soldier all men adore in times of trouble, and no more. For when war is over and all things are righted, God is neglected and the old soldier slighted. Recent events bear out the late President's belief that the more distant time moves from the sound of battle, the more dim public memory becomes of the sacrifices exacted at the price for victory, and the greater the inclination to challenge the veterans' programs once accepted as just and reasonable."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Bill. Now we'll have a recent mother of our Body here, Peggy Breslin. She will give us a little remembrance on Memorial Day."

Breslin: "In times of peace, in times of war, men and women of the armed forces have stood ready to protect our ideals of democracy. We will not forget their heroic deeds,



for they were done in the name of freedom. We cannot forget their loyalty, for it gave their struggle meaning and kept this nation strong. We must not forget them, for they gave their lives so that this nation might live. On Memorial Day, let's pay grateful tribute to those who lived and died so courageously for their country."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Peggy. Now we'll have a number entitled 'My Buddy'. This song was composed by Joyce Kilmer who was killed in World War I, and last year when I asked Carol Braun if she would sing this song, she didn't know the lyrics, and she had to call her mother in New York to get the lyrics. And now we will have Carol Braun, the belle of the midway. She is from the University of Chicago area, you know, give her version of that great World War I song entitled 'My Buddy'."

Braun: "(Sings) Days are long since you went away. I dream about you all through the day. My Buddy, My Buddy, nobody quite so true. Miss your voice, the touch of your hand, just long to know that you understand, My Buddy. My Buddy, you're buddy misses you."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Carol. Now we will hear from Penny Pullen who will give a recitation of the closing of the Gettysburg Address. Penny Pullen."

Pullen: "From our Illinois Son, Abraham Lincoln. It is for us, the living, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought have thusfar so nobly advanced. It is for us here to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion. That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain. That this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not parish from the earth."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Penny. Alright, Ladies and Gentlemen, for



the benefit of those new Members that were replaced those that retired or what have you. We have this program yearly, and as you know, the poppies are made up by the veterans that are in hospitals. This is a rehabilitation program, and they are given a little compensation for doing the work and also helping themselves physically. And...of course, the cost that it can, the making up of the poppies, the ingredients and what have you. So you figure by the time it is all over, a poppy is worth at least a quarter. So I always remind the Members that back in the 20's there was a preacher by the name of Billy Sunday, and after he got through with his sermon, he'd pass a tin plate around, and he said...he would say, 'I don't want to hear a sound'. In other words, that means come up with the greenbacks. I know I gave that Bob Mitchler two cans for the Senate over there...two containers rather. They come back with back with a lot of change in there. I don't know. But I know I can speak highly of the Members of the House. As a matter of fact, some of the donations we've already received in excess of one dollar as follows: Representative Frank Watson gave five dollars; Representative Bill Margalus gave five; Larry Bullock gave five; Jack Davis five; Al Ronan five; Mike Getty gave five; Clarence Neff gave five; Bernard Epton gave five; Jerry Shea, former Majority Leader, gave five; Glen Bowers gave five; Dave Jones gave five; Randy 'Whitier' from the Realtors gave five; and Tom Hanahan, the Spokesman for Labor, gave five. And anybody else that wants to give a fin or more', let me know, and I'll mention your name. And now, Taylor Pouncey is over here on the Democratic side along with Robert Pechous and Eddie Kornowicz selling the poppies, and on the Republican side we have Phil Collins, Jake Wolf, and Mary Lou Sumner. So please make sure you buy your poppies. Thank you. That concludes



our program for today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "On priority of call. Representative Getty, do you have a motion with respect to 1525?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 1505 (sic) I would move to commit 1525 to the Judiciary II Committee for interim study. I ask leave for this."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection or discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to recommit. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Monroe Flinn in the chamber? Flinn in the chamber? Take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye', and no 'nay', and the motion carries, and 1525 is recommitted. Now 3160, Garmisa. Who...Flinn...Representative Flinn. House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 1295. Representative Flinn is recognized."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to table that Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table 1295? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1295 is tabled."

Flinn: "I have one also, Mr. Speaker, on page six, 3238. Representative Sharp has already passed an identical Bill. For that purpose I would like to table that Bill also."

Speaker Redmond: "3238 is it, or..."

Flinn: "Yes. 3238, the second to the last one on page six."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Gentleman's motion. Does he have leave to table 3238? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now back to 3160. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, inquiry of the Chair. What...what was it we just did with 1525?"

Speaker Redmond: "Recommitted it to the Judiciary Committee."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "3160. Is Garmisa here? 3488, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "On 1525, the one that we just put back in interim study. Did we say that was going to Judiciary I? It came out of



Judiciary I. I might have mistaken Representative Getty.
I think he said..."

Speaker Redmond: "Two."

Jaffe: "What...it came out of Judiciary I. Why should it go to
Judiciary II?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty said it came out of Two.
Now..."

Jaffe: "No, but it came out of One."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let's recommit it from whence it came."

Jaffe: "Alright, fine. thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I fully intended to have it committed.
And I did not say recommitted. I said committed to
Judiciary II. We have already adopted previously
a Resolution asking the Judiciary II Committee to
study this. It was originally through a mistake assigned
to Judiciary I because on the computer print out it
appeared as probate rather than probation which is
clearly a Judiciary II subject matter."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, then your motion was to commit to
Judiciary II. Is that correct?"

Getty: "That is correct."

Speaker Redmond: "And that is the motion that carried.
Representative Yourell, you seek recognition? 3488,
Representative Leinenweber."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act to amend
the Local Governmental and Governmental Employees Tort
Immunity Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber. Use Representative
Collin's microphone."

Leinenweber: "I don't particularly want to...it's not my Bill,
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I have a note up here that you would
handle an Amendment and take it from Third to
Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Leinenweber: ~~"We did that last night. We put the Amendment on."~~



Speaker Redmond: "Oh...oh, okay. Then I'll forget about it.
3490, out of the record. 697..."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 697, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Pension Code, Third
Reading of the Bill."

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

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to reluctantly take this
out of the record. The Bill is...is somewhat controver-
sial. Representative Ebbesen is not on the floor..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay...out of the re..."

Davis: "...And I think he is an opponent. So reluctatly I am
going to take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1572."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1572, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading
of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. House Bill 1572 is a...legislation sponsored
by Representative Stuffle and myself, and as amended
would give spouses of retirees of state college and
universities a one percent raise on their pension for
each year of services since their prior benefits
commence. Now this legislation will help approximately
1,200 survivors in Illinois. Many of these folks
have no other income. Some of the people are drawing as
low as \$100 a month. No one has received an increase
in benefits regardless of how long she has been
receiving them. The average widows monthly benefit
is \$217.90 or \$2...\$2,614.80 a year which is well below
the poverty level. Approximately 80% are receiving
lass than \$300 a month. 45% are receiving lass than
\$200 per month. The purchases prior to these annuities



decreased 86.6% between 1967 and 1977. A \$200 pension granted in 1977 has the purchasing power today of \$34.95. The approximate length of service of...of the spouses of these survivors was more than 20 years. Unfortunately, the more elderly of this group are the ones that suffer the most. There is no way they can stretch their survivors benefits to cover their living costs today. Many of these folks have homes and small savings. They have to sell their homes and use up the savings in order to exist. Their savings have been exhausted. I and many more of you folks have received, I'm sure, quite a few letters on this. I have received petitions as well as probably 100 letters in support of this legislation. I'm going to say that this legislation has been studied by the Pension Laws Commission and has been approved from them. The cost of this small amount that we will give these 1,200 people is approximately... \$110...10 per year. It is a very small amount to help up to 12,000 (sic) people. And, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to ask Representative Stuffle to close this, please. And I would appreciate a favorable vote."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what the Sponsor is trying to do here is ^{meritorious} The Pension Laws Commission for some time has been trying to come up with a formula to take care of survivors benefits. To date we have not come up with a formula. This Bill...what this Bill does, it increase... will increase the unfunded liability of the state university's retirement system by one...\$1,700,000. It...I just...just so the Membership knows the status of this particular retirement system. In 1969 this system had an unfunded liability of \$194,000,000. In ten years...in ten years, this unfunded liability



increased to \$792,000,000. That is an increase in ten years of over 300%. So what you're doing here is very significant because if we take this action on this system, it means we have to do the same thing to every other system. Now to do this on one system without requiring an additional contribution by the active participants is a fraud on the system. So I say to you that this Bill is now before the Pension Laws Commission. It should be resolved, and some solution to it should be made before we put this additional liability on this pension system. And I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich...pardon me. Representative Terzich, you seeking recognition?"

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am also a Member of the Pension Laws Commission, and we are entering into new area of providing increment...post-retirement increments for survivors. It was a recommendation of the Pension Laws Commission that we do this on an ad hoc basis, and this is exactly what we did do by amending House Bill 1572. Although the cost is \$110,000 annually, this cost will be diminishing as these retirees expire and the...the cost will not increase over the years. So we did give this serious consideration. The present liability...unfunded liability on this group is over \$1,000,000,000 or \$861,000,000...I'm sorry, and certainly although it does increase it by \$1,700,000, it is small in comparison to the oversight...the overall size of the group, and I would urge your support in passing House Bill 1572."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, very briefly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



to reiterate what Representative Neff and Representative Terzich said, this particular Bill is approved by the Pension Laws Commission. It deals with a diminishing group of people...a closed group of people whose average annuity is only \$217 a month. That annuity base in 1967 is now worth only \$40 in purchasing power. 38% of the people covered in the Bill are over 75 years of age, and Representative Neff well articulated the other reasons to vote for the Bill. I would urge an affirmative vote on House Bill 1572."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye'; 23 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Inadvertently I missed 3206. So we'll put that in the record, Mr....3206."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3206, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3206 would require the Illinois Department of Transportation to establish a minority resource center to serve the East St. Louis metropolitan area and also to serve the railroad relocation project located there. This center would be responsible for serving as a clearing house for all the information and reference to the grants and projects of this project and assist minority owned businessmen in participating in the contracts and the project. Representative Ryan and I have been working with the Illinois Department of Transportation and we are now in an agreement on the form of the Bill, and I move for your adoption of this Bill and for your support."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3206 as amended and Sponsored by Representative Younge has the support of the Department of Transportation. The Bill now gives the Illinois Office of Minority Business Enterprise, located within the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, the responsibility of operating a minority resource center within the St. Louis rail...relocation project. The Bill as amended further clarifies the definition of this substantive legislation to correspond with the Department of Transportation's orders. It is my understanding from my conversations with the Department of Transportation that the Bill is additionally supported by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. As a Minority Spokesman of the Transportation Committee, I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call vote, and I join Representative Younge in supporting this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor, Representative Younge, would yield for a question or two. I understand that the Bill, with your Amendment, provides that assistance of some kind will be given to minority business activities. Is that correct?"

Younge: "That is correct."

Deuster: "And I understand that a minority business is defined in the Amendment as a business that is owned among other things, by a woman. Is that correct?"

Younge: "That is correct."

Deuster: "And that if a business were owned by a man who was not black, Hispanic, and not one of the other categories, but a white man, that he...that this Bill would not provide any assistance to such a business. Is that correct?"



Younger: "The definition of minority persons includes individuals who are black, Hispanic, Asian, American, American Indian, Alaskan native, or women regardless of race or ethnicity. The point here..."

Deuster: "So..."

Younger: "...Representative Deuster, is that the majority of businesses are already being benefited by this project, and the effort here is to have a focus within this project that it gives assistance to minority, including women, of business enterprises."

Deuster: "I...I understand that, but I believe your answer to my question that white men would not qualify is that ...that's what it provides because it defines business as one owned by a woman or one of the other minorities. So the answer to this is that men are discriminated against. Now I want to ask you this question, Representative Younger..."

Younger: "The point..., Representative Deuster, is that all of the contracts presently given out by the project are with white men, and therefore this center will give some assistance to minorities including women..."

Deuster: "Now my question is this..."

Younger: "And so the focus is...is to do that."

Deuster: "Yes. If we ratified the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution, would this Bill of yours be constitutional because it discriminates against men?"

Younger: "This Bill does not discriminate against men. This Bill merely gives a focus of...a clearing house within the project that will assist minorities who do not have the contracts now..."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the Amendment on the Bill. I think it is clear whether we want this to be Illinois policy or not. It may well be that we need to do something extra and something special to help women. And I think we can do that, and perhaps we should commend Representative Younger for doing that, but



this is a perfect illustration of how there are some instances where is we want to help women who need help we can do it, and we should do it, and this kind of discrimination may be proper and good and something that our constituents want, but I think it would be so unwise for us to engage in some other activities such as amending the United States Constitution to take away from us the right to help women the way Representative Younge is doing, and I did not really want to bring this subject into this Bill except it is a perfect example of...of why we would be giving away our own power to do something to help women as Representative Younge is doing because it would violate the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Borchers: "I was curious, do you consider the Japanese amongst the minorities you're mentioning?"

Younge: "I...consider Asian Americans...part of our Asian American population happen to be Japanese."

Borchers: "How about Arabs? We have Arab, Iranian, people that are...they're descendants of the real Arab, the real Iranian. They are American, but are they a minority?"

Younge: "An...an American who happens to be an Arabian would be vastly a minority."

Borchers: "Well, would you think it's right to put...to make this the law and pass this Bill through the House that we may have, theoretically, a Japanese-American who is a minority who might have behind him the great House of 'Kushuda' in Japan which could probably buy half the State of Illinois?"

Younge: "I don't believe the intent of the Bill is to...to help a person in a very solid financial circumstances that have...can on his own send it and get the contract, and



to do things."

Borchers: "But don't you..."

Younger: "The intent here is to have an in house focus or a clearing house to help those individuals who have trouble getting these contracts..."

Borchers: "Well, don't you..."

Younger: "It is not the intent to give businesses that already have that capacity, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, don't you think though that this would become the law...if it becomes that law that this would be mandatory even though there would be untold funds behind such an individual such as the Japanese family I mentioned, and or Iranian or Arab of Saudi Arabia. It is possible that we would be helping them and as we all know, many people...or many enterprises are being bought out in this country by these people. I just think...I just think I should call to your attention it is possible under this Bill, and our responsi...it is too broad. Our responsibility would be strictly...should be strictly to those confined just to American background such as the black people are. I certainly don't deny that they were equal in the dev...in their ancestry of true...of true Americanism."

Younger: "Well, I think that the definition of minority takes care of the objection that you have raised, Representative Borchers. The definition takes this turn, Asian Americans, American Indians, Alaskan native, and women. I think that that resolves the point. The whole intent of the center is to help socially disadvantaged groups get and participate in federal contracts in this project, and I don't think there will be one moment of confusion about the intent."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I originally was going to wait, and I decided to kind of wait and explain my vote, however since the



Speaker has recognized me at this time, I will share my thoughts and comments on some of the debate occurring on this legislation. You know, this country is still living with the legacy of slavery, the legacy of economic and social deprivation of certain... of many groups. Included among those groups are black Americans who have not yet fully able able to participate in the American dream. The fact of the matter is that we are looking toward a decade of the 80's in which if something is not done to begin to cure the effects of past discrimination, to cure the effects of past exclusion from contracts, from business, from partici...full participation as citizens in this country. We will be left in a very sorry state indeed when we go into the 21st century. The fact of the matter is that legislation such as that proposed by Representative Younge will go a long way toward bringing people into the mainstream, giving them a chance to have some economic parity with a society that is already moved beyond...beyond the point in which they may participate on an absolute equal footing. It is important, I think, that we not get confused about whether or not women, whether or not Latin Americans, whether or not Asian Americans are included also. The fact of the matter is that legislation such as this will provide a mechanism for avoiding the dependence on welfare for avoiding the creation of an underclass in American society. And until Legislatures such as our own begin to address the existance of that underclass, begin to address the economic and social deprivation that has been foisted on these groups, we will find ourselves as a Legislature having grapple with the existance of a segment of society that is not able to be productive because they have been kept out of...kept out of the economic mainstream, and I encourage not only on philisophical grounds, but also on the grounds that this



is a solid piece of legislation, a positive vote for progress, a positive vote for inclusion, and a vote for giving minorities and women an opportunity to become economically competitive or competitive in economic ...in the economic world of...in the economic sphere of the State of Illinois. I think it is only fair. Affirmative action is the law of the land, and I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After listening to the discussion and being a white male, I feel that I have a possible conflict of interest, so like Bernie Epton, I will vote my conscience."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff to close. I mean Younge to close. Pardon me. Representative Gaines. Pardon me, Representative Younge."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it once again disturbs me that during this time when you have riots in Miami and near riots in other parts of the country because of economic depression, the economic conditionsof black Americans that any question should be thrown into the Bill that is going to give an opportunity for black Americans to do what you white Americans think we ought to do, pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps. All this legislation does is help provide the bootstraps. And as we...I stand here today and heard this wonderful memorial and heard Representative Ropp talk about the country based on freedom and equality. Let's get a bit of equality. This is a country where black Americans also fought and died for our freedom. 'Cripus Attucks' was the first American to die in Boston commons. 'Dewey Miller' was one of the first Americans to die at Pearl Harbor, and the Fighting Eight from Chicago lead the advance up the San Juan hill and the 'Chateau Thiery'. And among



their heroes were Congressman Bill Dawson. The late Congressman Bill Dawson was one of the heroes of 'Chateau Thierry'. And then also, Colonel 'Warfield' who served in this Body. We have black Americans who have done everything white Americans have done, but they don't have the economic opportunity. All we're asking you to do is to pass legislation that will insure that black Americans like white Americans will get an opportunity to benefit from the free enterprise system. Thank you."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just changed my mind. I was going to say something else, but quite briefly, I want to bring this Bill full circle. Representative Winchester spoke in debate, and I think pretty much stated the problem, and I don't think once that he mentioned that this Bill has anything to do with pedigree or ethnicity. This Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, addresses an economic problem in East St. Louis area. And in the East St. Louis area, the Sponsors of the legislation and Cosponsors are attempting to meet an economic financial need. The present rail system in East St. Louis is overbuilt and underutilized. And it needs some economic assistance. A presence of many of the rail yards in the East St. Louis area have lead to disrupted traffic patterns, but moreover, much commerce and industry have not seen fit to locate in that area because of this problem. I think if we look at House Bill 3206, it is a simple Bill. It simply tries to meet an economic problem, to improve the railroad efficiency in the area and to provide and promote opportunities for non-rail economic development in the area. And I think that many of the persons from the East St. Louis area would probably agree and will probably speak on the Bill in explanation of the vote, but let us not be



sidetracked into some innocuous tenuous debate as it relates to the ethnicity of this particular project because it has nothing to do with ethnicity. It has everything to do with economics and economic growth in the east St. Louis area."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment, and I hope that the Members of this House will give it an affirmative vote. This is a proper Amendment. It is a proper function of the Department of Commerce and Community Development. It has their support. It is extremely important to the economic development of a very depressed area, the City of East St. Louis, and I hope the Members will vote 'yes' on this."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Younge to close the debate."

Younge: "I ask for your support in reference to the establishment of this center, in the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Community Affairs."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on House Bill 3206. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes', 16 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3118. Mr. Collins."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3118, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Collins on the floor? Take it out of the record. 3166, Mr. Campbell. Mr. Campbell on the floor? 3271, Mr. Marovitz. Read the Bill a third time."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3271, a Bill for an Act in relation to requiring the disclosure of beneficiaries and other parties related to land trusts."

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



Clerk Leone: "...Third Reading of the Bill."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the other extremely important arson Bill which would greatly assist in the arson investigation. It would require that after a fire, the fire official charged with the duty to investigate the fire for a possible arson would have the power to require the disclosure of a beneficiary of a land trust for his purpose only whether that...whether the property was held in a land trust, whether it was held by a nominee, whether it was held by a corporation if he held over five percent of the stock, and this would go a long way toward helping to determine whether an arson did in fact occur, and who in fact benefited. There is no public disclosure in this Bill whatsoever. This is only limited to arson cases, and it is only for the fire official investigating the arson. This is a Bill that has been endorsed by a Cook County Anti-Arson Committee headed by 'Sol' Epton. Among that Committee which endorsed this legislation is the superintendent of police in Chicago, the fire commissioner in Chicago, the United States Attorney, the head of the BGA, the State's Attorney of Cook County, Bernard Carey, Dan Webb from the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement, Phil O'Connor from the Illinois Department of Insurance, Elmer Conti, my good friend on the other side of the aisle, and both Chicago newspapers. This is a very important piece of legislation, and I would very much appreciate a favorable Roll Call on this anti arson Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matula."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 3271. Yesterday I had the opportunity to view ABC's 20/20 arson for profit film. By viewing this film I have gained quite



a bit of knowledge regarding the situation as far as arson for profit is concerned. I feel that House Bill 3271 will be a very effective tool for arson investigators. And as Representative Marovitz stated, this will be just for his own investigation and perusement. To determine whether repeated property owners who are profiting from arson for profit. I feel this will be a very very effective tool for the investigation of arson for profit. Thank you."

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

Williamson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would the Sponsor yield for a question please?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Williamson: "I would like to know that...suppose you have a fire ...a waste paper fire in the house and the fire department is called. Do you have a specific amount of damage before the arson investigator would come in? In other words, somebody could just go in a house and start a fire, call the fire department, and then the arson...they would be able to disclose who owns the property."

Marovitz: "Well, that depends on the fire official. If he...if the fire official believes that this is a possible arson case, that is within his jurisdiction...that's within his province."

Williamson: "I was just wondering for a little protection. It should be...amount of damage or something of that sort."

Marovitz: "The protection is that there is no public disclosure in this whatsoever. It is only for that fire official and that fire official only. There is no public disclosure whatsoever in this legislation."

Williamson: "Okay, thank you."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, some attention has been directed to one aspect of the arson investigation. It appears that a lot of the buildings



in Chicago where arson for profit went on were held in what is called land trusts. A land trust simply shows the name of the trust company that owns the particular parcel. They do not show the interest in the beneficiaries. When the Bill came to the Judiciary II Committee, the Bill was in a posture...this particular Bill where the information could be made known to fire investigators as to who in fact owned the property. The reason is that it was alleged that beneficiaries were deliberately setting fires in order to collect insurance and that fire investigators unless they knew the names of those individuals would not be able to prosecute the...them and to see that justice was done as far as...punishing people guilty of arson. So the posture in which the Bill is, there is no public disclosure of the names of owners, however, the trust company will have to give to fire investigators the full list of the beneficiaries of that trust. In addition to that, under an Amendment that was put on the Bill here on the floor by Representative Kosinski and myself, the fire investigators can not only get the names of the beneficiaries of that particular fire, they can also find out whether those beneficiaries have filed claims for other property where arson has been involved or may have been involved in the City of Chicago. So that if in fact there is a ring of people involved in this, the investigator will be able to find whether the individual who is the beneficiary of this particular parcel of the insurance proceeds, whether that individual has gotten money previously in connection with a fire in the Chicago area. In addition, there are other ways in which secrecy is maintained. Secrecy may be maintained by, for example, instead of owning the property in a land trust, it may be owned in a dummy corporation or the property may be owned in the name of a nominee. John Smith may take the property in his



name rather than in the name of the true owner. Under the Amendment that was...Okay. These will be able to be disclosed, and I would urge support for this fine Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to close the debate."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, This is one of the most important parts of the anti arson package. It is sponsored by Representative Telscer and myself, and I think it will go a long way toward determining whether in fact a particular piece of property was subjected to arson. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 162 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed." 3487...Mr. McPike. Mr. McPike on the floor? Out of the record. 3555, Mr. McGrew. Out of the record. 2520...Mr. Christensen."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2520, a Bill ^{for an Act} in relation to nuclear waste disposal and storage sites and spent fuel storage sites in Illinois, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2520 was put together as a result that the announcement that Illinois was being considered one of the states to locate a permanent dump site. And President Carter stated that the G.E. plants at Morris would be the logical place because they are already storing spent fuel rods from all over the United States. What this Bill does is...put a...any construction of a new site or expansion of an existing site would have to have the approval of the House of Representatives by a House Joint Resolution and signed



by the Governor before they could locate that site there. The intent of this is to show the President of the United States and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that we don't want to be the dumping ground for the entire State of Illinois. This does not stop the sites that are now being used as storage. It doesn't stop any new nuclear station from being operated. All this does is give us some control over the fact that the State of Illinois might be considered a dumping ground for the nation, and we would like to have some control of that. Plus...plus the fact that it also lets the...states where they can be located and one of the things it does is stop them from being located within so many miles...I think it is 30 miles or 25 miles of a city of a population of 40,000. In other words, the site that is located now is about five miles from Morris, maybe 20 miles from Joliet, and 50 miles from Chicago. And we don't think that that is the site ... the site should not be located in a populated area."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thnak you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise to support House Bill 2520. I think Representative Christensen pointed out the reasons that it is necessary that we pass this Bill. The site that is being considered is within our district and is in an area that is pretty densely populated, and we certainly want to stop that from coming into our district and certainly from Illinois, and I would appreciate your support on this Bill."

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

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Would the Sponsor..."

Christensen: "Yes."



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

Hudson: "He would. Representative Christensen, is it my understanding that along with House Bill 2520 comes Amendment #3..."

Speaker Bradley: "Three has been tabled."

Hudson: "Is that right? And three is included. Oh, number three has been tabled. I see. Was there any other Amendment then added to..."

Christensen: "I didn't hear the question."

Hudson: "You didn't hear the question. Was there another Amendment then added to it to take its place?"

Christensen: "Yes, number four."

Hudson: "Number four. Okay, thank you. That answers my question. Represent...excuse me, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Number three. Representative Christensen...Number three was the one that had reference to faults and all of that stuff, and I think you and Representative McClain has some disussion about that. Is that correct?"

Christensen: "Yes."

Hudson: "Took care of that?"

Christensen: "Yes, Sir."

Hudson: "Thank you."

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

Borchers: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Borchers: "I would just want to make absolutely certain that there is nothing in this Bill or the Amendments that would indicate that new construction of a new nuclear plant could not be...not be started somewhere in the State of Illinois. I agree with what you're doing on the waste, but does this preclude any opportunity of anyone or any one of our power IPL, for example, starting a new nuclear plant somewhere for the production of power for the State of Illinois?"



Christensen: "This Bill does not stop any new construction."

Borchers: "Okay."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Birkinbine, the Gentleman from Cook."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Christensen, do I understand that this just provides for a veto of a possible site by the Legislature?"

Christensen: "By the Legislature. Right. And for approval of the Governor."

Birkinbine: "But it doesn't necessarily require the approval of the Legislature for such a site in the first place."

Christensen: "No."

Birkinbine: "Okay. thank you."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor has given a correct answers to these questions. This Bill was amended in the House Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Committee as a result of the work of the appointed...of the Committee appointed by Representative McClain, the Subcommittee on Nuclear Safety that I chaired. And we had hearings around the state. We toured the Morris facilities of General Electric, the Commonwealth Edison plant at 'Dresden' and Zion, the new Illinois power plant at Clinton, and we came to the conclusion that do not have the expertise to determine whether there should or should not be any new nuclear power plants in Illinois, and therefore we amended Representative Christensen's Bill so it did not prohibit new nuclear power plants in the state, but it does regulate and give the Legislature a veto power over nuclear waste dumping sites either high level, spent fuel rods, or low level radioactive material because of the plan of the federal government to perhaps choose Morris as the one site in the nation away from reactor storage of spent nuclear fuel in this country. And because of that threat that was in:



the district near Representative Christensen and Representative Ryan who also worked on this matter, we determined that this was the best way to approach the matter. Representative Christensen was very agreeable, and his Bill was amended and became the product of himself and of the Subcommittee on Nuclear Safety of the House Environment, and Energy, and Natural Resources Committee. He has given correct answers to Representative Borchers and Representative Birkinbine that this Bill does not in any way prohibit new nuclear power plants. We didn't feel we had the expertise to make a final determination there, but it does give this General Assembly and the Governor some veto power over nuclear waste sites that might be established in this state to serve not only the entire state, but the entire nation which we're threatened with at this time in the Morris area, and therefore I give my whole-hearted support to House Bill 2520 as amended and approved by the Nuclear Safety Subcommittee of the House Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Catania: "Representative Christensen, did you say that Amendment #3 was not adopted?"

Christensen: "It was tabled."

Catania: "It was tabled. Okay, cause the Bill room is handing it out stamped adopted. Would you tell me what declaration of a site means because it says that we have to act within 90 days after a declaration of a site, and I wondered it that was some sort of official action that has to be taken on a specific date."

Christensen: "Alright, if the federal government approved a site, then we had 90 days to veto it."

Catania: "So by declaration of a site, we mean the day on which



the federal government officially declares that the site has been selected?"

Christensen: "Correct."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from White-side, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Schuneman: "Representative Christensen, as I recall working in this area in the past, federal statute indicates that nuclear dumping sites must be owned by either the federal government or the state government. Is...am I accurate in that recollection?"

Christensen: "New ones?"

Schuneman: "Well any. I think any disposal site has to be..."

Christensen: "G.E. owns the one in Morris."

Schuneman: "Well, but that's not generally considered a disposal site. I think it is considered a storage site. So I get..."

Christensen: "A temporary site."

Schuneman: "The crux of my question is, I am wondering if your Bill really does anything. Does the Bill affect storage? Or does it affect disposal?"

Christensen: "It affects both."

Schuneman: "Well, have you addressed the question of the fact that, as I understand it, the federal law requires that disposal sites can only be owned by either the federal government or the state government, and I am curious to know what affect that state might have over some decision that the federal government is going to make if they take over a disposal site."

Christensen: "Amendment #4 was McClain's Amendment, and I'll let him explain it to you."

Schuneman: "Alright."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Schuneman, that is why



we placed on #4, Amendment #4 where we said after... if you noticed one of the things we changed on the front page of the Amendment was after the effective date of this Act, 1980. So therefore, whatever happens on the Morris site, it will preclude the State of Illinois being responsible for purchasing the Morris site which is about a \$60,000,000 purchase. So with that Amendment which...it came...it came from someone who's trying to protect the Governor's office, so that would preclude the State of Illinois from purchasing the Morris site."

Schuneman: "Okay, so the state is precluded..."

McClain: "Your line of questioning...is accurate. We took care of it with Amendment #4."

Schuneman: "The state is precluded from purchasing a site until they get permission from the General Assembly then. Is that what you're telling?"

McClain: "Well, yeah, because we'd have to have the appropriation process, but the way...previously the Amendment had been drawn, we would have been...it could have been assumed that the State of Illinois would have purchased the Morris site, and so that's why in one of the items that we placed in Amendment #4 was making the effective date after 1980 so that there could be no court battle making us purchase the Morris site."

Schuneman: "Okay, well I have no particular objections to the Bill, I am just curious as to how the State of Illinois is going to prevent the federal government from coming in and establishing a dumping site in the State of Illinois if the federal government decides they really want to do that?"

McClain: "Well, there is a...I think that is the whole point. This is about as legally as sound proposal as you'll find. We've tried to address all the issues of constitutionality within the Amendment. It still... whether...we still don't know if we're going to be pre-empted



by the federal government, but it is about as close as we can get from all the legal advice that we're getting from the Governor's office and the Attorney General's office."

Schuneman: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Borchers on a point of order."

Borchers: "That's right. Incidentally, Mr...Representative Pierce mentioned my name in the debate, and therefore I decided to pull it out in answer to a question that the Governor of North Carolina, notwithstanding the federal government was able to stop the bringing of waste into North Carolina. If the Governor of North Carolina can do that, so can the Governor of Illinois, and so can the General Assmely of Illinois. So if Representative Pierce wants to go any further on the matter, why he has a right, I think, too."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Pierce says it's South Carolina. The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen, to close the debate."

Christensen: "This legislation was drawn up to give us some input as to where a site might be located in our state, and we feel it is constitutional. We feel that for once and for all if it is brought to the Supreme Court, we'll find out if we have some say so as to what is stored in the State of Illinois. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 'aye', six 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2051. Read it a third time."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2051, a Bill for an Act to establish motor vehicle emissions inspection and maintenance program by amending certain Acts, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2051 provides enabling legislation to establish a vehicle inspection maintenance program in those parts of the state where automobile quality air violations will persist after 1982. Inspection and maintenance refers to the process of having the exhaust of a motor vehicle analyzed at an inspection station to determine the amount of pollution a vehicle is emitting. Emissions are then compared to a set standard. If the vehicle fails the test, then it is required to have the maintenance repair work done to lower the emission to an acceptable limit. Specifically House Bill 2051 orders the Pollution Control Board to adopt regulations concerning the program, orders the Environmental Protection Agency to establish and conduct inspection programs. It allows the city...the agency to enter into contracts with the City of Chicago or the County of Cook to render the... to administer their own program, orders the Secretary of State to refuse registration of any vehicle that hasn't passed it, provides consumer protection by authorizing the agency to set up proficiency standards for mechanics who perform the emissions test. Inspection and maintenance is not just an effort to bring relief to thousands of persons with heart and pulmonary respiratory diseases. It is virtually necessary to insure the economic growth and employment of our metropolitan areas. The problem as you aware...are...is that inspection maintenance is a federally mandated program, and states that fail to adopt the program will face severe penalties. Federal law mandates that if the inspection program is not authorized, no permits for new



industry expansion can be granted, federal highway funds may be withheld, and in Chicago the estimated loss is \$300,000,000 a year. For those reasons I urge adoption of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Who is exempt from this program?"

Meyer: "Who is exempt?"

Dunn: "Yes."

Meyer: "You mean what car owners or the geographic areas?"

Dunn: "Geographic areas."

Meyer: "The area...the affected areas are metropolitan East St. Louis and metropolitan Chicago."

Dunn: "Is there an Amendment that exempts them from this or allows them..."

Meyer: "No, Sir. Nobody is exempt."

Dunn: "What...are they allowed to set up their own program. Is that the..."

Meyer: "Under state guidance and control!"

Dunn: "And who can...what local municipalities can set up their own programs? Chicago and East St. Louis?"

Meyer: "No, Chicago and the County of Cook."

Dunn: "And...and those people only?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Dunn: "And mandating would...this testing would then be statewide including Cook County?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, just..."

Meyer: "Now wait a second. You mean...the program would only be implemented in metropolitan Chicago and Metropolitan East St. Louis. The rest of the state would not have their cars tested."

Dunn: "Yeah, that's what I'm trying to get at. Do downstaters have to have their cars tested?"

Meyer: "If you live in metropolitan East St. Louis, yes. If you do not live in metropolitan East St. Louis, no. But it is a uniform statewide program."



Dunn: "I don't...I don't understand. If it is unified...uniform statewide program and it is only implemented in two counties, how is it a unified statewide program?"

Meyer: "You get the same type of test in East St. Louis as you do in Arlington Heights."

Dunn: "What kind of test do you get in Macon County?"

Meyer: "In Macon County you won't get one."

Dunn: "Then this is not a statewide program. Is it a statewide program or not? That's my question."

Meyer: "It is a uniform program. It is not statewide."

Dunn: "Okay. Alright. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, just briefly to the Bill, I...there was a Legislator here on the floor this week from Indiana and he said they have such a law in Indiana and just repealed it. I think we should take that into account when...when we're deliberating on this Bill."

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

Anderson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Anderson: "Well, Ted, if the state fails to establish the inspection and maintenance program, couldn't there be catastrophic effects for the whole state if we fail to do this?"

Meyer: "Yes, you would...you would stand to lose all your state highway funds, federal funds, and all of the waste water treatment funds."

Anderson: "Yes, now I've had correspondence from Caterpillar, and you better listen to this, that they are in favor of this. Usually they don't get mixed up in things like this. But the termination of new construction in the whole state could take effect if we don't put this into law. Caterpillar, right now, is thinking about 12,000,000 new square feet. This translates into something like 20,000 jobs. And some of it will be in the State of Illinois. So I think we should be very careful on what we do here. I'm going to vote for the Bill."



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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Often times we receive various magazines and literature in our office. For some reason, state government news of April 1980 caught my eye. In that...that magazine, this legislation is discussed and the difficulty other states are having facing this dilemma. If we don't pass this, it is alleged that we will loss our funding. Well, toward the end of this article it points out that Colorado has come closest to having a federal cut off of funds. The Colorado Legislatures decided they did not want to go along with this program. They then went ahead and filed suit in the tenth circuit court of appeals. They were then granted an injunction prohibiting the EPA from bringing the sanctions against the State of Colorado. This issue is currently in the courts out there. Again we have a gun to our heads. The federal government is saying if we don't put this program into play we will loss our federal matching funds. This is the type of thing that we faced with the helmet law for motorcylcists and a number of other things in the past. I am getting kind of tired of the federal government coming to the states and demanding that we do this and we do that. this is going to be, I believe, the testimony was \$15 to \$30 for this expense...inspection. That's in a way a tax increase for our constituents, and I would suggest that we vote 'no' and stand up to the federal government." Thank you."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the two points of the Gentleman..."

Speaker Bradley: "Just...you'll be able to close, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel exactly as the previous Speaker feels with respect to the threat of the federal government withhold-



ing such things as sewage treatment grants. How in the world they apply to emission control beats me. But the Republican staff analysis points out that Illinois is not now under the threat of these federal sanctions because the U.S. Dep...Environmental Protection Agency apparently has determined that in another law, we meet the requirements, and that requirement is evidently a requirement that would call for selective examination of vehicles. In the City of Chicago some years ago they had vehicle inspections for safety purposes. It was an absolute nightmare and finally was abolished. I suggest to you that this is not a good idea, and we ought not enact this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "I am interested in the Amendment that provides an exemption where repair costs would exceed \$100. Wouldn't...doesn't this provide an incentive for someone who owns a real klunker and would need more than \$100 worth of repair to keep that car because it makes them exempt?"

Speaker Bradley: "Turn on Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The \$100 exemption was placed in there because we felt that we wouldn't want to force out those people who need their car to get to work. It is an economic necessity, and the repairs would exceed the value of the car."

Birkinbine: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Birkinbine: "I think that Amendment may make a restrained situation. Here we are calling for a cleaning up the environment through a Bill such as this that I think is illadvised in the first place, but now we're saying that if indeed repairs are going to cost more than \$100, and



if anyone has had a tune-up recently, you know a regular normal tune-up is going to cost you about \$80. If it costs you \$100 or more to get whatever needs to be fixed fixed so that you can comply with these standards, you're exempt. Why would you ever want to get it fixed if you're going to be exempt under this law? It seems to me an absurdity, and I recommend we vote against it."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No one ought to have to ask any questions about this Bill because this is probably one of the worst examples of legislation that we've run across this term. Now obviously I can't blame the Sponsor who knows it's a bad Bill but feels compelled by some reason, apparently thinking that he's going to save the state billions of dollars in federal largess by putting this thing through, but the previous speakers that pointed out how asinine this is, and I am just telling you that you vote for this Bill and if it ever was signed into law and the people back home find out you had anything to do with it, when they find out they're going to have to go out and have one of these examinations and then have to spend \$100 or so which was just recently pointed out as one of the sillier aspects. The fact that you have a klunker that needs \$1,000 and is spewing out all kinds of particulate matter and fumes, you continue to drive it. But if you only have a minor thing wrong, it is going to cost you \$100 then you've got to go and have it fixed. The threat of losing the federal funds is merely an empty threat. They aren't going to cut out billions of dollars to Illinois because of this. That's why we send great men like our Senators and our Congressmen down there to make sure that doesn't happen. There's absolutely no reason to vote for this Bill. It is



asinine. It is unnecessary. It is foolhardy, and the people back home will really be looking for you if you vote for it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this piece of legislation is merely a product of a Joint Committee of the House and the Senate. It is not an easy piece of legislation to put together, They had hearings throughout the State of Illinois and especially in the affected areas. As you can well imagine, it is a...not an easy Bill to put...put in to the process. But here are some of the points that you ought to know, and I know it is easy for us to stand on the floor and scoff that maybe the federal government won't impose their sanctions, but you know, one of the things that I do know about Congressmen and Senators and federal bureaucrats is if you keep standing long enough and scoffing at them long enough, someday they're going to call in all their chips. And I don't think you necessarily want to do this. The sanctions on this piece of legislation is that...are that indeed they can hold up federal highway funds and sewer grants in the affected areas that this piece of legislation should...should impose these kind of restrictions on. So in other words in East St. Louis and the Chicago metropolitan area what you guys are faced with is losing these kinds of monies and these kinds of grants. For those of us in downstate, and not truly affected by this program, this is a program that we have to institute. This is a program that indeed is being forced upon us, and if we do not put forth, sooner or later the federal government, is going to mandate it. It does not affect us in downstate Illinois. It is put together by Legislators in the affected areas that will sooth the wounds as much as possible. One of the factors that we have in this piece of



is that we have certified mechanics that go over the process so that indeed the car owner will not be ripped off. So the piece of legislation that Mr. Meyer is putting forth and Mr. Kulas will close is not an easy piece of legislation, but it is a piece of legislation that we had to put together. We put together with all interest groups. We had public hearings, and I think it is foolhardy for those of us to stand on this floor and scoff at the federal government because you're playing with fire, and I think someday they're going to call in all their chips, and I don't want it on this piece of legislation. It does not affect downstate, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to ask the Sponsor a question. Metropolitan Chicago, what is Metropolitan Chicago? Would you name the counties please?"

Meyer: "Kane County."

Schoeberlein: "I beg your pardon."

Meyer: "It includes Kane County."

Schoeberlein: "And...the RTA area. Is that right?"

Meyer: "Yes, but there would be an exclusion for the rural townships."

Schoeberlein: "The rural what?"

Meyer: "The rural townships in Kane, McHenry, and Will."

Schoeberlein: "I would like to speak on the Bill please."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Schoeberlein: "This is another rip off on the...on the car driver, the motorist in the State of Illinois. Now you know as well as I do that the people perhaps in Chicago, they don't buy their vehicle license, and they are not going to have their car checked. They are going to be running around with that same old klunker, and they come out where we've got fresh air and want us to pay so



much for every car to be inspected. Now we're coming down here to represent the entire state, and you people downstate certainly know the problem we are having up-state. We finally got rid of the RTA tax the ones in Chicago got. Those poor people are paying a one percent sales tax, and when they find that out in the November election, you're going to hear about it. Some of you fellows are on pretty shaky ground, and perhaps Mr. Meyer is one of them. It is really shaky, and I would suggest that you join with us and give this Bill a good defeating...defeat before you get it thrust onto you downstate. Thank you."

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

Beatty: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman's motion prevails, and what purpose does Mr. Skinner arise?"

Skinner: "I rise to ask how many votes this will take to pass? It seems to me that a clearly...is a pre-emption of home rule power for every home rule unit in the state except for the City of Chicago."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we'll get the Parliamentarian out here. We'll make that ruling. In the meantime, Mr. Meyer to close the debate."

Meyer: "Mr. Kulas to close please."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kulas to close. Mr. Kulas."

Kulas: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As was stated earlier, this Bill is enabling legislation for the mandatory motor vehicle emissions testing program. The question here should not be one of sanctions by the federal government. The question here is the quality of the air we breath which is the principal reason why we are discussing automobile emissions testing. It is unfortunate, but in many communities in the State of



Illinois automobile air pollution periodically reaches a point where it adversely affects the health and day to day enjoyment of life of many people. In Chicago and East St. Louis air pollution gets so bad some days that people must stay indoors because of the acute health hazard that would result from exposure to the air. To stop this health threat, we must look directly at the automobile. Studies show that 80 to 90% of carbon monoxide is coming from the motor vehicles. Driving an automobile is not a right. It is a privilege. A privilege which has been abused by many people over the years. Why do we have to pass this legislation? Because the State of Illinois cannot meet the air quality standards set by the Clear Air Act by 1982. Why can't we meet these standards? Because people don't care. The average citizen is satisfied if his automobile is running and if he can afford to buy gasoline for it. The fact that his car is polluting the air does not concern him. But it concerns me, and it should concern each and every Member of this General Assembly. As Legislators, it is our duty to consider the well-being and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois. Not just for the present, but also for the future. A little inconvenience now is a small price to pay for cleaner air for our children and grandchildren. I know that it is not a popular decision to mandate a program on the citizens of the State of Illinois, but it is our duty as conscientious Legislators to sometimes make an unpopular decision for the welfare and well-being of the people of the State of Illinois. I am asking you today to make that unpopular decision. I want each and every one of you to look at your conscience and tell me in all honesty that air pollution is not a problem and that a motor vehicle emissions inspection program is not necessary for the State of Illinois. I don't want you to vote for this Bill because of the sanctions which may or may not be applied by the federal government.



if we don't pass this piece of legislation, but because you as concerned Legislators believe in the future of the State of Illinois. And we want to make the State of Illinois a better place to live for our children and our children's children. Ladies and Gentlemen, I solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Bill, and we'll give you a ruling, Sir. Well, just a minute. The question is on the...whether this Bill should be passed. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, to explain his vote."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would just like to point out that I was a Member, and I still am a Member of the Committee that...that...the Inspection Maintenance Study Committee...this joint Committee. I have some great reservations. I'm not going to support this Bill. I want to explain to you exactly what this does. I think it needs some more study. We have...we went to California. We went to Portland, Oregon. We went to Phoenix, Arizona studying their programs. I want...I want to tell you exactly what this entails. There is a ten to fifteen dollar fee which each person pays when they go in and have that inspection made. The average repair Bill is \$20 some dollars, and again what they are doing here is what they did in California is exempting anybody whose repairs would be over \$100. This is self-defeating. You're taking the worst wrecks, the worst polluters on the streets, and you're exempting them. This is insanity. This Bill is not in proper form. I don't think it should pass. I am going to vote 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Chair will rule it is going to take more than 56 votes. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I'm not trying to pass this Bill, but I wanted to raise some question and didn't have



the opportunity to do so. But under this Bill there are three provisions, and the federal government only mandates one at this time, and that's that a test program be established by the State of Illinois, and it seems to me the way the votes are lined up there now is the proper way, or a 'present' vote, so we can take out the two provisions and stick with what one is mandated, and that is a test program. There are too many loopholes in this, and I would say the best place to go with this is postponed consideration. Just go with the one provision and then we can pass it out and get by for this year."

Speaker Bradley: "It is going to take 89 votes. Only 89. There is nothing specific in the Bill as far as we see. The Gentleman from...in the statutes it is very clear that there is no specific language setting forth what manner and what extent. The limitation is now the power of home rule unit, and there is none...that we see in the language. So it is going to take 89. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote for one minute."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor might nod his head or respond to a question. Does the Bill, as it is now written, permit an exemption for large vehicle fleets whereby they can get somebody who can conduct this test and do it in house, and if not, would you be amenable to an Amendment on that subject at some point in the process?"

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, to explain his vote for one minute."

Polk: "No, Mr. Speaker, I am just...would request that we get eight more votes up there and no more than that, but get it up to 70 so we can put it on postponed consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Perry,...the Gentleman



from Perry, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would hope that we wouldn't get 70 votes on there so we can kill this bad Bill. Several speakers have said this doesn't affect downstate Illinois. I wonder what you think most of the 58th District is. We are in rural, a lot of our district and a lot of my district...Representative Birchler and Representative Richmond, we are in rural St. Clair County, and that has been ruled by somebody as a non-attainment area. Little towns like Marissa, and Smithton, and Freeburg, and towns with maybe 1000 population are going to have to have to set up emission testing standards and have their vehicles inspected, and I live right across the county line. I don't have to do that, but I think that it is wrong to impose this on some people of the state and not on the other people of the state. Someday, no doubt, we're going to have to have it. But let's wait till it has to be necessary and make it uniform throughout the state instead of taking picks on the people of East St. Louis and rural St. Clair County. Thank you."

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

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would really like to vote 'no' against this Bill and probably hope that it would get defeated. What I think is about to happen is that we're starting to inspect automobiles, and I can assure you that of the nearly 50,000 deaths that occur in Illinois, it is from a result of faulty brakes, faulty machinery, and I don't recall of any one person being killed on Illinois highways as a result of the emissions from an automobile."

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

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



House. I can agree with many of the people who have against this Bill, and I would like to myself, but at the present time Caterpillar Tractor Company is in the process of site preparation in my hometown double... which would double their parts plant there which means hundreds of jobs. I'm sure this is the case in many areas throughout the state and the sanctions the federal government will put on us are not just money. They cannot get the permit to go ahead with their building as long as we do not pass this. They must sit and wait or go to another state, and I do not believe that we can afford this. So I urge your 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. My support for this piece of legislation is a good deal more enthusiastic than is that of Representative Ackerman's. The issue here is the cost of clean air. Clean air is expensive. It is going to be expensive for individuals who are driving their automobiles which are right now polluting the air that we breath. We may not see the result of air pollution in increased traffic fatalities, but there is no question that carbon monoxide and other pollutants do kill people. They kill Illinois individuals, Illinois citizens. The reasons^S this legislation is limited to the Chicago metropolitan and the East St. Louis metropolitan areas is because it is in those two areas of the city where there is a serious danger to the public health because of inadequate pollution control programs. This is such a program. There may be problems with some ways it's worked out, Representative Kane's concern as to whether or not those people who drive klunkers should be exempt from this legislation is a legitimate concern. I don't know quite what one does



about it except if he has some very excellent suggestion that can be proposed when this Bill makes its way to the Senate. If we don't send this Bill to the Senate, we are asking our people in the Chicago and East St. Louis metropolitan areas to be breathing air that is dangerous air that is very likely to cause serious damage to the public health of the state. The issue is not federal sanctions. It is clean air, clean air for the people of Illinois, and I urge more green lights on the Board."

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

Steele: "On explaining my 'no' vote, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that there is legislation pending in Congress now that would repeal the requirement by which this legislation is before us, so I think we ought to go slow, and we certainly shouldn't panic and stampede into doing something that would be very very much against the interest of those who drive cars in the state. I would like...it's been stated in debate that the federal government's demanding we do something. I want to point out that a few years ago they wanted to demand that we have helmets on motorcycle riders, and yet they rescinded that requirement. I would like to point out a few years ago they required that we have billboards taken down our highways, and yet they are still up because those laws were changed, and they were rescinded. And so let's hope this law is rescinded. It is pending in Congress, and I think that is a good reason to vote 'no' against a bad Bill."

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

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure glad that you found my light. It so seldom goes on I guess you forgot it was there. I...I recall two or four years ago when we had the scare from the federal people about the sign



boards when we were spending more money to take down the signs and pay the people that had erected them originally because they were going to take away our money from our highways. Now they come along with this particular Bill. I still recall that we voted on this House floor to discontinue the program of taking down those signs and were still getting the money on that one. I...have part of St. Clair County in my district the same as Ralph Dunn and Bruce Richmond does. That includes New Athens, Marissa, Smithton, and those small towns. And believe me, we get lots of mail from those people saying vote out this terrible Bill. My vote is still 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Let's...let's take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'ayes', and 70 'nos', 15 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive...Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Meyer: "You know...don't you think it is an injustice that the Sponsor of the Bill isn't even allowed to comment on it?"

Speaker Bradley: "This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2768."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2768, a Bill for an Act in relation..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me. Mr. Kulas, what purpose do you rise?"

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, my light was on. I would like leave of the House to put this on postponed consideration. I had my light on, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any objections to the Bill being placed on postponed consideration? I...The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to allow him that courtesy. If not, I voted on the prevailing side, and I move...I would move to reconsider the vote only for"



the purpose to allow him to put it on postponed consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, why don't we make a motion to and take a Roll Call vote on the Gentleman's motion that it be placed on postponed consideration."

Kulas: "Alright, that will do it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kulas so moves. So all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', and opposed by voting 'no' on this being placed on postponed consideration. Alright. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 'ayes', 15 'nos', and the Bill will be...2051 should be on the Board. 2051 will be placed in the position of postponed consideration.
(continued)



Speaker Bradley: "Now, House Bill 2768. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the purpose of announcement, in the gallery to my left is the student body of 'Mulkeena Junior High School'. They're accompanied by Mr. Richard Quinn, Village Trustee, Mrs. Diane Hoffman, the Social Studies teacher, and a celebrity who must have just recently returned from Michigan, Mr. George Bush. The.. They are... The High School is in the District represented by Representative Davis, Representative Leinenweber, and Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2768 is a rare Bill. It.. The Digest is a bit misleading because this Bill as amended would cost the state nothing. It would cost business nothing. The Bill applies only when 100 or more employees are affected. It applies only when a company plans on moving 100 or more miles from its present site. The Bill requires that a business that wants to move must give one year's notice to the state and must file a statement of economic impact on the community. The Bill reaffirms what the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs is doing now specifically, investigate the causes of the relocation, attempt to find ways to minimize job loss, market the facility, prepare feasibility study, coordinate use of federal funds, etc. Recent surveys have shown that a one percent increase in the unemployment rate has a very traumatic effect on the population, specifically it has caused more than 36,000 deaths. In addition to that, when large numbers of people are laid off, there's a tremendous loss of local tax revenue. There's a loss of sales by the local merchants. Property values are reduced. Also, the cost of services goes up



because we have more people on welfare, more people who need health care and there is more crime where there is high unemployment. A recent newspaper, one of the major ones, if not the major one in Illinois, had an editorial recently which says... which calls for a company which wants to move to at least let the community and let the city know that you're moving so that we can tell you the city or the state what resources are available to the particular business. This basically is what the Bill is all about and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Read the Bill a third time."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2768, a Bill for an Act in relation to relocation of certain industrial or commercial operations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "We simply didn't read it the third time when you started. My fault. The Lady... The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

Hudson: "Representative Balanoff, in reading the Amendment on this Bill I understand that the Bill creates a job loss prevention task force within the Department of Community Affairs. Is that correct?"

Balanoff: "Yes, it is. And it is my understanding that the things that this task force would do, the Department of Commerce is already doing. "

Hudson: "Well, I was going to ask you if this ... doesn't this department already have an industrial retention division within it?"

Balanoff: "Yes. This does not add anything to what the department is doing. It just encourages them to do it again. That's all."



Hudson: "Well my understanding is that this does add to it. It creates a new level of bureaucracy in that it creates a job loss prevention task force. But anyway, doesn't this Bill require this newly created task force to work with local communities? That is not only required, but forces them. It says, 'they shall,' whereas now, the industrial retention division may. Isn't this so?"

Balanoff: "Well, well, actually I think it's a good idea to work with the community. Because these are the people who are involved."

Hudson: "Wouldn't... Representative, wouldn't this have the effect of forcing companies to stay in business or in a location for a year whether or not they can afford it? That is to say they have to file all of this information the year before they move a distance of 100 miles. Wouldn't this force a company then, have the effect of forcing a company to stay in business for a year after they file whether they could afford to stay in business or not?"

Balanoff: "Well, a company of the size which this Bill addresses, 100 or more employees, is a sizable company. Big businesses know when they want to relocate. This Bill merely says please share this information with the state and the community in order to avoid the traumatic effect that a plant closing has on a community. And in order to possibly help the business to find the resources in the Committee... in the community so that perhaps the business will stay."

Hudson: "Representative, I respect your intentions here and I'm sure they're extremely well motivated. But my concern is that if we are in effect forcing businesses to stay in operation for a year after they make their announcement, which this would be, that in itself I think could have effects on the business and it would



seem to me that their creditors then would get wind of this. Creditors... Wouldn't it have the effect of possibly their creditors refusing to do business with them? Wouldn't it have the effect of perhaps the employees of a given company once this notice is out of leaving the company so that it would have to operate with a skeleton force in effect?"

Balanoff: "You mean, limit credit to the employees or to the business?"

Hudson: "I'm asking if a company is forced to declare a year in advance that it will have to relocate, would not this have the .. have an effect on not only the creditors, but on the employees who might immediately begin to look for new jobs? They know the company is going out of business. And the company then is forced even further closer to the wall through lack of employees."

Balanoff: "Well, I wish that were the case. The fact of the matter is, now there just aren't enough jobs to go around and the problem is not finding employees."

Hudson: "Well, I understand. Is it not true that Wisconsin requires only two months? This Bill requires a full year."

Balanoff: "I'm glad you brought up Wisconsin. Because the subject of Caterpillar Tractor is always coming up and Wisconsin does have a requirement that a business which is relocating must give 60 days notice. In addition to that, a recent issue of Crane's Business Weekly stated that as far as Wisconsin is concerned, the Illinois per capita tax burden is about seven percent lower than Wisconsin's and the reason that Caterpillar moved to Wisconsin is that they needed 600 acres of land and it was not because of the business climate in Illinois."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."



Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill first came before our Labor and Commerce Committee, I could hardly, really believe I was hearing what I was hearing. The concept at that point seemed to me to be alien. An alien concept to our free enterprise system and to our freedoms and those freedoms that we have taken so much for granted in this country. But now the Bill has been amended, supposedly to make it more palatable, but it is hardly much better. Representative Balanoff described it as a rare Bill. It is indeed a rare Bill. But I'm going to suggest to you that what this Bill does even in its somewhat modified version is to inhibit freedom of movement in this country and I will say that freedom of movement, whether on behalf of a company or individual, is a fundamental freedom in the United States of America that we have always taken for granted. This Bill as I see it, begins to put a limit on this freedom of movement. It represents another intrusion of government into the private sector. It requires a governmental investigation of the causes and the circumstances of a business that seeks to relocate which I think is the beginning, the first step down a dangerous road. I can envision this concept if it is extended to its logical conclusion..."

Speaker Bradley: "Some order please."

Hudson: "Could eventually effect the farmer who may be operating. He's a businessman too. What if he wants to sell his property or to relocate? Is he's going to..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hudson?"

Hudson: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Hudson: "I will, Sir. I'll be through in one second. I'm going to conclude by simply saying that I believe a Bill of this kind is only the beginning and it will have a chilling effect on our business, businesses of all



kinds. This is only the beginning. And I would urge all of my colleagues here to think very carefully about it. It's a serious matter. It is a Bill that I think richly deserves defeat and should go down to defeat and I would urge you all to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, for an announcement."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the midst of this debate on freedoms, we're extremely fortunate to have in the balcony on the back of me on the right hand side, from the 38th District, represented by Hoxsey, Ewing, and Breslin, the 'Hinkly Eighth Grade.' They're here to see how our system works and recognize them please?"

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

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in 1979 when this Bill came to Committee, even the Democrats showed a little wisdom on this and it was a tie vote. However, in 1980, it did get an eight to six count out of Committee because all the Democrats were there and they all voted for it, unfortunately. Last year, one of them withheld a vote and that showed some real astuteness on that individual's part. This Bill is not only a ludicrous Bill. We could add to those adjectives and characterize it as an incredible one, an incredulous proposal, unbelievable. You could add any kind of preposterous. It's just asinine, add many, many more descriptions to this Bill and you would have the Bill characterized in its final form. I would suggest to you that this should get the 'Brian Duff Award' for the fewest votes ever assembled by any Sponsor of any Bill in this House. "

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee (sic), as mentioned before, we did have this Bill heard



twice in the Labor and Commerce Committee. We did amend it. And we also did have hearings in Peoria and in Edwardsville, Illinois. It was a little disheartening that members of business did not really show up to present their position on it. And I feel that business should have come out and spoke forward at that time.

Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You all have received letters about what the Illinois business climate is at this moment. It is not good. Can you imagine if you were in a business that was in a state other than Illinois wanting to come in and we on top of all the criticism that we've had will add a Bill such as this, a requirement that is extra? This is not the Bill to pass. Please, please defeat it."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we all know what is in this Bill. I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aye's have it. And the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Balanoff, to close the debate."

Balanoff: "This Bill I believe will improve the business climate in Illinois. As stated before, perhaps a business that is moving can be shown once we have the knowledge that it is moving that we have resources in Illinois and attractiveness right here in Illinois in order to keep the company here. Remember, Illinois has access to major customers. It has sophisticated distribution channels. It has availability of management personnel. It's quite an attractive place to do business despite what the Chamber of Commerce goes all



over the United States telling others about Illinois. In order to give... to help a community I will just give you one example in Peoria. The Hiram Walker Plant which announced its closing gave the public two years notice. You know, this gives people an opportunity to find new jobs, to perhaps have a retraining program and to cushion the traumatic effect of a plant's closing. And this idea is nothing new. As I stated before, Wisconsin requires some kind of notice before a plant can close or move away. The State of Michigan requires that any inducement the plant has received for settling there in the first place must pay back everything that they've gotten in benefits from the state if they plan on moving away. We must move into the 20th century. I have only to cite a Bill we passed overwhelmingly here today which helps the construction industry and that came out of here. We help business because we know business is part of the community. This Bill would just bring business, the community and the state together to help the business climate. "

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye; opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson: "Well, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the House Labor and Commerce Committee, Representative Dawson indicated, had hearings in both Edwardsville and Peoria to determine input on this particular proposition. And the Sponsor of the Bill wasn't even present at those hearings. Now I wonder how she can come before us and talk about the business climate in Illinois and what this is going to do and indicate that business or labor have a particular position on this proposition without even being at the hearings on her own Bill? I further suggest that



the reason businesses are leaving is because of the horrible business climate we have in Illinois and almost any survey of any organization will indicate that to you. I further wonder what's the penalty for violation of this is? We put a fence around the factory and not allow them to leave for a year? Or how do we enforce the provisions of this Act? And what about companies that have gone bankrupt..."

Speaker Bradley: "Bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Or that have otherwise... in other words had sufficient business losses that they can't make it? How do you penalize that? It's a bad Bill. 95 'no' votes is sufficient, but I certainly think it deserves more than that."

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

Hoxsey: "Yes, in explanation of my 'no' vote on this legislation, I just want to say that in LaSalle County we're facing an unemployment rate of around 17%, majorly because businesses have moved out to other states. Now, I'm getting a little tired of those people who are on unemployment compensation calling me to ask where do I go from here. So I tell them that when the food stamps run out, I suggest you go ask your leader of your union where you go from here for a job."

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

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask several questions, but was not called upon so I'll explain my vote. If ever there was a Bill to turn business away from and out of Illinois, taking thousands and thousands of jobs with it, this is it and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to



explain his vote for one minute."

Bluthardt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've waited a long time and I've almost forgot what I want to say, but I do want to say this, that if we were to restrict business from moving more than 100 miles or out of the state, that would be the first step perhaps. The next step would be prohibiting the employee from moving. It seems to me that we'd more likely hear a Bill like this debated in the 'Presidium' or the 'Poltifaro' over in Moscow and I'm amazed that there are 52 votes up there. It's certainly the right color for a Bill like this. I hope you'll change your votes and vote green."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the drafters of this Bill were doctors and their patient was dying, they'd give them a large dose of arsenic to cure the disease. And that's exactly what we're doing to business by even giving this type of Bill one vote of support. This is the height of ludicrous to even consider a Bill like this while business is dying in Illinois. I have tongue-in-cheek suggested on numerous occasions that we change the capitol of the State of Illinois to Joliet. I figure that's more closely to the middle of our population. I suggest we move it to Racine, Wisconsin if this is the type of legislation we're having today."

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

Matijevich: "Well, I wasn't going to explain my vote until I was called a communist. And I never thought I would vote for... Bluthardt called it communist.. I never thought I would vote this because of what the concept sounded like until in my area there were closings, the



U.S. Steel. I think that very often business goes to a community and finds out what the community can do for them. And I think it's a two way street because when you see people when they lose their jobs and they have families, believe me, we may be in a depression shortly. Then you're going to find out that there are people that are hurting, all kinds of people. What are you going to do? I think it is a two way street and business does have to do something for the community, community does something for business too and the workers, the families, are the ones that are going to be hurting. And therefore, I vote 'aye', not as a communist."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, in a point of personal privilege."

Bluthardt: "Point of personal privilege. I never used the word, 'communist', but I want to say this to John Matijevich. If the shoe fits, wear it and I hope it hurts like hell."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman (sic), Mrs. Currie, to explain her vote."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm surprised to see overreaction of my Chamber of Commerce colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This Bill imposes no onerous requirements on business at all. We're talking about notice, notice of termination of employment, only what's applicable. That is to say a company which finds itself in financial disaster does not need to .. cannot obviously comply with the requirements of this Act. The most important piece of this legislation is one that you should be supporting along with of us who are already voting green and that is, that this state should be concerned about the economic climate for business and for labor. The point of this Bill which directs the Department of Commerce and Community



Affairs to do investigations, is to find out why it is we are losing business and to take appropriate steps to correct the problems in the Illinois economic climate. You ought to be voting 'yes' on this Bill just as I am."

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

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what troubles me is this concept of this thought should still be around in this day and age. Mind you, you look at the eastern European countries. They are even moving away from that thought that products that thinking that you have. Even Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, are breaking away from that socialist thinking. What bothers me though, is that this thought of yours is still alive and as Leon 'Trosky' would say, 'It belongs in the trash heap of history'. And I think everybody in America is beginning to realize that no longer can government do anything. Judge 'Magar' has said his first law, 'Whatever government does, it does more or less badly.' And I agree with that. And I... This government should not be intervening in the market place."

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

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to compliment Representative Balanoff for bringing this issue forward. If.. If it wasn't for persons like Marion Balanoff and others in the labor movement, who have helped to develop legislation such as Social Security, Unemployment, Public Aid benefits, and so many other areas of human need, if some of the people on the other side of that aisle had an opportunity they would discontinue each and every one of these programs. And I want to say this, particularly to my



friend on the other side of the aisle who is a very good bowler and a very good golfer, this Bill is not ludicrous and asinine as he had pointed out, but it's a step in a direction of providing good common sense and good information. And when it was mentioned about credit, I know if you have information on...."

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

Peters: "Fellow comrades, does this have something to do with Peoria? I lost the train of thought here somewhere with Leon Trotsky and Judge Magar. I couldn't quite put the two together."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady... The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, do you wish to explain your vote, Sir?"

Dunn: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of us on this side of the aisle voting red who are not completely familiar with the procedures for getting credit with the State Chamber of Commerce. We'd like to know if we have to give a speech and explain our vote to get full credit or whether just voting red will suffice."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Kane, Mrs. Karpiel, to explain her vote."

Karpiel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like it known though that I am from DuPage, not Kane. I think everybody else has said what I want to say on this except that to me as a newcomer here, I find it incredible that while we are constantly forming commissions, committees, task forces, and everything else to study the declining business climate in this state, on the other hand, we are constantly regulating, ham stringing, and then just completely boxing in and in this case creating business of the hostage. I mean, the business of government is government and the business of business is business and the only thing that would have made this awful Bill better



would have been the Amendment submitted by Lee Daniels and Vinson, and since that Amendment was not passed, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape, for what purpose do you rise?"

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, turn that red light of or we'll have explanation of votes till midnight."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all yoted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 49 'ayes', and 116 'nos', four voting 'present', and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. The Chair would like to make an observation that it took us just an hour and five minutes to lose two Bills. House Bill 2824. Just...just a minute. We've missed something that has to be said over there, and the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "That's right. My light was on all the time..."

Speaker Bradley: "I thought you turned it off. I thought you'd turned it off."

Borchers: "No, I did not."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir. Oh, I thought you were going to..."

Borchers: "I don't want to continue. There's no use now, but ...just let it go."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2824. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2824 is a Bill that many of us are quite familiar with as far as the purposes and the contents of the Bill. House Bill 2824 was introduced in October of 1979 dealing with the very serious subject of voluntary quits who received unemployment compensation. I want to commend the Labor Committee, the Chairman, and every Member of the Labor Committee who worked diligently in working and performing a very worthwhile task for the entire community of the State of Illinois, both the business community and the labor community, in coming up with a very viable and excellent solution on this very serious subject. As you know, we had a number of hearings, both in Springfield and in Chicago, and over 500 people came in to express their views to the Labor Committee on this very important subject. May I point out to you that through the Committee hearing process we also had the opportunity to get the Employment Security Advisory Board to meet and to come up with a recommendation. And as you know, the Advisory Board consists of three people from the employees sector, three people from Labor, and three people from the public all appointed by the Governor. And may I point out to the Membership that in my personal opinion we would not have a solution to the Unemployment Compensation Insurance Bill if this Bill was not introduced and we did not have public hearings both in Springfield and Chicago to bring that Board together. But the Board did act and the recommendations they finally agreed to are contained in Amendment #1, which was adopted in Committee, and it will make the following changes. It tightens the definition of



"good cause" by adding the phrase, "attributable to the employing unit". This change will disqualify claimants that quit for personal reasons for a period of twelve weeks or until they return to work and earn six times the weekly benefit amount. Five exemptions to the limitation under this Section were agreed upon and they were discussed in the Committee. One, employees who quit work before they are deemed physically unable to work by a licensed or practicing physician or quit upon the advice of such a physician that assistance is necessary to care for his spouse, child or parent, who is in poor health and such assistance would not allow them to perform their normal duties or they have notified their employer the reasons of their absence. Two, a person quits to accept bona fide work and the person is employed for at least two weeks or earns at least twice the weekly benefit amount. Three, a person who when offered a transfer to other work that would result in the separation from that work of another currently performing it refuses to transfer and quits, the transfer would have to be under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement or pursuant to an established program by the company. Four, a person quits solely because of sexual harassment by another employee of which the employing unit had knowledge. Five, a person quits a job that was accepted after being separated after from other work and the job is deemed unsuitable under the Act. Also contained in this Bill, it would permit employers to challenge claimants availability and active search for work without having to supply irrefutable proof. An allegation would be deemed sufficient if reasons for challenging are provided other than general conclusions of law. This change will permit employers an opportunity to an appeal.



adjudicated decision on availability and active search for work which is not the case now. It also relieves, for the small businessmen, a part-time employer from being charged with an employee losing his full-time job and draws a reduced weekly benefit and continues to work for his part-time employer. It extends the period for notices, appeals, protests, and petitions for hearings as follows: it would extend from seven to ten days the time limit within which an employer may designate the period vacation pay is to be allocated. It extends from 14 to 30 days the time limit where an employer or claimant may appeal from a claim adjudicated a referees decision. It extends from 30 to 45 days the time limit with which an employer may file an application for a revision of the statement of wages. It also increases the minimum weekly benefit amount from 15 dollars a week to 15% of the state average weekly wage which is approximately 40 dollars. It increases a disregarded income from seven dollars a week to 50% of the persons weekly benefit amount. This provision is designed to encourage persons who are receiving unemployment compensation benefits to seek work. If a persons weekly benefit amount is 100 dollars, any earnings of less than full-time work of 50 dollars or less would be disregarded while those in excess of 50 would be deducted from the weekly benefit amount. It also lowers the recruitment from 50 to 25%. It corrects a drafting error which is contained in the 1979 legislation that was intended to charge 1/26th of the employees base period wages to the employer for each week of regular benefits and 1/13th of one half of such wages. It changes for reimbursing employers to reimburse monthly instead of quarterly and allows for quarterly to federal laws on retirement pay. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that the work product which is



contained in House Bill 2824 will help the business people in this state and be fair to the employees of this state as well. I strongly encourage and I'd be more than happy to answer any questions on House Bill 2824."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I apologize for interrupting the debate but in the gallery over here on this side is the graduating class from Passavant School of Nursing in Jacksonville represented by Representative Hannig, Sharp, and myself. Over here."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder on the Bill."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, really when you see legislation that has been with us many months and many years and then we come with another piece of legislation that attempts or pertains to change legislation with meaningful action, and then we come to a Bill which is 2824 when, in effect, it is only window dressing. It's rather travesty on the system. But it has one redeeming quality and one redeeming quality only and that is that there were attempts at input on both sides of the aisle from Labor and from Management. And if for no other reason, and since the Bill really does nothing of any import, the fact that it does get the two sides together on the issue and if it will continue the dialogue that has been going on for some time probably is the most important thing about this piece of legislation. And it does hit the ceiling. It picks up a few things here and there, a little crumb if you would. And I would hope that everyone would suggest that it doesn't do a whole lot but that it does get the parties together, and between now and January when the new Assembly comes together and when Representative Lechowicz comes back he will have



discussed this issue on a continuing basis with both sides and at that time he does bring back a meaningful piece of legislation that again we can support and perhaps it will do the job that needs to be done. So with that in mind I would suggest very seriously to the Sponsor that he do step down with the party, rather he does sit down with the party and do find areas of agreement so that we can solve this problem. It certainly is not solved by this piece of legislation. I would though, recommend it be passed so that we do continue the dialogue that has existed."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. There's been a lot of comments made over the last several years and I made many of them about the present Unemployment Compensation Act that we have in Illinois, some of the problems with it. This law does address one of the major problems we have in any unemployment Act and that's regarding voluntary quit. It doesn't go as far as I would like to see it go by a long ways, and I think that there... and while it does correct in many inequities that are in the / ^{present} law, I'd like to see additional changes. I'd like to see many further revisions of it but I think it's a step in the right direction anyway and its more than we've had in the past and I would urge adoption."

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

Mautino: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in support of 2824. I agree with the Sponsor that this is the definite agreed Bill version that was originally accepted by both Management and Labor on these questions. But I would like to point out that there's another Bill that's come over here that would have to have the



same type of consideration because I don't want us to pass the Bill over to the Senate and have it just sit here, sit in that particular Body and we then not address the additional unemployment Bill that came over here namely Senate Bill 1726. They both address the issue but in different forms. I think consideration has to be given to both of them, and with that understanding, I am here in support of 2824. Not going into detail on the legislation but pointing out that the Amendment that put this in its current posture as it pertains to voluntary quit was agreed Amendment by Representative Schuneman, Simms, Lechowicz, Mautino, and others, Mr. Mulcahey that tried to put it all together and I agree that this piece of legislation should go out of here and over to the Senate for enactment in its present form."

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

Schuneman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in support of this Bill. As some of the previous speakers have indicated, this Bill is not going to solve all the problems in the unemployment compensation area. Representative Lechowicz has worked long and hard on this Bill which started out reportedly to deal with the problem of voluntary quits and unemployment compensation. He has accepted several theories to deal with voluntary quits / I think are steps in the right direction. Notably, the fact that this Bill now says and accepts the idea that a voluntary quit is not eligible for unemployment insurance unless that quit is due to a cause attributable to the employer. Now, there are some exceptions in the Bill, and I don't agree with all those exceptions. Perhaps you don't agree with all of them, but I think we have to look at the Bill for what it is. I think it's a step in the right direction. As Representative Mautino has



said, there is a Senate Bill over here now which goes a little farther than this one and I would like to see the House also pass that Bill. But, as far as this Bill we're addressing right now, I think we should all support it. One other point that I don't think has been made and should be made here is that in addition to the agreed Bill, Representative Lechowicz and others have agreed to eliminate the so-called charge-back provision which is one of the problems that was complained to our Committee by so many small employers. And that's the situation where an employee quits, voluntary quits his employer immediately goes to work for employer #2 and is then laid off. Under our present system, that unemployment compensation claim is charged back to that employer #1 who really was not responsible for the unemployment. This Bill contains a provision that will help to moderate that situation. Here again it isn't going to be a cure-all but it certainly is a step in the right direction, and I think we ought to support it."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a Member of the House Labor and Commerce Committee, I want to rise in support of Representative Lechowicz's Bill and to commend him for showing the kind of leadership and patience that he has on this measure. I also would like for the record to know that the last Session of this General Assembly we were fortunate enough to pass Senate Bill 1331. As most of you know, Senate Bill 1331, at that time, was essentially an agreed Bill, and I think the record should show under that Bill that we granted to the employers of the State of Illinois a possible tax savings of about 53 dollars per employee and we were expecting a approximately 212,000 employees in the state. I think if we consider



House Bill 2824 and in tandem with that Bill as a second step in an awful long journey to enhancing the economic viability of the State of Illinois, that we certainly can say that when this measure reaches the Governor's desk that we will have given to business in this state in excess of 75 million dollars of relief via the unemployment insurance trust fund. I think that certainly this is not the total panacea for the problem, but I think that this Legislature is making an earnest attempt to make the business climate in Illinois favorable for small businesses to thrive and to flourish, and I certainly would urge a unanimous vote for this agreed Bill sponsored by Representative Lechowicz.")

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question.

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The ayes have it.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to close the debate."

Lechowicz: "Very briefly Mr. Speaker, according to the cost estimates we've received from the Department of Labor Unemployment section headed by Mrs. Miller who did the omen service in providing the necessary information so that this Bill could be considered in its present form and Mr. Les Kosinski also was also very helpful. They estimate that the cost to the employers in this state with the passage of 2824 will be in the area of 50 million dollars. I strongly recommend the passage of 2824."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall this Bill pass.

All in favor signify by voting aye, oppose by voting no. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to explain his vote."



McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'm going to vote for this piece of legislation. I guess everybody else is too. But one of the things that scares me was what Representative Schuneman said. My understanding of an agreed Bill process is this is the agreed Bill on unemployment insurance. But I hear Mr. Schuneman added in another principle that maybe we're going to hear another Bill coming down the pike and we're going an additional fight. I don't mind agreed Bills but is this just an agreed Bill on voluntary quit or just the agreed Bill on unemployment insurance for the rest of the Session. And that's what troubles me always is we seem to have an agreed Bill for just a day or two."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentlemen from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, a total commitment to the agreed Bill process which I have a total commitment to it would be that this would be the only Bill on unemployment comp.. That is a true commitment to the agreed Bill process, but from the comments that I heard from Mr. Schuneman there is not a total commitment. I'm going to be the only no vote I guess on this Bill because a year from now somebody's going to come back and say here's a guy at least that sat on the floor of the House that the premiums have not been reduced. And at least you can look back at somebody but my real no vote is that there is not a total commitment to the agreed Bill process."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 165 ayes, 1 no, 2 voting present. Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



House Bill 2845."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2845, a Bill for an Act to create the Employment Development Corporation Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Henry: "Mr. Speaker...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think we finally have a pro-business Bill. As amended, House Bill 2845 creates the Illinois Product Development Corporation and defines its powers and duties. The corporation is a quasi public entity. Its aim is the creation of jobs through providing financial assistance or risk capital to small Illinois companies to help cover expenses associated with the development of a new product, devices, techniques, or processes which can be exploited commercially. Such aid provides a smaller company otherwise unable to obtain risk capital. Funding for the operation of the corporation will initially come from a \$3,000,000/^{grant}from the general revenue fund. Subsequent financing will come from royalties, from products which were initially developed with Illinois Pruduct Development funds."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Gentleman a few questions."

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

Leinenweber: "It is my understanding that Amendment #1 was put on on the floor of the House. Is that correct?"

Henry: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "And has not been heard in Committee. Is that correct?"

Henry: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "When originally heard in Committee it was an entirely different thing. It created the Employment Development Corporation. Is that correct?"

Henry: "That is correct."



Leinenweber: "Now I notice that there are certain legislative findings in this Act. Who made those findings?"

Henry: "The Legislators."

Leinenweber: "What Legislators?"

Henry: "The Governor vetoed the original Bill that you are discussing, Sir. The Department of Revenue said there was some constitutional problems."

Leinenweber: "Well, there were a lot of problems with the original Bill. We're talking about an entirely new Bill which is the Illinois Product Development Corporation Act. Now my question is, there are specific legislative findings, and I want to know who found those findings, or who made those findings if it's never had a legislative hearing?"

Henry: "Last year there was a similar Bill, House Bill 2000 that went through Committee."

Leinenweber: "House Bill 2000 was the Illinois Product Development Corporation Act?"

Henry: "And also House Bill 260."

Leinenweber: "Alright, did that have Committee hearings?"

Henry: "Yes, Sir."

Leinenweber: "And what happened to the Bill?"

Henry: "The Bill came to the floor."

Leinenweber: "It never came to the floor. Was it defeated in Committee?"

Henry: "I don't know that, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Who was the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Henry: "Wyvetter Younge."

Leinenweber: "Alright, now...again...now referring to House Bill 2845, you mentioned small businesses. Can you point out to me anywhere in the Act, including legislative findings or the definition that restricts these grants to small businesses?"

Henry: "The Act itself creates the Illinois Product Development Corporation. The...the Act itself addresses itself to small businesses."



Leinenweber: "It does...well, I am asking you if you can point to any language in this Act which addresses itself specifically to small business as opposed to business in general?"

Henry: "The...the small businesses are the ones that have problems receiving cash, or payments, or assistance. The large corporations do not have that problem. Even in a tight money market as today, a sustaining manufacturer that has been in business some time can create new products because he has...he can finance them himself. The small business cannot. And that is the intention of House Bill 2845."

Leinenweber: "We're not...we're not talking about the person who can't obtain a loan. We're talking about grants are we not? Not loans."

Henry: "We're talking about a one time grant to the corporation. We are talking about assistance from this Board once it is erected to aid small businesses to develop new products...to put them on the market to create jobs. That is the intention of House Bill 2845."

Leinenweber: "Alright. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Bill now."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Leinenweber: "This is a entirely new Act which has been put on on the order of Second Reading and has never been heard in Committee. The Gentleman was somewhat hazy on what happened apparently to the prototype Bills which apparently were killed in Committee or never called. This Act makes specific legislative findings which will put us all on record of saying that it is the business and the duty of the State of Illinois to give money to private corporations so that they can develop products. Now I would like to point out that neither in the legislative findings nor in the definition of the person to whom these grants can be made, is there any qualifications. I'll give you the definition of person. This is a



recipient of these grants. Any individual, partnership, corporation, or joint venture carrying on business or proposing to carry on business within the state. That would include obviously Chrysler. It would include Borg-Warner..... It would include mom and pop. It would probably even include me. The other thing I would like to point out is that this proposal sets up a...a public corporation to be governed by a seven Member Board of directors, all of whom...I would like to emphasize, all of whom are appointed by the sitting Governor, and all of whom serve only during the term of that sitting Governor. Now the Gentleman proposes somewhere along the line to enfuse this monstrosity with \$3,000,000 from the general revenue fund. What we are going to be creating, and I don't know, perhaps the Governor is for the Bill, I don't know, but we're going to be creating a slush fund for the Governor of this state to tell his seven appointees to give x, y, or z, some individual who may be a friend of his some money, a gift...an outright gift so that he can go ahead and engage in competitive enterprise with other businesses of this state who will not be a recipient of such government largess. I suggest to you that if you thought,..if you think that the Chrysler Bill was socialism, if you think that this other Bill coming down the line to help a steel corporation in Representative Collins' district is socialism, this is even worse because there is absolutely no requirement at all here that...for any size, shape, or form. In fact, Chrysler could be a recipient of this money. So could this steel corporation that Representative Collins is for. I suggest to you that this Bill has never been heard. If it had been heard, some of these things might have come to light. We certainly oughtn't to put this up for a vote with...without having any kind of Committee hearing. I suggest we vote 'no' on it and kill it, and don't give it 70 votes or 89, and don't rely on the Senate



to kill it."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would hope that this legislation does not become a partisan matter. I would hope that the Republicans would support small business and support business with this concept even though it appears to have...not had a Committee hearing and appears to have been thought of by the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives. It is a good concept. The State of Connecticut has gone into a Product Development Corporation a few years ago. What they have done is use the royalties derived from the new products to finance it. At the present time, three-fourths of the funds is derived from royalties, and only one-fourth from state funds. It has been very successful not only in getting small business started with new inventions, new ideas, but it has also been successful in attracting new businesses and new employees to the State of Connecticut. New Jersey, Massachusetts are also looking at this idea. It is about time that Illinois and the mid-west take the lead and we begin to go with an innovative idea such as Mr. Henry's and come up with this program. Again I would hope that we would be able to get some support from the other side of the aisle for business and share not only the...the Bill with them, but also have them come out and use this in their campaigns and say that we worked as Members of the Illinois General Assembly, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but we saw a need for small business, and we met that Bill with legislation such as this. I think we have a responsibility to the citizens of the State of Illinois not just to go out on partisan pol...politics, not out on issues such as that, but to be united on an issue such as this and call it our legislation and campaign and use it in the general election. Thank you."



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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, in addressing the present status of House Bill 2845, I do think that Representative Henry has well intentions with this legislation, but the historical background of this legislation is similar to Bills that have been considered by the Labor and Commerce Committee that were introduced by Representative Younge and failed to pass favorably out of that Committee. But looking at the Bill as it stands at the present time, irrespective of the past historical background of such legislation, what this basically does is set up a brand new independent corporation using \$3,000,000 start up money of state funds to start a totally new corporation that's not tied to any department of state government that is totally not responsible back to any agency other than to the Governor and ultimately then eventually back to the Legislature for more money. What we are doing once again is creating another state bureaucracy. We are creating another bureaucracy of government for more employees, more taxpayers' dollars to be placed out for speculative purposes that very frankly cannot be justified on its own basis. If it were, an individual would be able to obtain the necessary capital and financing through the private sector of our economy. Instead, we asked here to appropriate through this creation of this new innovative Commission or corporation which has not been favorably acted upon in concept by the Committee system of the Legislature before to place out \$3,000,000 of taxpayers' money this year. What's to say next year they're not going to come back and ask for \$10,000,000, \$20,000,000 or whatever figure. What we're doing very frankly once again is putting government in the posture of getting involved in the free enterprise sector, and I don't think this is the direction that the people of Illinois want, is more



government. They want less government, less governmental spending, and therefore, I urge a 'no' vote on House Bill 2845."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this measure. Unemployment in the State of Illinois is 7%. In areas where Representative Henry and I come from, it is five times that amount, Ladies and Gentlemen. Clearly, the Bill may have a slight deficiency in that it doesn't designate what a small business is, but clearly this is an attempt to put people in an area that perennially unemployed... underemployed to work. Entities such as this will be ...will go a long ways in providing meaningful employ... employment for those people who presently are non-producers in a non-producing community. I'm asking the...the Assembly for an affirmative vote and in the Senate we could correct that deficiency and bring the Bill back in the proper language that...that Representative Leinenweber is talking about."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matula."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Matula: "Representative Henry, as I understand, this is going to create a new agency. I believe that I heard that it will be in the vicinity of \$3,000,000 to promote this employment corporation. How many inventors would you say need this subsidy?"

Henry: "Representative, based upon the low...high unemployment and based upon the new products that's not come in from the State of Illinois, based upon the products...new products not being incurred by the State of Illinois, and based upon you going to a shopping center and your buying new products that's made in Taiwan, and made in China, and made in the foreign east, South East Asia. I



would think half of Illinois' small businesses could use this fund."

Matula: "Representative Henry, we have a Small Business Administration. Don't you think that they could go and ask for a subsidy from them rather than start...going to a new agency and creating another cost to the taxpayers?"

Henry: "No."

Matula: "Why?"

Henry: "Because...by law, they are unable to do that because most banks will not loan a small business...business that might have a good idea because he does not have collateral, because he does not own the building, so therefore, his new idea is never put on the market. So therefore, we lose jobs that that market...that that marketable product could have made for all of Illinois, not just my district, not just downstate, but for all of Illinois."

Matula: "Representative Henry, you say they have no collateral. Then what collateral are they going to give to this new agency?"

Henry: "The federal government, and I think I laid on everybody's desk a pamphlet from Connecticut where the federal government gave a grant of \$400,000 to start Connecticut's successful Product Program."

Matula: "How successful were they?"

Henry: "They are highly successful, Sir."

Matula: "Have the people paid their monies to the...agency?"

Henry: "In the next...in the next five years they expect to have \$6,000,000...\$6,500,000 as their own funds to keep recycling in the State of Connecticut. Massachusetts and New Jersey have already started a program such as this. Great Britain and England, they expect by 1983 to have \$20,500,000 in their own treasury to recycle in the community."

Matula: "How much money did they invest into this?"

Henry: "\$10,000,000 floating bonds."

Matula: "How much of it has been paid back?"



Henry: "They have paid it all, Sir."

Matula: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Henry, to close the debate. I'm sorry. Mr. Epton, the Gentleman from Cook."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly have no quarrel with the Sponsor, and I very well may vote for this Bill. However, I would suggest that when he indicates that the federal government is collateral, I think he is in error."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Henry to close."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is intended to help encourage new products in the State of Illinois. I am sick and tired of going into hardware and to automotive shops and to supermarkets, shopping centers and finding that the jobs are being created outside of the United State, outside of Illinois. I am sick and tired of going and losing...going back into the communities throughout Illinois and finding that unemployment keeps rising, small businesses keep going bankrupt because they have no assistance. I am sick and tired of seeing young peoples' ideas being not incurred by this great state. If Connecticut ...if Connecticut can do it, if Massachusetts can do it, and if New Jersey can do it, I think we have the expertise and sophistication to make an even better product. And I'll grant you in the next five years if we pass this Bill, and it can be amended in the Senate. It can be amended in the Senate to identify small businesses and put it on the Governor's desk, and I guarentee you you'll have progress in the State of Illinois...this great state. Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, purpose of an announcement."



Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. We have to my left up above in the gallery the eighth grade class from St. 'Annthenasia's' high...or school in Evanston, Illinois represented by Representative Woods Bowman, Representative James McCourt, and myself, and we would like them to stand so they can get a round of applause from the...the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, if this gets 89 we'll verify it..."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr...please record Mr. Stearney as voting 'aye'. Somebody push his light over there. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Yes, Mr. Henry." "Have all voted who...wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes', and 61 'nos'. Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, at least at the moment we'll go ahead with the verification. We're trying to change some votes here."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Henry wants the...Poll of the Absentees."

Henry: "...Suggested that we verify. I want a Poll of the Absentees. If not, I want to save the time of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Catania, Ebbesen, Gaines, Griesheimer, Karpziel, Laurino, Meyer, Oblinger, Polk..."

Speaker Bradley: "Polk, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Robbins, Schlickman, Skinner, Vinson, Willer, no further."

Speaker Bradley: "Vinson, 'no'. Alright. Now there are 100 'ayes', 63 'nos', Mr. Steczo, what purpose do you rise?"

Steczko: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Fine. Call of the Affirmative. Starting off with 100 'ayes'. Pechous wants to be verified."



Sandquist, Kulas. Alright, let's proceed in call the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander, Balanoff, Barnes, Beatty, Bianco, Birchler, Bowman..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Getty wishes to be verified. Fine."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley, Braun, Breslin, Brummer, Bullock,..."

Speaker Bradley: "Gaines, 'aye'. Gaines wants to be verified, 'aye'. Mrs. Younge. Harry, Mrs. Younge wants to be verified. Leave? Alright. Mrs. Karpziel wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Pro..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative. Capparelli, Capuzi, Chapman, Christensen,..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Goodwin...Harry, Mr. Goodwin wishes to be verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Cullerton,..."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Mrs....Mrs. Braun wishes to be verified. Is that alright? Alright. Patrick wants to be verified. Mr. White wants to be verified. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Currie, Darrow, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Donovan, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer..."

Speaker Bradley: "Harry, the Speaker wants to be verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Epton, Ewell, Farley, Flinn..."

Speaker Bradley: "Harry, Huff wants to be verified...Mr. Leinenweber, Doug Huff. Mrs. Catania wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Correct? Catania."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dwight Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin, Greiman, Grossi, Hanahan, Hannig, Harris, Henry, Huff, Jaffe, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kane, Keane, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska, Kucharski, Kulas, Lechowicz, Leon, Leverenz, Madigan, Marovitz, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McPike, Molloy, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, Patrick, Pechous, Peters, Piel, Pierce, Pouncey, Preston, Rea, Richmond, Ronan, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Schraeder, Sharp, Slape, Stearney, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, VanDuyne, Vitek, VonBoeckman, White,



Williams, Williamson, Sam Wolf, Younge, Yourell,
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions? Mrs. Willer, what purpose do
you rise?"

Willer: "Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "She wishes...record her as voting 'aye'.
Questions, Harry?"

Leinenweber: "Bianco."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Leinenweber: "Chapman."

Speaker Bradley: "She's not in her chair. Not in the chamber.
How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take her off."

Leinenweber: "Darrow."

Speaker Bradley: "Darrow,...he's not in his chair. Is he in the
chambers? Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Dawson...not in his chair. How is he
recorded?"

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

Leinenweber: "Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: "Just take him off. Remove Dawson."

Leinenweber: "Ewell. I don't think I verified Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think you did either. He's in the
center aisle."

Leinenweber: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley...I don't see him back there. Is he
in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Leinenweber: "Dwight Friedrich."

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



Leinenweber: "Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Garmisa...is not in his chair. Here he is.
He's right here. And Darrow has returned to the chamber.
Put him back on the roll."

Leinenweber: "Greiman."

Speaker Bradley: "Greiman is here."

Leinenweber: "Harris."

Speaker Bradley: "And Farley is in the rear. Put him back on.
Who'd you ask? Harris?"

Leinenweber: "Yeah."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his chair. How is he...oh,
he's down here next to Richmond."

Leinenweber: "Alright, Tim Johnson."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Keane."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the cen...in the aisle."

Leinenweber: "Mugalian."

Speaker Bradley: "And Chapman has returned. Put her back on
the roll. Mugalian."

Leinenweber: "Mugalian."

Speaker Bradley: "...Mugalian is not in his chair. How is
he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The..."

Leinenweber: "Take him off, Mr. Speaker. He is apparently
not here."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Jane Barnes."

Spekaer Bradley: "Jane Barnes...how is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "They tell me she's up there...I can't see
her."

Leinenweber: "I can't see her either, Mr. Speaker. I don't see



her."

Speaker Bradley: "They tell me she's up there."

Leinenweber: "I did see her then. She threw something at me,
I think. Pechous."

Speaker Bradley: "Pechous...is not in his chair. They tell me
he was verified, Harry. I think you did verify Pechous."

Leinenweber: "Okay. Peters."

Speaker Bradley: "Peters...he's not in his chair. How is he
recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Piel."

Speaker Bradley: "Piel is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Leinenweber: "Ronan."

Speaker Bradley: "Ronan...I don't see him in his chair. How
is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Leinenweber: "Slape."

Speaker Bradley: "Slape is there."

Leinenweber: "Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Terzich...not in his chair. How is he
recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Leinenweber: "Kosinski."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the press box."

Leinenweber: "I see him. Kulas."

Speaker Bradley: "Kulas...I think we...I think we verified
Kulas."

Leinenweber: "Excuse me. I didn't mean to do that. There were
so many that..."

Speaker Bradley: "I understand."

Leinenweber: "VonBoeckman."



Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his chair. Is he in the chamber?
How is he recorded? Oh, he's in the rear of the chamber."

Leinenweber: "That's all."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Griesheimer, what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Griesheimer: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 95 'ayes', and
65 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional
Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2846,
Mr. Henry."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2846, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act, Third Reading
of the Bill."

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

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield to my hyphenated
Sponsor, Mr. McPike."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison. Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. The Amendment we adopted yesterday to this is
now the substantive part of the Bill, and that is the
investment tax credit for industry. I think you are
very familiar with this. We've discussed it before. It
gives industry a one percent investment tax credit
changing to a two percent investment tax credit after
December 1983. And that is for manufacturing and to
encourage manufacturing, processing, etcetera to
encourage industrial growth in this state. The philosophy
behind the Bill as I said yesterday, if you give industry
an incentive, and if indeed they decide to...to locate
here or to expand here, that creates new jobs, it creates
new profits, generates income both at the corporate
level from profits at the individual level from earned
wages which in turn leads to a growth in state revenues.
This then is a credit against the state income tax, and in



the long run it should more than pay for itself. It's ...it is an answer to...to those who have said we have a poor business climate in Illinois. This is a step in the right direction. This is something that business has asked for for a couple years now. It is...in addition to the tax credit that we gave them two years ago when we took the sales tax off of machinery, that was about a \$1,000,000,000 tax break over five years. This is an additional incentive to industry to locate and to expand in our state. And I would ask for your favorable vote."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this legislation on the philosophical basis that when the income tax was enacted in 1969 it was established very clearly that there would not be credits allowed for any purpose, and we have as a result, the income tax that we have, and I'm not too sure it is all together good. This, of course, would apply largely to the corporation income tax, and I don't know why credit should be allowed the corporation income tax when they are not allowed to the individual income tax. But if we got into the question of allowing credits on the state income tax as opposed to the personal property replacement income tax that we dealt with last week, then I think we ought to be considering giving a credit to those people who have excessive medical bills, those people who have excessive expenses otherwise such as college and things like that that are of absolute necessity for their well-being before we deal with giving credit for purposes that are...that are...not absolute necessities. Now I suggest to you that perhaps our income tax is not perfect, but we will not make it perfect by imposing things like this on a piece by piece basis. I think perhaps the income tax could stand an overhaul, but not in this manner, so I urge your opposition to this Bill."



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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am indeed concerned about this Bill. The Sponsor of the Amendment which has become the Bill is like having the fox watch the chickens when you talk about the business climate in the State of Illinois. This Amendment that was put on that Bill was put on that Bill to kill it."

Speaker Bradley: "What's your...what purpose does the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, arise? Mr. McPike."

McPike: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."

McPike: "If the...well, if you want to talk, you go on and talk when it is your turn. Fine. If the...if the previous speaker would like to address himself to the Bill, I think that would be appropriate. If he would like to castigate me and my efforts, I don't think it is appropriate on this House floor, and I don't think it is appropriate for him or anyone else to attack any other Member on this floor for their motivation or for their effort that they make on behalf of any constituents. I think he should address himself to the Bill, and...and not try to attack me or attack any other Member."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Collins, what purpose do you rise?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, to object to the previous speaker's interrupting Representative Ewing. He didn't have a valid point of personal privilege, and you know it, and I know it, and he should know it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ewing, would you proceed with your remarks, Sir."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and all the Members of this House. My deep apology if I have offended anyone. But of course, let's go on to this...the real point of this Bill. We have another Bill pending in this House which would give credit for this type of business incentive against the corporate personal property replacement tax. One of the more regressive



taxes which we have passed in this House lately. But this Bill itself would take \$96,000,000 out of the general treasury of this state. All the other Bill which is a much better proposal would allow that money to come out of the corporate personal property tax replacement money which is already going to pay this year 120% of what they received...local governments received in the last year from the corporate personal property tax. I think this is a bad Bill. I think it is put on here to kill the Bill. It is put on here to embarrass us, and I would definitely suggest a 'no' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday we passed legislation to increase the general distributive fund to schools in this state with an increase in excess of \$100,000,000. That Bill passed this House by a vote of 153 to nothing to one, I believe. You cannot pass legislation to provide greater state support for services on one hand and the very next day with the other hand pull \$120,000,000 out of the general revenue fund with which we pay these increased service costs. We're sent to this Body to be responsible. If we voted responsibly yesterday, and I believe we did, then we today cannot be irresponsible and vote for legislation which reduces our ability to meet legitimate state needs. And for this reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that the only responsible vote on this legislation is a 'no' vote."

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

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I filed a fiscal note... request on this Bill as it was amended, and I wonder if a fiscal note has been filed on the Bill as amended."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will. Is there...is there?"

McPike: "Yes, there is."



Speaker Bradley: "A fiscal note has been filed."

Vinson: "As amended?"

Speaker Bradley: "As amended?"

Vinson: "Who signed it?"

Speaker Bradley: "Who signed it? Let's see the fiscal note.

It is from the IESC staff."

Vinson: "Yes, they are not authorized to...they're not covered by the statute. That's not a fiscal note, Mr. Speaker, and I request that the Bill be taken out of the record until the proper agency files..."

Speaker Bradley: "Where's the Parliamentarian? Would the Parliamentarian please come to the podium? While we're waiting for the Parliamentarian, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, on the legislation on the Bill."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the crux of the argument that is going on today is not whether an investment tax credit is good or bad. Last week all of the Members on the other side of the aisle voted for an investment tax credit Bill. Today they're saying it's no good. Why? Because they are arguing that the state cannot afford it. Last week you voted for a Bill and said local government could afford it. The question is not whether an investment tax credit is good. We all agree that investment tax credit can stimulate industry and stimulate investment, but who is going to pay for it? The state right now has the largest surplus in the state treasury that we've ever had, and we all agreed to that. What is responsible? You're saying that we have passed increased state funds...increased state programs and we can't afford to give this kind of tax credit, but yet you say it's responsible to pass the cost over onto local government. And what have we done recently for local government and its revenues? We have increased the homestead tax...the homestead tax exemption. That is going to cost local government revenue. We've passed a freeze on farmland assessments. That is going to cost local



government. We've voted for property tax limitations, and we voted to increase the circuit breaker. All of these are going to cost local government. At one point you're saying let's put a limit on property taxes and on the other you're saying let's take away increased revenue from local government. You can't have it both ways. I think that the Sponsor of this Bill has been eminently responsible for saying that we're going to have an investment tax credit. It should be borne by the taxpayers of the whole state, should be equitably distributed, and this is a good Bill and we ought to pass it in this form and not...get the credit and then pass the costs on to units of local government. This is where the cost should lie. The cost should lie at the state level, and that we ought to pass this Bill and not quibble about how much it is going to cost the state treasury."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair will rule that the fiscal note is in proper order. They...it is the Economic and Fiscal Commission and the statutes provide that a Commission on Chapter 63, 'The fiscal note shall be prepared by such Board, Commission, Department, agency, or other entity and furnished to the Sponsor of the Bill within five Calendar days'. And on that...Mr. Vinson. Mr. Vinson...turn Mr. Vinson on."

Vinson: "I call your attention to Paragraph 42-32 which clearly says that the agency responsible for collection of the revenue proposed to be increased or decreased shall provide the fiscal note. Not the Fiscal Commission, but the Department of Revenue. It clearly says that. Why don't we get the real Parliamentarian up there if we can't have the real Speaker?"

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the real Speaker, and the deputy real Speaker, and the deputy assistant real Speaker, Mr. Madigan, have all ruled in the past that the Economic and Fiscal Commission is a perfectly proper Commission to



issue fiscal notes. Besides, this isn't timely. We're on Third Reading now. The Gentleman is late. I don't know where he was on Second Reading, maybe across the street meeting with the Chamber of Commerce, or the Department of Revenue, or Bureau of the Budget, Manufacturers' Association, 'Watch and Ward' Society, I don't know where he was, but we've ruled...we've ruled that the Economic and Fiscal Commission is a proper Commission to issue these fiscal notes, and besides, his objection is not timely on Third Reading. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, you are right, take your gavel in your hand, and move on with business so the same kind of confidence that the deputy Speaker often shows."

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

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is quite obvious that with the Sponsorship of this Amendment to House Bill 2846 which is now the Bill by Representative McPike is one of two things. One, he is in full accord with the tax credit situation, or two, he wants control of a Bill that can be dumped somewhere along the line. I prefer to think that he is in favor of a tax credit program. So then we have two questions. Should we support Representative McPike, or should we support Representative Bradley? And it is my opinion that Representative Bradley's Bill is the most feasible and the most sound. His Bill was studied many times over two Committee and whatever. This Bill found its way to the House floor via an Amendment as last resort as you might have it a flash in the pan, flash at night, and so I think we ought to defeat this one and go on to Representative Bradley's Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Mc...the ruling stands. Who wants to close? Mr. McPike or Mr. Henry. Yes, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "I move to overrule the Chair on that ruling if you are going to stand with that rule...The statute clearly indic-



cates that the ruling is wrong."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman is within his rights. All in favor of overruling the Chair vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 72 'ayes', and 88 'nos'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Mr...The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, to close the debate."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I serve on the Revenue Committee and listened to the witnesses testify on this, and the main witness for this Bill was from General Electric. And I doubt that anyone on this House floor has spent more time discussing this proposal with the witness from General Electric than I have. I have discussed it with him for at least two hours. All the various aspects of it, and I think I understand it as well as anybody on this House floor if not better. It is my opinion that investment tax credit applied against income tax...the state income tax in Illinois is not only the proper way to go, but the only way to go. The state can afford it. We have a \$500,000,000 surplus. It takes about three years to recover any of the investment credit. We can afford to wait three years for that recovery. Our units of local government, especially school districts cannot afford to wait three to five years for the recovery, and that is...that is the minimum amount of time that it takes to recover the revenue lost by this. The state is...the state is at a proper position to recover, and school districts are not. I do believe that it is an incentive for business to locate and to grow in this state. I think it is a wise move. I think it will lead to industrial expansion, and I think it is going to be a very interesting Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.



Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes', and 62 'nos'. Mr. McPike...poll the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees. Davis..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Bluthardt, Bradley, Campbell, Deuster, Donovan, Ebbesen, Farley, Gaines, Hallstrom, Keane, Klosak, Laurino, McMaster, Meyer, Molloy, Mugalian, Oblinger, Robbins, Schisler, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Tuerk, Watson, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 83 'ayes', 62 'nos'. Mr. Schisler."

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Schisler."

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

Schisler: "Please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record him as voting 'aye'. Mr. Gaines, how is he recorded?"

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

Gaines: "Please vote me 'aye' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Donovan wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

On this question there are 86 'ayes', and 62 'nays'. Hallstrom, 'no'. 63 'nos'. Mulcahey is recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Dunn, what purpose do you rise?"

J. Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I had my light on...point is a little stale now, but we had a...the record...the machine turned off a little quick here. Maybe we should take another Roll Call and let the people get on that want to get on."

Speaker Bradley: "No. The Speaker wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Redmond. On this question there are 87 'ayes'...Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, you're fully aware of the background of this Bill and the companion Bill, and I think it is fair to say that there was a quick gavel on the Bill, Mr. Speaker. And I know you're concerned with fairness, and I would think that in all fairness you ought to call the record again, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, arise?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, he may be the Majority Leader, but he has no right to speak at this time."

Speaker Bradley: "Anybody else wish to change their vote? To be recorded...Mr. Watson wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Pechous is already...he's recorded as voting 'aye'. McMaster wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Alright, how many...Mrs. Chapman, what purpose do you rise?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded up there please?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is she recorded?"

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

Chapman: "I am recorded as voting 'aye'? That is the way I want to vote. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, what's...what's the count? On this question there are 87 'ayes', and 65 'nos'. This Bill having failed to receive...Mr. Henry..."

Henry: "Postponed."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to put it on postponed consideration? It's on...it's within the rules you don't need leave. The Bill will be placed on postponed consideration. 2941."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2941, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act on blood tests, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2941 changes the Paternity Blood Test Act to allow that the results of the latest blood test can be submitted in court cases that are seeking to establish paternity. In 1978 there were 36...36,161 illegitimate children born in the State of Illinois. This Bill will save money for the State of Illinois and will help our state's attorneys and Attorney General's offices in their responsibility of assuring the child's support payments are made. It will also assist a growing number



of men who are seeking to establish their paternity for a child and who are now prohibited from submitting the results of the latest blood test which might be favorable to their case. Since 1957 when the current law was enacted new tests have been developed in the process of matching peoples' blood in order to provide donors for organ transplants. But those test results are also very useful in matching the genetic characteristics of the mother and the child and the alleged father. The Bill calls specifically for the inclusion of human leukocytes antigen tests...these new tests, as part of what the court can request, and it also requires that those results be introduced as evidence if it is clear and convincing evidence. It specifies also that that will not be conclusive unless there is other evidence supporting the paternity of that man to that child. Presently results can be submitted only if he is excluded as being the father and there is some question that this may be unconstitutional and that in fact we are prohibiting the submission of evidence that is pertinent. I will be happy to answer any questions on the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The ques..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Lechowicz in the Chair."

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

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't believe I have any conflict of interest in this Bill."

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

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

Spekaer Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Leverenz: "Are the tests 100%?"

Satterthwaite: "No, they are not, but they are quite...they are quite specific, and the probability would be part of the evidence that was submitted."

Leverenz: "Could you...I think I got more of an answer than I expected. The tests are not 100%. What is it that you



mean by probability?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Leverenz, the requirement in this Bill is that the evidence be clear and convincing, and that is a higher standard of evidence than is now required...a higher standard for decisions. In paternity cases now, we only require a preponderance of evidence to declare a man the father of a child."

Leverenz: "Being a certified non-attorney, I have a great deal of problem with your answer that the tests are not 100%. You're dealing with probability, and if my memory serves me properly, you said this rose from a problem in Champaign County?"

Satterthwaite: "No, I said that the Bill arose at the suggestion of the assistant state's attorney...or assistant Attorney General in Champaign County...in pursuit of child support."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

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

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that when I asked for the real Speaker and the real Parliamentarian I didn't realize what I'd get up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's no fiscal impact on this Bill."

Vinson: "In any event I do rise in support of the Bill...for two reasons..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Vinson: "...First of all because there is a fiscal impact on the Bill, and it is a desirable fiscal impact. What the Bill will...the result of the Bill will be to cut the ADC roles in this state significantly. It will make it possible to track down who the fathers are and to charge them for those welfare recipients they have produced. In addition, some people are concerned about the fact that what we're doing here is permitting evidence to be introduced in the court that is not 100% reliable. Well we do that every day. It is not the function of allowing evidence in to determine its reliability. That is the



function of the jury. We let in evidence very frequently that we let...in fact, every piece of evidence that we let into court hearings we do with the intention of letting the jury decide which set of evidence is right and which set is wrong. And that is all that Representative Satterthwaite's Bill does in this instance, and I think that is desirable. I think in fact that the reliability of the evidence that her Bill would be permit...permit to be introduced is quite a bit higher than most of the evidence that is submitted into a court of law. And for those reasons I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Bill. Please vote green."

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

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a group of students from the Lincoln School from the 13th District. They are represented by Representative O'Brien, Sandquist, and yours truly, White."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to close."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the American Medical Association and the American Bar Association's section on family law has positions favoring changes in laws such as we currently have on the books in Illinois. They favor changes that will allow the submission of evidence from the human leukocyte antigen test which this Bill calls for to be submitted. I believe that we have provided the necessary safeguards, and I believe that this is a Bill that deserves your support. It will have an economic impact on the State of Illinois, a very favorable one as Representative Vinson has indicated, and I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 2941 pass?'. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay' Dawson. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 12...130 'ayes', eight 'nos', 13 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2962, Mr. Beatty."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2962..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. The Gentleman's not there. 3154, Mr. Stuffle."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3154, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Farmland Tax Study Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3154 is the Illinois Farmland Tax Study Commission Bill which came out of the Revenue Committee on a 20-0 vote. We amended the Bill on Second Reading. It now provides for five Members from the Senate, five from the House, three public Members who would endeavor to clean up the provisions of the current productivity law, this is a companion as you know to House Bill 3173 which is the one year limitation on farmland assessment. I would be happy to answer questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 3154 pass?'. 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's 141 'ayes', 19 'nos', three recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

(continued)



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3173."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3173. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the piece of legislation which we discussed at great length yesterday and went through numerous Amendments to arrive at the position we are now. It provides for an eight percent limitation on farm land assessment. The increase is from 79 to 80 assessments that would be reflected for one year in the 1981 farm land assessment tax Bill. As you know, yesterday we went through a number of Amendments. Cook County is not now in the Bill. This Amendment which is the Bill, Amendment #12 which is the Bill, was arrived at through a great amount of discussion yesterday and in prior days with people on both sides of the aisle. It's my understanding that there's no opposition now from the leadership of either side. It has the approbation of every farm group in the State of Illinois. It represents the compromise not only among those groups but among Legislators on this floor. I would be happy to answer any questions that anyone has. It is a very important piece of legislation as all of you know who have farm land in your district. It only has a one year effect. We only want a one year effect until such time as we can clean up the productivity law now on the books which would cause great, great consternation and dramatic increases in assessments in 2/3 of the counties in this state in the coming year unless this piece of legislation is passed and enacted into law. I would appreciate a favorable vote. Reiterate that I would answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Will,



Mr. VanDuyne:"

VanDuyne: "Yes, I know Representative Stuffle's dedication to the farmer but I was just curious as to when he thinks we ought to implement this farm assessment law, whether it be '81, '82, '89, '92, or do you think that maybe next year you might be coming with another one to extend it another year or what."

Stuffle: "As I stated here yesterday and I stated here today, I am in support of implementation of a productivity standard basis for assessment of farm land that's why I've only asked for the one year..."

VanDuyne: "I didn't ask for an..., I just asked the year you're going to allow it to be implemented."

Stuffle: "If I said one year, that assumes the second year I'm for the action of implementing a productivity standard. We don't all agree that the Bill passed last year is the exact way to go..."

VanDuyne: "Okay. Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I guess I am to assume that the Amendment which was adopted earlier in the day which put the limitation on residential property is no longer in the Bill as you explained it."

Stuffle: "That Amendment was effectively negated yesterday by Amendment #12. The entire Bill is now Amendment #12 which is a one shot, one year, eight percent aggregate county by county farm land assessment limitation outside of Cook and that is all that is in the Bill now."

Hoffman: "So you made the decision to take that limitation away from the homeowners when you adopted Amendment #12. Is that correct?"

Stuffle: "We made the decision not to put it in this Bill. That's correct."

Hoffman: "You handled that very well." Thank you."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell at Mr. Hanhan's desk."

Ewell: "Mr. Stuffle, what happens to the farmers in Cook County under this Bill?"

Stuffle: "The farmers in Cook County are not covered by this Bill and I would assume that would be up to the local assessor if he attempts to implement the law that was put on the books last year, and one of our problems is, first of all, that it's not being implemented. Secondly, that some assessors say they can't implement the Bill."

Ewell: "How much revenue will this cause, loss, will this ^{to} cause/the local assessors throughout the state, the local units of government?"

Stuffle: "The Department of Revenue's fiscal note says that they cannot estimate what this Bill would do to revenues in the various counties or at the state level because just as they can't implement the Bill, they don't have the figures to make that estimate but they also say they also can't make those estimates for the existing law."

Ewell: "Well, I'd like to say now if we have a Bill where we can't even estimate the revenue losses and we know that it's going to cause great losses to many of the units of local government we have a problem there because I know that next year you'll be back talking about the lack of revenue in the small counties. Now when we in Cook County are confronted with such problems you tell us, 'Simple. Just raise the taxes on your people'. Now here you have a Bill that doesn't benefit Cook County in the least, in the smallest iota, and 50% of the people live in Cook County. Now it doesn't do much for the people who live in the towns and villages of Illinois and yet you're down here with this special interest legislation asking us to help you in your time of need. Is that correct?"



Stuffle: "You're absolutely right."

Ewell: "In the traditional sense can I ask of you
when we are in our time of need where will you be?"

Stuffle: "It depends on your needs."

Ewell: "All I can say is, Mr. Stuffle, this is a selfish
piece of legislation designed to help one particular
group in this state at the expense of many other groups
in the state. I think what we really ought to do
is put this Bill on postponed consideration and not
make a deal with just the leaders, but make a deal
with the Members of the House and the people who
have to vote on this Bill so that all of us can
go home to our people with some tributes in our
chariots. For when they ask us what tributes grace
your chariot wheels we shall have to say none. What
tribute did we bring home to Rome? None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Ewell: "So I think that it would be well to suffice that
this Body would consider this measure, perhaps put
it on postponed consideration and make a deal with
the entire Membership and not just the leaders."

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

Harris: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen
of the House. The past speaker so... most elegantly
I feel like that he knows when he needs votes from
people in the south part of the state that they are
usually there. They're there for him. They've always
been there for him and he realizes... he knows they're
always there for him. So this is something that's
needed. This is something that the assessors need.
We know we've had it said on this floor of this
House many a time that we are number one state in
agriculture. If you want to become number two, number
three, and number ten don't vote for the Bill. If
you want to stay number one, if you want to continue
to be number one I'd say we need to vote for the Bill.



The Bill has to come through. Farmers today are borrowing money at 20% to plant corn. They're borrowing money at 20% to plant soy beans. They're having to sell their cattle to stay in business. yet we don't want them to give them a little break such as this. I could go on to you my good friend, Ray Ewell, but I want to tell you that the next time you need a few votes, I think they'll be there and I really believe you're going to vote for this. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from St. Clair , Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt this fine discussion on this fine Bill but I'd like to introduce the eighth grade students from St. John's Lutheran School in Forest Park, Illinois represented by Representative Williams, Leverenz, and Bluthardt. Right up here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to close."

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

I think the merits of this Bill have been adequately discussed over a number of hours on the floor and Committee. I have indicated why it is of an important emergency nature that this particular Bill be passed in the House of Representatives and with due respect to Representative Ewell, I would remind him that I voted for his 100 thousand dollar appropriation between the medians in Cook County and I would like a yes vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall House Bill 3173 pass. All in favor vote aye, all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 146 ayes, 11 nos, 1 recorded as present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.



House Bill 2962."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2962, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workers' Compensation Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a simple Bill. It is a good government Bill. If you vote for this Bill you'll take arbitrators from the Industrial Commission out of the political arena. They won't have to come to a House Member or Senator to get a pay raise. They will be in the stream of things in Springfield, and when the Commissioners get a raise, they'll get one. If the Commissioners' salaries diminish, their salary will be diminished. This Bill keeps them at the current status of being \$4,000 less than the Commissioners of the Industrial Commission. This Bill is similar to the Bill in Cook County where a full judge gets \$50,500, the associate judge gets \$5,000 less and remain constant in that fashion. It is a good Bill, present...n order for these Gentlemen and Ladies to get an increase we have to come to the Legislature. They could 'spot' it better if we set it so they don't deal with politicians any more, and I would ask your favorable support." I was the politician they came to last time and it was a lot of work."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to say that I don't think it is a very good idea to tie salaries to other jobs...tie salaries of one job to that of another job. I don't think there is anything really wrong with coming to the Legislature and requesting a raise and having the Legislature...Legislature either grant or refuse that raise. Another objection I find to this Bill is that the percentage increase for the people at the lower level would be greater with each raise because



they are earning less and the difference remains the same. So I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill. I don't think it is well-advised at all."

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

Beatty: "Yes, this Bill was brought to me by the Arbitrators' Association, and even though the previous speaker is opposed to it, it is very similar to the situation in the courts where the higher judges...the full judges get \$5,000 more than the associate judges, and the duties performed by arbitrators are very similar to...the same cases that are handled by Commissioners. It's very similar to what happens in the court system. It is really, I believe, a good government Bill to take these people out of politics, and I would ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 2962 pass?'. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Just might. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Borchers: "I just want to point out to the House, these people are one of the reasons why we're...business is in trouble in this state. They're incredible giving the monies away, and the illogical handling of the compensation has contributed materially along with the EPA to the loss of business. So I am going to vote 'no'."

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

Beatty: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this has no current effect on the Members of the Industrial Commission. It will not give them any increase. It merely keeps them at the present level, and that level they've been at now for a couple of years. These Gentleman are not able to earn any income outside of the Industrial Commission because we, the Legislature, have said that it is in the best interest of our community that they not be engaged anywhere



else. So their sole income comes from the work they're doing at the Industrial Commission, and they, as you know, their work has doubled in recent years. We've seen the cost of this accelerate be...the...the number of cases has doubled due to the fine laws passed by this Legislature, and I think that we should imburse these... reimburse Gentlemen consisent with the Commissioners. They work full-time, and this is what they devote their duty to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 54 'nos'. A verification has been requested. Poll the absentees first."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Breslin, Campbell, Collins,..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Neff, what purpose were you seeking recognition?"

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to change from 'aye' to 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Neff as 'no'. Please proceed with the Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Daniels, Deuster, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Hannig, Kane, Klosak, Laurino, Leverenz, Margalus, Mautino, McAuliffe, Mugalian, Oblinger, Richmond, Robbins, Schlickman, Woodyard, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Mugalian as 'aye'. Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Would you vote me 'no' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Piel as 'no'. Mr. Ackerman. Change Mr. Ackerman from 'aye' to 'no'. Anyone else? Mr. Johnson. Change Mr. Johnson from 'aye'... oh, I'm sorry. Record Mr. Johnson as 'no'. Proceed to verify the affirmative roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Alexander, Balanoff, Barnes, Beatty, Bell, Bianco, Birchler, Bluthardt, Bowman, Bradley, Braun, Brummer, Bullock, Capuzi, Chapman, Christensen,



Conti, Cullerton, Currie, Darrow, Dawson, DiPrima,
 Donovan, Doyle, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines,
 Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin, Greiman, Grossi,
 Hanahan, Harris, Henry, Huff, Jaffe, Katz,
 Keane, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska, Kucharski, Kulas,
 Lechowicz, Leon, Madigan, Mahar, Marovitz, Matijevich,
 McClain, McGrew, McPike, Meyer, Molloy, Mugalian,
 Murphy, O'Brien, Patrick, Pechous, Peters, Pierce, Polk,
 Pouncey, Preston, Rea, Ronan, Sandquist, Schraeder..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Brummer asks leave to be
 verified. Leave is granted. Please pro...Brummer, leave
 to be verified. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sharp, Slape, Stanley, Stearney, Steczo,
 Stuffle, Taylor, VanDuyne, Vitek, VonBoeckman, White,
 Willer, Williams, Williamson, Winchester, Sam Wolf, Younge,
 and Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions of the affirmative vote?
 Mr. Vinson please."

Vinson: "Mr. Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Giorgi is here."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Kindly...
 Kindly record Mr. Boucek as 'aye'. Is that correct, Emil?
 Mr. Winchester, what purpose do you seek recognition?
 Kindly record Mr. Winchester as 'aye'. Oh, I'm sorry,
 'no'. What's the count? On this question there are
 92 'ayes', 58 'nos', this Bill having received the
 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.
 Oh, kindly record Mr. Collins as 'aye' on that last
 vote. Very good. (continued)



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3184. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3184, a Bill for an Act to accelerate payments of real property taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3184 as the Clerk indicated is commonly known as the 'Real Estate Property Tax Accelerator' Bill. However, I want to make it very clear to the House at the onset that the Bill has been amended several times and the Bill in its present form is quite different in several respects from the Bill as originally introduced. Let me tell you precisely in what ways it is different. First it applies only to Cook County. It does affect the other 101 counties of the state. It applies only to Cook. Secondly, we changed the billing procedures. There's no longer three bills required. There are only two bills required. The first is an estimated bill. The second is a reconciliation bill. Both dates are accelerated. Now this solves the problem that had been addressed earlier that the Treasurer was having in terms of the postage costs. Postage costs can be quite considerable. Adding additional payments did increase the costs and that problem has now been resolved. In addition, the assessor was having some problems because of the way the property tax billing procedure works now. The reconciliation payment could not occur before the final multiplier was issued by the Department of Government Commerce and Community Affairs and it had to be ... Well, we could not accelerate the reconciliation payment beyond the date when the final multiplier was available. So in order to accomplish that.. overcome that problem and still be able to accelerate the reconciliation payment, we had to split the year of assessment



from the year of levy, so the taxes will be extended against the last known assessment. Finally, the phasing schedule terminates in 1990 or rather 1992, where the...when the first Bill will be due on...or mailed on April 1st and the second bill on October 1st. Those are the fundamental changes of the Bill. Now, let me address the need for this legislation. In order to do that I would like to quote from an editorial in the Chicago Sun Times of April 1st. And ... because I think it states the case rather well and gives you some of the basic economic variables that we're dealing with. Illinois is one of the few states that collects real estate taxes a year after they are imposed. So you are paying your 1979 taxes this year. This forces local governments to borrow against the following year's tax collections at a cost of millions of dollars ⁱⁿ interest. As inflation rates have soared, so have interest rates. Cook County sold 125 million dollars tax anticipation notes in the last week of March at 10.6 percent interest, compared with only 6 percent last year. By the time the notes are retired in 1981, taxpayers will have paid 17.8 million dollars in interest on them. That's money that could have gone to bail out County Hospital or hire more judges or jail guards and instead it goes to the institution that holds those notes. According to County Comptroller, Thomas Beck, local governments in Cook County shelled out 60 million to 70 million in interest on short-term borrowing last year. Let me stop and repeat that. The Cook County government shelled out between 6 million...60 million and 70 million in interest on short-term borrowing last year. And this year, because of the higher interest rates, that figure is expected to climb to near 100 million dollars. So, what we are doing by adopting this



legislation is making it possible for the governments in Cook County to pay their bills on time without having to resort to any significant expense to the short term bond market. And thereby saving the interest costs. I...the...this will also enable them to take the...the money which they got earlier, or which they will be able to get earlier, and will not have to use immediately and invest. In effect, by accelerating the tax collections we are creating what amounts to a working cash fund, so that they can go... operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. I think this legislation is needed. It is supported by the Chicago Sun Times and by the local governments in Cook County. And...and I think with the Amendments that we have adopted, which I've worked out with the Department of Revenue, I think it responds to some of the problems that the local treasurer and assessor had and I now ask the...the House to give this Bill its favorable consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing, on House Bill 3184."

Ewing: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm still amazed that this good Bill got out of Committee, but here it is on the House floor. And I think we should label this 'The 1980 Governor Walker Tax Speed Up.' And I think, or I trust, that most of you here will remember how popular Governor Walker's tax speed up was and the fact that most of it has been undone because it was wrong. It was unworkable and the taxpayers opposed it. The Speaker's logic...the Sponsor's logic on this Bill, I think, would read something like this; 'I can't really make it on my 1980 income, so I think you really ought to advance me some of my 1981 income. And, of course, after I've spent my 1981 income in 1980, I still won't be able to make



it in 1981 and will have to do something else. This is a horrible Bill, a bad concept. It's going to increase the cost to our taxpayers and it is only a temporary bail out for any unit of local government. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Vinson, on House Bill 3184."

Vinson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative, what is the first year in which taxes are accelerated under your Bill, what calendar year will that occur in?"

Bowman: "Well, in 1982, the first bill will go out on January 1 and the second bill will go out July 1."

Vinson: "Nothing happens in 1981?"

Bowman: "No, would you like for it to?"

Vinson: "No, I'm just asking you."

Bowman: "No."

Vinson: "1982 is the first year?"

Bowman: "Yes, Sir."

Vinson: "In 1982, will more taxes be collected in Cook County than would otherwise be collected without this Bill?"

Bowman: "In 1982, because of the accelerated schedule, there will be three collections. The third one will occur in...well the first bill will go out December 1."

Vinson: "Will more taxes be collected in 1982 than would otherwise be the case?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Vinson: "In 1983 will more taxes be collected than would otherwise be the case?"

Bowman: "Wait a minute, I'm sorry...Representative Vinson... I'm sorry, the bills will go out. The actual collection will take place a month later or thereabouts, so actually, the collections on that last bill will be



spread between 82 and 83, the bulk of which probably will come in in 83. Now in that case...to pursue your point, in that case there will be more coming in 83 surely."

Vinson: "And in 1984 will there be more taxes collected with this Bill than would otherwise be the case?"

Bowman: "No, Sir."

Vinson: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the answer."

Bowman: "I don't believe so. 1986, I think, is the year you're looking for."

Vinson: "I'm sorry?"

Bowman: "No, Sir. I believe you're looking for a later year. It's not...that's not the year."

Vinson: "What is the year?"

Bowman: "Let's see. 1989."

Vinson: "In 1989 there will be more taxes collected because of this Bill?"

Bowman: "Well, we're...we're accelerating the payments. What would you expect?"

Vinson: "Would you say that this is a tax increase Bill?"

Bowman: "No, Sir."

Vinson: "Cook County won't have more taxes to spend because of this Bill next year, and in 1983 and so forth."

Bowman: "Representative Vinson, I am truly surprised at you. A man of your intelligence asking questions like this. You realize, of course, that this will mean that they will not be issuing tax anticipation warrants and you also realize that they will be able to invest that money, draw interest on that money and use it to reduce taxes. So, Representative Vinson, I don't understand the point that you're driving at."

Vinson: "I'd like to address the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Vinson: "I am...continue to be impressed by the creativity



that afflicts Cook County governmental leaders and their way to find more tax money to spend. I think we saw with the school crisis, how they would take money out of one pocket to use for some other purpose. I think it's interesting that here Representative Bowman has taken a Bill that is a page right out of the school board's book. He's taking money right out of another pocket to spend it on another purpose. This is a tax increase Bill, it's a fictional accounting Bill, it ought to be defeated. In no sense of the word should this Legislature pass this kind of legislation."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schuneman, on House Bill 3184."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I think you should be aware of what kind of concepts the Sponsor is trying to bring about here. Those of us that have been accustomed to paying property taxes in Illinois one year after those taxes are levied find in reading this Bill, that the Sponsor is trying to bring about a plan whereby now the citizens of Chicago will have to pay their taxes in the same year in which they're levied. What this amounts to is an 8 percent property tax increase, without referendum, for the citizens of Chicago for the next 12 years. That's what this really amounts to. This is a system which should be nipped in the bud, not only in Chicago, but certainly there before the system is...the attempt to spread the system to downstate Illinois. Another problem that is presented by this Bill is the rhetoric of the Sponsors who say that one of the reasons they're in such a problem is that they're borrowing money and the interest costs of their money is so high. Well I would suggest to you that borrowing money is strictly within the province of the government.



If governments did not spend beyond their tax revenues they would not be in the situation of having to borrow so heavily. The way to get a handle on that is not to increase the revenues, as this Bill seeks to do, but rather to reduce the expenditures of government. I think the next logical step, if we follow the logic of the Sponsor, will be to collect taxes a year in advance of the time that they're due. This is a bad idea, whose time has not come, and we should not inflict this idea on the citizens of Chicago."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Currie, on House Bill 3184. Representative Skinner, on House Bill 3184."

Skinner: "First of all, I'd like to thank the Sponsor for excluding downstate Illinois from this pernicious idea. I would like to know, however, if the Bill is still in the same shape as it was before insöfar as taxpayers will have to pay in 11 months the same... the amount of taxes that they otherwise would have to pay in 12 months?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman, to answer his question."

Bowman: "Yes."

Skinner: "The answer was yes?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Skinner: "I just wanted to know. It seems that the electrician had your volume turned down very low or else you were...you were sneaking the answer out. I'm curious as to why no one from Cook County has stood up to suggest that this is a tax-eaters Bill? Perhaps everyone living in Cook County doesn't care if the government sticks its hand a little deeper into the pocket of his or her ^{Cook County} property tax payers. If that's the case maybe we from downstate should just vote for it because you don't care."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Darrow, on House Bill 3184."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous question prevails and Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "I am really surprised that the Republicans would really have the nerve to exert such a forceful opposition to this...to this legislation. Because I think if we...we looked at the legislation and see who really gains from the present system, I can tell you, it's the banks. It's the banks that buy the tax anticipation notes that buy the securities and collect all of those millions and millions of dollars of interest payments. It looks to me as if the Republican Party is in the tank with the banks once again. The people who want us to mortgage our futures are the ones who now hold the mortgages. It seems to me that this particular piece of legislation will provide the means by which the government in Cook County can operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. Now, that's a principle that the Republican Party ought to be subscribing to. And the only reason, I'm sure, that they're not subscribing to it is because they don't want their banker friends to lose all of that interest. So I think that there is no reason why anyone should really be voting against this Bill unless of course, you have some banker friends. There's certainly no reason that anyone downstate should be voting against this Bill because it does not affect downstate one way or the other. I'd like to ask at this time that the Speaker would represent...recognize Representative Currie for the final arguments on the



Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Currie...I've called on you previously. Representative Currie, to close on House Bill 3184."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's been described as a quick-fix proposition. On the contrary, it's a long-term solution to a long-term problem the taxpayers in this state have faced since the depression years. We are paying our tax obligations a year after our debts as taxpayers are in fact incurred. What that means is the governments have to borrow money at expensive rates of interest. We, as taxpayers, in fact are paying through the nose for the opportunity to pay our tax bills late. Representative Bowman gave you the figures. One years interest, short-term interest, in the County of Cook for the six metropolitan area governments. amount to about 60 million dollars. At current rates of interest, the ten year cost to the taxpayers of that area are likely to run 600 million dollars. This proposal, House Bill 3184, does not deal with levies, does not deal with assessments. It only deals with the issue of accelerating the collections of real property taxes. We've been in a fix since the 1930's. It is finally time, in 1980, for the State of Illinois and the General Assembly, to give our taxpayers an opportunity to get out of that fix and to become current with governmental obligations and payments. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, the question is, shall House Bill 3184 pass? And I have quite a number of people that want to explain their votes. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'nay' and I have quite a number that want to explain their votes. Representative Davis, to explain his vote."



I have quite a number of lights."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that we should do for our local government what they can do themselves. And it's my understanding that under the powers of the Cook County Board that they can accelerate their taxes if they choose to do so. If that's the case I don't think we should do for them what they would not do for themselves and with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, while I have your attention, I think probably we're mandating something to a home rule unit that pre-empts home rule power and I would request a ruling on how many votes this requires."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schuneman to explain his vote. Representative Wikoff in the meantime to explain his vote."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Davis did ask a question. I'm not sure that you heard, but I think the purpose of the Bill .. this Bill is moot because Cook County, under home rule powers, can do this if they want and since this has been amended down that the only county we're talking about I think we're just cluttering up the statutes with another piece of legislation. It's not necessary and that's the reason I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Representative Bowman couldn't figure out why some of us are voting 'no' while he voted 'yes'. I think the reason is we studied arithmetic and not economics. And that makes it a little simpler because anybody knows that if you take 12 installments in 11 years you're accelerating and increasing taxes by eight percent. Now that's a fairly simple arithmetic problem and I'm surprised he didn't study that in school."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti, you want to explain



your vote?"

Conti: "No, I don't want to explain my vote not now."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. Representative Preston to explain his vote."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to announce that I have a potential conflict of interest and will vote my conscience."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pullen, you want to explain your vote?"

Pullen: "The reasons..."

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

Pullen: "The reason... I am explaining my vote, if I may, Mr. Speaker, please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pullen to explain her vote."

Pullen: "You did recognize me I thought. Thank you very much. The reason that Republicans are voting 'no' is because we don't like tax increases, Mr. Bowman. I'm voting 'no', too."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Parliamentarian informs me it takes 89 votes. Representative Cullerton to explain his vote. Please, quick. Representative Cullerton to explain his vote. Move over one mic."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to see if perhaps I'm wrong in my arithmetic as Representative Friedrich suggested. It seems to me that right now we're spending 60 million dollars, giving 60 million dollars to the banks so we can borrow money. If this Bill passes after it's phased in, we won't be spending 60 million dollars in borrowing money. Now, to me, that comes out as a tax savings. The idea of saying your Bills are due now; we'll give you a year to pay it, it certainly.. would not be very popular in private.. private industry. Yet that's what we do with that tax Bill. All we're saying with this Bill is the taxes are due. You own



the property. You owe taxes. Pay it right now. It seems to me to be a very reasonable proposition. At the same time, we're saving the money that we are now sending to the banks. To me, unless I've missed something in debate, it's seems like tax relief program rather than a tax increase. And that's why I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Reilly to explain his vote."

Reilly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could I explain to all those who were explaining their votes that we have a certain number of Bills to do today and if you'll quit explaining your votes on these fascinating Bills, we could get done and adjourn."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative O'Brien to explain his vote."

O'Brien: "Thank you. Representative ^{Tacoca} I've had my light on for some time. You've had some difficulty in seeing it. I'd just like to explain my vote and I think this Bill is reaching the vote total that it should receive and that is not a sufficient number of votes to pass. Over in the Senate there was a man who asked one question when each and every Bill came up and I think we should ask that question of ourselves. Who wants this Bill? This is a tax increase and it does nothing for the constituents of Cook County. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 66 'aye's, 35 'nay's, and Representative Bowman is recognized."

Bowman: "Well, I'd like to poll the absentees. Out of 24 absentees there might be four people who would like to vote for this because it seems to me that if there are problems that people are having with it, that we might be able to work on it over the summer and clear them up. So, if there are four people among those 24 who would vote for it we can put it on Postponed. And



then maybe put in on Interim Study Calendar."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bradley, poll these near 'aye's? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "If he just needs .. wants four more votes I'll gladly change mine from red to green to give him the one vote out of the four."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. I see four votes for the 70. Representative Katz also an 'aye'. That makes 70. And Representative Breslin is an 'aye'. And one more vote, Representative Vitek is an 'aye' and that's 70 votes. That's sufficient to put it on Postponed Consideration. Representative VanDuyne would like to vote 'no'. And the Bill is now on Postponed Consideration."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker?"

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the same reason, almost every day we come here prepared to work. We want to work. We don't care how late we're going to work. But don't let these people order their dinner and then tell them they're going to adjourn. Can the Chair give us a 'guess-estimate' as to what time we're going home so we know whether to order our food or not?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I asked the Leader... the Majority Leader and he told me seven o'clock about two hours ago."

Conti: "Don't order your lunch people."

Speaker Giorgi: "Next Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative.. Greiman on House Bill 3198. Mr. In the meantime, Representative Katz, for what reason do you arise?"

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Bowman wanted the last Bill sent back to Committee. Would you re-refer him to Committee, Mr. Speaker, right while we have it on the subject?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I.. Does he.. Was it a motion? Representative Bowman on 3184 again."



Bowman: "Yes, I would move that this be placed on the Interim Study Calendar of the Revenue Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Just use the Roll Call. Or should we use the Attendance Roll Call? Use the Attendance Roll Call and it will go to Interim Study. Leave is granted."

Representative Greiman on House Bill 3198. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3198, a Bill for an Act to help alleviate the hardship of economic recession by amending certain Acts herein named, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Greiman on 3198."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3198 is not properly described any longer...as it is in the digest. Since it has been significantly amended so that it will apply only to insurance and to no other area although the original digest indicates that it did. This Bill allows a person who has lost their job...who has been terminated from employment to elect to keep and maintain his medical insurance for a period of six months while he is looking for a job at the same premium level as the group that he belonged to and the same benefit level as the group that he belonged to. He, however, that is the employee that has been terminated, is the one who must pay for this insurance coverage. When he is fired, he can elect to continue his policy. Sometime ago, some years ago we passed a Bill that allows an employee who leaves to convert his policy. This is not the same because it is that conversion that is so expensive at a time when a person has lost his job. It is the ultimate time for most of us where we are instead now 'seems'...losing our jobs, increasing our medical payments with less coverage. There is no risk that is enhanced by not having a job. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has a limited life, however. It is to respond to the recession that we either



are in or that we will be in, or we are told that we will be in. It will die in 1982. It is for temporary relief to people who will find themselves unemployed. I ask then that you help people to get coverage and maintain their coverage during the period of recession. I thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson on House Bill 3198."

Anderson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Anderson: "Was it your intent, Representative Greiman, to cover Members of the General Assembly who have lost their jobs?"

Greiman: "Well, I would say that Members of the General Assembly are involuntarily discharged...or involuntarily terminated, and I can think of no one who would more be aptly described than Representatives who have lost their jobs in that way for which I am very sorry, by the way."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson on House Bill 3198."

Johnson: "A couple questions of the Sponsor. Representative Greiman, does this apply to individuals who have been terminated...maybe you answered this in your direct remarks, for cause...for example, a felonious employee who lost their job because an employer thinks it is unproductive for his business to have felons working for him? Would this Bill apply to that individual?"

Greiman: "Yeah, you know, we would really put an administrative burden on insurance carriers and everybody sorting out why people have been...have been fired. This way the guy is kept off of public aid. His family has got medical coverage. So that we...we find ourselves not burdening the system, and of course, he is paying for it. No one... no one is paying his share whether he is fired for cause or for economic problems or laid off because the plant's down. He is paying the payments for it."

Johnson: "Well, if...isn't it true that the insurance coverage through a particular employer is at least quasi-subsidized



by that employer. The same individual could go out in the market and buy a health policy, it would be significantly more expensive for them. Is that right?"

Greiman: "No...the answer to that is no."

Johnson: "Well then why does..."

Greiman: "He...the difference is...the difference is that there is a group rate and an individual rate. He is getting the benefit of the group rate, but the employer is not subsidizing him at all. If the employer's group rate, for example, is \$80 a month, he will pay the full \$80 a month. The employer will pay nothing."

Johnson: "What I'm saying is that there is...there is an economic benefit not realizable in the private insurance purchasing market realized by an employee because of his inclusion in the group. Is that right?"

Greiman: "There clearly is a benefit to be in the group. But it is a benefit that is costing not the employer anything, nor the insurance company by the way...because all we're saying is that he gets the same level premium, and he gets the same level of benefits that he had before. And, you know..."

Johnson: "Well...if...if the individual employee were discharged, and the insurance was lapsed as to that individual, that would have a...at least some affect on the overall rate...group rate to the employer. Right?"

Greiman: "I'm sorry. Would you repeat the question?"

Johnson: "Well, it seems like it is actuarially self apparent that if an individual was discharged, his exclusion then from the group policy would have an affect on the overall rate that the employer would have to pay to keep that group policy in effect."

Greiman: "Well, I think, yeah. In the first place, it depends on the specific experience of the employer. I don't believe that his health problems, for example, will be increased because he is not employed, because he has been laid off. No, there are no studies that show that. So that



the only thing that should increase...the employer...not the employer, the cost of that is if there is a significant increase in health problems, and there would not be. He is the same person that is part of the group before. If a group of employees are laid off, they are the same members of that group as they were before. There will be no increase...or should be no increase in the premiums."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in speaking to the Bill. To a lesser extent, this is similar to the...to the Balanoff Bill that we considered earlier today. In fact, it would seem that to some extent it really penalizes employers more. There is a good many reasons why employees can be discharged. They can be embezzling funds. They can be bad workers. There is a whole variety of reasons, including some reasons connected with a recession, and it would seem to me that to mandate that employers have to continue health insurance in force notwithstanding that the employee may have been discharged for theft, and maybe as a matter of fact be in prison for theft from the employer, or a whole variety of other reasons including just pure incompetence on the job really is the kind of thing the government oughtn't to get itself involved in. And for that reason and because I believe that the economics of the Bill and the area that we are concerned with would penalize honest employers, would put a damper on free enterprise in Illinois. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

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

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although the Bill sounds commendable on its base, it is actually trying to offer an employee who is no longer receiving an income and forcing that person to buy a Cadillac when he can only afford a Mustang. Our current premiums such as under the state plan that amounts to approximately \$50 a month for an employee and the



dependent premium runs approximately an additional \$100 a month for a total of \$150 a month. The individual purchase is basically on an individual basis where the needs of that individual determines what the...what he is going to purchase. A group insurance program consists of a group of benefits which may include life insurance, long term disability, dental benefits as well as health benefits, and when a person's income ceases, he certainly cannot afford to purchase all of those group benefits. All of the group plans in the state have a conversion privilege which provides a benefit to the individual and it is available to him on an optional basis, and I personally do not see why we have to infringe on the employer, and also on the employee, where certainly the previous Bill that we passed making available the continuation of the health benefits has not worked out in the state nor will this type of legislation that is being offered today, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Question or two of the Sponsor. Representative Greiman, who is going to pay for this additional coverage while the employee is not...is no longer an employee?"

Greiman: "The employee will pay all of it. It is not a burden notwithstanding what the Gentleman from Champaign said, it is not a burden on the employer at all. The employee pays it all. It is not a subsidy to anybody. The employee decides he wants decent coverage, decent medical coverage for his family, and he says, 'I will pay it'. He asks for no handout. He wants his family off of welfare. He wants his family just to be covered for decent medical care. He pays it. He asks for no handout from the State of Illinois."

Simms: "Well, my second question is, Allen, is...aren't most companies...don't they grant the right to convert to a private policy?"

Greiman: "...Well, that is really the problem. When you convert



to a private policy, you double the premium for what you're getting, and you reduce the...you reduce the benefits to the barest, meanest policy that you can get. So what you have at a very time when a person has lost his job, his insurance coverage goes down to the barest basic surgical policy. For example, State of Illinois policies have a very sophisticated and good insurance policy...very good policy, and that policy, if you got fired from the State of Illinois, you would end up with the basic policy. Now I want for my family a good policy. You want for your family a good policy, and just because I'm...I'm fired from my job doesn't mean that I am necessarily destitute. I may want to elect to make those payments, and this gives you a choice, an option, while you are looking for another job to at least have your family covered as it was covered before. I think it is just fair. It doesn't burden anybody."

Simms: "Alright, and my last question is does this period of time when the employee is no longer technically employed, does this affect the employers experience factor in determining future costs for insurance?"

Greiman: "It would, sure. Yeah, because he's part of the group. I am sure that they would. I am not really certain, but I assume that they would probably look at it because he is part of the group, I suppose..."

Simms: "Okay, thank you."

Greiman: "...But, you know, he is the same person."

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

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really can't add a whole lot more to what the Sponsor of the legislation in his excellent explanation of what the Bill does, very difficult to add any more, but there seems to be some confusion as to this piece of legislation. In my opinion, it is something that we should be doing. A person when involuntarily loses his job because of the recession, at that particular time it is very



difficult. It is a real hardship on that person and that Gentleman, and on his family to lose the hospitalization, the medical protection that he has when he is employed. All that Mr. Greiman is doing with the Bill is saying that the employee can continue to be covered for the hospital's medical...bill...insurance...the insurance will be the same. The rate will be the same. He will be able to buy it at the group rate. He has to pay for it. If there was an agreement that the employer paid part of it prior to his being involuntarily released from his job, the employer no longer picks up that part. The employee would pay all. But he gets that group rate that he so desperately needs that...rather than going out and buying that kind of protection on the open market. I think it is an excellent plan. It is something we should pass, and I wholeheartedly support it, and I hope that everybody on the floor of the House does."

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

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in bewilderment because I have tried to find a reason not to vote for this Bill, and I can't. I find myself in the unbelievable position of supporting one of Representative Greiman's Bills. I guess it happens once every Session, but I am happy to say that at last he's got a good idea, and I wholeheartedly support this Bill."

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

Greiman: "To Representative McAuliffe a thank you, I think. One of the Representatives in debate suggested that this would force someone to buy a Cadillac when they could only afford a Mustang. Unfortunately, the present law requires that you buy a Mustang at the price of a Cadillac, and it is that thing that we want to really end. I think the Bill has been debated and debated fairly. I thank you, and I appreciate a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 3198 pass?'.

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's 128 'ayes', 22 'nos', seven recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Put Mrs. Younge on that last Roll Call. (continued)



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3207."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3207, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to natural resources, research, data collection and environmental studies. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would establish a small... a minority business resource center within the Institute of Natural Resources. Basically the center would be responsible as a clearing house to help small businesses and minority businesses get and participate in the contracts which are the subject matter of the Institute of Natural Resources business. We know that 3/4ths of all the new jobs and new employment in Illinois are created by small businesses and if we give the additional opportunities to participate in these contracts in the Institute of Natural Resources, I think that we will have done something directly to help alleviate the unemployment problem in Illinois. And I ask for your support in this matter."

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

Leinenweber: "Would the Lady respond to some questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates that she will."

Leinenweber: "Why did you select the Institute of Natural Resources as a repository for a minority resource center?"

Younge: "This was done because as of this time, there .. all of the contracts that have been let by the Institute of Natural Resources none of them have been gotten by small businesses or businesses involving women or minorities and one of the explosions of new industrial technique and energy techniques in the field of energy and therefore, this will be the area in which there will be new job development. And since small businesses provide 3/4ths of the new jobs in Illinois anyway, it would be



a logical place in order ... place in which to put a small business resource center. I have talked with the Director about this and he is neutral on the Bill. I think that he thinks that it's a good idea and he said he thought that the Bill had sound legislative intent."

Leinenweber: "Well, you say, you think. He didn't say it though, did he? Let me ask you this. Why would we want.."

Younger: "He did say that he thought it had good legislative intent and he was not opposed to it."

Leinenweber: "Why would we want to put this in the Institute of Natural Resources and in a sense wouldn't it compete with the Office of Minority Business Enterprise within the Department of Commerce?"

Younger: "No, it wouldn't. The Institute of Natural Resources as for example, has jurisdiction and runs the institutional building grants program. This is a program that will convert Illinois public buildings to make them more energy self-sufficient and safe. It would^{be} logical that there would be an emphasis within the Institute of Natural Resources that would try to give the contracts to small businesses. Highest unemployment problem in Illinois is located in ghettos, it is located in the places where there is low capital accumulation."

Leinenweber: "Have you read the Bill to see what the center is supposed to do?"

Younger: "I drafted the Bill, Representative, and I know very well..."

Leinenweber: "Well, the Bill has nothing to do with granting of contracts. What it does, as I read it, was one to establish more or less a clearing house for information and design programs to encourage economically and socially disadvantaged enterprises and to conduct market research and develop support mechanisms. It doesn't seem to me that it has any relation at all to what the



Institute of Natural Resources is supposed to do.

And, Mr. Speaker, on the Bill...."

Younge: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I refer you then, Representative Leinenweber, specifically to Section 49.25, Section 5.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge? Mrs. Younge? Let the Gentleman conclude and then you can respond in closing."

Leinenweber: "Well, briefly, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it seems to me that if we pass this Bill, we're going to be working at cross purposes with the Office of Minority Business Enterprise which was established in the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs specifically to do precisely what this Natural Resources Center is supposed to do. You're going to be splitting whatever money the Governor or the Bureau of the Budget, the Governor and the Legislature through the appropriation process, you're going to be splitting the money between two, competing organizations which are intended to do the same thing. One of the ideas behind the development, the establishment of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, was consolidation. This is not consolidation. This is proliferation, not a good idea. And I think we should oppose it."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Lady would respond for a question? This has to do with..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates that she will."

Deuster: "This has to do with the assistance for minorities. Does this Bill also include women in your definition of minorities as the other Bill did?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Yes, Representative Deuster. And this Bill also includes men. It has been amended to include as one of the types of businesses to be helped, small businesses. And small businesses are specifically defined in the Bill. So it will help men and women, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I have the Bill and I don't see men in here anywhere. Would you tell me what line and what page?"

Younge: "I refer you to an Amendment which was adopted on May 9th to this Bill."

Deuster: "Is that Amendment #1?"

Younge: "Amendment #1."

Deuster: "And where does it say, 'men and women'?"

Younge: "Well, it defines it in terms of small businesses and we know that of course men operate small businesses. A small business..."

Deuster: "Well, what line? I'm looking at the Amendment. You're telling me... You're giving me an opinion. I'm just asking you, what line does it say, 'men or women'?"

Younge: "Small businesses are gendered neutral, Representative Deuster, and therefore, everyone knows that men own small businesses."

Deuster: "Well, why did you discriminate against men in your past Bill which is supposed to be a companion is it, and this one you're treating it differently?"

Younge: "Well, there's no discrimination against men in this Bill, Representative Deuster. The Bill has been amended to include small businesses and many men own small businesses, as we know."

Deuster: "Well, I'm sorry you can't respond to the question. You have not pointed out any definition here. And, what kind... what is the definition of 'minority' in this Bill?"

Younge: "The definition of 'minority' in this Bill is a



business which at least 51... is 51% owned by one or more socially or economically disadvantaged individuals."

Deuster: "I see. Thank you very much."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is no better today than it was the other day when we talked about it for a half hour, 45 minutes. And it was taken out of the record. The Institute of Natural Resources is certainly not something that we should be dividing in this way. We have been.. We are all concerned with the use of Illinois coal. We are trying to expand its use in every possible way. The Institute of Natural Resources has \$26 million in coal bond money, most of which is being used at Wood River right now and some of which is being used at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have a vital concern in Illinois' prosperity in the use and the cleaning and making usable Illinois coal. Now, this is certainly not a place for experimenting with such things as a minority resource center. I fail to see how .. how this differs from what we did earlier today in working with minority businesses and putting that in the Department of Commerce. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is pure over-kill. We have got to get sensible here and start doing the right thing. You know, you never know we're apt to pass one of these things and the Governor might sign it. Then, wouldn't we feel foolish. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to vote 'no'. Vote 'no' on this and for anything else like this that might come up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to close.... The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know why Representative Deuster was.. was belaboring the fact about men and women. The Amendment #1 which we



adopted on May 9th, defines small business. It said, 'a business which is independently owned and operated and which is not domina in its field of operation.' And the Department shall establish a detailed definition by rule of such a business. So, the Lady from St. Clair has amended her Bill on May 9th so it covers small businesses whether operated by men or women because he's hung up on minorities. Somehow minorities bother him. But this Bill has gone beyond minorities and now is aimed at helping small businesses throughout the state in entering into energy related projects and I think that's good. And I think maybe the Governor will sign it and therefore, we should vote for House Bill 3207."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman (sic) from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to close. I'm sorry."

Younge: "I ask for your support in this matter."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3207 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "I'd like to explain my vote in this way. I feel disadvantaged because I've never belonged to a Country Club. My father didn't belong to a Country Club. What is disadvantaged? Therefore, I'm going to have to vote 'no' because I'm completed unaware how it is I'm always disadvantaged. I don't belong to the Decatur Club; I don't belong to anything except, well, I did belong to the Reserve Officers Association, but nevertheless, it makes me feel a little bit disadvantaged because I don't play golf and therefore, I'm disadvantaged. I think I.. I get so tired hearing about ^{being} disadvantaged all the time. It's ridiculous. You make your own advantages."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Younge: "It is very important that we stop here and now and



give an opportunity to participate in inter-related projects to small businesses all over this state. And that is what this Bill will do. It is important further that we give an opportunity to participate in these businesses by minority, or black, or business men and women. The question is, 'How are we ever going to lower the unemployment rolls of Illinois? How are we ever going to get people off of Public Assistance and Public Aid? ' It is these minority businesses and small businesses that tend to be located in inter-cities that employ people who are minorities. And, what we're doing is balancing the equities. We want to get people off Public Aid and into gain...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 79 'ayes', 77 'nays', one recorded as 'present'. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Bowman. Breslin.

Doyle. Ebbesen. Ewell. Flinn. Katz. Kelly. Laurino. Leverenz. Mautino. McMaster. Molloy. Oblinger. Robbins. Schuneman. Telcser. Willer. And, Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Kelly as 'aye', Mr. Doyle as 'aye'. Mr. Flinn as 'aye'. What's the count? On this question there are 82 'ayes', 77 nos'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared... The Lady wants it on Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objection, put the Bill on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 3230."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3230..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'll get right to you. I missed it.."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act relating to elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was given to me about 20 minutes ago and it's a very thick one so if you'll bear with me, the Chairman of the Elections, the Vice Chairman of Elections, both have been excused because of illness. The Bill deals... This primarily deals with the new Election Code, the consolidation of elections. It's a clean up Bill. And, it involves a number of items. One, it amends the Election Code to require the election authorities to determine by a fair and impartial method of random selection of the order of placement of established political party candidates on the ballot. And that is really complying with a court order, court decision. It also deals with method for filling Chicago Aldermanic vacancies. It returns to a limited specially election system with special elections at the time of the regular scheduled election dates. It adds a mandatory notice of local elections authority lotteries for candidates, political parties, etc. It requires written notice to the County Chairman and to citizen watch dog groups and by posting in the office. It revises the nursing home voting procedure enacted... actually it was enacted last year. This was a request of the County Clerks Association. Specially it opens nursing home voting to either or both election day and the day before. Also adds a five year permanent nursing home disability card identical identification card to the five year disability voter cards. And it revises the procedures related to central counting of late absentee ballots. Also, a County Clerks Association request, reduces the requirement to submit lists to the polling place election judges to those voters that have been mailed absentee ballots, eliminating the names of those absentee voters who have voted in person and whose ballots therefore, will not be counted centrally. It's really a clean up Bill of the consolidation of elections Bill that we



passed .. well I take that back. It has nothing to do with consolidation of"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on the Committee Bill? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3230 pass? All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'ayes', 6 'nos', one recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Kindly record Mr. Piel as 'aye' on the last Roll Call. House Bill 3211."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3211, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill we had up early today and I believe the Gentleman is now in the Speaker's Chair asked me to take it out of the record, had some questions about it. I since, have been in consultation with the .. some of the Leaders on my side of the aisle and their staff and some of the Representatives of Cook County. I understand that they understand the Bill now and have removed their particular objections to it. To remind you what the Bill does, it does two things. The original Bill provides that the taxpayers must pay his taxes in full prior to the annual application for judgement for delinquent taxes by the County Collector which usually comes around by the first of December or before in order to go to court and protest their taxes. It also provides that the taxpayer must file with a second installment but not necessarily his first installment, his protest form in order to preserve his rights. That's what the Bill does. The Bill passed unanimously out of the House Revenue Committee and we had questions and a little talk about it this morning. I ask for support of House Bill



3211."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3211 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'ayes', one 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3291."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Marovitz on the floor? Yeah, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3291, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to landlord and tenant, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is the last Bill in the arson package and deals with absentee landlords. It was amended by the Illinois Association of Realtors in an Amendment which was agreed upon. This Bill would require the notifying of tenants of buildings from absentee landlords as to the individual responsible for the maintenance of the building, the name of the insurance company, and whether the insurance was cancelled. In the 20/20 expose, there was quite a bit about the deterioration of buildings prior to arson, things being removed from buildings, and it's very important I believe that individuals find out who in fact is responsible for the maintenance of the building. If the building deteriorates in such a condition that it becomes really a hazard, they should be able to notify the insurance company and if you are a tenant in the building, I think it's extremely important that within 24 hours, you be notified that the insurance in the building in which you live has been cancelled. I would ask for favorable Roll Call on this Bill."



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

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

I rise in support of House Bill 3291. In that particular film that Representative Marovitz is talking about, it showed many of the articles that were taken out of the building to make the building right for arson. In doing so, I think by having the posting of the insurance company and the landlord, these people will be able to contact, say for instance, the insurance company, and make them aware of the fact of what is going on. And as sure as ever, making that building right for arson. So I urge everybody to vote for House Bill 3291. Thank you."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield? Is there a penalty for not complying with this?"

Marovitz: "Yes, the penalty is a petty offence and subject to a fine of not more than 100... 100 dollars per day of violation."

Friedrich: "All right. Let me ask you a question of a situation that might arise. I have a 'fourplex' and I post notice as required by your Bill, but I leave and 15 minutes later, somebody tears it down. Then the inspector comes and the sign's not there. Do I still get fined?"

Marovitz: "No, you've complied. That was in the Realtors Amendment .."

Friedrich: "So I can put it up just once and then I don't have to do it anymore because I can say somebody tore it down."

Marovitz: "You put it up and somebody else tears it down. You've complied. That was the ..."

Friedrich: "I've got to prove that I put it up?"

Marovitz: "Well, actually how would they prove that you hadn't. The burden of proof is on the other party. If you say you



put it up, I'll say you..."

Friedrich: "Well, I can see in some of it, there.. the situations where some of the conditions exist, I think that you're trying to help and I admire you for that, that the sign wouldn't stay up very long anyway. Even the mailbox wouldn't stay up very long, much less the sign."

Marovitz: "Representative Friedrich, this is discussed with the realtors and at their suggestion we put into the legislation that said notice could be sent either by registered mail or be put into the rental or lease agreement and that would comply. So if they put it into the rental agreement, or send it by certified mail, they need not post and that complies with the notice requirement."

Friedrich: "That would make more sense, I think. Thank you."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much."

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

Stearney: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Stearney: "This Bill is part of the arson package?"

Marovitz: "Well, it was introduced at the same time. It's aimed at a problem that was focused on by the 20/20 investigation."

Stearney: "Well, perhaps I missed the point. But, how will this Bill eradicate or help eradicate arson?"

Marovitz: "I'm glad you asked that question. In the 20/20 ... I'm sorry you didn't come down to see it, but in the 20/20 investigation it showed the pattern of deterioration of all the buildings that were burned prior to the arson. The fact that things were removed, the building had very few tenants, the owner did not live on the premises, there was no one on the premises to maintain the building and had the insurance company been notified, of the state of the building, the insurance would have been cancelled and the individual would not have collected



the large sums of money that he had."

Stearney: "Very good. Thank you."

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

Schuneman: "Questions of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I just became aware of your Bill so it raises some questions in my mind. Does this apply everywhere in the State of Illinois or just in Chicago?"

Marovitz: "This applies everywhere in the State of Illinois."

Schuneman: "Okay, as I understand the provision, one of them says that within 24 hours from the time of cancellation, notice is received, that such notice shall be posted in the building. Is that correct?"

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Schuneman: "What kind .. For what reason must the cancellation notice be shown? In other words, there are a lot of reasons that policies might be cancelled including nonpayment of premium, well, there's a whole variety of reasons that they might be cancelled which have nothing to do with arson. Or may have nothing to do with arson. "

Marovitz: "That's true."

Schuneman: "Are you... Does your Bill require that in every case of cancellation that the owner must post notice of that cancellation in the building?"

Marovitz: "If a building... If the insurance of a building has been cancelled, if I lived in that building I certainly would want to know that that building that I lived in as a tenant was no longer insured. And that's what this is aimed at. This is not... That particular provision is not specifically aimed at arson, but it's aimed at notifying the tenants that they no longer have insurance in that building and they'd better get insurance themselves or take certain precautions because they're not going to be compensated by the owner of the building."



Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill.

I think the Sponsor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Schuneman: "... Is certainly well intentioned in what he's trying to do and I support any effort to curb arson in this state which is truly a serious problem. But it seems to me that he's tampering with something here which has little or nothing to do with arson, especially in most of the State of Illinois. There may be certain areas where his proposal would be good. But insurance policies can be cancelled for a wide variety of reasons, including the fact that the insured himself may not want to carry insurance on the property anymore. And, I think that this is kind of a ludicrous thing to put into law requiring this kind of response from every owner of every property of this kind in Illinois. I don't think he realizes how many times insurance companies... insurance policies are cancelled and for what variety of reasons they're cancelled. I think it's a foolish provision and I think the Bill ought to be taken back and corrected. I'm going to vote against the Bill."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, the bulk of this Bill is aimed at arson. That particular provision that Mr. Schuneman refers to regardless of what the reason for the cancellation is, I firmly believe that a tenant in that building has a right to know that that building that he's living in is no longer insured, and may not be insurable, regardless of what the reason for cancellation was. But this Bill will prevent absentee landlords from allowing their buildings to deteriorate in such a rapid manner prior to a fire and will allow tenants to notify the individual responsible for maintaining the building, and also to notify the insurance



company should it become a real risk prior to arson. The 20/20 investigation focused on facts that prior to arson ... There was a pattern of instances of buildings deteriorating, of people moving out, of things being removed. And the insurance company never knowing until it was too late, until people's lives were lost, and until huge sums of money had to be paid out on recoveries by absentee slum lords. This Bill is aimed at that important part of the package and I would appreciate an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3291 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'ayes', 36 'nos', four recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3358."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3358, a Bill for an Act to provide for loans to certain corporations. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've discussed this many times. We've heard a lot of good and bad about it, but my feelings are that when you have so many people on employment rates, that the state does have to step in and help the economy of our state. The money that is being spent on unemployment and Public Aid will far supercede any loan for the amount of 20 million dollars to any particular company in the State of Illinois and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 3358 also. Earlier this month we saw the so-called Chrysler Bill voted out of .. out of this House. The Chrysler



Corporation is one that is more than shaky. It is on the way out in my opinion. It is one who is making a product that apparently the public does not want. Now, by contrast, I think we have in the case of Wisconsin Steel, a company that has and can be viable. It is putting out a product that not only is one that will be.. will be purchased in the American market, but one that is really not subject to the pressures of competition from foreign steel because of the type of product they.. they do put out. We just don't import the foreign in their area of.. that Wisconsin Steel can produce. This is a company that for 43 years never had a strike. It is a company that has been viable and profitable for all the years of its existence and only because of a strike by another company which was their principle customer were they brought to their knees and put into the position that they are today. For 43 years this company was strike free. Their major customer was International Harvester who went on strike for an unprecedented six months and this is what brought this company down. Harvester is back in business now. Harvester is able and willing to buy the product from Wisconsin Steel. Now, nobody likes to put the government in the position of loaning or subsidizing private industry. But here is a case where it really is, I think, the economical thing to do. We have 3400 people out of work in an industry that today is not open.. nobody is hiring today, rather, because of the depression. They are cutting back. 3400 people who all they want to do is go to work. They're not looking for handouts. They are not looking for unemployment compensation. And only because of their situation are they forced into this situation. This is a company that with our assistance, and as I say, I think it would be an investment in the economy, to help them get back on their feet waiting to put out a product that is a



viable, saleable, product. I think that this so outweighs the case for the Chrysler Corporation Bill that anyone who voted for Chrysler, and indeed, some who did not, would be duty compelled to vote for this Bill. I ask for the support of House Bill 3358. I think you can hold your head up high when you cast an 'aye' vote for it."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Think we've got the Chrysler Bill back under a different label. A couple of things I think should be pointed out. As the previous speaker mentioned, that, yes, the Wisconsin Steel Plant was a subsidiary and wholly owned subsidiary of International Harvester and of course, Harvester has been on strike for quite some time. Here a while back, the Wisconsin Steel officials did announce that they were officially closing the plant, laying off its employees and to Representative Dawson, this was my idea. Jack, didn't put me up to it. They... But under an agreement that was signed by the Federal Government, the Economic Development Administration was to pay off the company's default on private loans totally some hundred million dollars. In return the Federal Government was to have rights to company assets. What really happened since the company declared it was closing, following Chase Manhattan Bank which was also one of the principle creditors, seized all the rights to Wisconsin Steel's inventory. International Harvester which hadn't been paid off what was owed on part of the purchase price, claimed the iron-ore rights and held by Wisconsin. Now, the Federal Government is left with nothing to pay off the hundred million dollars and now we're being asked, the State of Illinois, to bail out everybody. I think it's a bad Bill. It's a bad precedent. And I don't think we ought to vote for it. And it's another direct loan."

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



Balanoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, too, rise in support of this Bill along with the other Representative from my District. This is one of those few Bills where we're all united on. I would like to correct the previous speaker though. This Bill is not quite like the Chrysler Bill and Wisconsin Steel is not like the Chrysler Corporation. As was testified in the Committee hearing, marketability is not a problem for Wisconsin Steel. They have customers for the product. They just need the time, just need a little bit of financial help now and they can get on their feet again. I just wanted to make the distinction. This is not Chrysler. People want the product. Other companies want the product."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Eight years ago I came down to the General Assembly and I selected this seat cause I could sit next to a Gentleman whose views were so out-right, righteous and correct that I felt that his guidance would lead me to the promised land. Today, I feel like Virginia who's been told that there is no Santa Claus. This Gentleman has taken the position on this Bill which is, if it is not socialism, it's got to be darn near Communism. I don't know even whether I should call him 'comrade'. In any event, this Bill as one of the Gentleman pointed out, is and mark this, this is not a loan guarantee. This is an out-right gift. This outfit is out of business. The stores are shut. All the workers are laid off. They're an unfortunate victim of a strike, International Harvester and this is just the result of some labor warfare. However, they have no assets. If nothing else, fortunately, some Amendments were put on by Representative Skinner and others which would require them to post some security. Well, they have no security. They have no



assets. They've all been taken over by their creditors. They owe the Federal Government over ^a hundred million. They're stuck with... And we, as I guess taxpayers, are stuck with that and now these people want us to be stuck with another 20 million. There's no way in God's green earth they'll be able to pay back the hundred million, much less the 20 million. I imagine if we do appropriate this money, the Federal Government will grab it up and take it and help to alleviate some of its losses. This is a bad idea. It's a terrible idea. I hate to see people espousing these principles. Chrysler was bad. This is much worse. Chrysler at least, still is making cars. This outfit is defunct. "

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I movè the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dawson, to close."

Dawson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As has been said, there are approximately 3400 people out of work. And I don't know if anybody in any District that likes to have that particular problem. And I feel that if we could do something to prevent that, and alleviate some of the problem, I feel that the state should take that stance and I also feel that we've spoken before about the downstaters getting support from Chicago and now I'd like to ask for some support from the downstaters for this Chicago issue. Thank you very much. And also, one other thing; none of that money will be distributed unless the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs okayes those allocations. It would be up to their discretion to okay that lean or not."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3358 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to explain his vote."



Timer's on."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I was wanting to ask just how much..

I know they're hitting the state. They've hit the Federal Government. I wanted to ask but I didn't get a chance, how much money the unions of International Harvester, who was part owner of it, and the Steel Union was going to donate towards... or loan the steel company in order to keep it open?: Is it all. . . I wondered if it's all for government to support. None of the unions out its treasury?"

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

Hudson: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'no' vote, I simply want to say that I think this.. this Bill right here is a prime example of how one bad idea becomes the spawning ground for other bad ideas. We're making a mistake or about to make a mistake with Chrysler and I would use that as the basis... We use that as the judgment on which to make a determination on this. It's just... It's everything that Representative Leinenweber said. It's ridiculous. It's a mistake. We're compounding the mistakes we've made in the past with Chrysler. Now we're using that as an example of why we should continue down this dismal path to corporate socialism or bail outs or whatever we want to call this procedure. And I would.. I would urge you my friends and colleagues to think deeply before you ..."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, you know, it grieves me to hear the last... speakers like the last speaker who probably have a lot to do with helping form the United Nations, where the United States is paying most of their bills. He's probably one of the guys who advocated foreign aid and



since World War II, we've given away 260 billion dollars and now they're pointing the guns at us. We give money to the Asian Bank, the foreign banks. We give money to tobacco growers, sugar growers. Pan Am came in and asked for a loan. If I had said, 'Let's nationalize the railroad, you would have called me a socialist'. They come in and ask to be nationalized and they're doing a worse job than they were doing previously. You are in the marketplace with tax dollars. You can't tell me where tax dollars end and private dollars begin. You guys... You get conceptually nuts, You're philosophically in the Dark Ages. Why don't you study history? 'Conrail' was formed because of the railroads came in and begged for help. Pam Ameri... Pan Am wanted help. Penn Central wanted help. We're giving.. We've given away 260 billion dollars to foreign countries since World War II and they're pointing the guns at us now. You're talking about helping a local corporation where there's employment involved and the end of the world comes for some of those people that can't face their creditors the next day. You guys are losing your marbles."

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

Wolf: "I just wanted to explain to the last speaker, that it was a Democratic Congress that voted for all that nonsense."

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

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know what's wrong with the other side of the aisle today. They refused to help business. Now they refuse to help unemployed workers. I vote 'yes'."

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



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think the best part of this Bill makes the Chrysler Bill look good. At least, Chrysler is making cars. This outfit hasn't even got any furnaces and we're starting all over with an outfit that is bankrupt with no furnaces."

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

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, I just happen to be Chairman of the Board of a corporation and this is a wonderful, wonderful Bill, as you can see by my vote because if we start to go broke, some of these Gentlemen will be able to help us keep it from going broke. Maybe we can get a few votes down on that if I tell you how much I need this support."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I could probably sit here for the next three days and explain the giveaway that we've had in this state in terms of last year's appropriations, not to mention this year's appropriations. But here, you have an industry that's on its knees, due to no fault of its own. It's due to what we call disaster. This is sort of a national man-made disaster type thing. And if you can think of this as being a natural disaster that has descended down upon you, let's say a flood with rivers washed you away, or we've got too much ash from this mount... What is it? Mount Edna? Mount Helena, yeah. In other words, you can always think of natural disasters. But what we have here is a compilation of man-made disasters that's hurting a particular industry that's deserving of your help. Now, Gentlemen, think in your hearts, be merciful. Be kind and help the needy because Wisconsin Steel will one day lead this country to its preeminence in steel production. And if we don't help our



own, who can we help? Gentleman, have a heart..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Poll the absentees. Request of the Sponsor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Birchler. Casey. Ebbesen. Flinn. Emil Jones. Klosak. Laurino. Mautino. Mugalian. Oblinger. Schlickman. Slape. Stanley. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I know I didn't vote and I was rather reluctant to vote on this. But I couldn't help but notice one of the same Gentleman who got up and spoke so strongly against the Belleville Brewery, and the Peoria Brewery yesterday, sounded like a different person today. He was singing a different song at least. And so, I don't think it's going to do any good, but I'm going to.. because I promised the Sponsor that I would give him a vote if it gets close. I would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Flinn as 'aye'. Mr. Birchler as 'aye'. Mr. Slape? Mr. Slape as 'aye'. What is the county, Jack? On this question there's 89 'aye', 76 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, requests a verification."

Huskey: "That's right, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. We'll have a verification. Mr. Ronan wants to have leave to be verified. Ronan. Hearing no objections, Ronan is verified. Proceed to verify the Affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We already polled the absentees. Wake up."

Clerk O'Brien: "Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bradley. Braun. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow.



Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Epton. Ewell.
 Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi.
 Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Henry. Huff.
 Jaffe. Dave Jones..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell asks leave to be verified.
 Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz.
 Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Peters asks leave to be verified.
 Peters. Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Margalus.
 Marovitz. Matijevich. McBroom. McClain. McPike. Meyer.
 Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Piel.
 Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan.
 Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler. Slape. Stearney. Steczo.
 Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. Von-
 Boeckman. White. Williams. Williamson. Winchester.
 Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Slape, Representative Slape, for what pur-
 pose do you seek recognition?"

Slape: "Leave to be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Slape asks leave. Hearing no objections,
 the Gentleman is verified. Do you have any questions of
 the Affirmative vote, Mr. Huskey? Huskey in Mr. Hoffman's
 s chair."

Huskey: "Alexander."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady is in her chair." "The Gentleman from
 Madison, Mr. Sam Wolf, for what purpose do you seek
 recognition?"

Wolf: "May I be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Wolf, Sam Wolf, verified? Leave?
 Hearing no objections, you are verified."

Huskey: "Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. Who was that, Mr. Huskey?"

Huskey: "Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman is here."



Huskey: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is in the back of the chamber."

Huskey: "Where, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Farley? Mr. Farley? Somebody's in his chair. I'm sorry. Mr. Farley? There was somebody his chair. It's not him. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Farley."

Huskey: "Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa. / ^{Mr.}Garmisa in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Garmisa. Farley is not here either. Oh, I don't know. He wasn't here when he was called. I'm sorry. Who?"

Huskey: "Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan? How is Mr. ... Mr. Hanahan here? Put Garmisa back on the Roll Call. Mr. Hanahan? How is Mr. Hanahan recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Huskey: "Hannig?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hannig? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "You verifying the negative votes, too?"

Huskey: "Henry?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Henry is in the chamber."

Huskey: "Kane?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane is in his chair."

Huskey: "Keane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Mr. Farley back on the Roll Call."

Huskey: "How about Keane?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, let me just take care of Farley first. Is Farley back on the Roll Call? All right. Mr. Keane. Where? Mr. Keane? How is Mr. Keane recorded?"



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Keane."

Huskey: "Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Katz? Mr. Katz on the floor? Mr. Katz is on the floor. "

Huskey: "Leon."

Speaker Lechowicz: " Mr. Leon? Got to be around here somewhere. He's always here. Mr. Leon? How is Mr. Leon recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Leon." "Mr. VonBoeckman? Kindly record Mr. VonBoeckman as 'aye'. Mr. VonBoeckman wanted to have leave to be verified. VonBoeckman. Put Leon back on the Roll Call. "

Huskey: "I asked for Leon, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: " Leon is right here."

Huskey: "Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Huskey: "Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, Mr. .. Yeah, he's right here."

Huskey: "McBroom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McBroom? McBroom? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. McBroom."

Huskey: "Preston."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Preston is here."

Huskey: "Ronan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He has leave to be verified and it was granted."

Huskey: "Stearney?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stearney? How is Mr. Stearney recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stearney in the chamber? Remove him."

Huskey: "Piel."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Piel is in the chamber."

Huskey: "Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge is in the chamber."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who? Preston was not removed off the Roll Call."

Huskey: "You can give me a Roll Call now, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Soon as the Clerk is through tallying. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dawson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for our illustrious Majority Leader to come out on the floor so he could take a stand for the working people of the Democratic party instead of staying in the back."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Dawson: "Madigan. I'd like to have him come out on the floor and take his position on this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Boucek, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, down there with our great Speaker is my mentor and former University of Illinois Trustee, 'Park Livingston'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield, Mr. Livingston. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 85 'ayes', 76 'nos'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley? Record Mr. Stanley as 'no'. 85... What's the count now? On this question there are 85 'ayes', 77 'nos'. The Gentleman asks leave to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objection, the Bill is on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 3365."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3365, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to hear 3566 with it? They are companion Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What was the other number?"

Meyer: "3566...3366. Pardon me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's what I thought. The question is 'Shall the Gentleman have leave to hear 3365 and 3366?'. Hearing no objections, Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3366, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental...Illinois Environmental Facilities Financing Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3365 amends the Environmental Protection Act to strengthen the state's control over hazardous waste disposal and to build upon the programs that were established last year in House Bill 453. This Bill I can...I believe contains several major points which merit your consideration. This Bill will give the EPA new authority to impose restrictions on the future uses of hazardous waste disposal sites. Restrictions per... permit...prohibiting, for an example, building subdivisions or school divi...schools over abandoned sites. Within the last week, national attention was drawn again once more to 'Love's' Canal in New York City where precisely that problem occurred. We must avoid such a tragedy in Illinois. Additionally it creates a research and development program administered by the Institute of Natural Resources to develop necessary technology to recycle, detoxify, separate, and neutralize hazardous waste. Funding from this program is to come from the disposal fee established in House Bill 453 last year. I believe that it is important that we start doing



more environmentally acceptable things with those hazardous chemicals than burying them. The state can assist industry in this new area by helping to develop technologies required to reduce our dependence on landfills. This Bill additionally allows the Pollution Control Board to review categories of hazardous waste and to prohibit...prohibit the landfill disposal of certain individual hazardous wastes when it can be...when it can be shown that there is an alternative disposal process available and is economically reasonable and technically feasible. This...this is a further step in keeping our hazardous wastes out of the ground. We have established in Illinois a strong nationally recognized regulatory program for...for industrial waste disposal. House Bill 3365 amends that...expands that program with emphasis on encouraging development of safe and economical alternatives to burying waste. We can offer additional protection to the public health and the ~~environment~~ without unreasonable burdens to our state industry. House Bill 3366 amends the Environmental Facilities Financing Act to include those facilities which reduce, control, or prevent pollution...by reducing the volume or the composition of...of the pollution by changing the manufacturing or waste disposal facility process or providing for recycle resource recovery. Ladies and Gentlemen, these are both good Bills, and I urge their adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Two additional points to Mr. Meyer's statement which was very articulate as to the concept now of administrations Bill, 3365. First of all there was some, if you recall, some concerns over a siting authority or a preemptive authority taken back by the State of Illinois over



home rule units or governments throughout the State of Illinois. That has been removed. So in this Bill now there is no preemption problems or any siting authority in 3365. So if your memorandums or your digests talk about siting, all those kinds of considerations have been removed from this piece of legislation. Secondly, when the Bill was initially put in there were some concerns about industry, IMA, and the Chamber of Commerce. We had a series of long meetings with all effected groups, Waste Management, Interlake, the IMA, Chamber of Commerce, Illinois Environmental Council, and different groups including the administration, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, the Institute of Natural Resources, in all those cases now we tried to work out wording problems that everybody had problems with, and as far as I know now, there are...there is no opposition to this piece of legislation. I think it is a good piece of legislation. I compliment the Governor on this piece of legislation, and Representative Meyer, and I would urge your support."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen."

Would the Sponsor or Representative McClain yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Meyer: "Yes, sir."

Mahar: "Do I understand that the siting authority has been removed. Is that correct? The seven Member..."

Meyer: "That...that is correct by Amendment #3 which is the Bill. It's out. O-u-t."

Mahar: "Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "Ted, in the new Subsection H of Chapter 22 in



House Bill 3365, the Pollution Control Board can prohibit the disposal of hazardous wastes in a landfill where an economically reasonable, technically feasible, and environmentally sound alternative is available. Is that correct?"

Meyer: "Correct."

Birkinbine: "I'm having trouble with the terms technically feasible and available. If a college professor studies a hazardous waste, conducts research and writes a paper, concluding that an alternative technology exists but the technology is not actually in operation, could landfill disposal be prohibited?"

Meyer: "No, not until there is such a time as the alternative is actually existing. The...this is a technology forcing concept, but in order for the...for the...when the... when the hazardous waste is...is to be prohibited, there has to be a spot...an existing landfill site that would be...or, pardon me, not landfill site, an existing facility, recycling, detoxifying, or otherwise facility that...that would be in operation to accept it."

Birkinbine: "The the Board would issue a prohibition on landfill disposal which would become effective when the alternative was actually ready to operate. Right?"

Meyer: "That is correct. The alternative must be capable of handling the waste before the prohibition becomes effective."

Birkinbine: "If, for some reason, the alternative failed to prove out or had a high percentage of down time, what would happen then?"

Meyer: "Well, the Board's ruling wouldn't be...it...it would be a nullity."

Birkinbine: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Meyer to close."

Meyer: "I urge adoption of these good Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall House Bills 3365 and '66 pass'?. All in favor of vote 'aye', all opposed



vote 'nay'."

Meyer: "It is force of habit..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', three 'nos', 1 recorded as 'present'. These Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. House Bill 3406, Mr. Schneider."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3406, a Bill for an Act relating to the advanced disbursements of programs refunded under Title 20 of the Federal Social Security Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There are a few points that I would like to make about the Bill. Number one; is that in Committee a number of questions were raised that I had agreed to work out with the Department. We are still in the process of doing that and they, the Department and I, and other Members of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid have agreed not to move the Bill out of the Senate if we do not reach that agreement. However, we are very close and I'm reluctant to hold it in the House in the event we need a vehicle for those agreements. So, that's point number one. The substance of the Bill is very simple. It's one that I think is becoming very common to many of our problems, and that is, that providers to the State of Illinois and some services have been faced with delays and as a consequence, some of those providers are faced with economic hardship. What we have... What we are trying to do in effect, is to speed up payments so that providers can give us the service that we so badly need and also avoid the problem of them having to borrow and bear the cost of heavy interest. It is in final a.. will be in final form a permissive Bill with the discretion of the various Departments involved having the opportunity



to use discretion on this proposal once it is worked out between the Legislative Advisory Committee, myself and the Department. So I think it's a sound proposal. It's one that has gotten broad support from the various private communities who came to testify. I think it makes sense in the face of the need for the services and also it makes sense in the face of the financial crunch of the current year and potentially the years ahead. So I would solicit from you an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House Bill 3406 does what the Gentleman says it will do and that is, it requires the state to speed up payments on a quarterly basis of Title 20 funds. Now, the problem.. The only problem with the Bill is that Title 20 is a federal reimbursement program so in effect, rather than have the agency advance the funds and then get reimbursed from the State of Illinois. At the time, it gets the money from the Federal Government. The State of Illinois will advance the funds and the get reimbursement. Now, the Bill was amended in Committee and.. to make it not mandatory, but permissive. In other words, no agency private agency would have a right to advanced payments. But if the Department of Public Aid did hundred percent advance pay, these payments, it would translate into a one-time drain on the general revenue fund of an estimated 30 million dollars which would be reimbursed. However, according to the Fiscal Note, which has been filed with the Act, the Department of Public Aid translates this into approximate four million dollars in lost interest revenue because of the fact that the state would be without this money, rather than the agency. So the question is, who should lose.. Who should have the use of the money or who should lose the interest on the money?"



Or who should have to pay interest in the event that borrowed funds have to be utilized? The Bill otherwise is .. There's no problems with the Bill on a technical basis. There is however, this lost interest of four million dollars and a one-time drain of 30 million."

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

Schneider: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. We are indeed trying to concern ourselves and work out that problem of the one-time drain. I don't think there's going to be any ...in a permissive proposal, I don't think any agency or director is going to let go in that sense where you're expending 30, 40, 50 million dollars. I don't think there's going to be that kind of demand at the outset. So what you're really looking at is again an effort to speed up payments. We've advanced a number of Bills in the education field and now here, in the Social Service area, with the hope that perhaps people receiving timely payments would be more readily willing to provide again those services that are essential. Hopefully, we'll work out much of the problem. I would again solicit your 'aye' vote from you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3406 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Bruce, you want to get me over there please? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 157.. 158 'ayes', no 'nays', two recorded as 'present!'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3421."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3421, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels.²⁰⁷"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3421 allows the Illinois Housing Development Authority to issue bonds for the construction of single family dwellings. It adds to the statutes the language 'single family dwellings' and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 34..' The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "How does this change the policies of the Housing Development Authority?"

Daniels: "The language right now in the statute does not provide for their issuing bonds for the construction of single families. This would amend the statutes so that the IHA could issue bonds for single family construction. They currently do not have that authority."

Kane: "In the Section that you're amending is this limited to low and moderate income projects or would this be any kind of single family projects?"

Daniels: "It would be any kind of single family project."

Kane: "This would be... Would this be a departure from present policy limiting the Housing Development to low and moderate income?"

Daniels: "It's not a policy. That's the only thing the statute allows."

Kane: "So this would be a change in direction if this Bill was passed."

Daniels: "This would allow them to do that."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that if we're going to keep IHA functioning, and if we're not going to go overboard on the issuing of bonds, that we ought to keep it limited to the kinds of projects that it's presently involved with, that we ought



keep the state aid to low and moderate income and let private enterprise take care of the housing market that can be afforded by people of ordinary and high income.

And I would urge the defeat of this Bill at this time."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Bullock: "Representative Daniels, I don't want to misinterpret what you're proposing here. But, could this Bill in anyway affect the existing situation where IHA has chose to disregard a recent statute that was enacted and passed which gave them additional authority in the neighborhood of about 50 million dollars, that they have refused to utilize?"

Daniels: "Well, I would certainly hope they wouldn't.. they would not disregard an existing statute. This Bill is not intended to vitiate any existing statute. What this does is to provide that IHA can't operate on single family dwellings in this depressed construction market."

Bullock: "You may recall, Representative Daniels, we had a similar piece of legislation before the Body several days ago and it was sponsored by Representative Piel. And during the floor debate, I indicated that this agency in question, IHA, had a propensity to blatantly disregard the directives of this Body. And one such instance was a Public Act, I think 81-230, or something of that sort, wherein IHA had chosen not to utilize the authority given to it by this Body to both issue bonds and to ear-mark those funds for areas with high rates of unemployment and minority and low income areas. So, they have, in fact, historically, vitiated and blatantly disregarded directives and I'm fearful that if your proposal here encompassed in 3421, that they could in



fact pursue under this authority perhaps subjugating the previous authority we gave them, by disregarding it.

And that's my concern."

Daniels: "Well, I wouldn't think it would be very wise on their part to ignore any directives of the General Assembly or statutory language."

Bullock: "Would you be amenable perhaps in the Senate to let us further clarify the intent?"

Daniels: "I would be happy to continue to discuss it with you and see if we could work out something in answer to whatever question you might have. when it gets to the Senate."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Bullock: "The Sponsor of this Bill, in addition to being a dear friend of mine and I have great admiration for him, I think at this time that the Illinois Housing Development Authority should not be given opportunity as tempting as it may be to change its mission and to change the mandate as so prescribed by this Body. I think until the Illinois Housing Development Authority can comply with statutes and the letter of the law as enacted by this General Assembly, that we should hold them accountable and the proposal under House Bill 3421 does not in my estimation go an awful long way to substantiating the position of this Body and I certainly could not support my dear friend and Representative Daniels at this time. And I certainly would hope that others would do likewise and perhaps just vote 'present'."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed? The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from



DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3421 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Huff: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. In explaining my 'no' vote, clearly on the face of it, Mr. Daniels' Bill is rather superfluous because bond holders don't buy bonds based on whether they're going to be for a single family housing or Section 8, public housing. They just buy bonds. And, has anyone ever wondered why IHA has 150 million dollars uncommitted funds? I submit that they have as much as 300, 400; 500 million uncommitted funds because IHA has never made any commitment or secondary commitment to HUD or the ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 44 'nos', 19 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, i...Post... The Gentleman has leave to put it on Postponed Consideration? Postponed Consideration. 3465."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3465, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3465 comes from a long study by the Subcommittee on family law of the Judiciary Committee and it's a Committee Bill of the House Judiciary I Committee. The Bill adds a separate ground for divorce. We now have ten grounds for divorce in Illinois. This adds a separate, a new ground for divorce and provides that a court may enter a divorce if



the couple is shown to be living separate and apart for one full year. That is not waivable. You can't waive the living separate and apart. That there is proof that there are irreconcilable differences which have caused irretrievable break downs in marriage. You must also prove that there have been efforts made to reconcile and they have failed. And you must prove also and a court must find that it would be futile to have future efforts of reconciliation. It is a very modest effort to reform our divorce laws. It is a Bill that essentially brings our divorce laws into some relationship with reality. And I would be more than happy to answer any questions with regard to this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: " I didn't have my light on. I'm just one of the Cosponsors of it. I was waiting."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, okay. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, your light was on."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I had a couple of questions. Is this .. This is a no fault divorce for....Bill?"

Greiman: "Well, I think it adds another ground Harry. One does not have to prove fault. One has to prove some very specific items, four specific items. There's not requirement that there be cruelty and that there be commission of a felony and infliction of venereal disease. It does not require that. But it does require the proving of very specific faults so that the family will be kept intact and the divorce cannot be a casual thing. It is a serious, serious thing."

Leinenweber: "What is the fault? As I understand it, I'm looking from a staff analysis and it says that the main ingredient is that the parties have lived separate and apart for a continuous period in excess of one year."

Greiman: "Well, I'm saying that you need not prove the more



onerous things to secure divorce."

Leinenweber: "Well, in other words, what I'm driving at is there does not have to be any fault shown. The only. . . No matter what reason you're living apart...."

Greiman: "That's right. The parties could have decided to separate as most often happens and they need not have a willful dissertation. "

Leinenweber: "Or one party may decide to separate even though the other party disagrees with the idea of separation and then qualify for a divorce after the passage of one year. Is that correct?"

Greiman: "Yeah. I'm sorry. What was the question you asked? I'm sorry."

Leinenweber: "I said, one party alone, perhaps, a man who has a girlfriend, decides to leave the marital home and moves in with the girlfriend, and as long as he's gone one year, then he may file and obtain a divorce. Is that correct?"

Greiman: "He could, but of course he would be still bound with all the property restrictions that we have."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, which would be the same whether they agreed or not. I mean, in other words, if both parties sat down and said, 'We should live apart for a year,' and then got a divorce, the same property provisions applies. Is that correct?"

Greiman: "There would be protection for the other one yes."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we've had these proposals before. I've always personally been opposed to the idea of no fault dissolution of marriage. I don't think we should make it easier to break up marriages. The big problem however I see with this type of proposal is that it leaves the party who is not at fault in a position whereby they do not have the ability to negotiate a property settlement that they currently have under the present law. Now, I know a lot of



people say that if you're not living together then they shouldn't have to stay married. But there are many instances where it's a good idea to permit a party to hang onto a marriage even though they might be living apart when the living apart is at no fault of the party that wants to stay married. This is... This concept I realize is pretty widespread around the United States. However, Illinois, I think, we did adopt a so-called model Dissolution of Marriage Act a few years ago. I don't think we ought to take this step. This is a drastic step on the last day of the Session, the last day for hearing... the second to last day of hearing House Bills and I'm going to vote 'no' and I would urge the other Members to vote 'no'."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Huskey: "I think Representative Greiman is to be commended for this type of legislation that at least it's taking away some of the greed that the lawyers have in divorce cases and that's why I feel that he should be commended and I'm definitely going to vote 'yes'."

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

Willer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Willer: "Representative Greiman, I can't ask the question of the Gentleman who opposes this Bill. He's not the Sponsor. But perhaps you could answer my question for me that I would pose to him. He said, there are many reasons for ... There are many reasons where someone would want to hang onto a marriage or keep a marriage together even though they're separated for one year. I was wondering if you knew what he was talking about."

Greiman: "Well, I suppose sometimes they want to collect a pension. I remember I handled a case where the parties



had been living... the parties had been separated for ten years and the wife wouldn't give.. agree to a divorce because she wanted to hang onto his pension. That was... It wasn't much of a marriage, but that was the only reason that she ever gave."

Willer: "Well, so I assume then, the main reasons are really financial."

Greiman: "Well, some are, but we can under our law, we can make any adjustment in considerations based on the assets of the party so that the party would be protected, all parties would be protected."

Willer: "All right. Thank you."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Griesheimer: "AI; I voted for this in Committee, but since that time, one of the things that has crossed my mind won't this just really open the door for our sailors at Great Lakes when they come in there and they're stationed there for a year, usually their wives are back in the home state because there's not adequate housing... It would seem to me that Lake County, which used to be the marriage mill of the Midwest, might become the divorce mill of the Midwest."

Greiman: "I don't think so. I'll tell you why I don't think so. Most.. In the first place, they would have to be Illinois residents. They have to.....that. But, secondly, Illinois is one of three states that doesn't have a concept, if you will, no fault of any kind. So that, most of those sailors would be better off back in their home state. They can... They come from California, or in New York, or in any, you know, any .. 47 states. There's no reason why they come to Illinois. They're better off getting it in their home state."

Griesheimer: "Not quite, because their wives are back there and



they'd cause problems. Whereas, here in Illinois they could serve the wife either by publication or by substitute service and go through a process where there would nobody to refute what was going on."

Greiman: "Well, the wife would have all of her property rights. I, you know, I suppose that's true of any situation where somebody could theoretically move there. But I don't suspect that Illinois would ever become a state anybody would move to for a divorce. For example, this Bill is the most restrictive kind of Bill when you compare it to the law that other states have where divorce is casual. This does not make divorce a casual thing. It's a marriage... becomes and remains a very serious contract, as it should be."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicated he will."

Mulcahey: "Representative Greiman, what constitutes one year?"

Is it actually 365 days? 12 months?..."

Greiman: "I rather think so, yes."

Mulcahey: "Okay then, what if .. What if one of the partners came back home on the 360th day and spent three days there? Do you start all over again?"

Greiman: "That's right. That breaks the That breaks the chain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "One quick question. What effect would this have on the divorce lawyers? Could the two people just go into court and have this dissolution without having a lawyer?"

Greiman: "Well, they can do that now. I don't recommend it, Leroy Frankly, not because of the fees, but because you know, you can heal yourself, but you still go to a doctor. I think they'd still probably have to know something about the law. But they could go in now. You



can sign a form and get a pro-se divorce right now."

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

Johnson: "I don't think you can.. you can make the determination on a Bill like this by listening, as much as I respect the opponent, Representative Leinenweber, to catch words about making it easy or not easy to obtain a dissolution. All you have to do now is to perjure yourself. I defy people to tell me very many situations where you have attempted murder on the other spouse or impotence or continuous drunkenness or drug addiction for two years or the various things that are set forth in the statutes. All this does is that two people, a marital relationship, have gotten to the place where there's irreconcilable differences, there's separation for a year, and two or three other grounds, that you can obtain a divorce on that grounds. It's not a no fault Bill. It's a very moderate Bill. Matter of fact, the way the Bill came out of Committee originally, or through the Committee originally, was a no fault Bill. It's not that at all. Simply recognizes in reality and also requiring at least or hoping to require that people not perjure themselves then they go into court on a dissolution matter. I think it's a moderate Bill, a good approach. It came out of the Committee nearly unanimously and I would urge your 'aye' votes for Representative Greiman's Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Well, I think that Representative Johnson has actually put his finger right on the issue. People are getting divorces in our society. All of us are concerned about it. It's a tragic thing. But Illinois has a bunch of grounds. The grounds don't really reflect reality. People in this chamber are divorced, but how many have committed these terrible, terrible acts? None, I'm sure or a few. And so, we really get down to the essence of recognizing reality and recognizing what life is about."



And so then our laws coincide with the reality of life outside of this chamber. This is a very limited Bill. It requires a court to find one separate and apart for a whole year. Two irreconcilable differences, causes the breakdown of a marriage. Three, efforts made to reconcile and four, that future efforts would be futile. The marriage is dead after that. I ask therefore that we bring some reform to our Divorce Act. Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3465 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, this Bill is an excellent Bill. And it really depends on whether this Legislature wants to get into the 20th century or not, get into the 1980's or not. If a marriage is dead, if a marriage is over, if people are separated for a year and make an attempt to reconcile, cannot reconcile, the marriage is over. One person alone can't keep it alive if the other person doesn't want to stay married. Why should an individual have to take an oath before a Judge and lie and perjure himself because a marriage is in fact over? This just deals with reality and says you don't have to lie. You don't have to perjure yourself. You've been separated for a year. You've tried to reconcile. You can't. The marriage is over. We all know people who whether it's a male relationship or a female relationship with friends, whether it's platonic or not...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hey Zeke. Vote me 'no'. The Gentleman from Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Deuster: "I think the Sponsor perhaps does not emphasize one part of this Bill that's important. There are really three factors that have to be proven. If it was just living apart and separate for one year, I couldn't possibly support this because I've spent more than a year in



Korea and my wife could have divorced me just for being in the military service. But the living and separate and apart is combined with the fact that there are irreconcilable differences that have caused a complete breakdown of the marriage and that all efforts at reconciliation have failed. I think that when that happens, that should be grounds for a divorce and also the Judges that I know and the cases that I've handled, the Judges look at these things and with respect to property to protecting the wife they do a pretty good job of making sure that equity is done. So I think that it is a good Bill and it recognizes reality. You don't have to go in and have your client lie and say that he didn't do anything to provoke..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun. Timer's on."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to encourage more green votes up there for this excellent Bill. It used to be a joke about divorce that kind of went, murder yes, divorce never. The fact of the matter is that there are a lot of lawyers making an awful lot of money dragging out divorce proceedings when people have actually seen the dissolution of their marriage, in fact, and seek to have it become a fact in law. This legislation would allow for the divorce practice to be brought up to date. It would not inhibit or endanger marriages that were solid, marriages that could be reconciled. It would however, get rid of some of the unnecessary and convoluted and counterproductive machinations in the courts around a divorce. And I encourage more 'aye' votes, more green votes on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer. Timer's on."

Brummer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the testimony in Committee was there are only six or seven states out of



the 50 that have no form of divorce grounds such as this in which the parties have been separated for a lengthy period of time, the marriage is obviously dead. The only people quite candidly who in my opinion benefit from the existing status of the law are the lawyers who want to litigate ad infinitum with regard to the issue of grounds. If the parties have been separated for year if the other items are found, that the marriage is ir-retrieva... irrevocably broken, there are none reconcilable differences, the parties ought to be able to obtain a divorce and after all that period of time. I would urge more 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain. Timer's on."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Brummer really said it all. If you have an irreconcilable marriage and they've been separated for more than a year, this is a fair piece of legislation. I'll tell you, if you handle divorces or if you've ever had anybody in your family deal with a divorce, sometimes in the real... in real life situations, they just really have nothing in common anymore. And with our present law, the petitioner has to get on the stand and almost lie in order to build grounds. And in the real world, that ends up being more agonizing for that petitioner than getting the dissolution of marriage. So, I really have you consider that this kind of piece of legislation very restrictive and it's a good piece of legislation. I'd ask for 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Surely. Poll the absentees. We'll have a verification too. Well, we'll announce the call we're starting with anyway. On this question there are 81 'ayes', 60 'nos'. Request for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Beatty. Bradley.



Casey. Dawson. Ebbesen. Ewell. Ewing. Flinn. Klosak.
 Kosinski. Kulas. Maurino. Leverenz. McAuliffe.
 Oblinger. Preston. Rigney. Robbins. Schisler.
 Schlickman. Stearney. Terzich. Wikoff. Williamson.
 Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question: there are 81 'ayes',
 60 'nays'. The Gentleman asks leave to have the Bill on
 Postponed? Postponed Consideration. 3469."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3469, a Bill for an Act in relation
 to contracts for dance studio services. Third Reading
 of the Bill."

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

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 3469 creates
 expanded and separate provisions to regulate contracts
 for dance studio service and physical fitness centers.
 As you recall, this Bill was introduced in response to
 a Chicago Sun-Times series about dance studio abuses.
 After a hearing and further investigation by a special
 Judiciary I Subcommittee, basically what we do in the Bill
 is we make new contract requirements requiring that the
 contracts must be in writing and must disclose the
 customers' total payment obligation. There are certain
 aspects that deal with cancellation rights and it also
 makes violations of this particular Bill subject to the
 Consumer Fraud Act. I know of no opposition to the Bill.
 It passed out of Committee eleven to nothing and I would
 urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Pierce: "I've been asked by several of my colleagues, mostly
 on the other side of the aisle, would this Bill in any
 way restrict massage parlors and receive their concern?"

Jaffe: "No, we're keeping out of massage parlors, Danny."

Pierce: "Is this health studios? How do you define 'health



studio'?"

Jaffe: "Well, there is a definition in the statute if you want to read it. It's.. If you're really interested, I would happy to give it to you. But I think you're more interested in massage palors than you are in health studios, Danny, so we'll leave it at that."

Pierce: "All right. Thank you for that candid answer."

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

Wolf: "Will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Wolf: "I think it's a pretty good Bill here. I just wanted to ask one question. Is there any limit on the contract, the amount of dollars the person could sign the contact?"

Jaffe: "Well, actually we left the limit at the same amount that it was previously. We were going to cut it down but we felt that because of inflation and other factors, that that would really be sort of hard. So, what we did do was say that you couldn't have a contracts which were concurrent and so on and so forth. In other words, you couldn't add upon contracts as they have been done before-hands. So, now the limit is 2500. It was 2500 in the past too."

Wolf: "So, it's 2500 now. Thank you."

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

Kelly: "I guess I have to ask my friend a question or two about the Bill. I wanted to ask you about the bonding authority I know that there was some concern by some of the dance studios that maybe this bonding authority might be too expensive. Could you elaborate a little bit on that, Representative Jaffe?"

Jaffe: "Yeah. The bonding provision is ten percent of the gross .. of the dance studio's gross which we cut down actually from 25 percent. If you recall..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Excuse me. They can't hear you in the back, Aaron."



Jaffe: "We had 25 percent initially and we cut it down to ten percent. And we think that that's a reasonable bond, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Well, I do know that there was a concern that it was, I think, was the total amount of the bonds. I'm sorry. You mentioned what? Ten thousand? Or..."

Jaffe: "Ten percent."

Kelly: "Oh, ten?"

Jaffe: "Or, I believe, ten thousand.. ten thousand dollar minimum."

Kelly: "In other words, this Bill in no way would force the dance studios.... There are some good dance studios around. And of course, there are bad people in any business and I know that you're doing some meritorious work in trying to eliminate these bad operators. At the same time, your legislation won't prevent good dance studio or a health club or anyone else from going out of business with this Bill right now, right?"

Jaffe: "Well, that's correct. As a matter of fact, we exempt studios which don't take large prepayments. What we're trying to do is make sure in case...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion?...."

Jaffe: "That people would be covered."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3469 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'ayes', 12 'nos', two recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3470."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3470, a Bill for an Act to amend various Acts in relation to the dissolution of marriage. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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



the House. The House Judiciary Committee on family law spent some time with hearings all over the state monitoring the Divorce Act that we passed some years ago. We spoke with litigants; we spoke with lawyers; we spoke with Judges; we spoke with people who had dealt with the Act and tried to find those places where the Act wasn't working or the Act needed some change and we have a series of Bills which do modify and make some changes in the Divorce Act based on recommendations of the Illinois State Bar Association, Chicago Bar Association, Association of Matrimonial Lawyers as well as the many Judges and other witnesses who appeared before our Committee. House Bill 3470 is the.. is the first of them. It has a number of parts. One part is that it says, a court can take tax consequences of the property division into consideration when it makes its division. The question of whether you can do that, perhaps you can as a matter of law now, but this specifically says that a court may consider the tax consequences. Another aspect of it is that, question whether the old alimony and gross that we had under the previous Act, whether they can be changed or terminated under the new Bill and this Bill now provides that the agreements that were made before the old Bill are still intact and can't be changed. Because that's what their agreement is. Another one is a technical change. It adds the word, 'income,' so that a court can look at property and income and whatnot when it determines how much the parents have to pay for their children's education. And finally, we have what we call long arm jurisdiction which is allowing someone to sue in Illinois where.. and get service where a person lives outside the state. The Divorce Act as it stands now would allow almost anybody to come into Illinois and sue somebody outside the state. We limit it now and we say that only where the cause of action arose or the Com-



mission in the state or that there was an Act which would give rise to a cause of action, that was committed, then you can use this long arm statute and go and get jurisdiction on a person in another state. That's what the Bill is about. I don't think it's terribly controversial. And I would ask for your approval."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3470 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Gimme an 'aye' please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'ayes', four 'nos', three recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3471."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3471, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections to the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, this Bill is one of the Bills in the package of Committee Bills. It's the work product of the Committee, Judiciary, and specifically earlier the Subcommittee on domestic relations that held hearings around the state with regard to these Bills, with regard to problems that need to be addressed in the existing Marital Dissolution Act. This Bill does five things. Specifically, it states that the party seeking dissolution must have residence rather than domicile in the State of Illinois. It provides that maintenance may be engrossed for fixed or indefinite periods of time and may be from income or property of the spouse. It provides that the obligation to pay maintenance may continue by agreement of the parties after death, remarriage or cohabitation. Fourth, it provides that the court may put a specific limitation on the custodian's authority if it is in the best interests of the child to do so and fifth, it puts the burden on the moving... proving that



moving the child out of the state is in the child's best interest on that party that is moving out of the state. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz : "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3471 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Go ahead. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'ayes', six 'nos', six recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3472."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3472, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, the Bills in the series with regard to making some corrections and changes in the existing marital dissolution, the work product of the same Subcommittee and Committee. It's supported by the Illinois Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. It does several things. It provides that the .. It adds 'nonmarital property transferred into some form of joint tenancy property' to the list of property that is presumed to be marital property for purposes of distribution under the Marital Dissolution Act. It provides that when one spouse individually holds title to the property the presumption that all property acquired during the marriage is marital property affects the other spouse's interest in the property only in certain limited circumstances. It allows the parties to agree to a modification of the child custody judgment earlier than two years after judgment if the parties agree without the current requirement of showing their.. that there is serious endangerment to the physical, mental, moral or emotional health of the child and that is only if there



is an agreement between the parties. And finally, it retains the best interest of the child's standard as a standard for modification of custody judgments. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Brummer, is this the Bill that deals with alimony and gross?"

Brummer: "No."

Johnson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3472 pass?' 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's 135 'ayes', 11 'nos', five recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3474."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3474, a Bill for an Act creating the Local Government Finance Study Commission and defining its powers and duties, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3474 creates the Local Government Finance Study Commission. That Commission would consist of Members that would be appointed from the House and the Senate and by the Governor of the State of Illinois. The purpose of the Commission would be to study the tax revenue structure of Illinois local governments and school districts and to study methods for the improvement of local government and school district financial management practices. This Bill is recommended by the Governor, and I believe meets any questions that both sides of the aisle have had to this point in time, and I would solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 3474 pass?'. The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins. No, I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Cullerton: "Is there an appropriation with this...to fund the Commission?"

Daniels: "I don't have a separate one myself, Sir."

Cullerton: "Do you have an idea how much it is going to cost?"

Daniels: "No."

Cullerton: "Is it possible it wouldn't cost anything?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Should it therefore be a Subcommittee of the Revenue Committee?"

Daniels: "No."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is...yes or no. The question is on whether House Bill 3474 should pass. 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. Dump the Roll Call. He wanted to explain his vote. Mr. Daniels to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Are you dumping that and starting over again?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well wait. I wanted to put a timer on it first. Alright. The question is whether House Bill 3474 shall pass. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'."

Daniels: "This Bill has been recommended by the administration in connection with the local governments throughout Illinois. The purpose of the study is to look into their financial management structure so that we can determine if any changes should be needed to protect the local government financing structure throughout Illinois. I think the Bill is in good form, and I would suggest we all support this so that we can help our municipalities, Elmer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Let's go...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 49 'nos', 11 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3569."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3569, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker I pass this over to Mr. Dunn. It's really.. the contents of the Bill are his idea."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Daniels: "No, Mr. John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you. I wish I was Ralph sometimes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this House Bill 3569



is now and currently amended. What it does is to provide in guardianship proceedings involving disabled adults where the recommendation of a doctor is required, the physician will not be required to be personally present in court when the proceeding is not contested. The current law requires the physician to be physically and personally present in court in every situation and it seems like a needless requirement when there is no contest. So, a written report will be all that is required should this Bill become law, only in uncontested cases. Where there is a contest, of course, a doctor is subject to being subpoenaed to come into court. Request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I'm reading my analysis and I think maybe there's a switch in the signal. Perhaps you're describing a different Bill than the one that's on the Board or has this been amended and completed amended and it's a new Bill and the Synopsis description has nothing to with it. Why... How... Why did that happen? Why did we have a Bill introduced that does one thing and now we have it doing something entirely different?"

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the question, the Bill is in its present form through the graciousness of the original Sponsor of this legislation. The original thrust and the intent of the legislation involved the impoundment of guardianship files and I think I can say, we, the Sponsor and I, were working on this particular problem. We ran into a situation which may create problems exchanging titles to real estate because of lack of access to records. So that portion of the Bill was amended out and the portion that I'm talking about was left in. The Digest may be incorrect. The Synopsis on the



Bill, the original Bill, would be incorrect and the Bill now is as I indicated, simply a Bill to excuse the physical presence of a doctor in an uncontested hearing."

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

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman yield? In other words, the provision in the original Bill and regarding impoundment is no longer in the Act? Is that correct?"

Dunn: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "So, has there been a problem with this? I know in my county, we routinely when there's no contest appoint a guardian or a conservator on the basis of the medical report. Has there been a..."

Dunn: "That has for many years been the .. been:the routine practice, at least, I presume, all over downstate. And it certainly has been in our area. However, the new guardianship Act does specifically require the physical presence of the doctor at every hearing. And that is a recent Amendment of course and so in the past year or so, when this has come up, the doctors have been required to interrupt their business schedule to come to court on matters that they routinely just send a written report. in, in the past. We're trying to go back to what was formerly the practice."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dunn to close."

Dunn: "I just request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3569 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', no 'nays', one recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3594? What's the problem? Mr. Dunn..."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from... Could you read the Bill and then he can have it..."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3594, a Bill for an Act in relation to small businesses. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape. Don't dump the Roll Call or anything. Mr. Slape, turn him on."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3594 is a comprehensive attempt to give aid to small businesses in the State of Illinois. The Bill is designed specifically for those businesses with less than 500 employees. Currently there are 207,000 businesses firms in the State of Illinois. This legislation applies to all but 800 of these businesses. I would answer any questions. 3594."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Hallock: "What's the approximate cost of this program?"

Slape: "One million, five hundred thousand."

Hallock: "And, whose estimate is that? Who prepared the Fiscal Note on this estimate?"

Slape: "Yeah, that's the amount of the appropriation, going into the Department's budget."

Hallock: "Well, whose estimate is that? Did the Department of Commerce estimate that it would cost 1.5 to do that or is that somebody else's estimate?"

Slape: "That's what the appropriation is going to be for. That's what the Bill... That's going to cover the Bill, 1.5 million."

Hallock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if I can speak to that issue for a second here. At the present time, the Department of Commerce has within its confines



a small business section which in fact, has served the small businessman for the last year and the new Department very well. Without a doubt, there's more that can be done and we intend to do much more in this next coming year. But, by no means will it take 1.5 million dollars to address the problem of small businessmen in our state. I would say to you today this Bill is a rather ludicrous attempt to just pick a number from the air and say that's what they need. 1.5 million dollars to me goes far beyond the needs in our state. This is addressed now in the Department of Commerce already and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, I can't believe the Gentleman just said that 1.5 million exceeds the need of small business in the State of Illinois when we're talking about applying this Bill to 206,200 businesses in the State of Illinois which last year had ... Small business in the United States had a rate of bankruptcy 286% times more than the year before. I'd urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to check the appropriation? And take it out of the record, or what?...."

Slape: "The appropriation is 1.5 million, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay...."

Slape: "The Fiscal Note has been filed."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will. Only to you, Sam."

Vinson: "Does this Bill do anything about the cost of workmen's compensation to small employers?"

Slape: "That problem is addressed to large and small business alike in the State of Illinois. This Bill is aimed specifically to the problems that are just unique to small



business."

Vinson: "Does it do anything about the cost of unemployment insurance for small businessmen?"

Slape: "Once again, that's.... We've already done that in an agreed Bill anyway, Sam. Did you go to lunch or..?"

Vinson: "Wouldn't you say that this Bill is the epitome ... Wouldn't you say that this Bill is the epitome of the philosophy that says, 'I'm from the government and I am here to help you?'"

Slape: "No, Sir. This is a Democratic Bill."

Vinson: "I appreciate the affirmative nature of your answer and I urge a 'no' vote."

Slape: "Maybe we would get more respect in the morning. Let's take it out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 3595."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3595, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Abortion Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3595 changes the definition in the Illinois Abortion Act of the word, 'viability'. No? "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's give the Lady your attention please. Please continue, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Currently the definition of 'viability' uses the words, 'more than momentary survival'. This would change it to 'sustained survival.' So that the definition would read, 'viability means that stage of fetal development when in the medical judgment of the attending physician based on the particular facts of the case before him, there is a reasonable likelihood of sustained survival of the fetus outside the womb with or without artificial support.' The reason for this is that the definition of viability in Senate Bill 47 which we passed last year,



was struck down as vague because of the phrase, 'more than momentary'. And the Supreme Court has said that the preferable phrase would be 'sustained survival'. Because the definition was enjoined, those Sections that used the word, 'viability', were also enjoined. It is necessary therefore, to change the definition in order that the will of this House shall be done with respect to the regulation of abortions. I urge favorable consideration."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be moved?' All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, to close."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Bill is clear, on my explanation, I certainly hope so. And I urge the House pass 3595."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3595 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Vote 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Brummer: "Yes, would the passage of this Bill give more protection to the fetus or less?"

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

Pullen: "It will give more protection because without this Bill, there are many Sections of Senate Bill 47 which have been enjoined. With this Bill, those will be reinstated."

Brummre: "It would... Were they enjoined because it gave too much protection to the fetus?"

Pullen: "They were enjoined because of the use of the word, 'viability', and that definition, having been struck because of the use of the phrase, 'more than momentary



survival'."

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

Johnson: "Let it go. No, I don't want to explain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'ayes', no 'nays', 20 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3600? Take it out.. Take it out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 3146, Mr. Dunn? The Gentleman from McLean. Mr. Bradley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House stand adjourned till nine o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You weren't recognized for that. 3146."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3146..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Dunn on the floor? Out of the record. House Bill 3238, Mr. Flinn? House Bill 3238. Oh, it was tabled this morning. House Bill 3430. "

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3430..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 3513, same request, Sir? Read the Bill."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3513. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is intended to establish clear definitions of what is taxable and nontaxable property in Illinois. That is to say, what is personal property and what is real property? Prior to the abolition of the Corporate Personal Property Taxes last year, such definition was really not needed. Due to the change though in Illinois law, the matter needs to be addressed. The establishment of statutory definitions will be a positive action because it will clear up gray areas and remove uncertainty over future assessments. This Bill has been amended to remove some of the most objectionable parts on the other side of the aisle and to keep this legislation from causing any major reclassification of property at the local level. We need to have this legislation to avoid double taxation of business in Illinois because of the Personal Property Replacement Tax. We also need this to help aid our ailing business climate. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Unfortunately, I'm without a copy of the Bill but I did have..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get right back to you then. Why don't you get a copy?"

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

Dunn: "I've got it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mugalian."



Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor tell me when this Bill was drafted?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "I...I don't know when it was drafted. It was drafted and then went to Committee before the deadline."

Mugalian: "No, no. Who drafted the Bill?"

Ewing: "Well, I suppose the Reference Bureau drafted the Bill."

Mugalian: "By whose request?"

Ewing: "Well, I think it was requested by several groups in the State of Illinois, probably one, the Chamber of Commerce, the Taxpayers Federation are both big supporters of this Bill."

Mugalian: "Can you give me an idea as to the date which this thing was put together?"

Ewing: "I cannot."

Mugalian: "Well, what this Bill does is...is attempt to define personal property and also define real estate, which if it were not done very carefully could have a tremendous impact on all our local governments. Isn't that correct?"

Ewing: "Yes, this has been done very carefully."

Mugalian: "Well who did it and when?"

Ewing: "I don't think whether it was done carefully has anything to do with when it was drafted, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "All right. Well, as I understand it, this was done so carefully...this is a question...that it virtually eliminated from real estate assessment large manufacturing plants?"

Ewing: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Shame. Please continue, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, that's a question. He amend...the Bill was amended..."



Ewing: "Mr. Mugalian, have you..."

Mugalian: "...to eliminate lines six through ten. I..."

Ewing: "...read the Amendment. Have you read the Amendment?"

Mugalian: "I read that Amendment which apparently corrected the original draft which was so carefully drafted that would virtually exclude all large manufacturing plants from real assess...real estate assessment. Has this Bill been commented on or had any hearings before real estate assessors or bar associations?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Representative Mugalian, this Bill had the same hearing before the Revenue Committee that many other very important and far reaching Bills have had in this Session. And I don't think...."

Mugalian: "That scares the hell out of me...if that's the only hearing it had. I happen to be a Member of the Revenue Committee and if...if it had no better hearing than some of the Bills, I would suggest that we don't know what we're voting on and that perhaps the Sponsor doesn't know the effect. But, have any assessors commented on this Bill? They have to work with it, isn't...is not that..."

Ewing: "I have had no comment from any assessors."

Mugalian: "Well, may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mugalian: "I don't think that it's necessary to tell the Members of this House that we are dealing with dynamite here. If...I'm not sure what this Bill will do, that's why it's so important, Ladies and Gentlemen. In its original form, it would have eliminated, as I read it, all large manufacturing plants. If you'll look at line six to ten on page four, now that was done with some care, presumably. But the last part of the Bill also says, where we haven't made it completely clear, everything else is going to be



considered to be personal property. We are, therefore, taking the chance that the City of Chicago and your town and your school district may lose from one-fifth to one-half or maybe seven-tenths of its entire real estate assessment. Now I'm not saying this to be inflammatory, I'm really very concerned about this Bill and concerned that no assessor has been asked, what does this mean to you, what does that provision mean to you and so forth. As I understand it, this Bill still takes off the real estate tax rolls permanently...all major utility installations. And the Sponsor shakes his head and if he tells me that was amended out, that's again additional cause for great, great concern. As I read this Bill, it will probably exclude nuclear power plants and probably exclude from real estate assessment, petroleum fractionating plants. Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge you not to pass this Bill today. I think you would be...it should be studied. But the definition of real estate has still not been settled upon by the courts of Illinois when it comes to questions of fixtures for two hundred years. And I think for us to try to do it with a Bill that had maybe a twenty minute hearing in Revenue and barely got enough votes to get out would be foolhardy."

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the previous Speaker is...is right on point. I did talk with the Taxpayers Federation and the State Chamber of Commerce just today about this Bill because in reading the Bill I was alarmed ...as the previous Speaker is. The illustration which came to my mind is what impact will this particular piece of legislation have, for example, upon a blast



furnace in a steel mill? This particular piece of legislation, as I read it, says that machinery, equipment and furniture and fixtures relating to the business use of the premises are not buildings or structural components and that means that they will not be taxable. So if you had, for example, in your district a steel mill with a blast furnace in it, and everyone in here knows that something like a blast furnace is certainly a fixture part of the real estate, previously that would have been assessed and taxed... or should have been assessed and taxed as part of the real estate. This Bill, as I read it now, would remove...would remove that piece of equipment and it would not longer be part of the real estate, no longer be an item subject to tax. I raised this example with the State Chamber of Commerce and the Taxpayers Federation and they conceded that the argument is...is a good one. They say that by taking out line six to ten on page four they have improved the Bill but they do concede that if this Bill passes they do not know what will be removed from the real estate tax rolls and they do not know how much it will cost. And I suggest to the Members of the Assembly that everything that is removed from the real estate tax rolls by this legislation will be a direct loss to every unit of local government, every unit of local government represented by you in here. I think the previous Speaker is exactly right. We may need to have some legislation like this, but only after it has been properly studied by a Committee or a Commission with input from everyone affected, from the Bar Association, from the assessors, from the public, from the Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Manufacturers, from the Taxpayers Federation and everyone who has something to say about this matter. But not now, it's too soon and



I urge at least a 'present' vote, certainly not passage of this legislation at this time."

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

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

McPike: "Tom, following up on what he said, did you remove the...the language on page four completely, line six through eleven?"

Ewing: "Six through ten."

McPike: "Okay, on...on down the same page, I wonder if you could..."

Ewing: "That's right, six through eleven."

McPike: "Six through eleven, okay. On down on the same page, I wonder if you could explain to me line twenty-one where it says...you go through a whole list of things here such as walls, partitions, windows, a heating system, electrical wiring, elevators, escalators, chair...stairs, etc. You go through a whole list of things and say that they are structural components and then starting on line...the end of line twenty, you say, but only to the extent that the above mentioned components relate solely to the operation and maintenance of the building and not to the business use being made of the premises. Could you...could you explain to me what those lines mean, twenty through twenty-two?"

Ewing: "Yes, I believe that those lines mean that if you have a lot of extra wiring or extra things added to the basic building structure because of the type of business that you're conducting there that they will not be part of the structure. The normal, ordinary parts of the building will be part of the structure or the real estate."

McPike: "Do you mean an elevator that's being used to take people up to their office space is...is or is not going



to be real property?"

Ewing: "Would you repeat that?"

McPike: "An elevator that takes the employees up to their office space, is that elevator going to be real property or not?"

Ewing: "I don't think so."

McPike: "It's not going to be real property?"

Ewing: "No. That would be my interpretation, it would not."

McPike: "So...and the same thing with an escalator or a fire escape or the electrical wiring that would...that would be in an office space would not be a part of the structure, part of the building?"

Ewing: "It would not be unless it was necessary for some specific purpose besides the general purpose of an office building."

McPike: "Okay, well thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker, just to the Bill then. It really is very difficult to say how much will be removed from the local tax base by this Bill, but there's no doubt that there's going to be a substantial. This is probably the Christmas package that the Chamber of Commerce has been looking for for some time because it really does destroy the tax base of local government. What we have always considered to be real property is now going to be personal property. And everything that was a grey area before is...there's no...will not be a grey area now, but in no case was that grey area decided in favor of real property. In every single case, what was a grey area before will now be personal property and, therefore, not subject to tax. Not only will it not be subject to a tax but it will be removed from the tax roles. So that...we have had...a...a large nuclear generator or a blast furnace on the tax roles for...for thirty years, as of...as of the effective date of this, or as of January 1, 1981, that



will be removed from the local tax roll. It's...it is difficult to estimate what..what it will do but it could possibly remove up to, I would just guess, fifty percent of the tax base for industry could be removed from the tax rolls from this. It's really a rape of local government, cities, municipalities and school districts. It destroys all tax base they have and it really leaves the burden of paying taxes on individual homeowners. It's a terrible Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at different times I've told people in my district with regard to the keeping of the present system of how we elect Members to the House and the cumulative voting system, that we have certain people who, just by their presence, save the taxpayers a lot of money. And I did, in my district, point out to Rich Mugalian on a Bill that we had last year and now again Rich Mugalian has shown to me, and he alerted me to this Bill, he alone has shown to me the reason why we must keep cumulative voting. That he can save the taxpayers' monies just by being alerted to Bills like this. This is a rape of the taxpayers. This is a rip-off where the corporations have written a Bill for their own good. I remember a few terms back where former Representative Jack Hill, then...and now the Mayor of Aurora, on the floor of the House said, you know, I wonder who the contributors to the taxpayers Federation are. Because at that time there was a Bill that really didn't help taxpayers. And now I recall that speech of Jack Hill's. And we try to get the taxpayers' Federation to come forward, to let us know who really backed them up. And when they tie themselves up to a Bill like this, I wonder again. Who do they really represent? Because they surely



don't represent the homeowner, the little taxpayer. The is the worst Bill of the Session, believe me, and I don't think there ought to be a vote for it because you are not voting for the little taxpayer. Now yesterday...earlier this week, we put Terzich's revision Bill in Interim Study. And the reasoning was that the Committee of this Legislature had not gone over carefully those revision Bills. If anything ought to be in Interim Study Calendar, it's this Bill. Because it is dangerous and the Committee has not looked it over and it will hurt taxpayers. You know what I said you did to my district with the Bill that Ginny Frederick and I and Ron Griesheimer are trying now...to get back to the old law, if this Bill passes you're going to wipe us out completely. I urge the Membership to vote 'no'. And thank Dick Mugalian come...coming back off his sick bed to alert us to this."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The definition of real property is land and anything that's attached to it. Clearly, the provisions in Mr. Ewing's Bill applies in the principles of real estate 101."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now to real estate 102. Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Digest indicates that Representative Skinner had requested a fiscal note to be filed? Has there been a fiscal note filed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The note has been filed."

Cullerton: "All right. Could the Sponsor indicate to me what that fiscal note says?"

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

Ewing: "Yes, in part, the fiscal note said that they weren't able to determine what the effect was in dollars. It gives no dollar amount. It's about a full page if you would like to go down and look at it, I have a copy



here."

Cullerton: "Who...who wrote that fiscal note?"

Ewing: "J. Thomas Johnson, the Assistant Director of the Department of Revenue. That's the department most affected. I think that's the rule of this House we follow sometimes."

Cullerton: "And his answer was that he didn't know the answer to how much it would cost?"

Ewing: "He said he couldn't say, right."

Cullerton: "Do you have any idea whether or not it will save money or cost money to local government?"

Ewing: "As it's amended, we do not anticipate that there will be anywhere near the amount of shift or affect that some of the people on the other...on your side of the aisle have predicted."

Cullerton: "But there will be some?"

Ewing: "That's very difficult to tell. But there probably will be some shifting, there may be some added... property added to the tax role."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to close."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am positive that this is not the worst Bill of the year. There is no..."

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

Brummer: "Yes, I'm not acquainted with the details of the



Fiscal Note Act but I thought one of the provisions and reasons for the fiscal note...provisions were that we would know what the fiscal note and the fiscal impact was prior to voting on this. All we have here in this instance is the Sponsor waving a sheet of paper and saying it's over a page long. I really think in fairness we ought to have the fiscal note read to us so that at least we can make our own interpretation of what the fiscal note of the...of the Director says. I, quite frankly, don't have the slightest idea what's in it. Usually when we have a fiscal note, we say, well it's five million dollars or fifty million dollars or whatever. I...and that's a relatively simple explanation. Apparently, that simple explanation isn't available here. And I do think, in fairness to the Members, we are entitled to a complete reading of the fiscal note prior to being required to vote on this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Brummer, I'm sure with the outcome of this Bill, we will finally get a fiscal note eventually."

Brummer: "Well, I would like to have the fiscal note read and I...I feel that we're entitled to know what the fiscal note says."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Read the fiscal note, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Fiscal Note, House Bill 3513 as amended. House Bill 3513 amends the Revenue Act of 1939 to define by statute the meaning of real property, excluding from such definition, among other things, machinery, equipment, fixtures and structural components to the extent that such components do not relate solely to the operation and maintenance of a building, but instead relate to the business use of the premises. Fixtures, machineries, equipment and structural components listed on page four of the Bill



are at present considered to be real estate for property tax purposes. We do not believe the inclusion of machinery and equipment in real estate assessments to be widespread. Therefore, exclusion of machinery and equipment would not substantially affect the present property tax base of most units of local government. We believe that the exclusion of fixtures and certain structural components as noted above would adversely affect the real state tax base from most units of local government. However, we do not have sufficient information to qualify the portion of present real estate assessments attributed to these items. Signed, J. Thomas Johnson, Assistant Director of Revenue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, based upon that fiscal note, the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, again, I started this entire thing by saying that I'm not well acquainted with the details of the Fiscal Note Act. But I thought that the purpose of this was to...to give us a dollar...at least a solid dollar estimate of what the cost was. And I would question that this is a proper fiscal note...in light of the fact that there are no dollar statement in it. I really don't have the slightest idea...I was just handed the fiscal note. I heard the Clerk read it and I still don't know what the dollar impact of that is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, I believe you should really address yourself to the last paragraph because it's very important as far as the statement from the Department of Revenue. It says that, 'We believe that the exclusion of fixtures and certain structural components as noted above would adversely affect the real estate tax base for most units of local governments'. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, on the fiscal



note. Here you go, Tony."

Mautino: "My question, Speaker, was not on the fiscal note.

It was on line twenty-four of the Bill that makes a building not a building. I happen to have a building..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mautino: "My question to the Sponsor is that, how can a building not be a building? I have a building that houses twelve trucks. Are you telling me it's not a building? You have a...do you..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute."

Mautino: "Do you have a problem answering a very simple question, Representative? When is a building not a building?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mautino, we'll get to that point in a minute. Mr. Brummer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like a ruling of the Chair as to whether or not the fiscal note that is filed, as filed, complies with the requirements of the Fiscal Note Act."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The fiscal...would the Parliamentarian come back to the floor, please? Would you kindly review the fiscal note and see if it complies with the statutes of the State of Illinois? Mr. Ewing, do you want to answer Mr. Mautino's question in the process? Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Ewing: "I don't mind answering Mr. Mautino's question. But on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Ewing: "They had...and we have moved the previous question, you ruled it. This Bill is on Third Reading. The fiscal note has been filed. You have ruled...and yourself in that Chair...some rather wild rulings on



fiscal notes, and now because you have editorialized in that Chair, you would like to hold this Bill up. Well, Mr. Speaker, I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'd never do that."

Ewing: "...would like to finish. I had the floor when I was interrupted. And I believe that I have the right to finish in closing on this Bill. Everybody has the right to vote their conscience when I'm done."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, wait a minute. There's a question as far as whether the fiscal note is germane or not. And until I get an answer from the Parliamentarian, then you'll be able to close, Sir. The question is whether it's adequate, I'm sorry. I'll be with you in one second, as soon as the Parliamentarian gives me the...interpretation. He'll be okay. The minute that the...I answer the question...the Gentleman's question I'll get to you. Surely, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "What provision in the rules allows a question to come as to the validity of a fiscal note on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "In answer to Mr. Brummer's request, the fiscal note is properly submitted and is in order. As to the accuracy or correctness of the fiscal note, the Chair does not rule on such questions. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to close."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that this legislation is very important. I represent many local governments and I don't wish to injure them in any way. But I would hope that the other side of the aisle would consider legislation in this area and pass something before we have allowed all of the former personal property to be transferred to real estate and to double tax business in this state. Go



home and talk to the people that are out of work, see if they need jobs, see what the problems are. The ~~accusations~~ were wildly made on this Bill. They were wildly made without any consideration for the Amendments that were put on this Bill. It's difficult to understand how any Representative can get up and debate a Bill without any consideration to very substantial Amendments. Mr. Speaker, to save the time of this House, I'd ask to have it taken out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record, request of the Sponsor. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevidch, on the motion."

Matijevidch: "Is that on 3350?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "3350, right."

Matijevidch: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to .. and ask leave to use the Attendance Roll Call, to discharge Committee... this is.. 3350 is a Chain Lakes Commission Bill. Inadvertantly no one knew that it was introduced a day late and it was heard in Committee and nobody knew. It was supposed to come out of Rules Committee. So we had it back up to Rules Committee , reported it out and this is just a procedural thing to get everything back on track. This Bill is actually on the Calendar, but we have to do it legally. So I'd ask leave and use the Attendance Roll Call. We cleared this with everybody, Art." Well, I cleared it with your guy, I think it was 'Gonet' or whoever."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we just take it out of the record.."

Matijevidch: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And then we'll talk..."

Matijevidch: "If you want to play games, we'll play games. You know we can do that too, George."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor?"



On House Bill 2220. It's on Postponed Consideration.
Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to have leave of the House to return House Bill 2220 back to Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none... Objections have been raised."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend the appropriate rule in order to have House Bill 2220 returned to Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Will the motions.. Gentleman's motion prevail?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Takes 89 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "I request a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's request is in order. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. And Mr. Taylor asks for a poll of the absentees. Kindly record Mr. Bradley as 'aye'. Kindly record Mr. Beatty as 'aye'. Proceed to call the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Ackerman. Bianco. Bluthardt. Bower. Campbell. Capuzi. Daniels. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hoffman. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Neff. Oblinger. Peters. Polk. Reilly. Robbins. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Telcser. Tuerk. Vinson. Walsh. Watson. Willer. Williams. ... "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Williams as 'aye'. And Polk as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees: Winchester. And, J.J. Wolf."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. J.J. Wolf is 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Macdonald from 'aye' to 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 94 'aye' and 38 'no'. Has there been a request for a verification? Well, I can see from here that we should dump the Roll Call. Dump the Roll Call. Any... Representative Taylor, is this your Bill? We dumped the Roll Call on it. It looked to me like we were a little late."

Taylor: "Well, I think we are and I think that the few people right on the other side of the aisle at this particular moment.. and I wish we would take this out of the record until we get some time to discuss all the matters of House Bill 2220."

Speaker Redmond: "So, out of the record. Have we called 3019? On the Order of Third Reading, 3019. Where is it? Representative Flinn?"

Flinn: "That Bill's on Second Reading. I have an Amendment to put on." "On the first page."

Speaker Redmond: "That your Bill?"

Flinn: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "It's an appropriation Bill. You don't have to do anything with it."

Flinn: "Well, I would like to get that thing done..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, what do you want to do with it?"

Flinn: "I want to put an Amendment on it right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let's try it and see what happens."

Flinn: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Second Reading. Well, I looked for it on Third and I didn't find it. I looked on page two and it's the third one down. It's in dark print. That means appropriation. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3019, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the St. Louis metropolitan area airport



authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn? What did you say?"

Is there any motion filed with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor? "

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Flinn, amends House Bill 3019 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn : "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 to House Bill 3019

puts it back in its original form. And all I'm asking for is that my Bill be put back like it was originally and I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman is bringing to the floor an argument that .. or a measure that has been before this Body for many years. And that is, how are we going to fund or are we going to fund this airport authority in St. Louis? Or East St. Louis or Belleville or wherever it is. Time and time again..."

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

Slape: "Point of order. I don't think the Gentleman is speaking to the Amendment, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're right. Confine your remarks to the Amendment."

Totten: "I think. He's asking for funding for the whole thing. So this is.. The Amendment is the whole appropriation, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What is your... What is your..."

Totten: "I will continue."

Speaker Redmond: "Continue."

Totten: "Not only has this airport authority been before us before, and we have appropriated money before for it, but for years the proponents of this authority in the area



have come before us with new ways to continue funding for something that has been a rat hole for this state for years. Now, there are many Members and even if Rosco Cunningham were here today, he finally changed his mind, that this is a rat hole. And the Appropriations I Committee recognized that the state had been wasting dollars for years and moved the appropriation down in Amendment #1 from \$192,000 to nine dollars. And, that is where the Committee thought it ought to be, that is where many Members of this House think it ought to be, in fact, it may be too much. But for the number of years that we have.. that we have funded this authority and have received nothing in return, it has been the biggest waste of state money that this General Assembly has seen in years. The Member who brings Amendment #2 before us I'm sure does so in good conscience, but those of us who are responsible for the taxpayers dollar must act in good conscience also and that would tell us that this Amendment is out of order, to restore the money and to increase the appropriation to \$192,000. This Amendment would be \$192,000 increase in the appropriation and I would ask for its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I respect Representative Totten very much, but he spoke on the Bill as if it were on Third Reading. We are not seeking final passage. All I've asked the House to do is put the Bill back in the shape it originally was. I was unable to attend the Committee meeting and they reduced the appropriation from \$192,000 down to nine dollars. I would a lot rather them said, 'Kill the Bill in the Committee.' It's really an insult to do such a thing. But now that it is passed, I'm asking that the Bill be put back in its original shape and when it gets ready for Third Reading next week, we will hear it on its merits. "



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I probably will lose some votes for my position on this matter, but I've lost a few before, and I'm not going to worry too much about that. The truth about the money is.. we're talking about.. The appropriat... The purpose of the Appropriations Committee is to decide how much money each Department or each faction is entitled to. We decided they were entitled to nine dollars. Now, so that's what we talking about the Amendment here. So what is this additional money going to be used for? Well, I'll tell you. Forty thousand dollars is going down the drain, all in one chunck for a guy by the name of 'Reeves' who the biggest beneficiary of this whole thing. Now this has been going on for ten years or so. They've spent four million dollars just for this guy to ride around. They could build an airport with that or we could have with state money. So, all we're going to do everytime he comes to the Committee and says, 'Just one more time, if we just had one more year, we'd have an airport.' I'm for building an airport on the east side. But I'm getting tired of paying this guy just to ride around on state money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the saying goes, 'Enough is enough.' We've debated this issue before and we've always given them the money and actually we've given them nine dollars too much. You got nine dollars, Monroe. You ought to leave it at that, because you don't deserve anything. Now, the reason we gave you nine dollars was that there is a possibility that the Flying Tigers may come in which I doubt very seriously and we thought that is a viable way of keeping that alive. So, we don't have to keep that Gentleman alive. The taxpayers don't have to keep



him alive. Now, there's a women up in the gallery that's been here everyday, everyday because of this issue in her area and I'll tell you, they could sit around the whole gallery, these people who are home owners in that aarea, who know that this has been a rip off through the years. We've wasted enough. Enough is enough. Vote against this Amendment and let Monroe keep his nine dollars and leave it go at that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I know I'm delaying us from adjourning, I know we're ready to adjourn, and I'm the last guy in the world to do that, but had I been at the Committee, I would say to Representative Matijevich and I have a lot of respect for him, I would have told what he could have done with his nine dollars. If I'd been a Gentleman, I would have told him in a nice way. But I would like to take this out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm making this motion on behalf of Representative Kane, who's the Chairman of the State Government Organization Committee. I think it's been cleared by both sides of the aisle. We need consent to use the Attendance Roll Call to waive the posting requirement for a meeting tomorrow morning in C-1 a half hour before adjournment.. I mean before convening of the House and next Tuesday one hour before Session also in C-1. "

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion for the waiving of the posting rule. May he use the Attendance Roll Call? Leave. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Any announcements? Representative VonBoeckman. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Motor Vehicles Law Commission tomorrow morning at ten o'clock is having on display west of the capital building a high mileage vehicle that gets about 90 miles to a gallon. Those who would be interested in



stopping by and seeing it, we'd appreciate it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn. Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to commit House Bill 3146 to the Interim Study Calendar of the House Revenue Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is leave granted? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Anything further? Any other announcements? Representative Madigan?" Nine o'clock."

Madigan: "Providing five minutes for a perfunctory Session, I-move that we adjourn till nine a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. House will stand adjourned after five minutes perfunct till nine o'clock tomorrow morning."

Clerk Leone: "First Reading, Senate Bills, Senate Bill 1518, a Bill for an Act . Woodyard, a Bill for an Act to eliminate certain occupation and use taxes on gasohol. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1759, Bowman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1818, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to establish a motor vehicle emmissions inspection and maintenance program. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1832, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retailers Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Messages from the Senate; Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following title and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bill 1457, 1500, 1559, 1578, 1606, 1618, 1626, 1631, 1636, 1637, 1614, pardon me. It's 1640, 1643, 1662, 1665, 1666, 1678. Passed by the Senate May 22nd, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform



the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills with the following titles and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives; to wit: Senate Bill 1771, 1773, 1810, 1812, 1827, 1884, 1933, 1946, 1957, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 2000, passed by the Senate May 22nd, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Having no further business, the House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 22, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-1295	TABLED	PAGE	50
HB-1525	MOTIONS	PAGE	50
HB-1572	3RD READING	PAGE	52
HB-2051	3RD READING	PAGE	75
	MOTIONS	PAGE	91
HB-2220	MOTIONS	PAGE	251
HB-2520	3RD READING	PAGE	67
HB-2731	3RD READING	PAGE	7
HB-2762	3RD READING	PAGE	37
HB-2768	3RD READING	PAGE	90
	3RD READING	PAGE	92
HB-2824	3RD READING	PAGE	105
HB-2841	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-2845	3RD READING	PAGE	115
HB-2846	3RD READING	PAGE	129
HB-2918	3RD READING	PAGE	35
HB-2932	3RD READING	PAGE	6
HB-2941	3RD READING	PAGE	138
HB-2960	3RD READING	PAGE	17
HB-2962	3RD READING	PAGE	148
HB-2985	3RD READING	PAGE	19
HB-2994	3RD READING	PAGE	26
HB-3007	3RD READING	PAGE	13
HB-3019	2ND READING	PAGE	252
HB-3154	3RD READING	PAGE	142
HB-3173	3RD READING	PAGE	143
HB-3184	3RD READING	PAGE	152
	MOTIONS	PAGE	165
HB-3195	3RD READING	PAGE	7
HB-3196	3RD READING	PAGE	42
HB-3198	3RD READING	PAGE	165
HB-3206	3RD READING	PAGE	55
HB-3207	3RD READING	PAGE	173
HB-3211	3RD READING	PAGE	14
	3RD READING	PAGE	184
	3RD READING	PAGE	181
HB-3230	3RD READING	PAGE	179
HB-3238	TABLED	PAGE	50
HB-3271	3RD READING	PAGE	65
HB-3291	3RD READING	PAGE	182
HB-3358	3RD READING	PAGE	187
HB-3365	3RD READING	PAGE	200
HB-3366	3RD READING	PAGE	200

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 22, 1980

PAGE 2

	MOTIONS	PAGE	200
HB-3383	3RD READING	PAGE	10
HB-3406	3RD READING	PAGE	204
HB-3421	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HB-3465	3RD READING	PAGE	210
HB-3469	3RD READING	PAGE	220
HB-3470	3RD READING	PAGE	222
HB-3471	3RD READING	PAGE	224
HB-3472	3RD READING	PAGE	225
HB-3474	3RD READING	PAGE	227
HB-3491	3RD READING	PAGE	5
HB-3513	3RD READING	PAGE	236
HB-3540	3RD READING	PAGE	13
HB-3569	3RD READING	PAGE	228
HB-3594	3RD READING	PAGE	230
HB-3595	3RD READING	PAGE	233
SB-1497	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1518	1ST READING	PAGE	257
SB-1538	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1609	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1612	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1614	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1619	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1621	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1629	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1635	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1638	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1639	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1664	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1677	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1694	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1739	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1740	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1759	1ST READING	PAGE	257
SB-1818	1ST READING	PAGE	257
SB-1832	1ST READING	PAGE	257

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 22, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND-HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
REV. KREUGER-PRAYER	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	34
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	34
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	34
ANNOUNCEMENTS	PAGE	256
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	257
HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED	PAGE	258