

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

Rev. Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. It is written in the tenth verse of the forty-first chapter of the Book of Isaiah, 'Fear not for I am with you; be not dismayed, for I am your God. I will strengthen you, I will help you, I will uphold you with my victorious right hand.' Let us pray. Almighty God, we give praise to Thee this day for all the gracious gifts and loving care that Thou hast bestowed upon us. We are grateful for the opportunity to be of service to the citizens of this State of Illinois as we embrace our responsibilities as Members of this House of Representatives. We ask for an abundance of Thy grace, O Lord, that we may have the strength and stamina to meet the cumbrous schedules before us, that so aided we may effect only that which is of good and lasting value and consistent with propitious legislation through Jesus Christ, Our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Your own... your switch only. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. No, we're going to wait for that. Okay. Mr. Clerk... you weren't at your desk. Well, that's too bad. Nope. Nope, supposed to be at your desk. Nobody else can depress your switch. Representative Macdonald is welcome. Well, we'll listen. That's the priority of call list, those that are here at ten o'clock, nine thirty. You weren't in your seat. My memory's pretty good, yeah. Well you were here for awhile, but you weren't here when your Bill was reached a couple of times. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "There are three publications on your desks this morning: the priority of call for the day,



the no debate list in both a short form and a long form. They're on all Members desks this morning. Notice to the public, there are lists of the no debate form available in the Bill Room on the first come, first served basis. Also, priority of calls available in the Bill Room on a first come, first served basis to the public."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, a question regarding the long form of the no debate list. We... it was pointed out yesterday that we were amending Bills on the floor yesterday that were... have been placed on the no debate list as of two p.m. My question is, is this list sufficiently current as to indicate any Amendments which were adopted through the close of business yesterday?"

Speaker Redmond: "All Amendments are included."

Bowman: "Up through eight p.m. yesterday?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's what I'm advised. Everything."

Bowman: "Everything, okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you ought to thank the Clerk."

Bowman: "Yes, by the way, I think we should because this is an enormous task. I served on the Legislative Information System and I know that those people have been working pretty hard over in the Stratton Building, too. And I just wanted to point out to the House that the Appropriation Bills the Legislative Information Systems is going to be coming out very shortly and this is precisely the kind of work that we do demand and expect of them and receive from them. And I think they all deserve our thanks."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I agree. I think it's LIS and the Reference Bureau and the Clerk's Office... two o'clock this morning. Reading of the Journal. I think they've done a superb job."

Bowman: "The only thing that upsets me is they look more fresh and alert than we do. I don't know how they



manage to work till two o'clock at night and still do that, but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, when I was a freshman in college our English professor said, 'Hard work never really did you in, it's what you do when you're not working that gets you into trouble.' Representative Boucek."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the Forty-First Legislative..."

Boucek: "Speaker, to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "To Representative Bowman, the answer is there's a difference between working and carousing."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you explain the difference?"

Boucek: "Well, working you keep your mind on everything. You're doing a job and you know you're accomplishing something. Carousing, you never know what you're accomplishing."

Speaker Redmond: "Most of the Members only are familiar with work, so will you explain the difference, Representative Boucek? Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the Forty-First Legislative Day. The House met pursuant to adjournment, Speaker in the Chair, Prayer by Father William Krueger, Chaplain, Representative Ropp led the House in the pledge of allegiance, by direction of the Speaker a Roll Call was taken to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi,"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journal #41 of May 3rd, Journal 42 of May 4th, Journal 43 of May 8th, Journal 44 of May 9th, Journal 45 of May 10th, Journal 46 of May 11th, Journal 47 of May 15th and Journal 48 of May 16th, 1979 be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Journals are approved."



Giorgi: "How about the Agreed Resolutions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. Representative Mugalian, will you come up here a minute please? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 305, Mahar. 306, Van Duyne. 309, McCourt. 310, Johnson. House Joint Resolution 57, Bullock-Taylor. Senate Joint Resolution 50, Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 305 recognizes Mary Burns. Van Duyne's 306 honors the National Grain Board. 309 by McCourt, a fiftieth wedding anniversary. 310 by Johnson, the Mohomet-Seymour High School. And 57, House Joint Resolution 57 by Bullock and Taylor honors the 100th anniversary of Holy Angels Parish. And House Joint Resolution by... 50 by Lechowicz... I don't have it on my desk but I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "What does House Resolution 50 do, Representative Giorgi?"

Clerk O'Brien: "That's Senate Joint Resolution."

Ryan: "What does it do?"

Giorgi: "It honors the Archbishop of Greece. Greek Orthodox Church."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the... Representative Ryan? Question's on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. What page?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day, page 44 on your Calendar. House Bill 1355, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I look around I'm distressed that we don't have a better membership. I believe we do have a quorum, but those of us who have taken... that have gone to the trouble of getting here promptly so we can conduct the business of the House, I think deserves some extra consideration. And so to provide for that and also to encourage those people who may still be over in the State Office Building who are listening over their, the public address system, I'd like to make a motion at this time, Mr. Speaker, that we suspend the appropriate rule to allow you to roam the Calendar and take Bills in any order, to call Bills on the Calendar for the benefit of those people who are here, those Sponsors who are here on the floor who want their Bills called and... and up until the hour of 10:30. And at 10:30, we would then revert to the regular order of call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on Representative Bowman's motion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, we've been waiting for you to call House Bill 1801 on Short Debate, Second Reading for about two weeks now. We've passed it once because Representative Barnes wasn't here and I'm not sure I trust you with that much discretion at this point."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm at least as trustworthy as you are."

Skinner: "That could be."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to Representative Bowman's motion? Representative Friedrich."

D. Friedrich: "Well, I just want to ask if you're here if your Bill's going to be called or are you just going to roam around and pick out the ones you want?"

Speaker Redmond, "Well, just the people that are here."

D. Friedrich: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Just the ones that are here. Hearing



no objection... well, we'll take a Roll Call then. I guess we'd better have a Roll Call for attendance first. No... well, we're going to have another one now. Roll Call for attendance. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Now the question is on Representative Bowman's motion that... the provisions of Rule 37 be suspended until 10:30... permit me to call Bills of Members that are here. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Until what time?"

Speaker Redmond: "10:30 today."

Ryan: "Why don't you do that until 10 o'clock? Amend the motion to read ten o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's doesn't give you very much latitude. The average passage is about six to seven an hour."

Ryan: "Well, it gives us enough time, maybe we can have everybody here or more people here. You know, in another twenty minutes you could probably have more people here."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let's try it with 10:30 and see what happens."

Ryan: "Well, I object to 10:30, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're going to put the motion and we'll see how the count is then."

Ryan: "I just wanted to amend it to 10 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "10:15. Do you object to 10:15?"

Ryan: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll try it at 10, the motion is 10:30. Question's on the motion. Those in favor of Representative Bowman's motion that the provisions of Rule 37 be suspended to permit the Speaker to call the Member's... Bills of Members that are present without regard to the status on the Calendar. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Speaker, I'll withdraw my... objection."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I hear you've... the voice of reason has prevailed. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no' on Representative Bowman's motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question there's 107 'aye' and 5 'no' and the motion prevails. Now, it is suggested by the Parliamentarian that the Members who have Bills toward the back of the list, call it to my attention because those are the ones that are in trouble, the ones that are early on priority we'll probably reach all that. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Bills that are on the no debate list. If they are knocked off and we go to the regular Calendar, but they might get... I've got a Bill on there, for example, that is the second Bill on the priority or third Bill on the priority of call list. Now if we go past that..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll that that one. The idea of this really is to try to help the Members who might not otherwise be reached."

Kempiners: "No, I understand that. But you will..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll get to... if you're worried about 2097, we'll get there."

Kempiners: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a Bill that's necessary to the ordinary operation of government. It's House Bill 1501."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it? Where is it?"

Leinenweber: "It's on the priority of call somewhere."

Speaker Redmond: "That's very helpful. That's on no debate list, too."

Leinenweber: "I know but it might not be."

Speaker Redmond: "1039, where is it? You've got to tell me where it is. Okay. 1039. Representative Ryan."



Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, will you let the record show that Representative Kent is absent today due to an illness in the family?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record will so show. Is there any Democrats whose absence should be excused? We'll get back to that one later. 1039."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1039. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1039 amends the Illinois Condominium Property Act. It was heard in Judiciary Committee three times as a matter of fact and was not opposed by the real estate interests after an Amendment was made to the Bill which deleted the warranty requirement that was in its original form. In its present form, House Bill 1039 requires disclosure of existence of the court condominium form of ownership, provides guidelines about structural elements and requires additional financial disclosures about bi-developers in a conversion condominium. It is consistent with the Uniform Condominium Property Act and was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee and I respectfully request your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye' and 12 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1541. Representative Getty, for what purpose do you rise?"

Getty: "Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think there was a Bill on Consent Calendar that was read



a third time. Then there was a motion that was inter-
vened. We didn't vote on it: "I just wanted to be
sure we wouldn't forget it."

Speaker Redmond: "I won't forget it. You think... Senate
Bill?"

Getty: "It was House Bill 1355."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 1355, I won't forget that one.
1541."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1541. A Bill for an Act to
amend Sections of an Act to provide for the organiza-
tion and maintenance of the University of Illinois.
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff. Hurry up, hurry
up."

Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, 1541 is a Bill which will permit the University
of Illinois to act as a self-insurer. The reason for
this is they have been able to do so and they're
saving somewhere around a million, million and a half
dollars a year by doing so. There was some previous
opposition from the Department of Administrative
Services and they... or the Auditor General has
basically withdrawn his objection. I do have an
Amendment which due to the timing of this was not
brought back to Second. We'll put it on on Third
Reading or we'll put it on in the Senate which would
give them a three year moratorium. And if something
cannot be worked out or it can be worked out between
the Department of Administrative Services and the
University to solve the problem between them and
they can join with that to everybody'd satisfaction,
this will phase out within the three years. The
reason for the three years...if it was originally two
as suggested there wouldn't be enough time to give
them lead time to get into... back into that pro-
gram."



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

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, there was opposition to this Bill in Committee. The Auditor General has worked out an agreement with the Sponsor and I would support the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "By a moratorium do you mean that this Bill would not be effective for three years if approved?"

Wikoff: "No, I... I'm sorry, Gene. I didn't phrase that right or I didn't phrase it right. The... this they would not be able to continue this position after three years. This would basically give them three years in which to operate primarily as they are right now and that's primarily to give the Department of Administrative Services and the University time to get together if... if they can solve their differences. Right now, the Department of Administrative Services has a hundred thousand dollar limit. They're using this primarily in the Chicago Medical School to insure for malpractice. And, of course, malpractice... there is no limit on also... the University is involved under the Structural Work Act and there is no limit on that. And the hundred thousand dollar limit which the present Administrative Services has would create a problem."

Schlickman: "Is the one hundred thousand dollar limit within the comprehensive general liability plan?"

Wikoff: "That's the... University's insuring for everything other than the motor vehicles which they presently have in the state-wide motor pool situation. This this, the hundred thousand limit as far as the state is concerned is on everything. That's their maximum."



Schlickman: "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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 501."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 501. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 501 originally started out on the subject matter of the Capital Development Board insuring the bonds of local school districts that could not sell their bonds. As a result, a series of conversations, the Bill was amended to state that the Board shall investigate the difficulties that local school districts are having throughout the state in placing their bonds. And this Amendment was agreed on by Mr. Glickman of the Capital Development Board and so there is no controversy and I ask for the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question for the Sponsor. You say that the Capital Development Board now is for the Bill?"

Younge: "Yes, that's correct. Mr. Glick... I have talked with Mr. Glickman personally and he supports the Bill in its present form."

Leinenweber: "And what, what Amendments did you put on the Bill to bring it into the posture where he could support it?"

Younge: "I put Amendment #2 which would call for the Board investigating state-wide the difficulties that school



districts are having in placing their bonds. As we negotiated this matter and discussed it, it became clear that there needed to be a further study of the matter and so we have agreed that they will investigate the matter."

Leinenweber: "Have you then dropped the original provision in the Bill which would provide for the Capital Development Board to guarantee bonds of local school districts? It's now merely a study provision."

Younger: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Point of order. Could I inquire as to how many Amendments were adopted to this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond; "How many what?"

Schlickman: "Amendments. Our file shows only two."

Speaker Redmond: "One and two."

Schlickman: "There is an Amendment 1?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, what the Clerk tells me."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill as amended still provides that the Capital Development Board would be a guarantor of various school district bonds. This could result in a lowering of the state's bond rating. Now I don't know what the heck this Capital Development Board is thinking, but I can tell you that the Chief Executive Officer of the state opposes this Bill and I think rightfully so. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Younger: "Mr. Speaker, any guarantees by the Capital Development Board have been specifically deleted from this



Bill. And all of the Bill in its present form states and requires is that the board make an investigation as to the status and the difficulty that local districts are having. And I have stated to this Body that Mr. Glickman supports this Bill in its present form. There is no intent in the present form for the Board to guarantee the bonds. And I ask for your support of this matter. And the Bill specifically..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Younger: "...deletes that guarantee."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to refer to yesterday when Representative Younger put this Amendment on. She clearly stated that it was the legislative intent to strike the language that was in House Bill 501, the amendatory language, and to put in the language that is contained in Amendment #2, Representative Schlickman. I think the Lady will honor that commitment. If there's a technical problem with the Bill now in the Amendment #2, I'm quite sure that she would agree right now on the floor to delete lines 19 to 22 in the Senate if this were to come out so that the only language would be the language contained in House Bill... in House Bill 501 would be the amendatory language as contained in Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I... and I hesitate to get up but this... the Lady specifically said that that particular language was... providing the guarantee was not in the Bill. Now it is in the Bill. Now I can recognize the fact that she may want to take it out later, but right now the posture of the Bill is it requires the Capital Development Board to guarantee bonds. And I certainly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younger."

Younger: "All right, Mr. Speaker, apparently the Amendment is defective but the intent was to delete the language."



And if the Body would permit me to proceed on and make the correction in the Senate, I do commit myself to the fact that our agreement is that there will be an investigation of this subject matter. I have discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget. I have talked with Dr. Mandeville, I have met with Mr. Glickman and we are in agreement with the amended form. There perhaps is an error here, but I will..."

Speaker Redmond: "It would seem to me, Representative Younge, that the better procedure would be to put this on Postponed Consideration, bring it to Second, clean it up and then get it back here. In the light of the opposition, it seems unlikely that you're going to get the 89."

Younge: "All right. I would agree to that then, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 140."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Page 5."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 140. A Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis. Davis, 140."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 140 would authorize the juvenile courts in the State of Illinois to authorize restitution in a nonmonetary and monetary form for juveniles. That's essentially what it does. It passed out of Judiciary II Committee by unanimous vote and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any discussion? 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. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional



Majority hereby declared passed. 2194."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2194. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill actually is intended to build communications between supervisor of assessments and township assessors. It has been amended in the Revenue Committee and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? 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 96 'aye' and 17 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 2093, Representative Kempiners."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2093. A Bill for an Act in relation to agreements for continuing care of an individual for the life of an individual for a period in excess of one year. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2093 creates the Illinois Continuing Care Facility Registration Act and it basically outlines the procedure for this type of life care contract to make disclosure requirements to the people who are investing in these particular types of contracts and provides that certain information be provided to the Department of Insurance so that the people who purchase these types of contracts when they enter into them will be aware of what is involved. And I would urge your support of House Bill 2093."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Any discussion? 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. A hundred and... this question, there's 128 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2736."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2736."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to create the Commission on Revitalization of the Midway Airport. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, this Bill as amended would create a Commission of the Legislature to examine the current status and condition of Midway Airport in Chicago and to attempt to develop alternative aviation uses for the airport. The airport has been economically dormant for several years and this has caused an economic drain on the surrounding area. Now the purpose of the Commission would be to examine the situation and to determine if there are alternative aviation uses which could be implemented at the airport so that the airport would once again become an economically viable, but not return to its former status as the major airport in Chicago. I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any opposition? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, Hannig, Swanstrom, Braun, please sit down."

Schlickman: "Is there... is there an accompanying appropriation?"

Madigan: "Yes, there is."

Schlickman: "And how much is it?"

Madigan: "Fifty thousand dollars."



Schlickman: "What contribution of a financial nature, if any, will the Chicago School Board make with respect to this study inasmuch as I understand or recollect that the Chicago School Board is the owner of the property?"

Madigan: "The Chicago School Board owns the property. It was land grant property which they have leased to the City of Chicago. They will not be involved in the study because the study, in my view, would be community orientated with a great deal of input from the community to determine whether it is possible to continue an aviation use of this airport or in the alternative whether the lease should be terminated and then the airport used for some other use which would have a very significant impact upon the surrounding community."

Schlickman: "What financial contribution, if any, will the lessee, the City of Chicago, make with respect to this study?"

Madigan: "They've already indicated that the personnel of the Department of Aviation of the City of Chicago will be made available plus they have conducted at their expense a study in this area. And that will also be made available for our use."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Schlickman: "You say there is a study that's already been conducted?"

Madigan: "They have begun one themselves."

Schlickman: "Well, if the city has begun one, why should the state begin one?"

Madigan: "Because the city, that study is orientated toward the possibility of still another airport further southwest of the city. And the orientation of this Commission would be toward the maintenance of the current facilities."

Schlickman: "Inasmuch as this is a local matter, what



justification ~~is there~~ for establishing a State Commission funded by state money? And if there is, why shouldn't Arlington Heights do it with respect to some of its land that it can't secure the development of?"

Madigan: "The State of Illinois through the Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics is intimately involved in the regulation of the airport and in the control of the traffic patterns in the Chicago metropolitan area."

Schlickman: "That's of a regulatory nature though, not of an interest as the City of Chicago or the school board within the... the land."

Madigan: "The responsibility of the state in this area is the regulation of the air traffic and the provision of adequate airport facilities in the Chicago metropolitan area. If Midway Airport simply did not exist, there would be a serious problem as to available facilities to land and to park and store airplanes in the area."

Schlickman: "Well, is the purpose of this Commission simply to preserve the status of Midway as an airport?"

Madigan: "The purpose of the Commission is to determine if there are alternative aviation uses that could be implemented at the airport as an alternative to the current use."

Schlickman: "No alternate public purposes. That was taken out by Amendment 1?"

Madigan: "This Commission would be concerned with the aviation uses."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you remember the ghost cities of the old West. Well, around Midway Airport to those of you that drive around Midway Airport, it reminds you of the storybook that you've read of the ghost



cities. And the economic catastrophe that's developed over the years in the closing up and the slowdown of the Midway Airport, I think this money would be well spent. It may be a gamble but fifty thousand dollars would certainly be a good gamble and I certainly hope that this House will support this Commission because to do nothing is to accept a dying situation. To do something is to maybe revitalize or help revitalize something that needs to be - the economic growth of the great southwest area of Chicago and the surrounding suburbs. I certainly hope that this passes and something good develops. I would like to see a sunset probably put on this Commission but I would... I would certainly hope to solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Yes, my... just two quick questions. Our analysis is a little bit vague in... Exactly how... first question, how many members are going to be on this Commission. And second of all, what is the amount that you're appropriating for the Commission?"

Madigan: "The appropriation would be for fifty thousand dollars. And the, the membership is accurately reflected in the Digest pursuant to House Amendment #2 where the Speaker would appoint four members and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives would appoint four members. Excuse me, that's not correct. I misread that."

Piel: "Cause Amendment #1 says fourteen... new members and I was just wondering is that in addition to the twelve or is it twenty-six members or fourteen members?"

Madigan: "Amendment #2 indicates that the members on the Commission would be increased from twelve to twenty-four with the number of House members and public members appointed by the Speaker increased from two to four and two to four respectfully and the number of



House members and public members appointed by the House Minority Leader from one to two."

Piel: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the state, the City of Chicago and the federal government have a tremendous investment in Midway and I think this is a legitimate function of the Legislature to look into this problem and I support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I move the previous question on those no-debate Bills."

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

Madigan: "Request a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "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 137 'aye' and 6 'no'. Representative J.J. Wolf 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2420, Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2420. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning fees and salaries. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a salary increase for the Regional Superintendents of Schools. It increases their salary by three thousand dollars for fiscal year 1980 and provides that the salaries be increased by eight percent for the years 1981, 82 and 83. I would be glad to answer any questions or at least attempt to. I would move for the passage of House Bill 2420."



Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113, 116 'aye' and 16 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1912, 1912, Representative Catania. She's not in her seat. We'll wait for her."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1912. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to injunction. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In the 80th General Assembly, we established a provision for injunctive relief so that a battering-spouse could be barred from the household for up to thirty days. The problem was that the local police could not enforce that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, it's 1912."

Catania: "House Bill 1912 addresses that problem by making it a Class C misdemeanor to violate that court injunction. And it also provides that the injunction can be up to a period of ninety days. I ask for your support for this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Will the Lady yield?"

Catania: "Yield to your question, Representative Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Stearney: "Has Amendment #3 been adopted?"

Catania: "Yes, it has."

Stearney: "Well, in addressing the Bill rather than the Sponsor, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to look very carefully at this Bill because as I understand it as it came out of the Committee it would provide that if in going through a divorce proceeding, mind



you now, the judge were to order you to see the court psychiatrist or a counselor or anyone of that nature and you failed to do so, you would be guilty of a Class C misdemeanor which means up to thirty days in the county jail for failure to see the court counselor. Now, granted the Sponsor has some good intentions, but the way she has drafted the Bill makes it wholly nonsensical. I don't believe that anybody who is involved in a divorce proceeding and nevertheless voluntarily because the way he used the word 'intentionally' failed to go to the psychiatrist or the court counselor, he's in violation of a criminal statute. Remember, intentionally only means that you knowingly do not choose to go to see the court psychiatrist, that you decide you have other business that day and you are guilty of a Class C misdemeanor and off you go to jail. Now I think we should be careful in drafting statutes which are going to bind our constituents, especially so many of them who are going through divorce proceedings that we don't incarcerate them all for little niceties such as this. And this is one of the better Bills that the Sponsor has introduced but I think this is a terrible thing. I think this Bill here especially should be defeated. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I have a problem. Representative Stearney and Representative Catania are talking about court psychiatrists and I'm looking at it, is this House Bill 1912? And if it is, my synopsis in the Digest doesn't mention anything about court psychiatrists and I'm trying to figure out what it's all about."

Catania: "What Representative Stearney is doing is finding another section of the Bill than the one that is primarily addressed by the legislation. But it is true that the judge can recommend that either or both parties undergo counselling with a social worker,



family service agency, mental health center, psychiatrist or any other guidance service that the court deems appropriate. That's exactly what it says in the Bill. And what we're talking about here is domestic violence where people, including law enforcement officers, are in danger of being murdered. And I think it's entirely appropriate that the court has the discretion of saying that someone who has been deemed violent by the court and perhaps potentially homicidal must be ordered to undergo psychiatric examination in this kind of a case or psychiatric counselling and the court ought to have discretion to fine that person or to perhaps send him to the county jail for one night if that's what the court thinks is appropriate. And a Class C misdemeanor does give the court that discretion that if there is a violation, if a violent spouse, for instance, comes to the house and starts beating down the door and threatens violence, the court can send that person to the county jail for up to thirty days or fine him up to five hundred dollars."

Deuster: "Thank you. The central part of the Bill is it not that you... you... you stated that if there is a restraining order entered by a court, and I presume the reason Representative Stearney got interested is this... it might affect a divorce relationship or a... or where you might have a restraining order which is so common against a husband harassing the wife or where you have a restraining order that you make it a Class A misdemeanor or a crime to violate that civil restraining order, is that..."

Catania: "It's been reduced to a Class C misdemeanor, but yes, that's the gist of the Bill."

Deuster: "Well, by question is whether this is necessary. I have had instances where I've gone before the judge in a divorce matter where the husband's harassing the



wife and the... for contempt of court the judge has authority to throw the fellow in jail or to get rough with him. Why do we have to make it a crime when really divorce is a civil matter for which, in my opinion, the courts have adequate authority to... to be rigorous with, you know, bad actors."

Catania: "Well, the reason is, Representative Deuster, that when they're both there standing before the judge, they're both usually reasonably well-behaved and the judge may not feel that there's any reason to become tough on the violent partner. But when the violent partner demonstrates that he or she is indeed violent and comes to attack the other partner, the police need to have some enforcement power. I think Representative Greiman wanted to comment on it,"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, in answer to Mr. Deuster's question and even to perhaps correct the Sponsor, the... the difference in this Bill is that it is not for people who are involved in divorces. That's the whole point of it. Indeed Mr. Deuster is correct that in divorce, in the divorce court, has all kinds of chancery powers, all kinds of powers to do all kinds of things. But this Bill, the domestic violence injunction, was created in the last General Assembly to help save some families that didn't want to go to divorce. A woman had a... a woman or a spouse who was being battered had a choice in... and before last year to call the police, have the guy arrested and that didn't make much sense because the bond and the lawyers and all that came out of their family savings. Or her other option was to go and get a divorce. And that didn't make much sense if she wanted to stay. So the purpose of this Act originally and the purpose of the Act now is to save marriages, is to give people an alternative to divorce, so that they don't have to go to divorce



but they don't have to stay and be battered either and that they can do something. Now the court has the power to do a lot of things, but they had no power to do anything until we passed the Act last year. This tightens up the Act, this provides the court with some more powers and they're powers that are reasonable in terms of the aims of saving families where one spouse is being battered and saying, 'Let's find a way other than divorce, other than divorce to keep these people together.' And it is for that reason that the Bill was passed, it is for that reason that the Amendment to the Bill has been offered by Mrs. Catania. I support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

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

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

Catania: "I ask for your support for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Short Debate, Representative Katz. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuster. You spoke in debate, I didn't know..."

Deuster: "Oh, yes. It's the idea to save marriages by finding... finding one spouse guilty of a crime where there's a violation of a civil restraining order. I think this is a big mistake and I would ask everyone to think carefully about it. I think the Bill is unnecessary. I think judges have the authority..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the Gentleman spoke in debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he did and I would ask the Members



to respect the rules which they have adopted. This is Short Debate; you spoke in debate. Anything further? Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this legislation. You know, something like wife-beating and husband-beating is not a pleasant topic for us to deal with. Many of us want to say that it doesn't really exist. I sent out a questionnaire to my constituents and one of the rather innocuous questions, I thought, was, 'Do you think that wife-beating or husband-beating is a serious topic in this state that the State Legislature should address?' And I was amazed to find that 60% of my constituents which is in downstate Illinois said yes, they thought it was a serious problem and that the State Legislature should address it. This is a way to address it and I would suggest an 'aye' vote."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm rather shocked by the attorneys here who are saying that this is something that we don't need. If anybody looks at the statistics of what's happening in... in families and spousal beatings and those kinds of things, I don't think that anybody in their right mind can say we have enough or that we're doing enough. I think that with the kinds of situations that are happening these days with spousal abuse, I would urge the passage of House Bill 1912. We need more than we have. The courts are not adequately protecting people now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote and I hesitate to do it in this manner but today in Springfield is a funeral and I went to a wake. And I know that she would want me to bring this up on this Bill."



I went to the wake of Julia Cihak and some of you knew her: I knew her for at least ten years and what a wonderful woman she was. And she kept her private affairs very private. But we know, we know that by reading the newspaper what was involved in her death. And I think that this Legislature ought to respond to this very serious matter. How many beatings, how many deaths do we have to see before this Legislature responds to this very serious matter? And I hesitated to... because this was the funeral today of Julia Cihak but I know that as a testimony to her that she would want this Legislature to respond by voting 'aye' on this very Bill. And I would urge the Members to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, following up what Representative Matijevich just said. I think this is something we should do to honor Julia, but not, not only for that reason. I think we should do it because it's good legislation and I'm one lawyer who's telling you here that we've got to deal with this problem besides the divorce court and I ask for a favorable vote."

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

E.M. Barnes: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I see they have the prerequisite 89 votes so I won't raise the question, but I wanted to say to Representative... the Sponsor of the Bill, I'd like to vote for it. I'm going to vote 'present'. I would like to vote for it, but the Class A misdemeanor I think is just a bit too strong. Class C? Still, I think that's a little, little stringent. It's a good Bill, but I'm going to vote 'present' on it. I think we'll see it again."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."



Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I only would like to rise even though Susan has enough votes for her Bill, I'd like to rise to say that I think it is incredible that this House over and over again denies the growing problems of violence in this country. And those who are lawyers in this House seem to forget and seem to be unrealistic about what the problems are. They're not only involved with juveniles in violence in this country. We're involved in terms of divorce and marriage problems that are absolutely incredible. The problems of the battered wife are going to have to be met even beyond this particular Bill or battered spouses for that matter. But I think that it is time for us to take a long, hard, compassionate look at what the needs of society are and look at these Bills in the manner in which we could with responsibility and compassion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye', 34 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 226, Representative Harris."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 226. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 226 is an attempt for legislation to help our depleted coal industry. We all know there's a shortage of energy. Illinois has the largest known source of energy in the United States. This Bill as amended conforms with U.M.W.A., Progressive Mine Workers, the coal operators and after several meetings, the Bill is in the shape and been agreed by all just mentioned that this is what they need to help the coal industry. This is not only good for



southern Illinois and northern Illinois, House Bill 226 is good for the economy of our country. And House Bill 226 is needed so we can use our energy sources. I would ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 226."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 15 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. Representative Peters. I would like to reach you, Bill, but 10:30... the hour of 10:30 has arrived. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to suspend the appropriate rule so that we could proceed in this same order for an additional one half hour."

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

Bowman: "Let me just make sure he's extending my motion for additional half hour?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, we'll continue... we'll use the Attendance Roll Call and Representative... 2615."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2615. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pharmacy Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2615 received the full vote of the Veteran's Committee and what it does, it amends the Pharmacy Practice Act. Adds a definition of what constitutes pharmaceutical services, deletes from the Act a number of books and ledgers and instruments that a pharmacist was supposed to keep under the law but which are no longer applicable because of the fact we have most



medicines today in tablet and capsule form. It also provides that it would be unlawful for any business to use the word 'drug' in any sign unless, in fact, it was a pharmacy and had a registered pharmacist. This legislation is approved by the Illinois Pharmacy Association, the Illinois Medical Society and also by Amendment... agreement with the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and I solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any... we won't. Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Peters: "Yes, ma'am."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Peters, I have not had time to look at the Bill but the synopsis indicates that you're deleting some of the educational requirements. Is that still a part of the Bill?"

Peters: "Some of the... some of the... did you say educational requirements?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Peters: "No. No, we are not. The... the practice now is that five years is required by practice and all we're doing is bringing the law up into what is practiced today."

Satterthwaite: "All right, thank you. I misunderstood the Digest."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Representative Peters, I would like to know if this is also approved by Representatives Telcser, Ryan, Williams and Watson?"

Peters: "I'm not certain of that, but I know it's approved by Representative Ronan."

Terzich: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this 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 146 'aye' and no 'nay' and the



Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2664."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2664. A Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you're following the synopsis, the Bill originally introduced was a shell Bill awaiting the four Amendments. And what House Bill 2664 now does is it establishes the Director as the sole individual in the Department which shall establish policies and coordinate activities relating to child care licensing. It was ambiguous in the statute that was enacted previously and this puts the full responsibility in the hands of the Director. It is at the request of the Department and received unanimous approval of the Committee on Human Resources. I solicit your approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if Representative Peters could tell us if this does anything to get rid of the problem about unlicensed, small day-care homes which the Department of Public Aid is now using for its clients."

Peters: "With leave of the Speaker, Representative Skinner, this addresses solely one question and that is placing full responsibility for this in the hands of the Director."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 143 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1690."

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

Speaker Redmond: "1619, pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1619. A Bill for an Act to



change the Illinois Small Business Purchasing Act.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock, you want to hear these together? Does the Gentlemen have leave to hear 1620 and 1619 heard together? Hearing no objection, will you read 1620."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1620. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1619, 1620 make technical changes in the Purchasing Act for the State of Illinois. They are companion Bills. They have bipartisan sponsorship and they received bipartisan support in the Labor and Commerce Committee and I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Could you tell us a little bit more what they do?"

Bullock: "Yes, in the F.E.P.C. program let me just say that back in 1972, the Legislature decided to pass a Small Business Purchasing Act where the state buying contracts for construction and property and services were placed with small businesses. Now small businesses at that time was broadly defined as not dominant in any field of operation and this Bill amends that Act to require a filing of forms with the Department of Administrative Services and includes minority businessmen as part of that provision."

Leinenweber: "Very briefly on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, doesn't appear to do a great deal one way or another. However, the whole concept of set-aside is currently before the United States Supreme Court, they having accepted the case for argument as to whether or not this whole concept is constitutional. I just merely bring that to the attention of the Body."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall these Bills pass?"

Those in favor... Representative J.J. Wolf."

J.J. Wolf: "Would the Sponsor yield..."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

J.J. Wolf: "...to a question? Representative Bullock, I'm just looking at an analysis sheet here and there seems to be a question in my mind as to the definition of minority business. It's based on minority... the definition of minority business based on the owners of such business and if they are a minority."

Bullock: "Could you speak little louder, Representative Peter, I can't hear you."

J.J. Wolf: "I'm questioning on this. Is the definition of a minority business based merely on the owners of that... that they be minority members or is the definition in this Bill include that fifty-one percent of the employees must be members of the minority as well? What I'm trying to get at..."

Bullock: "Yes, you're correct on both counts."

J.J. Wolf: "Okay."

Bullock: "That the ownership should be minority and no less than fifty percent of the employees, but it's dealing with small businesses, not major corporations."

J.J. Wolf: "Okay, what about in the case then if you had a nonminority owner and eighty percent of his employees were minorities? They would not be covered I take it then."

Bullock: "Yes, it would. We say a minimum, Representative Wolf, a minimum of fifty percent of his employees from minority groups and I'm sure they could find females and Chicanos and Latinos and blacks and that would certainly allow them to qualify. And the definition is broad enough to include females and all minorities."

J.J. Wolf: "I don't know. Okay, I always have some trouble in determining what a minority is. The, you



know, Estonian community is only twenty-eight thousand in the whole United States. That's probably the smallest minority, you know, that there is, but nobody, you know, concerns themselves with that aspect."

Bullock: "Well, you know, if you had a particular problem with it, I'd be glad to put an Amendment on in the Senate. I didn't want to restrict it. I'm opposed to that type of restrictive language. But I certainly would be amenable to put an Amendment in the Senate if that would solve your problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative McBroom. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I sat on the Committee when this Bill was heard and at that time, I thought we pointed out to Representative Bullock, the Sponsor, that the term 'minority' was not defined as Representative Wolf pointed out. It could include Presbyterians, people with red hair or anything. It's very vague and I thought that, Representative Bullock, you were going to develop an Amendment before this got to Third Reading rather than to tell us it'll be done in the Senate. And have you had any opportunity to develop an Amendment or to think about it? Cause I can visualize some strange and weird minority that none of us are thinking about, none of us intend that might enforce this Act and cause chaos."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Friday's going to come awful quick and I thought that we had a Short Debate Rule."

Speaker Redmond: "We do. The Members voted for it."

Yourell: "Well, let's stick to it. We're going to finish by Friday, so everybody have a chance with their Bill. They ought to recognize the rule and abide by it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this... these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote



'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? You got both 1911, 1914, 1619, 1620, 'Mr. Clerk? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 26 'no'. The Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. 2590."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2590. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Animal Welfare Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2590 is a Bill which quite simply addresses itself to a current problem in Illinois. It has been brought to my attention, possibly been brought to some of the other Member's attention by people who are members of dog clubs, lovers of animals where young dogs, dogs under eight weeks old without proper shots, without proper pedigrees are brought into Illinois and separated from their mother, they're in poor health. This would provide certain safeguards for these animals. It would help our constituents who are concerned with the well-being of dogs. Some of our constituents buy very expensive animals, paying hundreds of dollars for pedigreed animals who turn out not to have been given proper shots and immunization and to have been taken away from their mother at a too young age. I would ask for your support on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Pardon me, Representative Johnson. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, we went over this Bill in some depth in Committee. At one point an Amendment was adopted to the Bill which would have made it very bad. Currently I don't believe it is quite as bad as it was when it had that Amendment on it. But I believe people ought to think about this Bill before



you vote for it because I think you're going to create one problem with this Bill if it's adopted which will come home to haunt every Member who has a rural area in his district. What the Bill would provide is that you can't sell a dog unless you can prove its origin. If you can't sell a dog, you only got two alternatives. You can kill the dog or you can take it out in the country and turn it loose. Now if you want everybody in every town in your district taking dogs out in the country and turning them loose to run free all over the farm country in your district, then this is a good Bill. But if you don't want that, I would suggest to you it's a bad Bill. And I suspect that anybody that's got a vaguely rural area in their district is going to be hearing about this if this is adopted and becomes law. And I urge a 'no' vote for those reasons."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty, to close."

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

I'd appreciate it if Representative Vinson would look at the Bill. The Bill applies only to dog dealers, not to dogs that would be born or whatever the term is with dogs in rural areas, farm animals and so forth. This only has to do with dogs sold by dog dealers. I think there was some misunderstanding in Committee. That thought was considered in Committee. That is not what this Bill in its present state says at all. As it is now it only regulates dog dealers. I don't believe there's any opposition to it as it is now and I think the Gentleman ought to look at that. I think our constituents, many who have talked to myself and Representative Conti, who is the hyphenated principal Sponsor of this legislation, have indicated very strong support to protect our people in Illinois who buy dogs at great expense from dog dealers. Doesn't have a thing to do with an individual sale of a dog



and I wish Representative Vinson would withdraw his objections. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is... Representative Conti. 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 33 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Representative McBroom, for what purpose do you rise?"

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Gentleman with Representative Ryan is one of the most distinguished educators in our community, Dr. Lindford Markret, the Professor of History at the Olivet Nazarene College. I wonder if, Doctor, if you'd stand and be acknowledged. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1334."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1334. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl, will handle the Bill. Representative Griesheimer and Polk, will you please sit down?"

C.M. Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Mary Lou Kent is the Sponsor of this Bill, but she is absent today because of an emergency in the family and has asked that I handle the Bill for her. House Bill 1334 provides that a downstate teacher may continue enrollment in the local district group health insurance plan after retirement. Presently, there is no provision for a downstate teacher to continue in a public retirement hospital insurance group after she retires. This creates a great hardship on downstate teachers. It's an important Bill and I would ask for its approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass?"



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Anybody know where Representative DiPrima is? Will you send the skirmishers out for DiPrima? Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I'd like to address myself to this proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell reminds us it's in Short Debate."

Ebbesen: "Well, I'll explain my vote then, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Ebbesen: "According to the information that I have here that this is going to cost something like seven million dollars. It provides that for group health insurance coverage for retired teachers, beneficiaries, annuitants and their dependents and it just authorizes the Board of Trustees to develop and administer the program. And you're talking about a fifty-fifty split here with the cost of the dependent coverage born a hundred percent by the pensioner electing such coverage that... it did not receive the approval of the Pension Laws Commission and I think that some of you people that are voting green ought to take a second look at this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich,"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just got word that Representative DiPrima is in his office practicing his Memorial Day speech for Tuesday,"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 14 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1841, Representative Breslin."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1841. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was amended and House Amendment #1 is the Bill. This Bill does not deal with the subject of armed detention. Rather, all it does is require that weapons be confiscated if they were used by a convicted criminal to perpetrate the crime for which he was convicted. The present law requires that weapons cannot be confiscated unless the weapons were used... unless the person was convicted of an unlawful use of weapons charge. That's a Class A misdemeanor charge. Many times the event... the offenses charged are numerous felony charges and prosecutors do not want to complicate their cases with minor misdemeanor charges. The result is that felony convictions are upheld, the criminal serves his time in jail and when he gets out, he can come back to the State's Attorney and demand that he get his weapons back. This is obviously ludicrous and... in this situation if a person is convicted of an offense in which a weapon was used, the weapon should be confiscated outright and House Bill 1841 would do that. I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 918. Representative..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 918. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to judgments and the manner of enforcing the same by execution. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich,"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there is



some... the law is not clear with respect to the time for redemption on commercial abandoned property. This does not change the law with respect to... to residential property, but does change it with respect to abandoned commercial property. As you know, abandoned property goes downhill pretty fast. This simplifies the procedure for foreclosure. It does also provide that the judge can accept a certificate as to the abandonment and it does simplify the procedure very much. It went out of Committee nine to nothing and as far as I know it's merely clarifying it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo,"

Steczko: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for ten Members to join me to... nine... nine other Members to join me to have House Bill 918 put on Long Debate please. It's... it has... could have far-reaching consequences. I think it should be debated fully."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'd better take it out of the list if... it would kill the nine minutes we have remaining for this order. We'll take this one out of the record. 1915. Representative Hallock."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1915. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill seeks to give the Juvenile Court another tool in dealing with juvenile crime. What it specifically does is allow the court in certain cases to hold educated juvenile offenders up to thirty days in detention. The Bill passed out of the Judiciary Committee with an eight to nothing vote and I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? 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 138 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 1996, Representative Birchler."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1996. A Bill for an Act in relation to community action agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker and the Members of the House, House Bill 1996 was prepared and developed in conjunction with the Governor's Office of Human Development Community Action people. What this Bill does, it proposes to set up a formula for the distribution of the funds to the community action agencies. The formula provides that fifty percent of the total amount available for state grants will be distributed on the county population and the remainder will be distributed on the basis of the poverty income people. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 128 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. 1223, Representative Epton."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1223. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "2547.5 a companion Bill? Okay, proceed with 1223."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which has taken many, many years on coming to fruition. I'm proud to present to this Assembly a Bill which compliments our guarantee



fund for casualty insurance companies. This Bill has the acquiescence and the approval of the Department of Insurance. The principal Sponsors including the Majority and Minority Leader and the Speaker and also the consumer. It provides for a guarantee fund for life, health and accident. And I ask for your approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? 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 155 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. ~~2547~~."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill ~~2547~~. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... just... and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Correction, this should be 2547. Would you read 1547?"

Speaker Redmond: "2547."

Epton: "Could be my error."

Speaker Redmond: "You almost passed Penny Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2547. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I apologize if I gave the wrong number. This, just as the other Bill was a final culmination of many years of work, this is... sets a precedent and hopefully we will beat New York who seems to think we're the second city. This sets up an Illinois insurance exchange which, in effect, is similar to Lloyds of



London. It deals only with those individuals who are paying expensive premiums, premiums in excess of fifty thousand dollars. It will give us an opportunity to not only capitalize and create.... capture some of the eight billion dollars in premium, which presently goes overseas, but it will bring multiple jobs to Illinois as well as revenue to the department in the State of Illinois. I think it.... it speaks well for Speaker Redmond, Majority Leader Madigan and Minority Leader Ryan and all who worked together and the Insurance Study Commission in producing this Bill. It should make us first and perhaps we'll be in operation even before the New York Insurance Exchange. And I ask for your approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and 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 162 'aye' and no 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1673."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1673. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections in relation to security deposits. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1673 had been placed on the no debate calendar and was knocked off this morning. Since it's on the bottom of the priority of call, I'd like to call it at this time. However, I think... Mr. Cullerton here has a question so I'm going to ask to have it taken out of the record at this point."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2678. It's the last one. Representative Breslin."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin. Will the 'arc de



triumphs," please sit down? Representatives Cullerton and Bowman, please sit down."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2678. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "This is 2678. Could we correct the board? Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Daniels and I are joint sponsors of this measure to abolish judgments by confession. The impetus for the Bill came from the Illinois Supreme Court that recommended the change pursuant to their constitutional duty to suggest improvements in the administration of justice to this Assembly. According to the Supreme Court, extremely few jurisdictions in the United States continue to statutorily recognize a procedure whereby a plaintiff obtains a judgment in court without prior notice of the proceedings and without the opportunity to present defenses. Of those jurisdictions who allow such judgments by confession, only Illinois has not imposed stringent legislative or judicial limitations on the practice. A recent California decision casts serious doubt on the constitutionality of statutes like ours because of its conflict with the due process clause. Representative Daniels and I think that it is constitutionally infirm and suggest that this procedure be abolished outright."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Bill 2678. The lady has shown what she considers to be some shortcomings in the Illinois law and perhaps she is correct that there may be some shortcomings. But to now come in with a Bill which throws the whole concept of confession of judgments out, rather than trying to improve the process, seems to me to be throwing the baby out with the bath water. I think it's a bad



concept. We in Illinois have a, what I consider a rather good credit and debtor relationship on the market where money is readily available to people. Now if we're going to continually make it more difficult for creditors to collect their money from debtors, we're going to increase the cost of lending money to people. And the people who are going to pay these increased costs are the people who pay them back. Now I think it's bad policy to protect the deadbeats at the expense of the people who do pay their bills. And I would urge a 'no' vote for House Bill 2678. Perhaps the sponsor can take it back and correct some of the procedural abuses that she perceives."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock." Representative Schlickman."

Breslin: "Short debate, Mr. Speaker."

Schlickman: "Well, I think we'd better take it off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin."

Schlickman: "We're taking it off of the short debate, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, then we're going to take it out of the record now. If Representative Bowman presents the same motion tomorrow morning at the opening of the Session, it will.... if the Members approve we will proceed along these same lines. We'll take a roll call right then and only those who are on that initial roll call will have their Bill called. So it's very important that we be here promptly.

Representative DiPrima." For your information; good, bad or indifferent, we passed twenty-six Bills in the last hour and a half, which is about twice the ordinary number. Representative DiPrima. Where's DiPrima? Take over the podium. You want up here or down there? We've got a new Clerk. Representative DiPrima is taking over the job of the Clerk."

DiPrima: "For the benefit of the new Members.... annually



we have a poppy day sales down here. And in conjunction with that we have a little program lined up. And that it begin.... I want you to know that this mornings program will be dedicated to the memory of Giddy Dyer's two brothers, Phifer and Edward, both of whom were killed in World War II. May God have mercy on their souls.

Now we'll have the pledge of allegiance by Gordon Ropp."

Ropp: "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: "Now we'll have the recitation of the poem, 'In Flanders Field the Poppies Grow' by Susan Catania."

Catania: "In Flanders Fields the poppies blow between the crosses, row on row that mark our place. And in the sky the larks still bravely singing fly 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 Fields. Take up our quarrel with the foe. To you, from failing hands, we throw the torch; be yours to hold it high. If you break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders Fields."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Susie. Now we'll have Barbara Currie give her rendition of the song, 'Trees'. She's got a little problem with her throat, but I guess she'll manage."

Currie: "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 their leafy arms to pray. A tree that may in summer wear a nest of robins in her hair, upon whose bosom snow has lain, who intimately lives with rain. Poems are made by fools like me, but only God can make



a tree."

DiPrima: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Well, I'm disappointed you didn't ask me on your poppy program, but I did this real quickly for you. I think that I shall never see a Legislator quite like Larry, a Legislator who really does his best when he fights for veteran's quests, a Legislator who in his own way makes certain that Memorial Day won't go away, won't go away, a Legislator who doesn't seem to care that this issue is still in our hair, upon whose shoulders this double Memorial Day has lain, and what the answer is he ain't sayin'. Poems are made by fools like me, not only God can understand Larry."

DiPrima: "Thank you, John. All right, now we'll have Carol Braun give her version of the tune, 'My Buddy'."

Braun: "Nights 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, your buddy misses you."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Carol. Carol called all the way to New York to get the proper words to the tune from her mother. All right, now we're going to close by the whole Body singing the song 'America' led by the three E.R.A. belles - Susan Catania, Barbara Currie and Carol Braun. We'll all sing the tune 'America'."

DiPrima and all Members of the House: "America for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain, for purple mountains majesty, above the fruited plain. America, America, God shed his grace on Thee, and crown Thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

DiPrima: "That was wonderful. Thank you ever so much. All right, now for the benefit of the new Members, annually we have a poppy day sales. And as you know, the funds, the money's collected for... from these



poppies go toward the rehabilitation of the veterans in the, veteran's hospitals. Now in order to make up one of these poppies between the cost of the containers, the making up of the poppies which the veterans do in the hospital, that's one of their rehabilitation programs, it amounts to about a quarter. So taking a little word from Billy Sunday who was a preacher back in the twenties, when he passed the plate around he'd say, 'I don't want to hear a sound.' So in other words... Now, the fellows that are going to be collecting, Jake Wolf brought the poppies from the Amvet Post #34 from up on Logan Square in Chicago. And Logan Square is named after John Logan, as you know, who was responsible for Memorial Day right here in the State of Illinois. And then, he'll be assisted, I believe, by Phil... Mary Lou Sumner, who is Vice-Chairperson, and the Vice-Chairman, Phil Collins, and Vice-Chairman, Ray Hudson, who is a past District Commander of the Legion. So, Ray knows what this program is all about as do Phil Collins, Mary Lou Sumner and Jake Wolf. And on the Democratic side we have Taylor Pouncey, who served with the Marines, as Chairman; Eugenie Chairman as Vice-Chairperson, who fights me occasionally on veteran's legislation like she did yesterday; Ed Kornowicz, another veteran, worked with another veteran, Robert Pechous, both Vice-Chairmen. Now the Honorary Exalted Racoons or members of this group will be Louis Capuzi, the Dean of the House, who served with the Second Armored Division and was awarded the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Combat Badge. And on the Democratic side, Laz Murphy, who served with the 509th Parachute Battalion and served both with the 101st and 82nd Airborne Divisions. He was the recipient of the Bronze Star, the Combat Badge and the Purple Heart also. But Laz Murphy reminds me of Bill Malden's characters in the old Stars and Stripes



we received during the war up front with Bill Malden, And Laz Murphy depicts those characters pretty good with the little cigar butt or the cigarette butt; you know, the way Bill Malden made them out. Now I have already received some monies here, Before we start I want you to know we're starting off with, Glenn Dawson gave me five dollars last night and I gave it to Jeannie Chapman which she'll put in the container. Bob Schrimple from the Illinois Bankers' Association gave me ten dollars as did Russ Hamilton, a former Member of this Body, who also represents the Illinois Bankers' Association. Don Udstuen gave ten dollars, he's Executive Director of the Illinois Medical Association. I ran into Jerry Shea downstairs for breakfast this morning and I picked up ten from him, former Member of the House and a Majority Leader. Hey, no, he was leaving when I got the sawbuck, I had to pay for my own lunch, breakfast. And the United States Steelworkers Union, headed by Martin Cotten, President of Local 5608, Subdistrict #4 Council, donated ten as he did last year. And then there's a retired steelworker in the gallery up here and he gave Glenn Dawson an additional five, so that makes... let's see, forty, fifty, sixty dollars we start off with. So now we'll have Phil Collins and Jake Wolf working here with Ray Hudson and Mary Lou Sumner and over there Taylor Pouncey, Ed Kornowicz, Bob Pechous and Eugenia Chapman. So open your hearts, folks. Any donations over five I will be happy to announce. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask Larry DiPrima a question. Is it true that when Taylor Pouncey... he was a one-man invasion all by himself?"

DiPrima: "Right. Tarahrah."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, I'm one of the new Members and I



wanted to make sure I heard him right. He started off... Larry started off by saying this was a benefit for new Members."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that's in a different context. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. We have with us in the Speaker's gallery there, the United Steelworkers of Illinois, Subdistrict #3, Carl Leslie, up there is their Director. They also, all of the members came to me yesterday, wanted to give the money in the hallway. I would not accept it as Larry and the others have done. And I'm going to make certain that someone see the United Steelworkers after they come down to the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "I think, I think we're indebted to Larry DiPrima and to the cast for the Memorial Day observance. There was a time that we used to have what I thought was considered... considered quite an impressive ceremony for Abraham Lincoln's birthday. We tried to revive it this year but it wasn't quite as good as Bill Horsley with Lincoln's Farewell to Springfield. You know, for awhile I was... I didn't think that we were going to get over the loss of Adeline Geo-Karis' voice. But I think that Representative Currie and Representative Braun fill the vacancy and we really aren't going to miss Adeline. Representative Collins. Representative Conti, do you agree with that?"

DiPrima: "All right, now I'm going to put in the can forty-five dollars that I have and Genie Chapman has five dollars from Glenn Dawson and Pouncey has the other ten dollars from the Steelworkers Union. Here's the forty-five dollars. Thank you ever so much, folks."

Speaker Redmond: "The order of business is House Bills, Third Reading, Priority of Call, page 2, Representative



Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you could enlighten the membership with some kind of a schedule for today."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, as it now stands, it's Priority of Call, proceed along that. I think that we have some appropriations on Second that we're probably going to move along."

Ryan: "We're going to work all day?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll work all day and work all night."

Ryan: "We're going to work right straight through?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, yeah."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'd like to ask what the status is, if I may. My motion, it was joined by others with regard to the suspension of the special order of business."

Speaker Redmond: "As of the moment, it's suspended. 1852."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1852. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Library System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like leave to hear 1852 and 1853 together. They're companion Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Will you read 1853?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1853. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bills that we started to discuss last week and I'm sure you're all familiar with what's involved. This is an appropriation of eight



million dollars for the lib.... to the Secretary of State for the libraries of the state. What it will do is to allow libraries throughout the state to have matching funds of twenty-five percent, up to twenty-five percent of the costs for the library buildings and then a special one-time grant of up to fifty percent for the new public library in the City of Chicago. And this is a reference library as I explained last week. It is a new building, it is right adjacent to the current Chicago Public Library. And I ask for your favorable support. If you have any questions, I'll try to answer them."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Remember last week when we took this Bill out of the record we probably had it beat. I think that the time is no better than right now to review where we are. This Bill appropriates or tries to authorize eight billion, million dollars for bond funds for libraries. Total cost to the state over twenty-five years, the life of these bonds, will be another five million dollars..."

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

Matijevich: "Well, I sort of make the point... point of order early because you ask for questions. I understand by our rule yesterday, everything is on Short Debate. Am I right?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Right."

Matijevich: "All right, I thought the Members ought to know that. All Bills on Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if we could return to my point of order from last week. I asked how many Bills, how many... how many votes it would take to pass the



Bill. I think the answer is 107 and all you have to do is say it and we can proceed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "I'd just like to say that last week we had 1854 in addition. This time it's only 1852 and 1853."

Speaker Redmond: "89 votes. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I'd like to ask the necessary number of Members to join me in taking this off the Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he joined... he's joined by ten Members. Off of Short Debate, it's on full debate."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Here we are again asked to spend monies in a new area or in addition to an area that we already have. Well, let me point out to the Members of the House that the state already appropriates a significant amount of its revenue funds to help libraries in this state. What the Gentleman from Cook is trying to do is to create a new fund that will have a long-term financial implication on this state of some fourteen million dollars. It's just at a time when we cannot afford to do everything for everybody that we should be here trying to put in debt future generations of this state for the tune of fourteen million dollars. The time is not right, the need is not there and I would ask that the Members of this House indicate their disapproval of this Bill by a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to correct myself.

I said that Louis Capuzi was the Dean of the House and I neglected to mention that you also were Co-Dean. I don't mean cough medicine. Listen, I got another ten dollar donation here from Charles Hassle, District Manager, Government Relations Office from the Illinois Bell Telephone. And I want to thank 'em. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Anyone further on 125... 1852 and 1854?"

Question is, shall these Bills pass? Representative... Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Beatty, for what purpose do you rise?"

Beatty: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, if I'm permitted to do so. I think this is a most... these are most important Bills. I think that just a few years ago there was a special Committee of the House that... out of the House Revenue Committee that conducted hearings throughout the State of Illinois relative to the need for libraries and to determine in what way funds could be raised for library purposes. And so on that Subcommittee some of the Members are still here, Representative Skinner, Representative Ryan, participated, I know, in some of the hearings. And Ralph Dunn was the Chairman of that Committee and it was determined that there is a need for funding libraries. And I don't know of any more important function than we can have in this state than to have adequate books and allow people the freedom of reading and being exposed to the various cultures of the world. And I believe that we should be supporting these Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would urge some more votes on this Bill. If there's anything important in the State of Illinois, it's the education and the continuing education of our young people and our adults and libraries play an important part, a most important part in our heritage and in our culture and certainly, I would urge some more votes on this. And I think it's a good Bill, both Bills should be passed. I'd ask for some more 'aye' votes."

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



Totten: "Well, if it goes over 89 votes, there some switches pushed that aren't here. I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Encourage you, only vote your own switch. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'aye' and 60 'no'. Representative Totten asks for a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Sandquist requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "The absentees - Capuzi, Darrow, Donovan, Dyer, Dwight Friedrich, Kane, Kent, McBroom, Meyer, Mugalian, Oblinger, Rigney, Schuneman, Swanstrom, Telcser, Tuerk, Vinson and Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "Verify the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Vitek, for what purpose do you rise?"

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I be verified? I've got to go to the Senate for a minute?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman be verified? He says 'yes'. Will you leave Representative Totten's microphone open?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Affirmative votes?"

Speaker Redmond: "Affirmative votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander, Anderson, Balanoff, E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Bianco."

Totten: "E.M. Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, I called E.M. Barnes."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, is the procedure that I, the ones I don't see here, to call them as we go along with the mike open?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that? Yeah, that's all right, I guess. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Change my 'no' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. That's Representative Stearney. Representative E.M. Barnes just came in, Representative Totten. Proceed."



Clerk O'Brien: "Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Preston, Braun, Breslin, Brummer, Bullock, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Cullerton, Currie, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "I'll remove the request for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Request for a verification has been withdrawn. What is the count? 95 'ayes', 59 'noes', and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. 1878. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request the permission to place 1878 on the Interim Study Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection..."

Richmond: "For Spring, next year."

Speaker Redmond: "You want the Spring Calendar or the Interim Study?"

Richmond: "Yeah, Spring '80 of..."

Speaker Redmond: "Spring Calendar."

Richmond: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we've got a slip here, Representative Richmond. Okay. 2097, Representative Kempiners. This is on the no debate list."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2097. A Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital District Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. This is on the no debate list."

Kempiners: "How do you want to handle that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kempiners: "Proceed?"

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



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh.

Walsh: "My understanding of the no-debate list, Mr. Speaker, was that it was not to take place until after five o'clock tonight, sometime tomorrow or Friday."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's right but I was just identifying the... those that are on no debate."

Walsh: "You weren't trying to shut us off at all, Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, no. I wouldn't do that, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, okay."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, even a quick Roll Call takes some time and I thought the procedure ought to be that, that we skip by Bills that are no debate and those that are going to be handled Friday because there's always... you know, that's why..."

Speaker Redmond: "We discussed that in the Rules Committee and it was kind of the understanding that if we did that and then we didn't get back to them, if they had any further problems, it wasn't fair to them, that they were entitled to their position on Priority of Call."

Matijevich: "Well, I think what you're doing is giving them the best of two worlds and the rest of us are getting the worst of both worlds."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, what happens if they miss their Priority of Call position, we don't get to them Friday?"

Matijevich: "That's the chance they take by getting onto that no debate call. I think they've got the advantage, both ways."

Speaker Redmond: "This question, there's... take the record. There's 140 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby



declared passed. The only problem is that if somebody's on no debate and they decide to take it off, why, you know, they gauge their position on the Priority of Call. It was kind of the idea. Let's work with this and see how it goes. And if it's... works a hardship, why we can change it. 224, Representative Huskey. This is also no debate."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 224. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Might make a little better sense to let the Sponsor explain what it is and then go that way."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 22... and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 224 provides that the State Board of Elections shall make available to all election authorities and the public at large a book containing all 'revelant' information relating to the filing for a public office of governmental ethics and campaign disclosures. The book shall be available at no later than a hundred and sixty days before the primary election. Now we have made this to be, come in effect after the new election... consolidation of elections takes place. And these books are not to be passed out promiscuously. If anyone wants a book, library or County Chairman, County Board, they would have to buy 'em. I move for favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? On this question there's 148 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 317."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 317. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to require reporting of information essential for the sealing of wells. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill requires that the logs from test wells drilled in connection with the search for coal be filed with the State Geological Survey, with the Institute of Environmental... Environmental... whatever the name of it is. The current law requires that logs from oil, gas and water wells be filed with the State Geological Survey within thirty days after drilling. This provides a thirty month exemption with regard to those logs concerning... that are drilled in connection with the search for coal. This would provide an inventory of the natural resources of the State of Illinois in some central locations. It would provide that inventory the time that we have some concern about energy. It would also provide the availability of that information to the public after thirty months which would of some benefit to the land owners and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'aye' and... Representative Conti. No 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Conti."

Conti: "I rise for the purpose of an introduction. The Thomson-Mills School from Thomson, Illinois; represented by Representatives Mulcahey, Rigney and Swanstrom. Right up here in this class here. Glad to have you with us."

Speaker Redmond: "530."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 530. A Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of an Act to gift taxes. Third



Reading of the Bill. To tax gifts."

Speaker Redmond: "Just explain the Bill, Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill for the Treasurer of the State of Illinois, repealing an antiquated section of the inheritance tax statute that has not been in effect for thirty years and is no longer applicable. The external auditors, the Treasurer's office have recommended repeal. And what it does actually is they used to be required to furnish the book to the Circuit Judge. They no longer do that, haven't done it for thirty years. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 602."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 602. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, explain the Bill."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 62 would require that various notice sent to Legislators and others as required by Section 37 of the EPA contain the legal description and street address or other description of the location of the facility. Several years ago I passed a Bill that required that this notice be sent to Legislators and since that time, they have been sending the notice to the Legislators, but only using the legal description of the property which, as you know, is very difficult sometimes to locate in your districts. And all I've added and asked them to do as where...



where it is applicable where a street address is available that that street address be included as well to make a more firm identification of the area in question. I move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 602."

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 155 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 660."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 660. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist, to explain the Bill."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 660 is a Bill that gives the same equity from state taxes that Congress gave last year for federal taxes where liquor is destroyed or lost because of fire or theft, breakage or vandalism. It provides that where this happens, the person who may... had the loss can by filing a claim with the Department of Revenue within six months and proving that they did not get it back in any other way through insurance or, or any other reason, they can get their claim for credit. I think it's a fair and equitable thing. Congress did it and that's what we're trying to do here. And I want to point out there's no way that there can be double recovery."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is... Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I hesitate to rise on this Bill, but it's unworkable according to the Department of Revenue and it raises a rather interesting precedent that this industry should be given this favored treatment where no other



industries are. And as I understand it, the refunds are made to the persons who don't make the taxes and for a bunch of other reasons this Bill should be, too."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to have six people join me on this. I'm a little concerned about this Bill and I'd like this off of no debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Joined by... well, this is on Short Debate."

Conti: "Short Debate."

Speaker Redmond: "Joined by nine, I guess, isn't it? Is he joined by nine? Okay, joined by nine, full debate. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We heard this Bill in Executive Committee and there were a lot of questions raised on this Bill. I was surprised to hear it on no debate. Representative Sandquist, I think, is approaching the problem from an unapproachable standpoint. Representative Mugalian was quite correct. The Department of Revenue would find it an almost impossibility to do this. In cases of loss, I'm sure the insurance industry is going to address that situation. But as far as the tax is concerned, the tax in Illinois is paid by the manufacturer-wholesaler and not to the retailer and Representative Sandquist seeks to have the retailer reimbursed for the tax that was paid by somebody else out of state coffers. And therefore, I think I would have to oppose the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "I'd like to correct something."

Speaker Redmond: "Whoever's standing between me and Representative Sandquist, please move over."

Sandquist: "First of all, Representative Davis, this was not heard in Executive, it was heard in Revenue. It passed out with sixteen to two. When they say the



Department of Revenue has problems, it specifically says they're the ones that are going to set up the rules and regulations just as Congress gave to the... the Federal agency. This is a fair and equitable thing. That's all it is, is where a tax has been paid and it is true that the wholesaler pays the tax to the state. But he passes that on to the retailer in the... when he sends the material to the retailer. And the only way the retailer can get a claim for credit, it's not getting any money back. He's got to prove that he did not collect it in any other way. So that... if insurance does cover it, then he cannot collect it. But I've given the Department of Revenue all the latitude they set up the rules and regulations. And all it is is trying to be fair, the way Congress was, what where a tax has been paid and yet the property was destroyed, the state does not get a windfall."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I just wanted to raise a point of order. The Gentleman from Will did not ask a question, the Gentleman from Cook was not closing debate. I think his remarks as just expressed were untimely. And I think others wanted to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you for calling it to our attention and conserving time. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker., I would apologize to Representative Sandquist and his point of order was well taken, but it was not heard in Executive. I happened to be sitting with you that day in Revenue. I think it all gets a little confusing at times, but the objections are still the same, Representative Sandquist."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you for conserving time, Representative Davis. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, I know that the Sponsor of this Bill has been an expert in the... in this field but the thing



that concerned me the most, Roy, is it's going to be rather difficult to determine exact magnitude of such a loss of inventory and how can they control... how will we know what the inventory was and how are we going to make these repayments?"

Sandquist: "Well, the burden of proof is on the claimant. He's got to file it within six months. He's got to establish with the Department of Revenue that he had the loss, that... that, that he did not collect it any other way. And just like in any other case with the burden of proof, he's got the problem. And all I'm saying is that if he can do these things, it's only fair and equitable that this tax should not have been paid."

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? Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, let's don't kid ourselves. Manufacturers do not absorb the tax. The tax is definitely passed on to the retailer. And if... and he pays the tax when he purchases liquor through the manufacturer. It just so happens that the manufacturer or the wholesale distributor or the bottler is the responsible one, but don't be misled that the retailer is not paying this tax. He is definitely paying this tax. And.... and it... and if the consumer buys the whiskey, then the consumer's paying the tax. So don't be misled by those statements that someone else is paying somebody else's tax. It just don't happen."

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

Sandquist: "Just... I'd just like to point out that it's trying to be a fairness doctrine. And I don't think that any of us want to take taxes from anyone where it



was not a legitimate tax. That's all that I'm trying to do with this Bill. Congress did it on the Federal level and I think we should do the same thing on the state level. And I ask in the name of fairness that you give this Bill serious consideration."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I don't recall how much money the liquor industry gives to the coffers of the tax of the State of Illinois, but many of us forget that the liquor dealers that have employees and the liquor distillers that have employees pay extra state income tax. They're a collector for us of state income taxes and these people that sell it retail also collect sales taxes for us and we've never given them a consideration that they've... they're doing our work, they're collecting our state income taxes, they're collecting our state sales taxes. We're imposing on employers all over the State of Illinois. In fact, I had a Bill that was killed in the Revenue Committee that would allow every employer in the State of Illinois to deduct something for his efforts in collecting state income taxes for us and collecting state sales tax for us and many other taxes that they collect. And I think that this is a case where they're, it's not in their control. In many cases, it's forced bankruptcy and I think they deserve a break."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 70 'aye' and 61 'no'. Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Postponed consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed consideration. 681."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 681. A Bill for an Act to amend the Dram Shop Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reed."

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



legislation is something more than another Amendment to the Dram Shop Act. It's basically a Bill that deals with service and economics because liquor is currently being served in the five lodges owned by the State of Illinois. However, it's being served on a restricted basis which takes us immediately to the question of economics. Those five lodges built by the state at a cost of approximately forty million dollars are leased for ten years on a competitive bid basis. Because of liquor restrictions, the bidding on the leases is minimal in number and in price. It's as simple as falling off a log. Why lease a facility where the greatest margin of profit is restricted? Certainly top professionals in the motel-hotel business are not interested and that's where service comes in. The facilities and sights are beautiful if Illinois Beach Lodge and Starved Rock are any examples. Food is ordinary, the housekeeping is fair, upkeep and maintenance minimal and service is barely there. The five lodges in the words of a former Speaker of the House are like monasteries and they certainly are and their occupancy rate proves it. Yes, I am going to contend that if these five lodges could serve liquor like any other hotel, the bidding on leases would become highly competitive, the top professionals in the business of hotel management would bid on those leases, the food service, management, maintenance and occupancy would improve and we would all benefit. The state will from increased leasing fees and percentages paid on gross annual receipts as well as increased employment and even the sales taxes paid. People of Illinois will benefit from the extra state revenues generated, but they also retain and are the beneficiaries of improved accommodations and services at the state lodges. This legislation asks that the hours that liquor can be served in the five lodges



be between eleven o'clock a.m. and midnight, an extra three hours a day over existing law. It also asks that food service not be the only condition under which you can order a cocktail. Ladies and Gentle- men of the House, we are talking about service and economics, not just liquor. Give us the extension of the hours and we'll give you the positives of service and revenue and the tourists that the lodges were built to generate and accommodate. I emphasize the word 'generate' and that's why the Illinois Association of Illinois Hotel and Motel Owners join with the Department of Conservation and me in urging your support of House Bill 681 because it takes us back again to economics. The Association contends that the entire tourist industry in Illinois will benefit from the full occupancy of those lodges on a year-round basis. I ask your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye' and 8 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 746. Representative Friedland,"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 746. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections... certain health service plan Acts to provide for inclusion of services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "746, Representative Friedland, explain the Bill."

Friedland: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 746 has bipartisan sponsorship and would amend the Nonprofit Health Care Service Plan Act to provide that a subscriber has the right to select a foot specialist who is a podiatric surgeon or a general physician to treat ailments of



the foot. At present, as you know, and if your patient has a valid and recognized claim, if he chooses an MD but cannot recover costs...if he or she goes to or is referred to a podiatrist, I submit that if this insurance covers foot problems, he should be entitled to receive treatment by a foot specialist without penalty. Now, a subscriber to a health insurance plan has the right to expect reimbursement of health care expenses if he or she requires medical care. However, some subscribers who need the services of a podiatrist have discovered, much to their dismay, that they themselves must bear the financial burden, because policies exclude podiatric care entirely or cover only a small portion. In other words, policies that often cover foot care, but only when it's rendered by a general physician. Ladies and Gentlemen, in Illinois, podiatrists are authorized to use all the tools of modern medicine, including surgery and the prescription of drugs and orthodic devices. He's licensed to practice on an independent, professional basis. As a matter of fact, the Health Resources Administration of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has officially recognized the close identity of these foot specialists with general physicians by incorporating podiatric medicine in its division of medicine. The demanding curriculum for podiatrists includes four years of undergraduate work plus completion of four years of a professional education in a college of podiatric medicine. Courses include hundreds of hours in anatomy, physiology, pathology, microbiology, pharmacology, physical diagnosis, physical medicine, radiology, internal medicine, functional orthopedics, anesthesiology, and numerous other subjects. Following graduation about half go into residency programs at various hospitals. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, allowing the subscriber a freedom of choice of doctors



will not increase total health care cost. First, as I mentioned, this coverage is provided in most policies. Therefore, the services of a podiatrist would merely replace other medical services, and, secondly, as you know, it's documented that preventative health care like preventative medicine is far less expensive in the long run than requiring the dam...repairing the damage later. Also, the Bill is amended...permits podiatrists and plant operators who mutually agree to provide coverage for podiatric services under the Voluntary Health Services Act. The Bill passed Committee 13 to 1. The Medical Society signed in as opponent to the measure but did not testify. I request your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a potentially important Bill to the state and the people in the state. I'd ask to be joined by nine other Members, so we could ask some questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Joined by nine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on full debate. Proceed."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Repre...he indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "Thank you. Am I right that this could be called the podiatrist version of the chiropractors' Bill that we heard in Insurance Committee and was soundly defeated?"

Friedland: "I don't believe so. I didn't have a Bill in Insurance Committee."

Birkinbine: "Well, I think it's similar. It's simply a different form of medicine, and we probably had more information on that...that attempt on the part of the chiropractors than any Bill we heard the entire Session, and it was soundly defeated by the Members."

Friedland: "Mr. Birkinbine, this affects podiatrists only."



Birkinbine: "But it would do the same thing is the point I'm making. Question, isn't it true now that say a business man is buying a plan for his company...has a choice of whether or not he can add the podiatrist into his coverage plan and this would make it mandatory as opposed to being an option?"

Friedland: "That's correct."

Birkinbine: "Well, I'd...if I could speak to the Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Birkinbine: "...I would say that I don't think that option should be taken away right now. It's something that people who select a plan can add. We would be forcing them to do it."

Friedland: "Well, you see, Representative Birkinbine, you're correct in that foot problems are covered under many of these policies but only if you're treated by an MD, and in a day of specialized medicine, eye, ear, nose, throat man...a chest man, or whatever, we're talking about foot specialists, and we want to include them in this, also."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I'm a little bit surprised that this Bill went to Veterans Committee rather than to the Insurance Committee where other Bills similar to this have gone. This is simply one in a series of Bills which seeks to force insurance buyers to pay for insurance coverage that would benefit the health practitioner. We have Bills in the General Assembly that would seek to do this on behalf of clinical social workers, and here's one on behalf of podiatrists, and I suggest to you that there is no public demand for insurance coverage on these services. The demand comes from the podiatrists and the clinical social workers and others who seek to have



their bills paid, and I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the Gentleman's Bill, but I wonder if he would yield to one question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Reilly: "Representative Friedland, this...really just to get this into the record, because I'd asked you this before. There's some concern, I think, that this Bill might be amended to include other groups. It's my understanding with my conversation with you earlier that you will not accept Amendments in the Senate to include other groups. Is that correct?"

Friedland: "Absolutely. I would not accept any other Amendments."

Reilly: "With that understanding, I support the Bill."

Friedland: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Griesheimer: "Representative Friedland, are podiatrists medical doctors?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "No, they're podiatrists, and they have a very, very similar curriculum, and they're authorized to use surgery and prescription of drugs for the area of the foot."

Griesheimer: "Yeah, but the question is they are not...you're answering then they are not medical doctors. They are not...they are not..."

Friedland: "Neither...another profession: Neither is a dentist an MD, which is included in many of these..."

Griesheimer: "I know a dentist isn't, but I really didn't know. They are not medical doctors, then?"

Friedland: "As far as the foot is concerned, they are."



Griesheimer: "No, I really don't know the answer to this, and I think you're putting me on. Are they medical doctors or are they not medical doctors?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Friedland: "They are doctors."

Griesheimer: "Yes or no?"

Friedland: "Affirmative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Slape: "Is it possible now for an individual to buy a rider to his policy or provide...or have this coverage provided for him by the insurance company?"

Friedland: "Under some plans that may be. Yes."

Slape: "Could you tell us under a majority of the plans or under a selected few of the plans or...?"

Friedland: "I believe approximately 80%."

Slape: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Slape: "I would rise in opposition to this Bill. I think that the option is already there for the customer. If he wants to add this protection to his insurance, all he has to do is have a rider apply to it. We've already learned that podiatrists are not medical MD's, and to expand this coverage now for a select few, I have received no correspondence from any of my constituencies...constituents who want this service and to raise the cost of medical coverage for all of the citizens for a select few, I think it would be wrong at this time, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

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



House. I would like to correct something that I believe the Sponsor stated a minute ago. He stated that they were doctors. They are foot doctors. They are not MD's. The question was, 'Are they MD's?' No, they are not MD's. They are foot doctors. There's a big difference between a foot doctor and an MD. With that, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Friedland to close."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call on this important measure."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a conflict of interest in this matter, but, as usual, I will vote my conscience. I have refrained from entering into the debate, but I should correct one statement. The fact is that this insurance is available to those who seek it, but in the vast majority of the cases the employer does not seek it, because he is not prepared to pay the price, so that in that regard there are many individuals who would like this coverage but are unable to get it. However, I will vote my conscience."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm supporting this measure because while a podiatrist may not be a doctor, per se, we must not lose sight of the fact that he is medically trained, and I think the insurance companies will get a kick out of this."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Friedland's Bill. The Bill has been discussed with various health service providers in the State of Illinois and being a former Representative of Blue Cross and of one of those other health providers, I can attest to the fact that this Bill is needed. Many of the persons, particularly in the urban areas who have access to medical providers, need the services of all medical providers. I don't think we should take a position in the State of Illinois that we're going to restrict the provision of medical care to any particular group. I understand that the medical profession made several positions on this Bill and near the end of the Session they came out in opposition to House Bill 746, but I think that Representative Friedland and the podiatrists in the state have made an earnest effort to reconcile whatever differences originally presented itself with this Bill, and they're operating on good faith, and they're making an attempt to provide the kind of care that the people of the state need, and I would urge persons on both sides of the aisle to support Representative Friedland's Bill and give some more green lights for House Bill 746."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in support of this legislative proposal. Podiatry is an area of specialization and even though these people are not classified as medical doctors or many of these podiatrists that are on the staffs in hospitals, they do surgery. They do a fine job. It's an area...the foot is an area in which, in the medical field, is not one that is an area of



specialization with many people. They serve a very useful function in the area of the allied health field, and it amounts to a freedom of choice. An individual who wants to go to a podiatrist and for his professional services, in a...especially in a day in which we have third party payment, I think this is an excellent piece of legislation and merits your consideration for putting a green vote up there, and I would encourage everyone to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're close to it. We're there, and I think that these people who treat such menial things as corns that the average doctor does not want to take up his time in doing and for old people the things...the mundane things such as ingrown toenails...all this kind of thing. The average doctor has no interest in at all. I think this is a good Bill and should be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition. I think we're getting the issue a little bit clouded. It's not an area that the previous speaker talked about of taking off corns or ingrown toenails. You're talking about giving permission and, expanding it, talking about general anesthesia...putting someone to sleep under anesthesia by someone that's not licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches. You're expanding an area. You're forcing insurance. You're going to increase the cost of insurance premiums in the State of Illinois by forcing this demand, and I think it's an erosion upon the practice of medicine by people that are not entirely qualified to practice in all of its branches. They're only entitled to practice in a very small, limited area, and we have orthopedic surgeons that are MD's that do specialize in surgery



of the foot. And, for these reasons, I would vigorously oppose this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I only rise to indicate that I'd like to request a verification if this ends up with the proper number of votes."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would hope that the Members listen carefully to the debate, because somebody mentioned that anybody can get a rider to include this in their insurance. Now, why should I, as an individual, have to purchase a rider when if I do have a foot ailment, under my insurance without a rider, I can go to a physician licensed to practice medicine in all its branches when I can't go to a specialist...one who is a foot doctor? Why should the law discriminate? I shouldn't have to pay an extra premium to get the medical services that I deserve... a specialist to treat my foot ailment? Why discriminate? I don't think that the laws of the State of Illinois ought to be molded by the Illinois Medical Society. They ought to be molded by us...us who realize that they should be molded to serve individuals...to serve the citizenry. This is a good Bill, and it's a consumer Bill. I urge the Membership to vote 'aye'."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We are in the midst of an energy crisis which is growing. It's getting worse all the time, and the distinguished Senator from California, S. I. 'Hayakowa', said the other day that it was just fine with him if the price of gas kept going up and up, and the people at the bottom of the spectrum had to walk. A lot of people aren't going



to be able to afford to drive, and a lot of people want to save energy and spend a lot of time walking, which is kind of a lost art. But, a lot more of us are going to be doing it and, as has been pointed out, most physicians licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches can't be bothered worrying about the kinds of foot problems that people who walk a lot and people who jog a lot develop. These are the specialists who are able and willing to take the time to work on all those mundane things like corns and ingrown toenails, as Representative Waddell pointed out. We need these people, and we can't go and get them if we don't have this kind of coverage. It's too late once you've developed all these severe foot problems to say, 'Gee, I wish I'd had that kind of coverage.' We need to have it guaranteed so that the growing number of people who are going to have foot problems will have a place to go to have them properly care for. These are the specialists who do it. I think we ought to pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a special reason...a personal reason for supporting this Bill. My secretary's son, who graduated from the University of Illinois with honors, tried to get into medical school and could not be accepted...was not accepted, so he took up podiatry and is going to school in Chicago now, and I would hope there'd be insurance to pay for his patients when he becomes a podiatrist. I'd urge your support for this Bill."

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

Friedland: "At the proper time, I'd like to get a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Goodwin."

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



rise in support of this Bill. This is really a consumer's Bill. This is for the people who work 8 hours a day on their feet, and they need that care. Also, somebody said that you're letting people put people under anesthetics when they're not qualified to do so. A podiatrist operates just like any other physician. He does it in a hospital, and the anesthesiologist does the ...what he should do, and I will urge you to get some more 'aye' votes up here. These are for the people who are working on their feet, and they have to depend on their feet to make them waitresses, porters, and things like that. We need that, and it should not be taken out of their pocket. I urge you to get an 'aye' vote up there. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'aye' and 52 'no'. Representative Vinson has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Friedland requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk." Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Go slowly enough so that..."

Clerk Leone: "Capparelli. Currie. Darrow. DiPrima. Doyle. Dyer. Garmisa. Keane. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Leon. Leverenz. Kulás. Oblinger. Pullen. Telcser. Terzich. And, Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Leave Representative Vinson's microphone open, and Representative Walsh, and Schlickman, and Pullen I'm sure will sit down. We're on verification. Sandquist, Deuster, Simms, Gaines, Skinner, please sit down. Representative Bower, sit down. Obey your own Rules. Sit in your own chair. Sit down. You didn't vote for Prohibition, either. Representative Mautino, for what purpose do you rise?"



Mautino: "I'd like to ask the Gentleman if I could possibly be verified at this time. . . I've got an appointment."

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Mautino be verified?"

The answer is 'yes'. Representative Jones and Barnes, will you please sit down? Representative Friedland. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bluthardt. Bowman. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Campbell. Capuzi. Catania. Collins. Conti. Davis. Deuster. Domico. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Ewing. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Katz. Kelly. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Matijevich. Mautino. McBroom. McClain. McCourt. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. O'Brien. Patrick. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Henry. Skinner. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Taylor. VonBoeckman. Waddell. White. Willer. J. J. Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa, 'aye'. Representative Ropp, 'aye'. Representative McMasters. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Beatty here? He was here, and he addressed the Bill. He's evidently off the floor now. What's your pleasure? Representative Beatty. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Ebbesen."



Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified to go to a meeting?"

Speaker Redmond: "The answer is 'yes'."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Proceed. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Bradley here? I know where he is. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Vinson: "Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Collins? He's the man across the aisle from you."

Vinson: "Representative Conti."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Conti here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Friedrich."

Speaker Redmond: "Friedrich? How is he recorded? Well, Dwight is not on the floor and Virginia is...which one do you want?"

Vinson: "Dwight."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Vinson: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty is here. Put him back on the Roll Call. Beatty."

Vinson: "Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Hanahan here? How's he recorded? Where's Hanahan? He's here."

Vinson: "Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"



Vinson: "Hoffman."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Hoffman here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. There's Bradley. Put him back on."

Vinson: "Who did you put back on, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Bradley. Walking down the aisle here."

Vinson: "McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "McBroom. Is McBroom here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Richmond."

Speaker Redmond: "How's Rep... is Representative Richmond in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Birchler."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Vinson: "Birchler."

Speaker Redmond: "Birchler. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative White."

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

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative White be verified?"

Vinson: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Vinson: "Schraeder."

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

Friedland: "Request postponed consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed consideration. 765."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 765. A Bill for an Act in relation to natural resources, research, data collection and



environmental studies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

House Bill 765 authorizes the Institute of Natural Resources to aid and advise urban and agricultural communities as to how they can solve their problems through alternative energy resource development. Alternative energy resource development refers to solar, wind, and water, biomass, and geothermal energy resources. This Bill would give the Illinois Energy Resources Commission...the Illinois Institute of Natural Resources the power to make available small sums of money to these communities, so they can prepare their applications to the Federal Government for various types of demonstrations. There would be \$75,000 which would be made available on a state-wide basis to the Illinois Institute, and the Institute endorses this concept and supports this Bill, and it passed Committee 8-1, and I ask for your approval of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Dunn."

J.Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this Bill put on full debate and would request that 10 Members join me in asking for full debate on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "It's full debate. He's been joined by nine other Members. Full debate."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, will you please...? Mike."

J.Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there were a number...this Bill provides for alternative energy sources in the State of Illinois. One of which, of course, is the proposed use of gasohol. There were a number of Bills introduced in the Illinois General Assembly this Spring Session by Members of this House where the subject matter was gasohol. Each of those



Bills, which out front discuss the subject of gasohol, was sent to the House Transportation Committee. Because there were a number of them, a Subcommittee was formed in the House. A gasohol Subcommittee in the House Transportation Committee, and each of those Bills was placed in that Committee for the purpose of working over the summer on this important subject matter, so that any legislation which is recommended by this chamber will be the product of thorough study on this important issue in the State of Illinois. Each of the Sponsors... each of the individual Sponsors on both sides of the aisle of those pieces of legislation consented to placing their Bills in Subcommittee for this purpose. Not to kill those Bills, but to work over the summer to develop the issue. As everyone knows, the present proposals about gasohol include the removal of the motor fuel tax from gasohol. With our road fund in the desperate condition it is in now, to remove the motor fuel tax from any item, which is a source of revenue for the road fund, is a serious, serious matter. We should look very carefully into gasohol. We should study this issue thoroughly over the summer, and we should not rush into this matter. This particular Bill and a couple of other Bills on the Calendar seek to come by indirect means by the purpose...by means of amendment to circumvent the procedures of the gasohol Subcommittee of the House to discuss this issue. We will be hasty. We will be premature if we act now. We should discuss this matter at a proper time under proper conditions and develop a position that we can all be proud of in the State of Illinois. We should not be stamped into anything at this point in time by anyone in this General Assembly. And, furthermore, for those of you who have consideration for your colleagues, think of the position in which they have



been placed if they introduce Bills early in the Session. One of those Bills, I believe, is House Bill 170 something...a Bill placed in Subcommittee that will now not come out if this is done, and that Sponsor will get no credit for the gasohol subject matter which he introduced. None of those Bills are my Bills. I happen to be Chairman of the House Gasohol Subcommittee, and it was partly at my urging that these Bills are placed in Subcommittee. There is no Bill pending in the Senate. There is no need to amend these Bills at this time to push them out of here and take hasty action on gasohol. Let's wait till summertime. Let's do it right. Let's put the entire subject matter where it belongs in a working Subcommittee, and let's defeat this Bill this morning."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Barnes in the Chair."

Barnes: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Chairman, some people in this House, including the Gentleman from Macon, may think they own the subject matter. A subject matter is not owned by the Subcommittee of Transportation. This Lady had her Bill sent to Environment. It's not her fault it was assigned to Environment. The Environment Committee heard the Bill and voted it out. It's not hasty. She introduced this Bill two years ago, and it was approved by the House of Representatives. No one Member, even though he may have a large manufacturer in his district that makes gasohol, owns the subject matter or controls the subject matter in this Legislature. The Committee on Assignment of Bills chose to send this Bill to the Environment Committee. The Environment Committee heard the Bill and approved it. Mrs. Younge now has the Bill on the floor. The Energy Resources Commission, the Institute for Natural Resources are willing to go along and support her Bill. Her Bill doesn't call for any gas



tax exemption. That's the worst red herring I ever heard. There's nothing in this Bill that calls for any gas tax exemption or rebates, and to bring that red herring up on this Bill is wrong. If the Transportation Committee chose to send these Bills to Subcommittee, that's their business. They have the right to do that. If the Sponsors agreed to go along on Transportation, that's their right, but the Environment Committee passed this Bill out. The Lady from St. Clair County has worked hard on it, and she has the right to have the Bill heard on the floor on its merits. It doesn't exempt anything from taxation. It's a very mild Bill. It no...it doesn't take the credit away from anyone who wants credit for gasohol. Any Member that wants credit for gasohol, I'll write a letter to his district, and the manufacturer in his district is a great supporter, friend, or expert on gasohol, but that shouldn't in anyway impede the merits of this Bill, and I support House Bill 765."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur with Representative John Dunn. I am the Minority Spokesman of the Transportation Committee, and we did, in good faith, take both Democrat and Republican related Bills to gasohol and put them in a Subcommittee. Gasohol is a very, very important topic. It's probably the coming form of energy to run automobiles in this country. It's something not to be taken lightly with just one individual piece of legislation. It belongs in a Subcommittee where testimony is taken over a period of time, and a Bill, perhaps just one Bill that is developed, that will have some important relations to the use of gasohol in the state. Therefore, in all due respect of the Sponsor of the Bill, I would



say that I think that this Bill should be defeated and that your input is welcome into the Subcommittee which I am a Member of. I would ask that this Bill be defeated."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really don't understand Representative Dunn and Representative Winchester's comments. It seems like they're truly two persons who identify with their own pet proposal. All this does is permit the Illinois Energy Resources Commission the right to aid and advise urban, suburban, and agricultural communities how to solve some of their energy problems through alternative energy resource development. It doesn't have anything to do with Subcommittees or full Committees or anything like that. It just gives the Energy Resource Commission the right and the responsibility to aid local governments and find alternative energy supplies be it gasohol, atomic energy, or whatever. I think the Lady is to be commended for it. Originally, it was just the urban, suburban, and rural areas, and she knocked out rural and put agricultural communities, which all of us are interested in. I think for Mr. Dunn and Mr. Winchester to lock in only on gasohol it shows some narrowness, and what we ought to be doing is giving our Commission the right to aid those communities, and I support Mrs. Younge. I think it's a good Bill. It passed out of Environment 8 to zero."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Johnson has moved the previous question. All ready for the previous question being



put. All in favor signify by the sign of 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The previous question... Representative... the... Gentle... Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younger, to close."

Younger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it is extremely unfair for someone to say, 'Put a Bill in Subcommittee.' when the Bill was first introduced on March the 8th. It was a Bill having to do with the subject of energy. The Bill went to the Environment and Energy Committee and had a full hearing and was approved by that Committee eight to one. This is a Bill to permit the Institute of Natural Resources, which deals with energy matters and which all their matters come through the Energy Committee, to assist communities and suburban and agricultural groups in applying to the Federal Government for demonstration funds, and I ask your approval of this matter, because this is a vital subject that we need to pursue immediately. Gasohol is not involved at all. You should read the Bill. It covers alternative energy resource development which has to do with wind, solar, and local governments, and I ask for your approval of this matter."

Speaker Barnes: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 765 pass?' All those in favor signify by 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo, is your light on? Do you wish to explain your vote? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Henry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the Lady and the Bill. I think Representative McClain hit the Bill...hit the purpose of this Bill on the head when he suggested that it should pass. We have all sorts of alternatives in the State of Illinois. We've gotten in quite a debate on gasohol, which is kind of a side issue. It's one that is extremely important to me."



I was the first Sponsor of any gasohol Bill before the General Assembly. Perhaps, the only thing that's wrong with Representative Younge's proposal, is she was too modest. When I first introduced the legislation, I wanted a four million dollar appropriation to come into some real research. I think that that is ultimately where we'll be headed, and I ask that we get enough votes up to pass this Bill."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't think any of us have a priority on all the Bills, or all the stations, or all the problems. It's not just a gasohol thing. Frequently, we hear Members standing up talking about 'my Bill'. It's always your Bill until it binds me and all of my constituents and the rest of the people in the state into law. I think we have to be flexible. We have to be reasonable. The Lady's trying to work on a difficult problem. Gasohol is only a simple, elementary part of the problem. It doesn't include wind, solar, and numerous other alternative methods. All we're attempting to do is be broad on it. She took it to Committee and did all the things that are proper. It's a good Bill, and we ought not do this to the Sponsor."

Speaker Barnes: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'ayes'... Representative Winchester, the Gentleman from Hardin, you seek recognition, Sir?"

Winchester: "Yes, I would like to have a verification of the 'aye' votes, please."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Winchester has requested a verification. Representative Laurino, you seek... Representative Laurino votes 'aye'. At the moment there is 94...95 'ayes', 21 voting 'no', 23 recorded as



'present', and the Gentleman has requested a verification of the Roll Call. Representative Younge requests the absentees be polled. Representative Katz, you seek recognition, Sir?"

Katz: "To be verified if I might, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Barnes: "Well, would you hold that for just a minute, Representative Katz? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

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

Speaker Barnes: "How's Representative Ryan recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Ryan: "Record me as 'aye', please."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Ryan votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, votes 'aye'. Just a moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would respectfully request that my request for a verification be withdrawn."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Winchester withdraws his request for a verification on this...on House Bill 765 there. Representative Kosinski votes 'aye'. Representative Davis votes 'aye'. Representative Vinson votes 'no'. Hold on for just a second now. Just hold on. Representative Wikoff votes 'aye'. Representative Piel votes 'aye'. Representative...perhaps we should take a new...I think the Clerk has them all if we can just hold for a second. Representative Vitek votes 'aye', and Representative Dawson votes 'aye'. Representative Watson votes 'aye'. Representative Johnson votes 'aye'. Representative Winchester votes 'aye'. Representative Preston, do you seek recognition, Sir? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."



Preston: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask how my vote has been recorded?"

Speaker Barnes: "How has Representative Preston been recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'aye'?"

Speaker Barnes: "Change Representative Preston to 'aye'.

Representative Peters votes 'no'. Representative Molloy votes 'aye'. Representative Bianco votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, could we...could you take another Roll Call on this?"

Speaker Barnes: "Well, the Clerk indicates to me that he has all of the changes. That's the reason we didn't."

McClain: "I think it would be wise, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Barnes: "Rep...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I think we need a new Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Barnes: "Another Roll Call has been requested. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that's absolutely out of line. You've announced the Roll. The thing has been taken. It's over with, and there's no need for another Roll Call. It's just not necessary, and I vehemently object to the proposal."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "That's just as much in order as dealing with this Bill and another Bill that's coming on a special order of business. I think we ought to take another Roll Call and find out where the deals are cut."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins. Let me say this, there have some questions relative to the count, and I think probably the best way out is to take another Roll Call. Representative Collins."



Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you stated yourself that the Clerk is up-to-date and has an adequate count, so this is ridiculous to have another Roll Call, and for the Gentleman who suggests there's any deals on a special order, the special order has been suspended, so how can you deal on something that doesn't exist?"

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, you're a good Democrat, and you have the gavel. Let's get another Roll Call."

Speaker Barnes: "I believe it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if you do not plan to conduct another Roll Call, please change my vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Barnes: "I plan to take another Roll Call, Representative Madigan. Let's dump this Roll Call and take another Roll Call. The question is on House Bill 765. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The Board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Younge."

Younge: "I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Barnes: "You may, Representative, go right ahead."

Younge: "This is a Bill that is vital to all of the people of Illinois. It has a state-wide capacity to help urban and agricultural areas get the assistance of the Institute of Natural Resources to prepare their applications to the Federal Government. There is available at this time some 2 billion dollars available from the Federal Government for demonstrations and alternative energy resource development, and the communities which this assistance could be made available to are not applying for it, because they do not have the technical skills necessary or the staff necessary to do so. The Bill merely says that the



Institute of Natural Resources should assist these communities, and this Bill gives them the statutory authority and the wherewithal to do so. And because of its urgency, in that we have to convert from oil and gas as an energy source to alternative energy resources, I ask for your support of this matter."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing display of power politics. You see the muscle put on a Bill with all those yellow lights and red lights up there. I think you all ought to go yellow, because that's what you are when you buckle under to this kind of hammer. The Minority Leader is referred to by the Majority Leader as a velvet hammer. There's no velvet about this. This is raw muscle, and you're taking it out on this Lady and her Bill, because you're afraid that she's going to vote her conscience on another Bill. As I said, those yellow lights are just where they should be. This is yellow. It's cowardice, and you ought to be ashamed of yourselves."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. This is simply..."

Speaker Barnes: "State your point, Representative."

Madigan: "...a symbolic reaction to what has occurred on this side of the aisle for the last two days as Mr. Edgar and his other henchmen have walked up and down this aisle with their offers of state jobs, and road projects, and public work projects for House Bill 2700. So, for you Republicans who will vote for 2700 out of the kindness of your heart or because of party loyalty, you ought to get over on this side of the aisle and pick up some of those jobs that they're passing around."



Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevidch."

Matijevidch: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you talk about yellow, you people on the other side of the aisle haven't voted for a Bill of Wyvetter's all Session and last Session, either. We can tell what's going on just by looking at that Board. It's easy to tell around here when a deal is cut. We've found out immediately. I mean, you're the guys that are yellow. That's the fact, Collins, and you know it. We caught you right with your hand in the cookie jar, and you don't like it."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "...Madigan, and Mr. Chairman, and Speaker of the... Members of the House, I'd simply like to know if Mr. Madigan, to get my vote against 2700, can get a friend of mine named Chairman of the RTA?"

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, I just wanted to ask a question about some of those jobs. I didn't know the Governor knew how to spell the word 'patronage'."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have appreciated and enjoyed this debate and the comments of Representative Madigan. This was the first time I was aware there was any jobs available. Thank you."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've heard the Majority Leader very often make fierce political attacks upon the Members of this side of the aisle, and I guess that's part of the process, and it's



something we've come to accept. But, what I can't understand is why the Gentleman does this at the expense of one of his own Members who everyone knows is more...is about as sincere as a Member could be about their particular district. I don't know a Member of the House who works as hard for their district as the Sponsor of this Bill does. She is constantly introducing Bills, constantly showing concern for her district, and the Majority Leader is letting her Bill go down the drain, and I'm surprised to see that he puts partisan politics above the interest of one of his own Members."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I know you're fair, because I saw how you dumped that other Roll Call after you made the announcement of what the Roll was, and I know you're going to be fair now. I don't know why we should be taking it out on this young Lady's Bill. I wish you would dump this Roll Call and give this Lady the vote that she needs to pass this Bill like she had when you announced the Roll Call before."

Speaker Barnes: "Well, the Board..."

Conti: "I think you...I can't think you'd dump the Roll Call again."

Speaker Barnes: "Well, Repre..."

Conti: "Show your fairness on this."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative, the Board is still open, and anyone can vote any way that they wish. I didn't announce the Roll Call before, and the Board is still open. Rep...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, this is an enlightening process to me, and I'm glad that we're getting the bidding out of the back room somewhere, and maybe if we could have open bids in this situation, we might solve something."

Speaker Barnes: "Sold. Have all voted who wish? Have all



voted who wish? The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."

Younge: "...ation."

Speaker Barnes: "I'm sorry, Representative. I didn't catch it."

Younge: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Barnes: "Does the Lady have leave for Postponed...?"

She doesn't need it. House Bill 7...House Bill 765 should be placed on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 882."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 882. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the performance of medical, dental, or surgical procedures on and counseling for minors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's a good thing I have a noncontroversial Bill coming up. This Bill merely addresses the problem of teenage alcoholism. We've all talked a lot about teenage alcoholism this Session, and I think now is the time to do something realistic about it. Basically what this Bill does is it amends the Act concerning the performance of medical, dental, and surgical procedures or counseling on minors, and it includes alcohol use as a problem for which a minor may obtain treatment without parental consent. It requires the persons furnishing the care and counseling of minors to seek the minor's consent in involving the family of such minor in his or her treatment. This Bill is supported by the Illinois State Medical Society, by the Illinois Department of Public Health, and the Commission in Children. I know, really, of no opposition to it, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on it."

Speaker Barnes: "Does anyone stand in opposition to House Bill



882? If not, Representative Jaffe, to close."

Jaffe: "I just want a favorable vote."

Speaker Barnes: "All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The Board is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On House Bill 882 there's 125 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', and no one voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder is it...the Members when they explain their Bill, they made...they could make the procedure much easier if they would give their position on House Bill 2700."

Speaker Barnes: "House Bill 975."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 975. A Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to the deposit of public funds. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentlelady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the intent of this Bill is to require that all custodians of public funds put those funds to work earning interest. It requires that prompt investment be made of monies that are in the hands of these fiscal officers of local governmental units. It doesn't change in any way the procedures currently available to them for investment. It simply indicates that monies deposited with state or local banks have to be placed in interest-bearing accounts and then transferred to demand accounts at the discretion of the Treasurer. Passage of the Bill will be of a benefit to the taxpayers, because the greater amount of interest that is earned by having the funds invested for a longer period of time will mean that there is a less...a lessening of the tax



burden on the taxpayers. I know of no opposition to the Bill, and I solicit your support for the measure."

Speaker Barnes: "Does anyone rise in opposition? The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I think the Bill is a very good idea. I think it is all right with the exception of one thing. It doesn't say in there whether those ought to be accounted daily...deposited in savings accounts daily or monthly or weekly, and, as you'll find in a lot of these small counties, the schools want their money just as soon as they can get it, and so you're going to have money going in and out of that account, because they all draw theirs in less than 30 days or as soon as they possibly can. You're going to have money going in and out of an account, and it's going to be a lot of extra bookkeeping is going to keep...you're going to require another person if you're not careful just to keep track of your deposits and where your money is. And, I oppose this Bill for the reason I think that we'll impose an undue burden on the county treasurer. Thank you."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Satterthwaite to close."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are not touching in any way the current statutes that indicate when treasurers have to deposit money. We are still leaving that just as it is currently. We are simply saying by this Bill that when the money goes to a state or national bank, it must go into an interest-bearing account. We had testimony in Committee, and I've had a number of local fiscal officers talk to me indicating that the new electronic banking processes that are now available present no problem in this regard. In fact, a good fiscal officer will even put this out to bids so that they can get an extremely high rate of interest in many cases. They also have the alternative if they want to currently, not by this Bill,



but currently to invest in the State Treasurer's pool. However, many of the people at the local level would prefer to have their money stay in the hands of their local bankers. I think this is completely workable. It does not deprive anybody of funds. They can move it back to demand accounts even if it's only in there overnight. It just maximizes the effect of interest that they can be earning on your money, which they are keeping in trust for you as a taxpayer, and I urge your support."

Speaker Barnes: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 975 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, it appears that my words of wisdom are not necessary. The Bill goes just fine."

Speaker Barnes: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti. Representative Conti. The Gentleman from Cook."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I have nothing wrong with the concept of the Bill, but I am very much concerned, and I wish you'd all look at the deletion of the words in the last paragraph of the Bill. It makes it unclear as to the liability of the Treasurer in this area. For instance, does this deletion mean that they are liable for problems with investments when the money is in the custody of a bank. Now, with that...I'm very much concerned with that like I have been with the savings and loan Bills and all other Bills. Why was that...the deletion of those words in that Bill?"

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of inquiry to the Chair. Would you please tell me what Order of Call is the Chair on at this time?"

Speaker Barnes: "We are on the Priority Order of Call on Third Reading on page 2 of the priority list."



Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Barnes: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On 975 there's 105 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no', 14 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitution. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan. Would you step aside for just a minute, because I couldn't see you, George?"

Ryan: "I would like to verify this Roll Call."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Ryan has requested a verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Laurino, votes 'aye'. Laurino votes 'aye'. Representative Satterthwaite requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Katz, the Gentleman from Cook."

Katz: "May I be verified, Mr. Speaker? I have..."

Speaker Barnes: "May Representative Katz be verified, Representative Ryan? Representative Ryan, may Representative Katz be verified? Just hold it for just a second so the Clerk can get it out with...would the Clerk please poll the absentees and everyone please be in their seat? We're on the verification."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Bradley. Capuzi. Darrow. Dawson. Domico. Dyer. Ewell. Ewing. Dwight Friedrich. Emil Jones. Kempiners. Kent. Kozubowski. Lechowicz. McAuliffe. Oblinger. Peters. Stearney. Tuerk. Younge. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Leon. Representative Leon changes from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to be verified at this time."

Speaker Barnes: "Would you hold that for just a second? Is there anyone seeking to change or adjust their vote on this Roll Call? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I'd like to be changed, Mr. Speaker, from 'aye' to 'present'."



Speaker Barnes: "Would you change Representative Walsh from 'aye' to 'present'? Just hold tight. Hold your hand up, and I'll get to each one of you. The Gentlelady from Cook, Representative Alexander, votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bianco, votes 'no'. Are you...change Representative Bianco from 'aye' to 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Matula, from 'yes' to 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molloy."

Molloy: "Vote from 'yes' to 'present'."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners. I tried to put you in Kankakee."

Kempiners: "Well, that's all right too, Mr. Speaker. We have a problem in Will County with the Will County Treasurer holding up funds so long that the local taxing bodies have to take out tax anticipation warrant, and because of that concern I have with this Bill, I would vote 'present'."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Change me to 'present', please from 'yes'."

Speaker Barnes: "Change Representative Anderson from 'yes' to 'present'. The Gentlelady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Change me to 'present'."

Speaker Barnes: "Change from 'yes' to 'present'. Just a minute. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, change me from 'yes' to 'present'."

Speaker Barnes: "From 'yes' to 'present'. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest you dump this Roll Call and take another one. Save us...and it might save a verification. I mean, we did it on a Bill just a minute



ago. I don't know why we can't on this."

Speaker Barnes: "Well, let's dump the Roll Call. The question is on House Bill 975. All those in favor, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I would ask the Speaker what his posture would be on those people who previously had asked leave to be verified, because they had to leave the chamber prior to the fact the party is dumping the Roll Call, and I would ask what your posture would be on that?"

Speaker Barnes: "There was only one such person. Representative Katz, and would you vote him 'aye'? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentlelady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "May I ask for a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Barnes: "Would you poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. E. M. Barnes. Beatty."

Speaker Barnes: "Vote Representative Barnes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi. Catania. Darrow. Dawson. Dyer."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Dawson. Representative Dawson votes 'aye'. This is a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Dyer. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Emil Jones. Kane."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Vote me 'aye', please and verify me, also."

Speaker Barnes: "This is no verification, just a poll of the absentees at this point. Representative Catania indicates she wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Representative Catania. Continue the poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Kent. Kozubowski. Laurino."

Speaker Barnes: "Representative Laurino indicates he wishes to be recorded 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Leverenz. Oblinger. Peters. Skinner. Stearney. Tuerk. Younge. And, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Barnes: "What's the total, Mr. Clerk? There'll be 82 voting 'aye'. Representative Leverenz votes 'aye'. Eighty-three voting 'aye'. Representative Macdonald votes 'aye'. There's 84 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite, do you wish to put this on postponed consideration?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes, please."

Speaker Barnes: "Postponed consideration. House Bill 982. Representative Neff. This is on the no debate list, Representative. Do you wish to call it now? House Bill 982."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 982. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to county zoning. Third Reading of the Bill."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 982..."

Speaker Barnes: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff. Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 982 is the result of a coordinated study by the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission that there appears to be an org...and there appears to be no organized opposition. It will use earmarked funds from the motor vehicle recycling fund and no new money will be needed. It has the support of the Illinois Municipal League; the Illinois Association of County Boards, the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, the Illinois Sheriffs Association, and the Secretary of State, and the Department of Transportation. Now, in Committee, the Department of Law Enforcement did make some remarks against it. But, after they studied the Bill out, particularly the Amendments we put on it, I have a letter in the file here that they are in full support of it. I know of no opposition, and I would appreciate a favorable vote on House Bill 982."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti is recognized."



Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's welcome the St. George Grammar School from the 30th District represented by Representatives Dawson, Collins, and Balanoff up here on the Democratic side."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 982 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Flinn in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On...Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, I want to explain my vote. The reason I'm voting 'present', I think that two can play the game, and I don't think that we ought to be holding off on Democratic Bills and passing out Republican Bills. And, until we get some agreement that we're going to work together and forget about the political side issues, I'm going to vote 'present' on any Republican Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, I don't know who to tell you to talk to, but talk to anybody you want. On this question... You'rell asked his button to be pushed from up here. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, since we're playing games, I ought to change my vote to 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Schraeder to 'present'. Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman wants to verify the Roll Call...Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Friedrich wants to vote 'aye'. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I think it's a bad Bill. Believe it or not. That's why I'm voting 'no', because it happens to be a bad Bill, you know, regardless of where it is...I wouldn't vote it if my seatmate was the...it's just a bad Bill. That's all."

Speaker Flinn: "Anderson, 'aye'. Representative Henry."



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

Speaker Flinn: "Change Henry to 'present'. Representative Domico. Representative VonBoeckman. I'm sorry."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think if we're going to start playing games then, I think we'd better adjourn. I feel this is a good piece of legislation, and I think we should reconsider what we're doing here even if we have to reconsider the previous vote that was taken."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't want to participate in that. Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Change my vote to 'present', please."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Alexander to 'present'. Domico. Change Domico to 'present'. Mr... Representative Jones, 'aye'. Oblinger, 'aye'. Skinner, 'aye'. Peters, 'aye'. Getty. Representative Getty is recognized."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I think we have the same problem again, and I think we ought to take a new Roll Call on this."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, the Clerk is caught up here if there's not many more changes. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is no reflection on you or the Gentleman that was sitting in that seat before you, but I think we have spent an awful lot of time, you as well as I, on the Rules Committee yesterday to try to expedite this legislative process so we can get out of here by Friday night. Now, I'm appealing to you to ask the real Speaker to come out here and get this mess straightened out so we can quit playing games the rest of the day. Unless we want to hit the front pages of the daily presses again about being a three ring circus, I think we'd better get to work."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Chapman: "I requested a verification of the Roll Call."



Speaker Flinn: "Well, if the Lady will let me pick up all the people who are trying to change their vote, we will determine how many there are, and you may not want a verification. Representative Yourell. Change Yourell to 'no'. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Representative Getty made a very good suggestion. He recommended that you dump the Roll Call so that those people who are not on the Roll Call...who are not in the chamber would not be voting and that might save us a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, if...if there were a number of people who were still requiring a change in their vote, but we already have them caught up, and we're just totting them now. Representative Neff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of permission to take this out of the record at this time."

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave? There's objection raised. There's objection. Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to put Representative Satterthwaite's on...taken out of the record and take this one out of the record until we get the...resolved. Our differences resolved."

Speaker Flinn: "There's objection on that, too. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we ought to test our integrity and our sincerity. Why don't we give leave to do that to that Bill and we'll...and give leave to do it to Satterthwaite's Bill and then we'd start out even? How's that?"

Speaker Flinn: "I wouldn't know how to negotiate with."

Matijevich: "Maybe they want to cut a deal. At least I do it out in the open. I don't run around somebody's chair. My deals are cut over the mic."



Speaker Flinn: "My duty is to try to announce the Roll Call, and if there are... due to the request for verification, there will be a verification, and that's my role. I don't intend to editorialize or participate in any negotiations. There are 93 'aye' and 6 'no', and the Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, asked for a verification. Representative Jacob Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that we adjourn until the hour of 1:30."

Speaker Flinn: "You're not recognized for that purpose. Does Representative Neff want the absentees polled? Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Bullock. Catania. Darrow. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Gaines. Garmisa. Giorgi. Goodwin. Hanahan. Harris. Huff. Emil Jones. Keane. Kempiners. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Mautino. McGrew. Kulas. Patrick. Pierce. Pouncey. Rigney. Schoeberlein. Stearney. Stuffle. Taylor. Tuerk. Younger."

Speaker Flinn: "Leave Representative Chapman's microphone on and poll the affirmative votes. We already announced the results once. There were no changes during the process. There were 90...93 'ayes', 6 'noes'."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Ackerman. Alexander. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Bluthardt."

Speaker Flinn: "Just a minute. Representative Alexander, for what purpose do you arise?"

Alexander: "I asked to be changed to 'present' on this vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I can't change your light, ma'am. You're marked as 'present' here."

Alexander: "I know it. But, he's calling affirmative votes, isn't he?"

Speaker Flinn: "You changed to 'present' already, and the light will not change when you ask."

Alexander: "Okay, thank you."



Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt; Borchers; Boucek; Bower; Campbell;
Capuzi. Collins."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Birchler, for what purpose
do you arise?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Birchler: "Change me to 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Birchler to 'present'. Proceed. Rep-
resentative Kempiners, for what purpose do you arise?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Change Kempiners to...vote Kempiners 'aye'.
Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Conti. Daniels."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Wolf. Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote to 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Sam Wolf to 'present'. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Davis. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Donovan.
Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Woodyard. Epton. Ewing.
Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich.
Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hoffman.
Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Kane.
Kempiners. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Macdonald.
Mahar. Margalus. Mautino. Matula. McAuliffe.
McBroom. McCourt. McMaster."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bradley, for what purpose do
you arise? Proceed. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Neff. Oblinger.
Pechous. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly.
Richmond. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler.
Schlickman. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms. Skinner.
Stanley. E. G. Steele."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schoeberlein."

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



Speaker Flinn: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Schoeberlein: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Schoeberlein, 'aye' Representative Anderson, are you seeking recognition?"

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

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

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Neff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would again ask for a postponement of this legislation, because it's a good piece of legislation, and we're taking up too much time on it, and I think we should postpone it."

Speaker Flinn: "Postponed Consideration. Oh, are...you asked for postponement."

Neff: "I referred to Representative Lechowicz, please."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz. You're recognized. He wanted you to be recognized."

Lechowicz: "Well, what he really wants is to take it out of the record."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schlickman objects to that. Representative Beatty. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, record Beatty as 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Beatty to 'no'. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I will have to disagree with the objection that was raised, but I just want to point out that this is very early in the day to be put in the posture that we're going through this afternoon. There were a couple of good Bills that were presented to this General Assembly for fair consideration and a couple of games were played on them. Unfortunately, two measures. This measure is very important... It's important not only in Cook County but in a lot of other



areas of this state, and it is really at the request of Alan Dixon, the Secretary of State, that this measure was considered in conjunction with the full cooperation of the Sheriff's Association throughout the State of Illinois, and the Bill should've been on its merits as Collins' Bill should've been on its merits. I think that maybe what we should do is reconsider the measures that are...those past three measures and proceed in the orderly workings of this House. I'm just saying it's a little bit too early in the day to be putting this posture with the work load that we have before us. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Sumner."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich on a point of order. State your point."

Matijevich: "Well, I didn't hear anybody object to Postponed Consideration, because that's what I heard him say."

Speaker Flinn: "The Sponsor said that's not what he intended. That he asked to take it out of the record, and there was objections on this side to him taking it out of the record."

Matijevich: "Well, I didn't hear him say that. I heard Ted say that, but I didn't hear him say out of the record."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you can go ask him if you don't believe me. Proceed. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Matijevich is absolutely right. It was Representative Lechowicz that asked to take it out of the record. I think the Sponsor asked that it be postponed, and that's his right, and we should postpone it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Neff, would you state again what your request is of the House?"

Neff: "I asked that the request be withdrawn and to take it out of the record."



Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave? He does not have leave. Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Swanstrom. Totten. Vinson. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Waddell. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Abramson."

Speaker Flinn: "Abramson. He's in his seat."

Chapman: "What is the count please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "The count remains at 93 'aye', but we now have 7 'noes', which was...here or there."

Chapman: "Ninety-three. Thank you. Abramson."

Speaker Flinn: "He is in his seat."

Chapman: "Kane."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schraeder, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I don't like to interfere with the verification, but I think I would like to re-echo what Representative Lechowicz has just said."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you already did interrupt the verification, and I..."

Schraeder: "Well, I think you...it would be fair to ask for ...to withdraw the verification of Representative Chapman being anene."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, she knows she has that right. Representative Chapman, what was the next name?"

Chapman: "Did you take Mr. Kane off the record, Sir?"

Speaker Flinn: "Who?"

Chapman: "Mr. Kane."

Speaker Flinn: "Doug Kane? Is he...is the Gentleman on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him out of the record. Representative Richmond. Change Richmond to 'present'. Representative Conti."



Conti: "Did you take me off?"

Speaker Flinn: "You weren't taken off. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. DiPrima."

Speaker Flinn: "Larry DiPrima? Is he on the floor? I don't see him. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the record."

Chapman: "Mr. Donovan."

Speaker Flinn: "Tim Donovan. He's in his seat."

Chapman: "Mr. Yourell. Oh, Mr. Yourell is in his seat, I believe. Mr. Dawson."

Speaker Flinn: "Tim Johnson?"

Chapman: "Dawson."

Speaker Flinn: "He's standing at his seat."

Chapman: "Mr. Schisler."

Speaker Flinn: "Gale Schisler. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. Is he on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the record."

Chapman: "Let's see, Mr. Richmond went to 'present'. Mr. Flinn. Mr. Speaker, how are you recorded, Sir?"

Speaker Flinn: "I don't care to say at this time."

Chapman: "Mr. Redmond."

Speaker Flinn: "The Speaker was on the floor a moment ago. I don't see him right now. There he is in the back. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "If the Lady wants to verify me, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "No, she did not want to verify you. She was just saying that you had changed. If we would not have so many interruptions, maybe we'll get through this and finally get someplace on the next Bill. Representative Chapman. Representative Gaines."

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

Speaker Flinn: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"



Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Gaines, 'aye'. Representative Stearney.

Stearney, 'aye'."

Chapman: "Mr. Schraeder."

Speaker Flinn: "Schraeder. He's at his seat."

Chapman: "Mr. VonBoeckman."

Speaker Flinn: "VonBoeckman. I can't see. There's somebody standing in front of him."

Chapman: "He's there."

Speaker Flinn: "There? Okay."

Chapman: "I believe that's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "What is the count? Representative Rigney.

Rigney, 'aye'. Representative... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Just in case we're going to play some more games later on I want to change my vote to 'aye' in case we need to reconsider this vote. Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1341. Wait a minute. I think I'm wrong. Let me get straightened out on the new Calendar. 1011 it is. Sorry about that."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1011. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me start out by saying this is not a Republican or a Democratic Bill. This is sponsored jointly by myself and Mike McClain. There have been no deals made on 2700 or 2659 or any other. We have enough opposition from some of the strong lobbyists, but this Bill is really for the consumers, and it's a very good Bill. So, I hope that whatever games we've



been playing on the last two Bills, you will earnestly consider this Bill on the merits. What Bill...House Bill 1011 does is it gives people a freedom of choice when we're talking about the treatment of mental disorders. What it does, it amends the Act to provide that, in addition to medical doctors and that's medical doctors in any kind of a profession be they baby doctors or skin specialists who are now allowed to treat mental disorders and clinical psychologists who are allowed to treat mental disorders, it allows for clinical social workers to come under this Act if the...if it's to be offered. It gives the person a freedom of choice to pick that. When I'm talking about clinical social workers, these are people who are qualified. They're qualified by having a master's degree. They've been in the field for five years at least, and they have a special graduate degree to put them in this class. You will recall that we amended the Bill. I accepted the Amendment of Representative Jones which provided that an agency could only be paid under this Bill if the work was actually done by the qualified clinical social worker. I think it's a very good Bill. I think what it'll do, it'll give people throughout the state the opportunity to be treated. I think it will lower the cost...lower the cost of...for the treatment of these mental disorders because of the clinical social workers who are qualified to do it. There are a lot of areas in this state where there are not psychiatrists that can carry it out. I think it's a good Bill. It's one that we passed two years ago, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, is recognized."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very important Bill, and I would ask sufficient Members to join me in order to remove this Bill from the Short Debate Calendar."



Speaker Flinn: "All right. We have enough. You asked for six, I think, but it takes nine additional. It appears that we have nine additional, so it's on Long Debate. Did you wish to speak to the Bill, Representative Chapman?"

Chapman: "Yes, I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question if I may?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will yield."

Chapman: "Representative Sandquist, could you talk a little bit about what you regard to be the cost implications of this? Many of us are concerned with the escalating cost of health care, and while we agree with many of the views that you have expressed in presenting this Bill, have concern that this will escalate the cost of premiums and may price insurance out of the market for many individuals. So, could you talk a little bit about the cost, please?"

Sandquist: "Yes, in my opinion, there is really no evidence to say that this is going to increase the cost. As a matter of fact, I believe it could reduce the cost, because the charges made by qualified clinical social workers are not near as high as those which are made by psychiatrists, so I don't think that there's any proof that this is going to increase the cost."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill. A little earlier today we had a similar Bill that would've mandated that group insurance buyers must include coverage for a podiatrist. Now, we have another Bill mandating that group insurance buyers have to include insurance coverage for clinical social workers. I think one of the problems relating to the cost here that has been alluded to by the Sponsor may have missed his attention in that the Bill says that not only shall



the insurance be required to pay for the bills of clinical social workers but also for any agencies employing clinical social workers. Now, this is going to include within the purvey of or the purview of your group insurance field many, many social agencies which are not now generally considered to be a part of the medical practitioner community, and I would simply point out to the House that this is another instance of mandating insurance costs on insurance buyers. Now, this Bill has no effect on the insurance industry, because they'll be perfectly willing to pass these costs along to the insurance buyer, but if you have an interest in the cost to the insurance buyer, I think you should oppose this Bill. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative... Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill passed the Illinois House last year and in the last few days of Legislative Session... or last Session... the last few days of Legislative Session Senator Guidice who is the Senate Sponsor, did not proceed with it. This Bill received overwhelming support in this House of Representatives two years ago. I should point out to the Membership that we did the same thing for clinical psychologists a few years ago, and it had no impact on insurance premiums. Likewise, this Bill will have no impact. I should po... and I should point out that, in the Committee, the insurance lobbyists alluded to that and state it, and I, in fact, quoted a 'Warshin' Life agent saying that to the full Membership of that Insurance Committee if the Membership will recall. House Bill 1011 provides that clinical social workers are those people that have five years of work after a master's degree in social work or have two years under a supervised clinical practice practitioner.



The point that Mr. Schuneman was talking about has been taken care of with the Chairman of Insurance Committee's recommendation, so there won't be any fraud or anything like that in terms of agency reimbursement. I would like to point out to the Membership that this is indeed not any partisan vote at all, and it should not be confused at all with any kind of issues. This Bill is endorsed by the National Association of Social Workers, Illinois Society for Clinical Social Work, Illinois Association of Community Mental Health Agencies, Mental Health Association of Illinois, Association of Community Mental Health Association of Illinois, Catholic Charities of Chicago, Belleville, Joliet, Peoria, Rockford, and Springfield, Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, Lutheran Welfare Services of Illinois, Child Care Association of Illinois. I'd like to point out lastly that what we're doing here is clinical social workers in the State of Illinois. There are only approximately 1100 of them, and they're identified, and there's no problem thereof. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 1011."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Doug Huff, is recognized."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this Bill because very simply, Ladies and Gentlemen, in the real world there is a need for the clinical psychologist, because most often...more often than not it is the clinical psychologist who forms the first line of defense in the area of mental illness not the professional psychiatrist. And, more often as not, in most instances, the professional psychologist is usually a foreign national who has no relationship, no empathy for the people who need this type of service, and another point I'd like to make, it's high time that we call in to the invidious



discrimination indulged in by the insurance company. By that I mean it's wrong for the insurance companies to somehow give the stamp of inferiority to various professions as they have done in this case or attempted to do with the clinical psychologist and as they have done in the other Bill we heard earlier with the podiatrists. I think that the Constitution denies this, especially when it flies in the face of the purpose of the state. In this case, we saw last Session what the state, under the revisions of the Mental Health Code, clearly intended to include the clinical psychiatrists with the particular background that we are discussing here now. I think that it is a good Bill, and it should be supported by all of us..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative..."

Huff: "...because the need is there."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schuneman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schuneman: "Point of order. Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Schuneman: "The Gentlemen continues to speak about clinical psychologists, and that's not what's being addressed here. The Bill addresses clinical social workers."

Speaker Flinn: "Your point is well taken. Would you... Representative Huff, would you address your remarks to the Bill?"

Huff: "Well, if you examine that term very carefully, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you will find that we are talking about the same thing, and I think that Representative Sandquist will back me up."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sam Wolf, is recognized."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The previous question has been moved. The



question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The...Representative Sandquist to close."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to say this is good legislation for consumers who have to use these...the services. The question that Representative Schuneman raised about the agency, that's been clarified by the Amendment. Only those services performed by a qualified worker can be reimbursed. I think this is a good Bill. It's something that's needed by consumers. I think we will maybe get people...some of the public aid and welfare costs will go down, because the state will not have to pay, because it'll be covered by this type of legislation, and I might say that when you go in to get an insurance policy you have a choice to ask whether or not you're going to have the treatment of mental disorders and things in this related line. If you do, what we're saying is then you should include the clinical social workers who do so much of the work and they're part of the area that has to be covered. I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House 10...House Bill 1011 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Vinson to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Representative Schuneman accurately said, this Bill will raise the cost of group health insurance. Now, what that does is make it that much harder for us to provide basic insurance coverage for everybody in this country. It's part of a big picture. The more you raise the cost... in other words, we might be able to buy a Ford in terms of insurance coverage for everybody in the country, but you can't buy a Cadillac, and everytime we piecemeal



raise the cost of group health insurance we move that much further away from providing basic coverage for every person in this country, so I urge a 'no' vote and request a verification if it gets the...an adequate number."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Emil Jones, to explain his vote."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was heard in the Insurance Committee, and it passed out with an overwhelming vote, and it passed two years ago out of this House with an overwhelming vote. The Bill was amended on the floor to clear up the problem concerning the agency. I offered that Amendment, and only those agencies who are employing clinical social workers and those individuals that are performing the work as defined in the Bill will be reimbursed according to this Act. Now, it was stated earlier by a previous speaker that this will cause all agencies to fall under this Bill. This is not so. It is clearly stated in the Bill. It's a very good piece of legislation, and I think we should all put a green light on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Schneider, to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears that the debate has lost track of what, I think, is the issue. The insurance question is, of course, at stake, but what I think's at stake is various kinds of ways to resolve individuals' difficulties, and I think clinical social workers have the kind of expertise, in many cases, that satisfy the needs and the health care interests of many people. If we are restrictive, let's say, to MDs, psychiatrists, or possibly even psychologists, they like anybody else carry a particular point of view that does not always resolve one's emotional and



personal dilemmas, so what I would suggest is that we pay more attention to the notion of how we serve people in terms of their emotional problems and also take a good look at the capacity of the person who is rendering the service. I think we ought to broaden the scope of choice. I think there are many points of view that qualify people in this kind of career...bring to helping individuals resolve their varying depths of problems, and I would solicit an 'aye' vote and not be so pinned down by the question of insurance."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Preston, to explain his vote."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker and distinguished Representatives, social workers primarily treat children. House Bill 1011 will provide much needed mental health care for children, and I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative John Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I would just like to point out that if this Bill passes, those of you who have community mental health centers, will find that there will be no problem processing insurance payments for work done by clinical social workers, and your community...your local mental health agencies are always strapped for money and short of funds and very concerned about where their dollars are coming from. This will be a great advantage to them, and I would encourage enough votes to pass this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't even have to drop my drawers to be recognized today. But, seriously, I think we ought to stop and think about what we're doing. You say that with a broadening of coverage that it does not increase the premium of that insurance. Why certainly it does. It must. Just two years ago this General Assembly enacted a Bill that required



that anyone having group hospitalization for...must include pregnancy as a regular type of illness. That provision added eight dollars per person in the Village of Schiller Park. You continue to increase the coverage it costs the taxpayer...the ultimate person who pays for the insurance, so that in a little town like Schiller Park, for instance, to cover all our employees and their family it costs roughly \$100,000 a year now. And, if that's not an example of what we do when we mandate this type of coverage, then I don't think you realize what a burden you're putting on local government and well, even the question is whether or not we ought to even carry group insurance because of the tremendous cost. I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt in the middle of a Roll Call, but they're going to leave. Bill Damish's eighth grade American History class from 'Tuft' Junior High School from Streamwood, represented by John Friedland, and Roger Stanley, and Richard Mugalian, are up in the gallery. Let's give them a hand."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't disagree with the last speaker more. It's my understanding of the Bill that we're not mandating anything except some additional coverage in people in group policies that seek to add the rider for mental health care into their policy and pay for that, we're simply seeking, in this Bill, to expand the group of people who can treat under those provisions if you choose to buy that provision. Now, I supported this Bill two years ago. In fact, I put the Amendment on in Committee, and a lot of people weren't very happy with me about it, but I can tell you



one thing, in many rural areas in the state and, in fact, in some urban areas there aren't enough clinical psychologists and psychiatrists to go around, and the degree of safety built into this Bill through qualifications for clinical social workers to practice psychotherapy are far in excess of the ones that I had when I was practicing psychotherapy as a graduate from the... Southern Illinois' graduate school working for the state, so I suggest to you there is no cost to the Bill. There will be no mandate. It's simply an extension of the ability of therapists to pract...another classification of therapists to practice therapy for the benefit of the consumer."

Speaker Flinn: "Before I recognize the next Gentleman, I've been very liberal in letting people explain their votes beyond the one minute. When we get on...back on Short Debate, I'm going to use the two minutes for the debate for the Sponsor and anyone in opposition and the one minute for explaining votes, and I'm going to use the clock. It's time we started moving. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to disagree with Representative Davis. Anytime that we mandate something which we are doing here, we're expanding costs for employers to provide the money and also the people who have to pay for their group insurance premiums have to pay for this expanded benefit. I don't believe it's the Legislature's position to mandate these types of benefits on anyone. We should also include Christian Scientist practitioners. As a matter of fact, my sister told me that her dog got sick, and it cost her \$345 over a three-day period, so maybe we should cover veterinarians as well. It's not our position if the people want to pay for the benefit. I'm sure that's true with our own group insurance



carriers. They can...can't provide this type of benefit, and we should leave it up to the employers and the employees to determine what type of coverage that they want rather than mandating another benefit on them."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too rise in support of this legislation. I couldn't disagree more with the most recent speaker, Representative Terzich. I agree with what Representative Davis has said that it's not a mandate, and there is an additional cost. If the services...on a given individual, somebody has to be paid, and in terms of third party payment, which is coming more and more into our lives everyday, that this merely means that the individual, especially in the rural areas, has the opportunity to be...to get that recognized service from certain individuals. In this particular case, the ones that are mentioned in the legislation, and I just think that it's like freedom of choice, where do you want to go, and we recognize that they are authorities. They're competent people, and they ought to be paid."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 'ayes' and 53 voting 'no', and Representative Vinson has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call, and Representative Sandquist asked for a poll of the absentees. As soon as it comes out, we will poll the absentees. It's out."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees. E. M. Barnes. Darrow. Dawson. Dyer. Dwight Friedrich. Griesheimer. Kane. Kent. Kornowicz. Kozubowski. Laurino. Leverenz. McBroom. Ronan. Ryan."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, Clerk. Representative Conti, for what purpose do you arise?"



Conti: "Mr. Speaker, we're honored to have with us today the State Committee of the National Council of Jewish Women seated in the Speaker's gallery. Glad to have you with us, women."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Further absentees."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, absentees. I'm sorry."

Clerk O'Brien: "C. M. Stiehl. Tuerk. And, Winchester."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Boucek. Bowman. Preston. Braun. Bullock. Catania. Cullerton. Currie. Davis. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Gaines. Garmisa. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallstrom. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Katz. Keane. Kempiners. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. Excuse me, I skipped Matula. Matula, then Mautino. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Kulas. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Rea."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Garmisa, for what purpose do you arise? Garmisa."

Garmisa: "I'd like to change my 'aye' vote to 'no', please."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Garmisa from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative McPike, for what purpose...to 'aye'. McPike to 'aye'. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to change my 'aye' to 'nay'."

Speaker Flinn: "DiPrima 'aye' to 'no'. Harris to 'aye'. Murphy, 'aye'. I'm waiting on the Clerk to catch up. Murphy, 'aye'. Harris, 'aye' and Murphy, 'aye'. Capuzi. Capuzi from 'no' to 'aye'. Leon."



Leon: "'Yes' to 'no', please."

Speaker Flinn: "'Leon from 'aye' to 'nay'. Kulas.'"

Kulas: "I'd like to change my vote to 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Kulas to 'present'. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Further affirmative votes. Reed. Richmond. Ropp. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Henry. Simms. Skinner. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Van Duyne. Vitek. White. Willer. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Leave Representative Vinson's microphone on. Questions to the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Vinson. Starting with...wait, let's get the starting number first. We're at 89 'aye' and 55 'no' right now beginning."

Vinson: "Beatty."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty's in the aisle."

Vinson: "Bowman."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman's at his seat."

Vinson: "Rea."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Rea. I don't see the Gentleman. There he is on the Republican side making a deal."

Vinson: "It's a good reason to defeat this Bill. Cullerton."

Speaker Flinn: "Who did you say? Cullerton? He's in the back of the Republican side."

Vinson: "Deuster."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster. I don't see him at his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Vinson: "Dunn."

Speaker Flinn: "Which one?"

Vinson: "John."

Speaker Flinn: "John Dunn. He's in the aisle on the Democrat side."



Vinson: "Doyle."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Doyle. There he is over here on my left. Representative Kane, for what purpose do you arise? He wants to vote 'aye'. Record Kane as 'aye'."

Vinson: "Mr. Epton."

Speaker Flinn: "Epton. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. Is Representative Epton on the floor? He is...they tell me he is temporarily indisposed. Remove him from the Roll."

Vinson: "Farley."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Farley's at his seat." Rep-
Sam Wolf, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote to 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Wolf from 'aye' to 'present'. Change the Speaker from 'aye' to 'no'."

Vinson: "Getty."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty. I don't see the Gentleman at his seat. Is he on the floor? What...how's the Gentleman recorded? There is Getty."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman just arrived. Here he is now."

Vinson: "Lechowicz."

Speaker Flinn: "Who did you say?"

Vinson: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Speaker Flinn: "Lechowicz. I don't see the Gentleman at his seat. Is he on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Vinson: "Marovitz."

Speaker Flinn: "Marovitz. I don't see the Gentleman at his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? There he is."

Vinson: "O'Brien."

Speaker Flinn: "O'Brien. I don't see the Gentleman at his seat. I see Representative Epton has returned."



Would you return him to the Roll? Is he... Representative

Clerk O'Brien on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Vinson: "Richmond."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Richmond's at his seat."

Vinson: "Schneider."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schneider's in his seat. Doyle

was okay. We kept him on the Rolls. Do you wish to change your vote? Representative Doyle's recognized. Doyle."

Doyle: "I rise to change my vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Doyle from 'aye' to 'no'. Any further questions? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Record me as 'no', will you please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Change Ryan from whatever he was to 'no'.

Representative McBroom to 'no'. Change the Speaker back to 'yes'."

Vinson: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Domico. He's standing right here."

Vinson: "Representative Ropp."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ropp. I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is he on the floor? I don't see him waving anyplace. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Representative Simms."

Simms: "I'd like to be recorded as changing from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Simms from 'yes' to 'no'."

Vinson: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Give us the count." On this question there's 83 'ayes' and 60 'noes', and the Sponsor, Representative Sandquist, asks for permission to place it on Postponed



Consideration. Permission granted. Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1019."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1019. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1019 is one of a series of Bills that have been moving through the legislative process that deal with the very serious problem of stolen cars in Illinois, and this Bill deals with the laundering of titles which has been a major problem in the movement of stolen cars. Hundreds of dollars are paid to acquire a vend number so that a certificate of a title can be acquired to match a car that has been stolen. That's what this Bill simply does, it says that when a salvaged title is being exchanged for a good title it must bear the word 'rebuilt'. Now, because of some opposition from some of the downstate auto rebuilders I have agreed to change the word 'rebuilt' to the simple letters of SV, and I will...assures the condition of Senate sponsorship that the title...that the letters SV are in the title. This was agreed to just a few days ago. The Bill has the support of the Secretary of State's office and also has the support of law enforcement throughout the state, and I would urge its passage."

Speaker Flinn: "Anyone rise in opposition to this Bill? Short Debate. If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1019 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', and the question having received the Constitutional Majority...Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1125. Is Representative Griesheimer here? He's not here."



Take it out of the record. House Bill 1142."

Clerk O'Brien: "~~House Bill 1142. A Bill for an Act to amend~~
Sections of the Illinois Farm Labor Contractor's
Certification Act. [Third Reading of the Bill.]"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Polk; the Gentleman from
Rock Island."

Polk: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Bill 1142 is a Bill
we passed last year...sent it to the Senate. The Senate
put a one-year marker on it...sent it back. We agreed
to it. We sent it to Committee this year. It got out
nine to one. All it does is just codify the Bill...
the laws that are on the books now, and this will make
permanent. I appreciate a 'do pass'."

Speaker Flinn: "Does anyone rise in opposition? Representative
Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder why we are considering this
Bill at this time, and I would ask that it be taken
out of the record. It's on the No Debate Calendar,
and I don't think it's appropriate to vote on it at
this time."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we're going right down the line hearing
them as they are even if they are on the No Debate.
It's up to the Sponsor. If he wanted to take it out of
the record or have it heard, we are leaving it up to
him. This is the discussion we had in the Rules
Committee last night. You're not standing in opposition,
are you? Okay. If there's no further discussion, the
question is, 'Shall House Bill 1142 pass?' All those
in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk
will take the record. On this question there are 141
voting 'aye', 7 voting 'nay', and the question having...
the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is
hereby declared passed. House Bill 1143."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1143. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Sheriff's Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, House Bill 1143, received an extensive hearing in the Committee on Counties and Townships. What it does is to give to the sheriffs in the various counties outside of Cook virtually the same authority over their internal operations after the budgeting process is concluded by the county boards, as are enjoyed by other county officials in the State of Illinois. This Bill, as I said, was extensively heard. It passed out of Committee on an eleven to four vote. It is merely to give the independent, county-wide elected sheriff the same authority as other officials. It was supported in Committee very ably I might add by the Minority Spokesman, Representative McMaster, and I would urge an affirmative vote on House Bill 1143."

Speaker Flinn: "Anyone rising in opposition? If not, the question is...wait first. May I recognize Representative Conti? I think he has an introduction to make. I was trying to hurry up and get to him. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it is indeed an honor today to have 100 honor students of the 23rd Representative District with superintendent Sauers represented by John Vitek, Walter Kozubowski, and William Margalus. A hundred honor students up here in the left."

Speaker Flinn: "Who is speaking in opposition to this? Here's some hands. Representative Hallock or Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "...Debate?"

Speaker Flinn: "It sure is. Everything is Short Debate."

Schlickman: "I would ask for nine others to join in making it Long Debate."



Speaker Flinn: "I see one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. You got them. Representative Schlickman is recognized to speak to the Bill."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "When...under...if this Bill becomes law...excuse me, Larry. I didn't see where you were. When this... if this Bill were to become law, what is the procedure that would be followed with respect to the funding of the sheriff's office relative to equipment, materials, and services and compensation?"

Stuffle: "It's my understanding, Representative Schlickman, from talking to the people who promoted this Bill, the Sheriff's Association and to Representative McMaster, my expert on county government, that what would occur would be essentially that the county board would still have the authority to provide a line item appropriation for equipment for the sheriff's office. They would have the ability to provide a line item appropriation for personal services for the sheriff's office just as they do now for county clerks, treasurers, and that sort of thing. The sheriff's ability would be to control the purchases within the appropriation. He would go ahead and make his purchases as do the county clerks and treasurers. He would have the ability to fix the compensation of the deputies within the appropriation for personal services. The idea behind this being that the county board would not be able to arbitrarily offset the wishes of the independently elected sheriff in such a way as to say line item by name each person's salary or line item by amount what he would buy for, let's say, a specific purpose, for papers and typewriters and so forth."

Schlickman: "May I address myself to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House..."



Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "...I oppose this Bill. It's the county board that has the responsibility of raising revenue, and incident to that responsibility of raising money is spending it, and I think that there ought to be a direct relationship between that corporate body that raises the money and then determines how the money is to be spent. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that we want to appropriate a lump sum to the Governor of the State of Illinois. We wouldn't want to appropriate a lump sum to any other Constitutional officer and then allow that Constitutional officer to spend that money as he or she sees willy-nilly. We've got the responsibility to raise money, and I think we also have the responsibility and should be accountable for how the money should be spent on a specific basis with respect to office equipment and particularly with respect to the compensation of public employees, and it's in those bases that I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, in my anxiety and privilege of having those 100 honor students here I forgot to mention that they are also represented by that great assistant Majority Leader, Jim Taylor. Jim Taylor's up here, too, and while I'm on my feet, we have 81 students, nine adults from the 'Gompler' School in the 28th District represented by Emil Jones, Ted Meyer, and Jim Keane."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm so overwhelmed by that introduction that I don't really...I've lost my train of thought. I would point out, however, that there are some counties without independently-elected sheriffs, mine being one of them, and I don't know whether my county board would want to write a blank check to the sheriff's office or not. I see no reason...at least the argument hasn't been made



on the House floor of a need for this legislation. I know there are court suits in DuPage County which very, very clearly delineate the power of the independent elected county officials of which I used to be one when I was county treasurer, and, frankly, I don't see any reason that sheriffs ought to be trusted more or less than any other county official. I would point out that our Constitutional mothers and fathers of 1870 picked out two offices in the county arena where they did not allow the county officials to run for re-election. One office was the treasurer. The second office was the sheriff. The argument that I've heard, which I suspect is closer to truth than not, was that the people didn't want to have a sherrif around for two terms if he was... if he was too dumb to pick up enough loose change while he was in office for the one term, and I'm just not at all sure that the more checks and balances that one has on the chief law enforcement officer of the county the better off the people of the county would be, and I await Representative Stuffle's concluding remarks. Perhaps, he can convince us that there is a need other than by pointing to the Roll Call and the Committee, and that's all he's done so far."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I noted with interest that Representative Stuffle in his dissertation said that the sheriffs were only going to be allowed to do what the other...what all the other Constitutional officers in the county would do, and he noted the treasurer. Now, Representative Skinner will also note that the treasurer is allowed to take a lump sum appropriation and...and allocate this money to his own help. We had a case in our own county where our treasurer defied the line iteming of the county board



and was sustained in the court. The court ruled that here the county board did have the right to allocate a lump sum to his office, but he had also the right to pay it out according to each individual in his office, so I'm just wondering what effect this would have on the counties like Will who have a union in the county where they have a bargaining agent and also people who belong to the union, the deputies being a part of that negotiating body. Now, they have a set down rule as to what sergeants, lieutenants, and members of the police force get in terms of years of service and so on, so I think, Representative Stuffle, and you can clarify this for me. I think you're wrong when you say that this would not usurp the power of the county board and also the union negotiating body."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed... the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put, and the... I recognize the Sponsor, Representative Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I heard, I think, a couple of red herrings raised on the floor here. Representative Skinner said there's no explanation except it got a good vote in Committee. I think if you listen to my answer, at least Representative Schlickman, he would understand that's not the case. If he would also listen to the fact that I indicated there would still be, as Representative McMaster indicates to me, the ability to line item, that would answer Representative Van Dwyne's question, I believe. We're not here to impair contracts or deal with negotiations or harm the collective bargaining process by any means. It goes on



in those situations where the other county authorities have the ability to receive their money, control their internal operations after the appropriations. I would also indicate that that is indeed the case that the others have that particular authority. We're asking for the same thing for the sheriff, who is an elected Constitutional officer, and I think that the Bill speaks for itself and the arguments made on the floor here by the proponents, including myself, speak for themselves for the need for this Bill to give the sheriff the same inherent authority over his elected office after the appropriations process is completed as have the other county officers in the governments around the State of Illinois, and I would urge an affirmative vote on this particular Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1143 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative McMaster to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think perhaps I could've cleared up some of the misunderstandings of people such as Gene Schlickman. You know, each elected official of a county prepares a budget that must be approved by the county board, and that budget he line items everything that he is going to spend out of his office whether it be for personnel, materials purchased, or whatever. And, in preparing his budget for personnel, he has to say what he is going to pay his deputies. So, all of this is line itemed in the elected official's budget, including the sheriff when he presents it to the county board. He goes along until towards the end of the fiscal year, and if he is short in any one line item of that budget, he must in turn go back to the county board and ask their permission to transfer within his budget. It does not give him a lump sum of money that he can spend in any way he wants to, Gene, and you're not even listening.



You're talking on the telephone, Schlickman. But, doggone it, I don't think the county treasurers should be treated...or sheriffs should be treated any different than any other official. He deserves the right to go before the county board for their approval of his line itemed budget, and I urge you to vote 'yes' on this Bill. I don't see why you should discriminate against the county sheriffs."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Terzich."

McMaster: "Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm sorry. You weren't finished. Representative Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a good Bill. This was supported by GIS, which is Governmental Information Service, and I understand that Joe Mudd passed everyone out a deputy sheriff's card, and I think that certainly would merit some support of this Bill. I think it's a Bill that we can all live with. We...it did come out of Committee eleven to four and certainly the sheriffs of these counties certainly can account for all of these funds, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have to agree with the previous speaker. This is an excellent Bill. I've seen an awful lot of abuses up in Cook County. My only regret, it does not include Cook County. Some of these sheriffs that get elected, and we have some large unincorporated areas in Cook County that are larger than municipalities, and the county board controls their budget, their appropriation, and there are some...just in Leyden Township alone, a population of 18,000 people that have to wait 45 minutes to two hours to get any police calls answered. I'm only sorry that Cook County is deleted from this."



I'm hoping to get this Bill passed, and I hope that it comes back here next year and include Cook County, too, because I think all elected officials should be responsible directly to the people who vote them in office and not to the whims of a county board."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower, to explain his vote."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm a former county official. I have specifically checked into this. I know that every other county official has the internal control of his office. If we don't trust the sheriffs enough to administer the internal operations of their office, maybe we ought to do away with the office of the sheriff. It's a classic example of a situation where the county board has control over the purse strings as has been explained by Representative McMaster. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Van Dyne, you spoke in debate. I don't believe you're entitled to explain your vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers, I'm sorry. I overlooked you. Your..."

Borchers: "Is my light on, by the way?"

Speaker Flinn: "Your light's on, but you're on my blind side. You see, I can hardly see out of that eye."

Borchers: "Well, my light has not been working like it should for some time. I'm a twelve-year member of the board. Also, the finance committee in the past in my county, and I don't mind the internal...internal regulations that this Bill proposes that the sheriff controls the internal operations of the office. That's all right, but it goes beyond that, and you're interfering, by this Bill, with the fact that the people elect the members of the board of supervisors. They represent the people, and they're the ones that should control



all other aspects of the budget. And, if you give this kind of a power, you're opening up a dangerous precedent. You're opening up the position that one officer can actually dictate to make the decisions in relation to the budget, and I think we should vote it down.

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise to move that we suspend all introductions until after the end of the week."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you hold that just till we finish this Bill, and then I'll recognize you for the purpose of that motion? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 33 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Friedrich, for the purpose of a motion."

Friedrich: "I just want to move that we suspend all introductions until the end of this week."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion has been made that we suspend all introductions...are the boosters in the gallery?...for the balance of this week. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the motion carried. Would somebody... I see Representative Conti here. Make sure Representative Taylor knows about it, so we don't embarrass him. House Bill 1187. Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Vinson: "We're on the order of expediting business. I move that we suspend explanation of votes for the remainder of the week."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we suspend the explanation of votes for the balance of this week. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...we'll have a Roll Call. I can't tell the difference...You know, that sounded like about one different to me."



The...I'm advised that it takes 89 votes anyhow, so we couldn't do it by voice. So, all those in favor of the motion, which is to suspend the explanation of votes for the balance of the week, vote 'aye', and those opposed to that motion vote 'no'. Suspending Rule 5-0.56B. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 51 voting 'aye' and 88 voting 'no', and the motion loses. House Bill 1187. The Clerk will read the Bill." Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1187. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Bingo License and Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1187 is one of 20 Bills introduced in this Session by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. This particular Bill is in response to rules concerning bingo licenses proposed by the Department of Revenue. The Joint Committee objected to the proposed rules because of two provisions which did not provide statements of standards on which actions by the Department would be based. One of the provisions concerned requiring and setting the amount of a bond for a limited bingo license, and the other provision concerns requiring an additional bond for a licensee. In both provisions the Joint Committee believed there were inadequate standards to guard against arbitrary action by the agency and to fully inform the public of the agency's policy toward exercising its discretion in these areas. The Department refused to modify the rules stating the standards, if necessary, would be stated... should be stated in the statutes and the Department should not limit the discretion. So, with the Department of Revenue, we decided to introduce this legislation so that the statute would be quite clear and



and that we would have no further problems with that area. I move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 1187."

Speaker Flinn: "Anyone standing in opposition? If not, the question is, 'Shall House...Representative Schlickman.'"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I won't ask that this be taken off the Short Debate, but it's my understanding that the Department of Revenue opposes this Bill, because it does not believe that such additional power can be clearly and evenly administered."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell, you can answer the question if you want to. You don't want to. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1187 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', and the question...and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1210."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1210. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to fencing and operating railroads. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1210 amends an Act relating to fencing and operating railroads. It provides that railroad companies obstructing public grade crossings for more than 10 minutes shall be guilty of a business offense with a minimum fine of \$500. Members of the House, this is one of the most important Bills in our Session. This Bill is for the people, and it protects the lives and limbs of the...of our children. In regards to...in regards to the fine, I believe a Bill of this type should be approved, and I ask you for your full support."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there anyone standing in opposition? If



not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill...?' Who's
whopping' over here? Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Would the Gentleman yield for questions?"

Kornowicz: "Yes."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't know whether that's in order or
not."

Winchester: "Oh."

Speaker Flinn: "Do you stand in opposition?"

Winchester: "I stand in opposition. All right. I believe
that this piece of legislation is unnecessary. It's
just putting another hardship on the back of the rail-
roads. It's going to cost...it's probably going to cost
a considerable amount of money. I don't understand
what's going to happen in a case of accidents or
mechanical difficulties on the part of the railroad
that were unintentionally to themselves. They blocked
the crossings and are fined a considerable amount of
money. We're in a time, as a result, in a time it
appears it is a result of the energy crisis that we're
going to be depending more and more and more on rail-
roads. I think it's time that we started strengthening
the railroad system in the State of Illinois and this
county instead of finding ways...more regulations...
more ways of putting hardship and financial burdens on
the back of railroads, and I would urge a 'no' vote on
this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz, to close. I'm
sorry, we're on Short Debate."

Kornowicz: "I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1210 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote
'no'. Representative Terzich to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, apparently I believe this
Bill will get support. Those of us who live in areas
that have railroad crossings, I think it's about time



that we stand up and tell them that we won't tolerate all of this. Especially, in Chicago where they are constantly delaying traffic for up to an hour. It's caused problems with emergency vehicles getting to the person who is sick or disabled, the fire engines to get to fires, and, personally, I think that the railroads, over the years, have said they could give a damn about the people and the obstructions that they perform, and I would urge an 'aye' vote for this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Macón, Representative Borchers, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question, but I was cut off on that because..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, the questions are out of order on Short Debate."

Borchers: "I understand."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Borchers: "I understand, but for...the reason I'm voting against it is because what's already been said. The fact we need the railroads, and in my area we do have some problems now and then, but I think, as citizens, we have to take care and put up with some of this for the good of the general...good of the country, so that's the reason I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 126 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1211."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1211. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, House Bill



1211 amends the Act concerning public utilities and provides that the railroad companies shall inspect and test all signals. Chairman Mr. Speaker, can I bring this back to the Second Reading?"

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave to bring this back to eleven...Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading."

Kornowicz: "Will you read the Amendment, please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Kornowicz, amends House Bill 1211 as amended by House Amendment #1 and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz, to explain the Amendment."

Kornowicz: "Amendment #2...it amends the...by deleting the month and inserting the quarter calendar...in other words, what we're talking about...originally the Bill mentioned that they should make inspections monthly and with the cooperation of the Commerce Commission. We cooperated with them, and they felt that a quarterly inspection will be proper, and the cost of the entire inspection will be cut down. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, all those in favor of Amendment #2...Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Has the Amendment been distributed, Mr. Speaker? We don't have it on our desks."

Speaker Flinn: "It has been distributed. All those in favor of Amendment #2 being adopted to House Bill 1211 say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has requested leave of the House to move this back to Third for the purpose of moving it today. I think that takes 107 votes or leave of the House, doesn't it? Third Reading. Now, he has



asked leave to hear it today. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I object, Speaker. This is a bad precedent. Okay? And, I don't want to..."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, the Gentleman moves to have the Bill heard today."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "It takes 107 votes."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes."

Walsh: "May I...you continue to hear me?"

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, I thought you were just objecting, and I took the objection..."

Walsh: "No."

Speaker Flinn: "Sorry, I guess too much."

Walsh: "No, in the first place, we'd have to have a Supplemental Calendar, but the other thing is that the Speaker, the fellow that's hardly ever here, would not do that under any circumstances and would not permit it, and I think if you'll consult with the parliamentarian, he will bear that out that this is a practice that he will not permit and except for the last day or a deadline day, he would make an exception and permit a motion to suspend the rules."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, the Gentleman has a perfect right..."

Walsh: "When there is another...well, but the permanent Speaker would tell him to sit down and not to pursue this matter. He would not have it heard."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I'm not the permanent Speaker, and I think the House has the right to make that decision, and the Gentleman made a motion, and I'm going to call his motion. The motion is to suspend Rule 35C and commit to hearing the Bill today. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there are...on this motion there are 100...there are 88 'ayes' and 40 'noes'; and the motion loses. The Bill will be held on Third Reading. House Bill 1213."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1213. A Bill for an Act to Amend Sections of the Pharmacy Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a very simple Bill. What it does is it exempts pharmacists from jury practice. The reason I brought this Bill before the General Assembly is two-fold. Number one, it's a health care issue, and many downstate communities and in many inner-city communities there's a problem when a pharmacist is called to jury duty. He has to close his pharmacy and consequently cut off pharmaceutical services for residents of his community. Secondly, it's a fairness Bill. Up until 1975 pharmacists were exempted from jury duty. At that point, all the exemptions were knocked out and many of them have been added since then for doctors, dentists, attorneys, Members of the General Assembly, sheriffs, coroners, and other groups. Because it is such an important issue, I hope that everyone gives it favorable consideration and votes green on this issue."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Polk, do you stand in opposition? Representative Polk is recognized."

Polk: "And, I believe there are quite a few others. I would ask for nine others to join me."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't see nine hands yet. There are nine hands now. It's on Long Debate."

Polk: "Well, we all understand what soft ground we stand on when those of us debate against the pharmacists in the House. However, we'll bite the bullet and pursue. Contacting my...my pharmacists contacted me in my district, and they actually asked me not to support this



Bill, Representative Ronan, and I apologize for standing in opposition to it. They pointed out they did not wish to be a special interest group, frankly, Watson. They pointed out that they indeed wanted to have the opportunity and the right to make this decision whether they should, in fact, serve on jury duty or not. They also pointed out and I contacted the county clerk's office and the circuit clerk's office and asked what would happen in an instance such as this downstate where one man owned an operation, owned a pharmacy, owned the drug store and was called upon to serve on jury duty. He said...simply said all he would have to do was contact us and indicate that he was being called for jury duty and request that he be taken off, and he would be. All of us recognize the necessity and the importance of those people who serve in those capacities, but they want to be treated like everybody else, and they'd just as soon not be taken off."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think in addition to the arguments put forth by my colleague I believe this Bill amends the wrong Act. It amends the Pharmacy Act rather than the Jurors Act. I think that's probably a technical failing in the Bill, but, secondly, one of the ideas behind juries is to have a group of our peers determine whether or not if it's a criminal case, where they're innocent or guilty or if it's a civil case, whether we are entitled to recover or not recover if that be the type of case it is. Exclusions are being sought by virtually every interest group in the state from jury duty, because it, frankly, is not all that convenient to be on jury duty. However, if we continually exclude groups because they feel it's inconvenient to subject themselves to the jury...to be involved in the jury system, we are going to end up with a group of



people who are not our peers. The people that have been picked over and for some reason, because if they don't do anything particularly important, they will be left over for the jury system. I think this is bad practice for us to consider these exclusions, and I strongly urge a...defeat of House Bill 1213."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ronan, to close."

Ronan: "My only comments that I'll make before asking for a favorable Roll Call is that the Illinois Pharmacists' Association brought this Bill to my attention in addition to pharmacists from my own district, so I don't understand Representative Polk's concern, because it is an issue brought by the Pharmacists' Association. As far as amending a wrong Section of the Act, when I asked for the Bill to be drafted, the Legislative Reference Bureau said, 'This is the right place for it to be.', and I will go with their judgment on the issue. It's a fairness doctrine. I assume that all the attorneys in the House who are exempted from jury duty will feel the same compunction that I do that if we're going to exempt phar...if we're going to exempt attorneys, and sheriffs, and coroners, this group and the health care industry definitely deserves this type of exemption. Thank you very much, and I move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1213 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'nay'. Rep...Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't mean to usurp Representative Epton, who usually takes on questions like this, but unless I'm incorrect, attorneys are not exempt from jury duty. I don't know where that concept came from. I've never been exempted from jury duty by any matter of legislative intent. I think this is a bad idea."



Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no', and this Bill having not received the Constitutional Majority. Representative Gene Barnes, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Barnes changes his vote to 'aye'. I would suggest you come down here and file a motion, because that's the only way you can do it now. Okay, I had not announced the total and the fact that it had lost anyway, so this Bill having received 70 votes... voting 'aye' and 61 voting 'no', Representative Ronan asks for Postponed Consideration. Postponed. House Bill 1218."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1218. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1218 amends the Vehicle Code. It requires the Department of Transportation to place and maintain all traffic control devices on state highways, including those located within the corporate limits of a municipality. At the present time, by agreement with the Department, most municipalities are responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of traffic signals within the city limits even though they are on state highways. I feel that these...this is wrong, because just outside the city limits we could have an intersection with a traffic signals and the county or township that it's located in, although they receive motor fuel tax funds, they do not have to pay for that maintenance, and I think that this is discriminatory to the municipalities. Many of them absolutely cannot afford it, and I would ask that you join with me in changing this policy."



Speaker Flinn: "Anyone standing in opposition? Representative Anderson, are you standing in opposition to the Bill?"

Anderson: "I would like this taken off the Short Debate if nine Members will join me."

Speaker Flinn: "I see nine more hands besides your's. It's off...it's on Long Debate. Do you wish to speak to the Bill?"

Anderson: "Yes."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Anderson: "Representative Richmond, what is the fiscal impact of your Bill?"

Richmond: "I'm told it's between 10 and 11 million dollars."

Anderson: "And, it passed out of Committee twelve to nine. Therefore, there was some opposition to it in Committee?"

Richmond: "I thought it was twelve to seven, but anyway... yeah, there was some opposition."

Anderson: "Due to the fiscal impact, I'm certainly going..."

Richmond: "Twelve to seven was the vote."

Anderson: "I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill because of the fiscal impact."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further questions? Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm a hyphenated Cosponsor with Bruce Richmond on this, and I'll tell you why this has come about. The DOT has recently begun a policy of requiring municipalities to take over the maintenance and care and repair and pay the energy of traffic signals within a municipality. Now, if you want that highway, which the state highway resurfaced or improved, you cannot get it done unless you agree to take over the maintenance and care of those traffic signals that may have been put up there by the state without even consulting the municipality. It appears to be a light coat of blackmail that's being practiced by the DOT and the explanation is that



they are trying to save money so they can build other highways in other places. I don't think it's fair, though, to charge the municipalities for the improvements that the DOT has put in and not only that, to use that as an excuse to deny resurfacing your streets, state highways, or have you first take over the care and the expense of the maintenance of those traffic signals before you can get any improvements done. That's why that...this Bill has been filed."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins."

Bluthardt: "I urge you to vote for it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, considering the previous speaker's long record of sponsorship of bad Bills, nobody should be surprised that he's added another one to his list. However... however, this one outdoes the...even some of the previous things that he has introduced. And, as Representative Anderson stated, this Bill would spend at least an additional 10 million dollars of state funds that aren't available. Now, this Bill is another Bill...a long series of Bills designed to have state governments taking over the responsibility of municipal governments. I think we should reject this Bill. You may remember the cost of this is 10 million dollars. I would only disagree with Representative Anderson in that I don't think we should vote 'present'. We should vote a resounding 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's always difficult to rise in opposition to my good friend, Bruce Richmond, and now my friend, Ed Bluthardt. But, I agree with Representative Anderson and Representative Collins. This is going to cost the road fund approximately 10 million dollars



and also this is why we have motor fuel tax money for municipalities to take care of problems such as this. But even worse is that in the Illinois Highway Code there is no definition of traffic control devices, and this could expand what Representative Richmond is wanting to do. It could go to lane markings, flashing lights, signals, signs, and probably increase from the 10 million dollars to 20, or 25, or 30, or 40 million dollars. I'm afraid that the road fund just can't stand this type of legislation at this time, Mr. Speaker, and, therefore, I would ask a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell. Ewell. Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 1218, and it seems that some of the stories we've heard thus far this afternoon about the Illinois Department of Transportation not picking up the costs of maintenance, and energy, and traffic signals is very unfair to many of our municipalities in the state. However, for those who think that this contravenes the policy of the Illinois Department of Transportation. I've just been informed within the last few weeks that the Department of Transportation now has changed their policy. If there are two state highways intersecting within the boundaries of a municipality. Now, they will accept the costs for the energy and maintenance of those signals. It's only fair to extend that to have municipalities reimbursed for traffic signals that are on state highways when they intersect with a local road. The local municipalities, albeit, they receive motor fuel tax money simply cannot afford the cost, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 1218."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House, ordinarily I agree with Phil Collins and the fiscal impact it's going to cost the state, but those are the crocodile tears that I was talking about yesterday. When we start mandating programs for these municipalities and then we come back with a Bill like this and they say the state hasn't got the money, why did they mandate these municipalities for the maintenance of these programs in the first place? I hope that Phil Collins and everybody else that is concerned about the state not having 10 million dollars the next time a mandated program comes up for these municipalities, they would vote 'no'. Ordinarily, I wouldn't be a Sponsor of a Bill like this if it wasn't for the mandated programs and because of that I urge everyone to vote for this Bill. It's a good Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Richmond, to close."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like, in closing, to address my remarks to a few of the things that have been mentioned here in debate. My friend, Representative Winchester, touched on something that...concerning devices. Had he read the Amendment that was put on this Bill in Committee, he would've found out that we have changed that to traffic control signals to eliminate the possibility that he did bring up in his remarks. Traffic signals makes it impossible for the confusion to arise that he indicated might be a possibility. I would also point out that motor fuel tax money going to municipalities, as someone suggested, was for that reason...to pay for these things. But, also, you know, the counties and townships receive motor fuel tax, too. And, they do not pay for the upkeep of the...and maintenance of these traffic signals. I think another point worthy of mentioning is the situation that could arise around a municipality that has expanded and taken in new areas



and also at the same time these new areas have included traffic signals that now they must pay for although the county or townships did not pay for the upkeep on these signals. I think this is grossly unfair. I believe that it's true that it does cost 10 or 11 million dollars, but after all it's costing municipalities the same thing that I believe it would be proper for the state to take over this cost and get it out of the right pocket instead of from the municipalities. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1218 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is an incredibly bad Bill when we think of the financial impact this is going to have on the state at a time when we can least afford it. Particularly, I'd call to the Sponsor's attention that the municipalities already receive 60% of the road fund money. They are given this money to take care of this type of thing. Thus, to place this burden back on the state would be unconscionable. Let's also think about the fact that most of these stop lights are put in at the request of the municipality. Plus, you haven't accounted for the situation of a state road crossing a municipal road. You did, in effect, cause the municipality to escape any form of responsibility for their portion of the road. I think it's a basically bad Bill...a Bill that we just can't afford at the present time."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no', and the Sponsor requests Postponed Consideration. Postponed Consideration. The Sponsor of House Bill 1274 has requested it be taken off of this list and left on the



No Debate. The next Bill is House Bill 1287. Is Representative Ewing back there? You're up."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1287. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Highway Advertising Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a small attempt to try and make our highway sign program in the state a little fairer. Currently, there are certain counties, those which are unzoned, who can place signs within 600 feet of an area which is used for an industrial or commercial area along our interstate highways, while in a county that is zoned you cannot put a sign within 600 feet of a zoned commercial or industrial area even if the local zoning would allow it. This Bill would make counties that are zoned equal with counties that aren't zoned, and if local zoning allowed for a sign that was within 600 feet of a commercial or industrial area, this Bill would allow them to put it there. It also has a provision for the placement of political signs which are now illegally put up, and this would allow a 45-day period for the placement of these signs."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there anyone standing in opposition? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1287 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This Bill has received 120 'aye' votes, 15 'no' votes and having received the Constitutional Majority it is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1324."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1324. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cullerton."

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



the House. This Bill requires the Director of Insurance to reduce auto insurance premiums for autos that have anti-theft devices. There shall be an automotive engineering advisory panel to make recommendations to the Director of Insurance. The Bill, as amended, has the support of the insurance industry, the Director of Insurance, the Secretary of State, and will definitely benefit the consumer. The Cosponsor of this Bill is Representative Epton. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Anyone standing in opposition? If not, the question is, 'Shall House...the House pass House Bill 1324?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 124 voting 'aye' and 5 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1345."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1345. A Bill for an Act to create the Land Resources Management Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mugalian, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mugalian: "I'm the chief Cosponsor of this Bill. I've also been authorized by Representative Brady if there's any doubt about it."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Mugalian: "Proceed with the Bill? Thank you, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members. House Bill 1345 passed the House in each of the two past Sessions. It is, in my import... in my opinion, as important to the State of Illinois as any legislation introduced in the past six years. Representative Brady understood the importance of this legislation. I think the passage of this Bill would be a fitting tribute to Mike. This Bill establishes a Commission, but do not think of it as merely another Commission Bill. It establishes a Land Resources Management Study Commission, and the Commission study would be comprehensive, and I have a long speech for this, but I know we're on long...short debate. But, one assignment is to study the effectiveness of municipal zoning on areas outside but adjacent to municipalities. No one can deny that land use policy and land use control in our state is chaotic. There are dozens and dozens of units of government: federal, regional, county, township, municipal that have pieces of control, but they are duplicative, conflicting, ambiguous, and most importantly, ineffective. What is the answer? I don't know. That is why I think we should pass this Bill. Mr. Speaker, Illinois is land. Illinois is water resources and minerals. Illinois needs transportation. It needs..."

Speaker Flinn: "Your two minutes are up. Would you bring your remarks to a close?"



Mugalian: "All right. I sinc...I really submit that this is an urgent Bill. It passed this chamber twice. I'd like to have one more chance to get it out of the Senate. It's probably the most important Bill I've ever had. I've always felt so, and I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pullen, are you standing in opposition to this Bill?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there can be only one purpose for a Commission to study land resources and usage in the State of Illinois and that is to provide, in future legislation, for state control of land use. I urge you to defeat this bad, new Commission Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mugalian to close."

Mugalian: "Any Bill that we pass as a result...or any proposal that is suggested by this Commission will be within the full control of all the Members of this General Assembly. I, again, urgently plead for your support to this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1345 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schlickman to explain his vote. One minute. The clock is on."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my vote, every private interest group in this state is looking at land for its individual, special vested interest. There are units within the Executive Branch that are looking at land, the most basic natural resource that we have in Illinois. It seems to be very appropriate that the General Assembly itself, in the interest of good, sound public policy, establish this Committee, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 100 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1393."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1393. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to the Illinois State Fair. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what this Bill does actually is to encourage a speed-up of the payment of premiums that exhibitors receive after the Illinois State Fair. A few years ago, it took, at one time, beyond four months for that to come about. This Bill merely states that after 60 days a one percent interest must be payable to the winners who receive those awards, and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there anyone standing in opposition? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1393 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 133 voting 'aye' and 9 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1408."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1408. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Is Representative Ewing back there someplace? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, this...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill would allow people 65 years of age to obtain the circuitbreaker relief at the time they become 65. Currently, under this legislation in this state many people are 66 or 67 before they get this...I'm sorry. Excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen. It's the homestead exemption. Same Bill. Same explanation that if you don't...if your birthday isn't on the 31st of December on the...you won't get the homestead exemption for a year after your birthday. This drives most people at least one year if not two years after they're 65 before



they actually see the tax relief show up on their tax bills. We all know that our senior citizens are hard-pressed to meet their real estate taxes. I believe this is one good piece of legislation that would aid them in reducing their real estate taxes when they need it the most when they become 65."

Speaker Flinn: "Is anyone standing in opposition? Representative Conti, are you standing in opposition?"

Conti: "I'm not standing in opposition, but I just want it called to my attention, the...my colleague, Representative Collins, that this is the third Bill that we're mandating on municipalities since he got up and gave that awful speech against that 10 million dollar appropriation. This is going to cost municipalities money."

Speaker Flinn: "I suppose Representative Ewing has an opportunity to close. That sounded like an argument against the Bill. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Well, I wouldn't disagree with the distinguished colleague, but we have, for a long time, set up the program for homestead relief to our senior citizens. I don't think that anybody, when they passed the program, believed that we would have to wait until you're midway between 65 and 70 to get the relief. I think we're just really carrying out the intent of the original legislation, and, therefore, not a new mandate. I would ask for the favorable approval of this House."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1408 pass?' We got to wait just a second. All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Collins, to explain his vote."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say in return to Representative Conti that he can spend his money on stop lights, and I'll spend mine on senior citizens."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who



wish? The Clerk will take the record. 139 'aye' votes, 2 'no' votes, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1431.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1431. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Bill. It changes the tax..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Getty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Getty: "If...in view of the Amendment placed on this Bill, I would ask the Chair to rule on how many votes would be required to pass this Bill and the pre-emption."

Speaker Flinn: "While we're waiting on the parliamentarian, I'll note that Rep...former Representative, Jack Lauer, is in the back. Parliamentarian advises me that since it's a tax limitation on home rule units it would take 107 votes. Proceed, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I was saying, this was a very simple Bill which changed the tax delinquent procedures to avoid forfeiture of residential-owned property sold for taxes. The Bill has been amended and now does carry some very important legislation as a tax freeze which all of our citizens need, and I would defer to the Minority Leader and the proposer of the Amendment on this Bill to explain this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pierce, do you stand in opposition to the Bill? Pierce."

Pierce: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is Short Debate. I understand the Sponsor has finished his exposition of the Bill,



and I stand in opposition to the Bill. What the Gentleman from Livingston did was take a defeated Bill in Committee...a discredited tax freeze Bill. It was defeated in Committee and it's...as would a Minority Leader..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan, for what purpose..."

Pierce: "...to pass out most of these Bills..."

Speaker Flinn: "Just a minute, Dan. One moment, Dan. Representative Getty rather."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very significant thing, as the Gentleman has pointed out, and I would ask that 10 Members join me in asking that this be opened up for full debate."

Speaker Flinn: "Do I see 10 hands? There are sufficient hands. It's on Long Debate. Representative Pierce, proceed."

Pierce: "Well, I think that's a good idea, because you could get the Minority Leader to better explain this Bill than he did in Committee where it was defeated. Amendment #1 on this innocuous vehicle, which now it should be defeated, because it's been used to destroy the Committee system...Amendment #1 is a complete tax freeze on all local governments, including school districts, home rule units, non-home rule units, community college districts...a tax freeze. No matter what kind of inflation we have, whether it's a 7% rate, a 10% rate, 11% rate, the school districts, the local governments will be frozen to their past collections and extensions. This is too much of a burden. There's been no one who's been more for local real estate tax relief than I have. I favor homestead exemptions for people regardless of age, circuitbreaker relief regardless of age, homestead exemptions tied to cost of living increases. What this absolute freeze says... says to the local governments and the schools, there's



no more inflation. We don't care what you have to pay for your policemen, your firemen, your garbage workers, your school teachers, your janitors. You're only going to collect and extend...extend and collect what you did in the past. You're frozen while the rest of the economy goes on from an eight to ten percent inflation rate. The Committee saw through this charade, and the Committee defeated the Bill even though it passed several of the ...Representative Ryan's Bills that had more merit, and we gave them a good hearing. This Bill was defeated and yet the Spokesman on that Committee for the Minority Party chose to take one of his Bills and allow it to be amended with this Bill that the Committee system determined to defeat. This is in derogation of the Committee system. It would completely cripple local government and schools. It will require the state, out of its coffers, to make up the difference, because this is a rigid statutory freeze that completely flies in the face of any future inflation that we have. Most of us would favor, and I would favor tying in extensions and collections by local government to the cost of living. If it increases five percent, that's all they should get, and that's all they should be able to extend their taxes...five percent. Eight percent...eight percent. But, this freeze cripples local government, and I never thought I'd see the day when the Republican Party would favor crippling that government which is closest to the people, townships, mosquito abatement districts that they love so much, cities, villages, sanitary districts, cemetery districts, and all these local governments that they feel so close to...so close to the people that they wish...that they say the people can no longer govern. We're going to freeze them here in Springfield and freeze them out of existence, and, for that reason, I urge a 'no' vote."



Speaker Flinn: "The TV lights are on. Representative Stuffle
is recognized by Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, was this taken off of Short
Debate?"

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear you."

Stuffle: "It was taken off of Short Debate. The first ques-
tion?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, it was."

Stuffle: "To the Bill, it seems to me obviously that Rep-
resentative Ewing is very well intentioned in this
activity, but it seems to me, also, that we were sent
here to be very responsible, as responsible as possible
to taxpayers and taxing districts and hopefully, to
taxpayers first. I don't think that this Bill is
responsible for the reasons set out by Representative
Pierce. Notwithstanding even the fact that the Bill
in similar form was defeated in the Revenue Committee.
It is not responsible. It is a meat axe approach...
a meat axe approach that says even if we were to have
30 or 40% inflation and cost increases in the taxing
districts over a period of two, or three, or four years
that those taxing districts would still be saddled with
'79 revenues. There are other Bills on this floor...
on this Calendar today and in the future days that will
deal with this in a more realistic...a more responsible
manner. We do not need to use a meat axe approach
simply so we can go back to our constituents and say
we cut the heart out of the taxing districts and the
services, because if we do, we'll be back here after
having done that in a year or two years saying, 'My
God, we made a mistake. We've got to now do something
to turn the corner and put some more money back in
those districts.' Let's be responsible and reject
this Bill and look at the other more reasonable and
sound approaches to tax limitation and spending limi-



tation that will be offered in future Bills today and this week. I urge, despite its well-intentioned Sponsor's effort, a "no" vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. How soon some people forget... How... don't we all remember after the California referendum when Proposition 13 went sailing through all of a sudden every politician in the country got religion, and they were for spending limitations, and they were for tax ceilings and tax limitations. But, apparently now, some people have forgotten that message they got from California and it's back to business as usual, but let me say to the previous speakers to say that this Bill would cripple the local governments is ridiculous. The tax freeze does what the people have been crying for saying, 'Give us some relief from our property taxes before you break our backs.' And, if they think that they need additional taxes, all they have to do is turn to these very people who they want to tax and ask them, 'Do you want to raise taxes?' Then put it on the ballot. Put it to referendum, and let the people of that local municipality say, 'Yes or no, we want more taxes.' This is the relief that we all campaigned on. This is the relief that people throughout this country have been asking for, and this is the relief that we owe them. We certainly must vote for this Bill. The people in every one of our communities has come to us and what are they writing us about? Stop taxing us to death. Give us some relief. Let us up. Get your hand on...feet off our throats. Well, now is the time to take positive action. Pass this good Bill. Let's give our taxpayers some relief, and we can go home and get the accolades for a job well done."



Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Collins put it pretty well. Besides the property tax freeze that everybody in the state is crying for, you're kind of overlooking the main purpose of the Bill. There's also a property owners' and a taxpayers' benefit to the Bill. It keeps homeowners from losing their homes, because they haven't paid their back taxes, and so that makes this Bill even that much better when you put the freeze on here. Representative Collins pointed out the Proposition 13 in California. Every place I've traveled in the State of Illinois. I've heard about property taxes being too high, and that's the case, and you know it. And, this is the chance to do something about it. Support the people that pay your salaries down here. Vote for this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, is recognized."

Peters: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. Representative Ewell, to close. Ewing, rather."

Ewing: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that we all think very carefully about this vote. You have the chance to do what we know our voters at home are looking for us to do. Put a limit on skyrocketing real estate taxes. I'm sure that you know that the entire state will be looking at this vote to see how we're carrying out the mandate of the people. This is the chance to save millions of dollars for our taxpayers. It's not easy. It's not easy on local



governments, but we can all tighten our belt. We can all do with less. We can all do with a lot less government, and I would urge you to give this a very serious consideration and to give it an overwhelming approval so that the voters at home will know that we're carrying out their wishes here in Springfield. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1431 pass?'"

All those in favor vote 'aye' and all those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schneider, to explain his vote."

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

I don't think that a tax freeze is very complicated to put together in a Bill. Obviously, since it's been done. What it doesn't deal with is the sense of reality. Many previous speakers so far have talked about the problems as it's related to school aid, and if you do a simple calculation on the formula as it exists today or even as we're beginning to change it, you will notice that there will be severe impairment of the ability of districts to provide educational funds for quality education. So, that one, I think, is rather easily understood. So, the ease with which one can draft these kinds of Bills are understood. The complexities, however, that follow are a little bit more difficult. There will be serious questions, I think, raised about the Constitutional right of one's pensions and whether or not this kind of a freeze would impair that. I guess the bonding authority would not be jeopardized, because that pay out would come right off the top and then services would be reduced accordingly. And, those are ongoing day to day services not the kinds of brick and mortar services that bonding, in many cases, would take care of. So, a freeze is not related to reality in this sense. The reality, I think, that has been addressed by some of the proposals in the House have



talked about the relationship to cost of living to the growth of income, and I think that's the more rational...rational approach. We don't find ourselves being faced by screaming taxpayers who say, 'Get your hands and feet off our necks.' But, rather, we find that they want a reasonable approach to paying for services based on the ability of their income to relate to that, so tax freeze is unreal. I would continually solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester, to explain his vote."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't understand why all those red votes are up there on the board now. All during the last two years when we were campaigning before we all were talking about tax relief, and one of the biggest items that we were talking about was freezing property taxes. This particular Bill that Representative Ewing and Ryan's Amendment will offer 75 dollars on the average to the average taxpayer...some 75 dollars a year, and that is a tremendous amount of tax savings. It would be on a state-wide some 300 million dollars total would be given back to the taxpayers. I don't understand why, at a time...during election times, why Members of the opposing party would stand and say, 'We're in favor of tax relief. We're in favor of freezing property taxes.' But, when the time comes... when the time comes to make that fiscal responsible decision to act properly on behalf of all the taxpayers in the State of Illinois, they go the opposite direction. I just don't understand. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl, to explain her vote."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think that there's a Representative



in this Assembly that has not heard from almost every constituent in their district about their major concern, and that's ever rising property taxes. Many people can no longer afford to keep their homes because of our ever rising taxes. Now, they've said to us very clearly and very often, 'Reduce taxes and limit government and government spending.' This places no undue limitations on government, but it does put restrictions on the vast growth of new governmental bodies and, most important of all, it does say to the people, 'We heard you. We are doing something about the tax that bothers you the most. The tax that is hardest to pay and affects the most people.' This is an important vote. It's important to you, and it's important to the people, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If there was ever a vote to be watched by the taxpayers of this state to decide who they will return to this House chamber, it is this vote. We have more hypocritical people sitting in this chamber to the tune of 59 than I ever thought would be imaginable. One Legislator stands up and says, 'Let's face reality.' Well, reality are people losing their homes, senior citizens who can't pay their taxes, young people that can't afford homes because the local real estate taxes are driving them to their knees. Let's talk even more importantly about Lake County, Illinois. I was shocked to hear the first speaker get up in opposition to this. This distinguished Legislator from Highland Park, who heads up our Revenue Committee, is the Sponsor of the Bill that would roll back the assessment level for property, because the people in Lake County are clamoring for tax relief. How can he be opposed to this? If we



don't grant some form of tax relief to our people by freezing local taxes, then we are literally freezing them out of their homes. How can you go back to Lake County and face the people that are your neighbors?

"You're not doing justice to them."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Griesheimer: "In any case, we have an obligation to vote for this. This is why we're down here. We must vote 'yes' on this."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've just taken a survey in my district of 20,000 people, and the single most important complaint they had was property taxes. They want a limit on property taxes. I don't think my district is any different than yours, and if you want to go back home and tell them that you sat here and voted 'no' on a deal that would freeze their property taxes, you go home. I'm going to go home telling them that I voted to freeze them."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, in 1970 the people were promised if they would help vote in the new Constitution which put an income tax on them, they would not have these high taxes. Now, it's all right for a person to vote like they want to. In this Session of the Legislature, we are going to raise the corporate tax income. We're going to keep raising personal property tax, because with inflation, if you don't put this freeze on, you're going to sell their house out from under them. Now, think what you're doing and vote green and freeze these taxes like they should be."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pierce, you spoke in debate. You're seeking to explain your vote?"



Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I was attacked personally by my colleague from Lake County. Now, let me tell you my Bill, the circuitbreaker Bill, gave relief to homeowners. I have homestead Bills for homeowners."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please."

Pierce: "This Bill is..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from LaSalle...the Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey, to explain her vote."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Flinn: "The House will be in order now. We're moving along fairly well considering all the discussion going on."

Hoxsey: "Do you have order, Mr. Speaker? May I have a word? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Flinn: "Just a moment, now. We're either going to be in order or not. If you want to have bedlam, just go ahead, and we'll wait until you get finished. Let's give the Lady some order, now. She is entitled to be heard to explain her vote. Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...Hello. A long time ago, before I became a Representative, I was a person who had real estate and paid real estate taxes. My husband said the best thing that the state could do for us was to freeze the real estate tax and get a source of revenue elsewhere if we needed more money. If I didn't pay anymore today than I did 10 years ago in real estate taxes, I would think I was quite lucky. If I don't pay anymore in real estate tax 10 years from now than I do today, I will consider myself lucky. Now, there is 80 'yes' votes up there, 57 'no' votes up there, and I can't imagine anybody that can vote 'present' on this vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Satterthwaite: "In response, I can very definitely vote



'present' on this Bill. Someone across the aisle said, a few minutes ago, that there are a number of hypocrites in this House, and there certainly are. A few hours ago... a few hours ago, when I tried to pass a Bill that would have been to the benefit of the local property taxpayers in your district and my district, the response from that side of the aisle was quite an overwhelming 'present' vote. If we want to really represent our taxpayers, we will give them the best use of their tax money. We will provide services without standing down here voting against Bills on personality. I proudly vote 'present' on this bad Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 90... On this question there are 90 voting 'aye' and 57 voting 'no', and this Bill having not having the Constitutional... Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1480 (sic) out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 1495."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1495. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to fencing and operating railroads. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Just a minute before I recognize the Sponsor. Representative Conti, for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, having voting on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the... that the last Bill for Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't think the motion is very timely. It's not a final vote. It's a Postponed Consideration."

Conti: "I would like to..."

Speaker Flinn: "The final decision has not been made on the Bill. It's still under consideration on Postponed



Consideration. Representative Jack Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the rules recall the rules provide for unanimous leave of the House to have a Bill placed on Postponed Consideration, and I object."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijeovich, on a point of order." Representative Davis, in answer to you, Rule 38 grants the Sponsor that right to do that, and that's all we did. Representative Matijeovich, are you still seeking the floor for a point of order?"

Matijeovich: "Well, I was going to raise two points of order first. That Bill's on Postponed Consideration. There is no prevailing vote on it, because it's on Postponed Consideration, and the second point is we've...we're beyond that course of business."

Speaker Flinn: "That's correct, and we're on the next Bill. Representative Kornowicz. House Bill 1495. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. We have just witnessed an exercise in hypocrisy unheard of on the other side of the aisle and now to compound this hypocrisy, the Sponsor..."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't believe that's a point of..."

Collins: "...of this Bill is..."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't believe that's a point of personal privilege. It's not a point of personal privilege. For what purpose do you arise, now?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, it seems that when anybody attempts to speak the truth around here, you people scream. It is common practice for the Sponsor of a postponed Bill to be given a copy of that Roll Call, but your Leadership is afraid that the world will see how they voted on that last Bill, and so they won't give the Sponsor of that Bill a copy of that Roll Call. Mr. Speaker, I demand that Representative Ewing be given a copy of that Roll



Call, as every Sponsor of every postponed Bill has... as many years as you and I have been down here—I know they're afraid. I know that they don't want anybody to know how they voted. I don't blame them for that, but let's not see anymore hypocrisy and cowardice around this House today. Let the world know how you voted, Mr. Speaker. What are you people afraid of?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins, I wasn't aware that I was the one that was screaming." Representative Matijevich, are you trying to make a point of order?"

Matijevich: "Well, I want to make the point of order. The Gentleman well knows that when a Bill's on Postponed Consideration there is no Roll Call. You've never seen one. You know that, because it's..."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is moot. We're on House Bill 1495. Representative Kornowicz is recognized for House Bill 1495. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you have several other Members on this side of the aisle that would like to be recognized, and I think that's your obligation, and I wish you'd do that."

Speaker Flinn: "If they'll state their purpose, I'll recognize each one one at a time till we get to all 88. Representative Simms. Telcser, I'm sorry. I'm..."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Speaker Redmond is right there in the Clerk's desk. Mr. Redmond, you don't have to leave. Mr. Speaker, you know it has always been the practice of this House to give a Sponsor a copy of the Roll Call, so that he or she could work the floor and see what they need in order to get the necessary number of votes next time it's called..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, it has never been the policy...never been the policy...when Blair was Speaker...when Ralph Smith was Speaker. The first of March having arrived, it would seem to me that we should



get on the business of the House and stop the histrionics. Representative Flinn proceed with the business of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kornowicz. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, since I started this turmoil I think I have a right, on the point of personal privilege, which I have never used in five years..."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Ewing: "...to a couple of answers. The Clerk of this House tells me he has the Roll Call. Is this a public House? Who has the right to those papers? And, you're saying that I, as the Sponsor of that Bill, don't have and yet the Clerk would admit that he has that..."

Speaker Flinn: "Pardon me. Representative Ewing, pardon me. Representative Hanahan, what's your point of order?"

Hanahan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. A motion to call the point of personal privilege of the Membership of this House is clearly spelled out under what conditions you may do this in Robert's Rules of Order on page 194. I would suggest that the Membership be instructed on exactly what a point of personal privilege is. It is not what this Gentleman is trying to address himself to, and he has no right, under a point of order, to address this House on a point of personal privilege according to Robert's Rules of Order, page 194."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, your point is well taken, Representative Hanahan, but I must state that this is not the first time that that point of personal privilege has been abused and probably will not be the last. Representative Ewing, complete your point of personal privilege."

Ewing: "I completed. I asked for an answer."

Speaker Flinn: "What was your question? I...there was confusion; and you could appreciate the fact that I may not have heard you."



Ewing: "I said the Speaker (sic) of this House indicates he has this Roll Call. Is this not public property? Is this not a public Body? And, why am I not entitled to a copy of that? Now, they can rise to their point of order over there. They're great for interrupting, and the last speaker...if anybody abuses the Rules of this House...I'd like an answer, please."

Speaker Flinn: "Let me answer his question first. The Rules do not provide that a Postponed Consideration vote is any public property at anytime."

Ewing: "Well, only the final record is public property in this House?"

Speaker Flinn: "It's not a record vote, is why it's not available. That...the Bill is still under consideration. It's still on the Calendar under another heading than it was today."

Ewing: "Well, who has a copy of that? I understand the Speaker (sic) of the House has a copy of it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich, state your point."

Matijevich: "Point of order. You ruled. Now, we all know that..."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm trying to be fair to the Gentleman and explain again what has already been explained, and I don't intend to explain it anymore. Representative Kornowicz, on House Bill 1495. Proceed with the Bill now."

Kornowicz: "Speaker, Members of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 1495 amends an Act relating to fencing and operating railroads. It provides that any railroad serving Chicago, Chicago only, during rush hour shall clear sufficient railroad yard track to enable an arriving train to be properly yarded without blocking the grade crossing in the vicinity of such yard in the rush hours of 7 a. m. to 8 a. m. and from 4 p. m. to 5 p. m. I ask for a favorable vote."



Speaker Flinn: "Is anyone standing in opposition? Representative Winchester; do you stand in opposition to this Bill?"

Winchester: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it's somewhat controversial. I'd like to have nine other Members join me in having this Bill put on Long Debate."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Long Debate. Plenty of hands. Do you wish to speak to the Bill?"

Winchester: "Yes, first a..."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Winchester: "First a question. Do you have any idea, Representative Kornowicz, what the cost to the railroads would be on this particular Bill?"

Kornowicz: "In regards to the cost, there is no cost if they comply with the...with the wishes of the Bill."

Winchester: "Would you explain what the purpose, again, of the Bill is?"

Kornowicz: "What is the purpose? Because the railroads are blocking the railroad crossings and during the rush hours people are going to and from work and are delayed and, at the same time, they are being penalized from their industry for being late."

Winchester: "If I might speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Winchester: "This is another ridiculous piece of legislation that's been drafted to just hamper the railroads once more. As we all know, we're in a time in the history of our country when we're going to be depending more and more and more on railroads in this country. Instead of trying to promote the railroads we're doing more and more to regulate them. This particular idea and concept that this Representative has is almost an impossibility for the railroads to comply with. Who ever heard of... what would they...I assume that they would have to have people standing at the railroad crossings making sure



that the...that the trains are gone. Is that correct, Representative? Mr. Speaker, I would just simply ask that the Members of...of the House vote 'no' on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, Rep...the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. I'm sorry, Representative Hanahan. He has a perfect right to make the motion. You know how to vote if you don't like it. All those in favor vote 'aye'...or say 'aye'. Those opposed...all those in favor of closing the debate vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Telcser. This is not a debatable motion if you want..."

Telcser: "Is this a motion to close the debate? Move the previous question?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, it is. The previous question was moved by Representative Brummer."

Telcser: "That requires a two-thirds vote, am I correct?"

Speaker Flinn: "There's plenty of explanation of votes. The lights are on, and I'm going to recognize them."

Telcser: "...not an explanation. It requires a two-thirds vote, I believe. Right?"

Speaker Flinn: "Right. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 47 voting 'aye' and 92 voting 'no', and the motion loses. Speaking back to the Bill. Representative Hanahan is recognized."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know where these Gentlemen who are opposing this Bill come from, but they just don't seem to know what the hell they're talking about when they talk about the frustration of the citizens of Illinois with a railroad train blocking the access going to and from the home, to and from your place of work, to and from church, to and from



the hospitals, to and from every kind of civil, responsible action that a human being could endeavor in this state, while some people around here would sooner have those railroads blocking us for a day or a week. Who are we here to protect? The railroads or the people? The people of Illinois deserve better protection than to allow railroads to block crossings anytime they want, and I don't know what this Gentleman's talking about in southern Illinois that he don't need this kind of legislation. Let me tell you what happens in northern Illinois. You could sit for a day sometimes before these damn railroads get out of your way so you can go to church, or go to the hospital, or take care of the things that you need to take care of. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is good legislation. It's about time the people of Illinois send a message to the railroads and let them know that we're sick and tired of sitting for a half hour or forty-five minutes for a railroad car to cross. I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, this is not the fault of some engineer or the fault of some railroad worker, because he has no control of when to move that railroad. He's controlled by the directors of the company."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hanahan. One moment, please. Representative Conti, for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think he's got the right Bill. I'm for the Bill that he's talking about. This has nothing to do with blocking radios...railroads. This is fencing and operating railroad yards. It has nothing to do with the blocking of that. We voted on that... 1210 before."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Hanahan: "Let me tell you something. Have you ever gone to the amphitheater in Chicago? Did you go through the crossing yards there and sit for a half hour trying



to get to see a stage play or an athletic event at the stockyards to the amphitheater, and then damn railroad cars won't get out of your way, and you paid \$12 for a ticket, and you're sitting there waiting for a railroad car to get out of your way? This is needed legislation. This is what we're going to do. Let them get the Goddamn things out of the way. All right."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's a tough act to follow. But, in any event, I live in Chicago and, in the recent months, I've observed that with the railroads blocking the crossing at Archer Avenue and Pulaski that the traffic on Route 55 has been backed up and the buses that the...the railroad was there so long that the CTA buses could not use the expressway. They had to come down Archer Avenue. The traffic was tied up at the rush hour and is creating a public hazard. It is making things unsafe, and these are the conditions that Representative Kornowicz is speaking about. The railroads really need to correct this situation, and if this is the way to do it, we should support this measure."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes does it take to pass this Bill?"

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear you, Representative Vinson. I'm sorry."

Vinson: "How many votes does it take to pass this Bill?"

Speaker Flinn: "What's your point of inquiry? Why do you ask?"

Vinson: "Well, it's a stark invasion of home rule, and we should not permit that without complying with the Constitution. It should take 107 to pass this."

Speaker Flinn: "Regulation of railroads, the parliamentarian



advises me has nothing to do with home rule whatsoever."

Vinson: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Eighty-nine votes. Eighty-nine votes. The

regulation of railroads has nothing to do with home rule. The
parliamentarian advises me."

Vinson: "Well, aren't we regulating something here and ex-
cluding the home rule from regulating it, and don't they,
to some degree, regulate railroads?"

Speaker Flinn: "No, there are no limitations on home rule
units."

Vinson: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Flinn: "There are no limitations on home rule units
in the Bill."

Vinson: "May I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, this is a blatantly bad Bill. Chicago,
for a century, has been regarded as the railroad hub
of America. This is where every railroad that goes
east and west and north and south in the United States
passes through, and all this Bill can do is completely
constrict the ability of the railroads to move freight.
We're fortunate in this country to still move some
freight by railroad, but if we keep regulating and
restricting the railroads, we're not going to move any,
and we're going to have a complete breakdown of the
transportation system in this country, and we're going
to be down here with no railroads moving to try to
finance highways to raise the gas tax. So, I urge a
'no' vote on this."

Speaker Flinn: "The TV lights are on. Representative Van
Duyne is recognized."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I liked Hanahan better
when his throat was sore. I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.
All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes'



have it. I think there's enough saying 'no' that the motion loses. I think we're wasting our time, but I'll try to be as fair as I can. All those in favor of closing debate vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. This is the previous question. It requires two-thirds of those voting to vote 'aye' to close off debate. Have all voted who wish? You'll have to get somebody to push your button. Representative Borchers wants to vote 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 83 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'no', and the motion loses. Continue debate. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think there's some misapprehension and misunderstanding about this Bill. Now, what you've really got to do is read what the Bill says because, unfortunately in this Body, frequently we have a tendency to vote on things just listening to some slight explanation and not reading the Bill and finding out what it actually says and what it actually does. I found out that if we rely solely on the synopsis (sic), we are in some cases listening to people who may have only been on the job for a week or two and they don't really understand it and, as a result, you get a mass of confusion as to what goes on in this Body. Now, Mr. Kornowicz's Bill has been misrepresented to most of the Body. What we're talking about is in the City of Chicago and the other cities and villages throughout the state. You have railroad trains which consist of anywhere from thirty, forty, fifty, up to a hundred coaches. These trains, during the rush hour, block the passages of the people. What it does is make it impossible for people in the rush hour to even arrive on commuter trains. It makes it impossible to get to work. It means that the entire economic system is in disarray, because the people



cannot pass simply because of willful negligence by the railroad. Now, this is what we're opposed to. We didn't say that the railroads could not block for a reasonable period of time, but we ask them specifically in this Bill between particular hours of seven to eight and four to five that they would then realize what an economic crunch we have in the city. The failure on our part to act is the disadvantage and the total economic disruption of many people in the city. Now, the railroads, what they do in blocking these passages, is they make it impossible for such things as even the ambulance who get stuck behind three or four blocks of cars. They can't even make the cross streets. The same thing applies for emergency vehicles. The fire department. They have contingent plans, but they find out that they can't even get across the streets, and the police departments are in total frustration, because anybody who decides to commit a crime between these hours discovers that even the police department is immobile. And, these constitute serious problems and now we, on this side, and Mr. Kornowicz, in particular, has been laboring long and hard on this particular issue. He's gone through every Committee, and no matter which Committee they send him through he keeps carrying a message that the people want to be free to pass, and I think that the failure of these dynasties, the railroad magnates, is a total insensitivity to the problems of the people. This is a people's Bill, a working people's Bill, a Bill that will allow the average citizen some dignity. But, what we're doing here is totally...totally reprehensible, and I cannot understand for the life of me the opposition to this good legislation. If there were anyone who could raise the point or who could explain to us why this simple Bill of twelve lines should not be adopted, I would be glad to listen. But, in the absence of that



explanation it makes it very difficult for me to understand why we're acting the way we act. Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been here a little while, and I have tried very hard to remain quiet because it's difficult. I like to talk. I like to hear myself talk. I do it for practice, but while I'm here, I think that this legislation of all the legislation that we have is perhaps one of the most empirical pieces that we have to do. It represents the difference in party philosophy. It represents our concern about what we always say are the little people. Mr. Kornowicz has a wonderful piece of legislation here, and I cannot understand for the life of me why there should be any opposition. Why would we defend the railroads? What do the railroads do for us or the citizens of the State of Illinois? You have stock? Oh. I found out why one Gentleman votes for them. He has stock. Now, that's an honest answer, but it's reprehensible to me that we can sit here and sit on this type of legislation without cause and with no meritorious defense. And, I must ask very reasonably, why? Why do you Gentlemen persist? Why do you not allow the people of Chicago and the smaller towns and communities free passage? It's the only thing that we ask. Perhaps, it's the only decent legislation we'll get out this entire Session. Now, I'm concerned about this, and I'm sure you're concerned. And, I'm sure if we could all sit down, we might be able to reason together."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you arise?"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears that we're in the midst of a filibuster here. How much time does the Gentleman have to speak on this issue?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, it's on Long Debate, and the two minutes doesn't count, and I'm sorry I haven't had the timer



on. But, if I need be, I'll turn it on. Would you please bring the remarks to a close?"

Ewell: "Well, if you would put the timer on, I would be glad to bring my remarks to a close, because we cannot... no, no, no, no. No, we cannot overestimate the importance of this type of legislation, and Mr. Kornowicz is one of the most honorable men here in this Body. He has never undertaken anything except in the interests of the people of the State of Illinois as a whole. He's not even a provincial Legislator who's concerned with only his district and only his share of the pork. His legislation is general, that which will benefit all of the people and all of the districts, and this indeed is an admirable quality."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Dwight Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedrich: "I thought we were on Short Debate, Mr. Speaker and..."

Speaker Flinn: "No, it's on Long Debate. It was taken off."

Friedrich: "What is the time allowed now?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, on Short Debate it's two minutes, and I think it's probably ten minutes on Long Debate."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Ewell: "I'm concerned that I should be interrupted so often. It depresses me, but anyway I'm saying that this is not special interest legislation where there's any benefit. And, no one in this Body would accuse Mr. Kornowicz of receiving benefits from this type of legislation. Now, there is other legislation here where all of us might have direct benefits, and we might expect even political contributions and the like. But, this legislation is motivated out of the purity of his heart, and I assure you that there is no insincerity in this Bill that only the people can benefit, and all of you who



would oppose this type of legislation ought to say, 'Shame'; for it indeed, it's almost criminal that we, as a group, could oppose reasonable legislation. Now, we see unreasonable legislation for every kind of dam, creek, river, and even slough but this is motivated by only the highest of intent, and I'm sure that if you Gentlemen ever had the occasion to sit here next to Mr. Kornowicz, as I have, that compassion would fill your hearts, and that you would understand the true nature of this great man. And, having sat here, I say to you that I almost cry when I have to look at you Gentlemen pushing red lights against legislation of this order, and the Ladies, also. I do not mean to be a nonperson."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative, would you bring your remarks to a close? Representative Harris, for what purpose do arise?"

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intended to speak to this Bill, but I'd like to yield my time to Representative Ray...Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, specifically some of the great offenders in this occasion happen to be railroads, the Northwestern Railroad, which runs late most of the time. It doesn't take proper care of either the passengers or freight, and I fail to see why we here should try to take such good care of them. What rewards can...?"

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Jake Wolf, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wolf: "I think Mr. Ewell has already used Mr. Harris' time."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "If you've ever ridden on the Northwestern Railroad, you'll understand that they are a cold and insensitive body. They have never been concerned..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Roman Kosinski, for what purpose do you arise?"



Kosinski: "...personal privilege with the interruptions. I've been missing part of his speech. I wonder if he could begin where he left off at 'end!'"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, if they let him rest, he's going to last longer. Representative, proceed."

Ewell: "And, I've also had an occasion to ride the IC Railroad, and that's another great offender. They block the crossings, the passages, the walks with the cold and cool indifference to the people, and I think this is wrong, because as I am here I pledge to come down and try to do something for the people of the state, not just of the people of my district. I don't ask for all those bridges, dams, surveys, consultants, and all of the other goodies that come out of the state. All I want to do is attempt to say that I came down and supported worthwhile legislation, and I assure you Gentlemen and I ask you, in fact, how many of you have actually read this Bill? Could I have a show of hands? So few have read the Bill that I feel compelled to read it for you. All it does is a Section...Section B...8A of an Act relating to fencing, operating railroads approved March 31, 1874 as amended. It is added thereto the added Section to read as follows. Now, the following Section is important."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Jake Wolf, for what purpose do you arise now?"

Wolf: "Oh, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say I was going to yield my time to Mr. Ewell. He's doing such a great job."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, fine. You've got ten more minutes. Go ahead. Representative Brummer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Brummer: "Yes, I was wondering if this is the first time Ray Ewell's reading the Bill?"

Ewell: "I didn't hear that. Would he repeat it?"



Speaker Flinn: "The question was...I think it's out of order, but it was is this the first time you read the Bill?"

Ewell: "Yes."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, proceed."

Ewell: "Honesty is the best policy. I mean, honesty will save you when nothing else will for it is the truth that will truly set you free. Anyway, Section 8A, any railroad company, and I want to note that the peculiarity in which this Bill was drafted, we didn't talk about the railroad. We were specific to say any railroad. Any railroad company providing train service to and from Chicago and note, to all of our friends from downstate Illinois, that we did not interfere in your local and domestic affairs. We tried to stick to the railroads that were peculiar to the City of Chicago and the nearby environs, and this, I think, is another worthy feature of this particular Bill. We...we then proceed to say that during the rush hours and all of you know what rush hours are, and if there's anybody here who doesn't know, we'll attempt to explain. I see Mr. Collins doesn't know. Rush hours are generally those hours in which there is a great deal of activity. The activity may vary from place to place for we have found that all people are not the same, and in some areas where this Bill might encompass, the rush hour might entail the rushing of, let's say, putting breakfast together to rushing the kids out to school, and this is a very important function, for certainly all of us desire to have our children educated, and I understand that this is one of the top priorities of our party. There are other rush hour activities. The other rush hour activities may include such things as taking one's car to the car wash. This is a very essential ingredient to the American philosophy and way of life for if you don't wash the salt off the cars, they are sure to rust,



and I am simply not a person to believe in those ads by Rusty and the others who say that they will prevent this rusting. Then there are others who have more important chores."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you arise?"

Deuster: "Well, I think Representative Ewell will be happy to yield for just a moment. I would like, at this time, to place his name into nomination for the office of United States Senator. I think he has demonstrated his capabilities and his ability, and he's wasting his talent here in Springfield. He should be..."

Speaker Flinn: "You'll have to attend the Democratic caucus to do that."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Show up at the Democratic caucus and we'll take care of it."

Deuster: "No, I'm willing to go on a bipartisan ticket."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Deuster: "You know, it doesn't matter."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Gaines, for what purpose do you arise?"

Gaines: "I rise to ask equal time, because I'm from the same district and the television cameras are on. I'd like to have equal time with Mr. Ewell."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I was about ready to turn them off, but I'll leave them on. Go ahead. Representative..."

Ewell: "No, we've had one colored Gentleman. That's enough. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know and of great importance that there are two rush hours, not just one. But, we'll get to the second rush hour in a moment. When we talk about the importance of the first rush hour, we have to think about the people who have morning activities that make is necessary for them to go onto the streets, and these are the people that I'm concerned



with, because have you ever stood in line to get your car washed and already you've been in line waiting for the train to move for a half hour? I tell you it's repulsive. What this does also is it delays the CTA and even the RTA, and God knows there are many of us who want to give help to the CTA and for that purpose we have sent the one and only and honorable Mr. Barnes to see what he can do to straighten it out, and he, too, is a very honorable Gentleman, and I'm sure is going to straighten out the problem. But, back to the rush hour."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you arise?"

Winchester: "Well, it's obvious now that the speaker's being dilatory. He's not even talking to the subject of the Bill, and I would suggest that we move on with a Roll Call vote and kill this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you get back with the Bill, please?"

Ewell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry and wish to..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson."

Ewell: "...offer my...apologies."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Vinson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "I..."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, that's out of order."

Speaker Flinn: "...don't think you can interrupt one of the speakers in order to make a motion of that sort. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you were the real Speaker...or the velvet hammer would give us some indication of how long it's going to take that plane to get in here from Rock Island with Representative Darrow on it. Maybe we could recess long enough to go down and get a sandwich while you play these silly games up here in the chamber."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to letting the Gentle-



man go for lunch provided..."

Ryan: "I would move that we recess until the plan gets in,
Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "What's your...state your point, Representative
Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, we're in the middle of a debate, and it's
a very important debate, and I'm having a very difficult
time following Representative Ewell. I think he's doing
a real commendable job, but we can't follow him with
these interruptions, and they don't have any...they
cannot interrupt him while he's in the middle of the
debate."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you won't give us leave to
wait...to adjourn until we get the plane in from
Rock Island, maybe we could all get on a plane and
go up to Rock Island so we could conduct the people's
business there. Obviously, this is a charade...a
typical stall. You need all 88 or 89 or whatever it
is you have, and I think that this is absolutely
dilatatory, and if the real Speaker would come out and
do the job he's getting paid for, maybe this wouldn't
be going on."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Mr. Ryan, I don't want to join it..."

Ryan: "I'm appalled that you're allowing this to go on while
you sit in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "Mr. Ryan, I don't want to join the debate,
and you're making accusations against me, but I would
remind you the Republicans put this on Long Debate.
Representative Ewell, proceed."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, if I could please have a little order."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson, for one moment. One..."

Ewell: "A little order."

Vinson: "You ruled against my right to move the previous
question?"



Speaker Flinn: "You weren't recognized to make a motion. I thought you were rising on a point of order. You were interrupting the Gentleman who was speaking." Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, could you tell us how much time the Gentleman's got left to speak?"

Speaker Flinn: "If he doesn't get granted some time from somebody else, he's about out it."

Ryan: "Well, what's how much time? You got a clock up there."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, it looks like less than a minute."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "It's on yellow up there. Right above you. Representative Emil Jones, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had planned to speak on this, but I'll yield my ten minutes to my esteemed colleague from the 29th District."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. And, I want to apologize profusely for the time that I could not speak and for...and for the interruption. Anyway, back to the rush hour from 7 to 8 a. m. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is perhaps the most critical time of day and how often have any of us thought about what we do between seven and eight and how important it is to the day? It's more important to start the day off right than it is to finish it off all wrong. Think. If we did not get a good start this morning, where we would be now. It shocks me, and I tremble at the mere thought of it. But, anyway, the rush hour is not to be overlooked, because it is the most important time of day and think of all the functions that we do and take care of during the rush hour. I, myself, have many things that I do during the rush hour. I rise in the morning. I brush my teeth...my



molars, incisors..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please."

Ewell: "Bicuspids."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you arise?"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appeal to your mercy. The Gentleman is dilatory. He is definitely not speaking to the Bill. However, he has almost convinced me that it might be a good Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "I would warn you again, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "All right."

Speaker Flinn: "Speak to the Bill."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, it is most depressing, but I have just discovered that it's a train that's blocking Mr. Darrow. If he could just get to the airport, things would be different. But, anyway...no...no. As I brush my incisors, molars, and the four teeth in front, I'm very careful to think about the projects for the day."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, he's still not addressing the Bill. I wish..."

Ewell: "Oh, yes...yes."

Vinson: "...you would severely admonish him."

Ewell: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm warning you again. Address the Bill."

Ewell: "Line 10...7 a. m. There are twelve hours."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers, arise?"

Borchers: "If I may be excused a minute, I have a pair of pliers in my car."

Speaker Flinn: "Go get them. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Twelve hours in the a. m. and twelve hours in the p. m. and the most important are between seven and eight."



And, back to the Bill, it says to eight."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. One moment? Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm certainly enjoying this, but as a matter of personal privilege, I was just wondering if I could inquire, since the Bill addresses railroad crossings and railroad crossings carry atomic fuel waste, and waste pertains to the nuclear generating plant up in Zion, and since that pertains to the energy crisis, and since the Arabs have been controlling the oil, I wonder if you have any opinion on the Syrian government?"

Speaker Flinn: "It's not in order."

Griesheimer: "I do."

Speaker Flinn: "That's not in order. You can answer it if you want, but..."

Ewell: "No, but I..."

Speaker Flinn: "He's not the Sponsor of the Amendment. We've got to stay in order here."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to keep the Gentleman enlightened, and I know a little bit about Syrian and I could tell him about the Syrian government and the policies that they have there. They are causing the oil to go up and taking money out of the pockets of all of the American motorists, all of the American people, pushing our fuel bills past the point of intolerance."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. For what purpose does Representative Vinson arise?"

Vinson: "He's not addressing the Bill, and I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "I'll warn you one more time. Address the Bill."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, with profuse apologies..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please."



Ewell: "After a. m. there is a period..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Schuneman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schuneman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Schuneman: "I'm sure we're all enjoying this show. It's really an interesting show. I would voice some concern, Mr. Speaker, about what we're doing here today. I think you have tried within the constraints that you have to be fair, but this is a new procedure, Mr. Speaker, since I've been in this House, and I think it's a very dangerous one, and I would like to ask that we not be establishing any precedent here, but if the show is to go on, those of us who are spectators and have paid for our seats here, would ask for another act."

Speaker Flinn: "I assure you that we are not establishing a precedent here today. Proceed."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I am affronted. But, nevertheless, I shall proceed. After a. m. there is a period, and the period represents a very concise and exact drafting of this Bill to show you that it was just not a random piece of legislation thrown together without thought, without consideration. For we could've used a comma, but we did not. We used a period, because it was necessary to have the true import and meaning of the Bill, so that many of us, who have trouble with the language, would be able to understand. Now, I, myself, am sort of new to the country, and I don't understand too good, so you'll have to excuse me for a few errors that I make. But, anyway, then we go to 8 a. m. and in all deliberate haste, and here I'm reminded of the Supreme Court which once issued the edict to try to make all deliberate haste, and I think at the last count it was 25 years..."



Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please."

Ewell: "But, I'm willing to go a little faster."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Robbins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Robbins: "I have a question on the Bill. I..."

Speaker Flinn: "You can only question the Sponsor, and he is not the Sponsor. He is one...he's speaking in behalf of the Bill, and we're on Long Debate, and he's been granted...he's now on Emil Jones' time. He has approximately eight minutes left of Emil Jones' time. You could not question him. When your turn comes, I'll recognize you. Representative McBroom, for what purpose do you arise?"

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, immediately to my left is Representative McBroom...McGrew, Representative Campbell, Mr. Schwartz. I'm trying to listen to Representative Ewell."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you Gentlemen return to your seats, please and...?"

McBroom: "Could you provide a little order?"

Speaker Flinn: "...keep quiet so we can all hear?"

McBroom: "Some of us are fascinated with the debate, and I'd like to listen to it, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on a point of personal privilege, if I may?"

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Telcser: "My point in rising really occurred to me when Representative Schuneman stood up and very sincerely tried to make a point to the Members of the House that what we're engaging in now is sheer utter foolishness. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Majority Leader just doesn't have the votes necessary to do whatever he wants to do at the present moment, and because of that that he is causing every Member of this House to be



embarrassed. He's causing this House, as a Body, to be looked upon as some sort of a joke, and he is simply encouraging those citizens in Illinois to look upon their government as being just sheer foolishness, and I can understand how the public feels when they see what the Legislature does on afternoons like today. Mr. Speaker, the Majority Leader and the Speaker, along with a few Members of his side of the aisle, have for some unknown reason decided that today is the day they want to call certain Bills which they favor. We had hoped that those Bills could be put over till next week, because we will probably all agree on what the substance of those Bills should be. For some reason which I can't really imagine, the Majority Leader is insisting upon this afternoon and in doing so he is denying every single Member of this House, no matter what side of the aisle they happen to be sitting on, the opportunity, or the right, or the privilege, or the time to have their particular individual Bills sincerely considered and debated on, and that is the very reason why the Members on this side of the aisle had hoped that we could consider those very critical important issues next week once the deadline this Friday at midnight has passed us by. But, now because of the Majority Leader's whim, we're all forced whether we like it or not...whether we wish to be part of it or not, we are all forced to collectively be engaged in utter foolishness. I'll make a personal appeal to you, Mr. Majority Leader, to reconsider your idea of hearing your Bills today. Put them over for next week and let your Members and the Members of my side of the aisle have every opportunity to have their important district matters heard. You're taking away their time. You're further eroding our reputation and our ability to function as a Legislature. I know there are many, many



sincere Members on the other side of the aisle who are working very, very hard on individual Bills which they are very concerned about. I know how concerned Representative Kornowicz is about this particular Bill. He has talked to me about it a couple of times. All this is going to do is to force more Bills to be lost for the rest of this week, so Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, particularly the Members on the other side of the aisle and really, really those Members on the other side, who I know are embarrassed over what the Majority Leader is forcing all of us to do, I hope and suggest you talk to him, and you encourage him to put off what he considers to be important until next Wednesday or Thursday. It will make no difference whatsoever in the scheme of things. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that is the point I wish to make, and I hope many Members on both sides of the aisle will take my remarks seriously."

Speaker Flinn: "In response, Representative Telcser..."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "...I would answer you like I answered Representative Schuneman. Again, we are not setting a precedent here today. Representative Jones, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought we were discussing the merits of House Bill 1495, and I know I have ten minutes that I yielded to Representative Ewell. According to my count, Mr. Speaker, I have eight minutes left, because he has been interrupted so many times, so I wish you would..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I'll grant him a little extra time to try to make up for that. Representative Deuster."

Jones: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you arise?"



Deuster: "I rise for a point of order. Rule #55 provides in Section F that no Member...no Member shall speak longer than ten minutes at one time."

Speaker Flinn: "It also states that...it also states that a Member may yield another the time allotted for the Member's debate, but no Member may yield to another the time allotted for explanation of votes, so we're still in debate. We're not on explanation of vote, so all of the 176 Members can yield the Gentleman ten minutes if they so desire."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "The same Rule you were reading. Just read paragraph H."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "Go ahead, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I think that it probably would reflect the sense of a good many Members of the House who share the remarks of Representative Telcser that the General Assembly is being made into a farce that we always have the ability that this Body can support a motion to suspend a Rule, and accordingly, I would move to suspend the provisions of Rule 55H for the balance of this week, so that we have no further charades, no further farces..."

Speaker Flinn: "When you are recognized for the purpose of a motion, you will be able to do that. We're...one of the Gentleman's being interrupted, and you interrupted for the point of personal privilege, and that doesn't happen to be a point of personal privilege...making a motion. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Winchester: "I have a question of the parliamentarian. I find that on page 1, line 14 that there is a mistake in the legislation. Therefore, I suggest it be taken



out of the record and then sent back to Second Reading."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, we are in debate. I thought, and it's a point of order. Does he have the right to raise the point now?"

Speaker Flinn: "What is the mistake?"

Winchester: "The word 'vicinity' is misspelled."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Matijeich, what's your point?"

Winchester: "Well, it's a technical error."

Matijeich: "I make a point of order. If the whole Bill were a mistake, we can't do a think about it, because we're on Third Reading. That's my point of order."

Speaker Flinn: "Absolutely right. There are number of places that correction could be made...Enrolling and Engrossing, in the Senate, lots of places. And, the Sponsor is having his Bill heard here now, so the question...you could've done that by an Amendment on Second Reading. You could have corrected it for him, or he could've done it. Representative Dwight Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Friedrich: "You know there's been a lot of oratory around here in the last few minutes about rights and rules, and I don't question the fact that you are ruling according to rules. You got the parliamentarian there, but there's very little in our rules or even the Constitution about responsibility. Now, I think the speaker, Mr. Ewell, may be acting within his right. I think he's being irresponsible, and I think we have an obligation to the people, and I think we have an obligation to the Members on this floor who have Bills they want to pass before Friday night to get on with the business of the House. I think what Representative Ewell is doing is very irresponsible. It may



not make any difference in his district, but I can assure you it will make a difference in what the people think of this Legislature."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jacob Wolf, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, according to Rule 61, it says...61A, while a question is under debate, no motion may be entertained except that to fix a time at which to adjourn or recess, and I would like to move that, at this time, Mr. Speaker, that we recess until the hour of 5:30."

Speaker Flinn: "You were not recognized for that purpose. You are interrupting debate. You were not recognized for any motions. Not a point of personal privilege, it isn't. Representative Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't rise on a point of personal privilege. I just rose to point out the rule, and that was the only rule..."

Speaker Flinn: "For what purpose did you arise? I thought that's what you arose for when I asked you to state your point."

Wolf: "The point was to make a motion, Mr. Speaker. According to Rule 61A..."

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't recognize you for a motion. I thought it was a point of personal privilege. Representative Telcser. Repre..."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I move we recess till 9:30 p. m. tonight."

Speaker Flinn: "You were not recognized for that purpose, either. You're interrupting debate. Representative Ewell, proceed."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I have not become thin-skinned and despite the slings and arrow that have been flung at me, I'm not going to ask for personal privilege and respond to the callous charges that have been levied



against my character. I'm going to proceed."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further...any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1495 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, if this..."

Speaker Flinn: "...explain your vote."

Telcser: "...gets 89 votes, I want a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Fine. We'll get to you if we get it. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'ayes', 54 'nays', and the Bill having... Representative ... Representative Mautino, 'aye'. Representative Beatty, 'aye'. Representative Griesheimer, 'no'. Representative Kelly, 'aye'. Give me a new count now. There are 87 'ayes' and 55 'noes'. Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "...the absentees, please."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has requested to poll the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Bianco. Bower. Catania. Daniels. Davis. Doyle. Dyer. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Hoffman. Kempiners."

Speaker Flinn: "Kempiners, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Kent. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Neff. Reed. Ropp. Sandquist."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, please. Representative Bower, for what purpose do you arise? Representative...record Representative Bower, 'no'. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Schoeberlein. Tuerk. Watson. Wikoff. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "I'd like to make a point of order. I see a switch pushed on the Republican side. I don't mind people pushing switches, but I think it's not very good of a



person to push someone's switch that votes them contrary to their district, and I think that we should start enforcing our rules if we're going to vote Members contrary to the way they would want to vote if they were sitting there."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Doyle. Representative Doyle."

Doyle: "I want to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Record Representative Doyle as 'aye'. The Speaker sent a message out to record him as 'aye'. He'll be here. He's talking to somebody in Japan. I don't know who it is. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Perhaps I could explain my vote."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't think so. Representative Darrow. Representative Gaines."

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

Speaker Flinn: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Gaines: "Well, since I wasn't given equal time with my district, make...change me to 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change him to 'present'. Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the right to ask a question. I have the Bill in my hand. I have a question of the Sponsor. Does this Bill affect...?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, just a moment. We're on a verified... rather on a Roll Call right now, and I...that's out of order at this point in time. Representative..."

Robbins: "Well, you...you told..."

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave to ask a question of the Sponsor? Is there objection? I can't hear whether you're saying 'yes' or 'no'. There's objection? Okay. Representative Borchers, for what purpose do you arise?"

Borchers: "In a sense, personal privilege. I see Representative Tipword in the balcony...a former Representative,



and I think he should pay for the show."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, the Speaker is here. If Representative Collins is in the...on the floor, he is here in person to vote 'aye'. Representative Ryan, were you asking for the floor?"

Ryan: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to see that the real Speaker's here, and I would like to address you, Mr. Redmond, if you'll listen. Fair Bill Redmond, are you paying attention? Bill Redmond, are you listening to me? Because, this message is for you, Mr. Speaker. While you sat in the back room because you didn't have guts enough to get on the podium, we've now wasted two hours after we put up with all of your nonsense all Session long about moving this House along, and you sat back there and ignored everything that went on out here...total abuse of the Chair that's going on right now on this Roll Call, absolutely no respect for the rights of the Members here, and you're the Speaker of the House, you ought to be totally ashamed of yourself."

Speaker Redmond: "I want to be sure we have the television lights on."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matula."

Matula: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Matula from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Reed."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Reed, 'no'. Daniels votes 'no'. Darrow, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to thank you for the courtesy you've shown me today. My mother-in-law passed away earlier this week, and I was at the funeral and unable to come down here, and I apologize for any delay. I recall that the same courtesy you've extended on other



days, and it was very greatly appreciated by other Members of the House such as the Minority Spokesman, Mr. Ryan, when his mother-in-law died, I believe, last week. Speaker Redmond took a few of his Bills out of the record and was very courteous to him. I think that shows the caliber of men that serve in the General Assembly, and I thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Wikoff, you were asking for the floor? Wikoff, 'no'. On this question there are 87 'ayes' and 60 'no'. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded, Sir?"

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Katz: "Change that to 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Katz to 'aye'. Katz, 'aye'. Representative Madigan, your light is on."

Madigan: "What's our Order of Business, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "We're still on the Roll Call here. Representative Taylor, you had your light on a moment ago. I'm sorry, you've got it off now. What's the count? Eighty-eight 'aye' and sixty 'no', and this Bill having not received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared... Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Postponed, please."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman asks for Postponed Consideration. Postponed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, was the last vote put on the Order of Postponed Consideration? Mr. Speaker, I now move that we suspend the provisions of Rule 11C to move to the Special Order of Business displayed on page 47 of the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. Well, the Gentleman moved. Do you object to it moving? Representative Telcser. Let's not..."

Telcser: "What will it take...?"



Speaker Redmond: "...we're on the motion."

Telcser: "...Mr. Speaker? Eighty-nine votes?"

Speaker Redmond: "Eighty-nine votes."

Telcser: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the question? The question...Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd like to know if you took possession of the copy of that last Roll Call that doesn't exist? I understand that there's no such thing."

Speaker Redmond: "No substitute for good manners, Representative Collins."

Collins: "I don't think that anybody on your side would recognize the difference, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well..."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do object to the Gentleman's motion on the suspension of Rule 11C. The Rule of 11C, as you know, deals with the establishment of a Special Order of Business, which you placed on the Calendar on Monday of this week. Eight Members of the Rules Committee filed to suspend that Rule. The Republican side of this aisle has tried to make you operate in a responsible and sensible...in a more sensible way which we now realize is utterly impossible, but as Representative Telcser pointed out earlier, if you're going to accommodate the Members of this House...if you're going to show them the common courtesy to which they are entitled...if you show me the common courtesy of listening, which I know that is too much to expect also, but if you would show your Membership the common courtesy of accommodating them by listening to their Bills...hearing their Bills this week and then going to the simple expedient of extending your so-called Special Order to next week when we can logically consider all of the substantive legislation, we could do



it in a reasonable fashion. But, no, you want to cram this stuff down people's throats to hear at this late hour and going into the night tonight when you could consider logically and sanely this legislation, which agreeably is very important. Mr. Speaker, this motion of the Majority Leader's is totally irresponsible which is to be expected I know, but I do object, and I would ask for a Roll Call vote on the motion."

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

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I request a Republican conference in Room 118 immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "How long?"

Ryan: "At least an hour."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll give you half an hour. Twenty minutes after five."

Ryan: "Why can't I have an hour, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll go back in Session."

Ryan: "We...wish..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll go back in Session in half an hour and proceed with the business of the House."

Ryan: "What time are you going to call us back?"

Speaker Redmond: "Five twenty. That's exactly half an hour."

Ryan: "You're all right. It's a real dictatorship you're running."

Speaker Redmond: "A motion to recess for a half an hour. The House will stand in recess for half an hour. We'll start the business of the House at 5:20. (recess) 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 106 'ayes', no 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Rodney. Representative Hoxsey, what's the occasion of the flowers? Is it a birthday or a...?"

Hoxsey: "Yesterday."



Speaker Redmond: "Did you know that Representative Hoxsey had a birthday yesterday? She doesn't look a day older. Do you want to bring Representative Geo-Karis back here to sing Happy Birthday? Objection has been raised. Representative Garmisa have done yesterday? The House will come to order. There are some things that we can do here I hope. Committee reports. Representative Woodyard."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Garmisa, Chairman of the Committee on Transportation, to which the following Bill was referred, action taken May 1, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 1063."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1063. Woodyard. A Bill for an Act relating to construction, operation, and maintenance of deep waterways. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard, have you talked to the parliamentarian?"

Woodyard: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. This was created evidently by a bleep-bleep in the computer. This Bill passed through Transportation Committee. It should've been put on the Consent Calendar and passed through the House. It was not picked up by the computer. This Bill simply changes the technical part of some language in a statute. I would ask leave of the House to move this to Third Reading on the No Debate Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's asking unanimous consent to move it to the No Debate Calendar on the Order of



Third Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. It will be added to the No Debate Calendar, Third Reading. It's a good thing you're alert, Representative Woodyard. Totten did that? On the no debate list...wait till we get...we're just... No Debate list. Mr. Clerk, what..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...have been 84 Bills removed...either removed or passed previously today. There...I have one correction to the mark up list in front of me here. House Bill 948 was marked with a red circle in error. There were no objection...no objections to House Bill 948."

Speaker Redmond: "Whose Bill is that?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Cullerton's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Redmond: "So that will stay on the no debate list. Now, how about any withdrawals of objections?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Relating to House Bill 1434, the five objectors signed a report withdrawing their objections and the six objectors. The same six objectors signed a request withdrawing their objections to House Bill 1434."

Speaker Redmond: "Do they have leave to withdraw their objections? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Objections are withdrawn. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1063 that we just moved to Third Reading. Was it ever on Second Reading? Did it ever come out of the...?"

Speaker Redmond: "The problem...the problem is it...through an error. It should've been reported by the Clerk of the Committee to be on the Consent Calendar. The report got mixed up. If you'll look in your Digest, you'll see that it shows that it was tabled."

Currie: "Tabled. Yes."



Speaker Redmond: "That's in error, so the only way that we can get around that is the procedure that we followed."

Currie: "Which is to go immediately to Third Reading or is it going to be on Second Reading at all?"

Speaker Redmond: "We read it the second time today."

Currie: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...who is that? Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for a point of information. The annual report of the Data Information Systems Commission has been distributed to the Membership of the Legislature."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell, would you repeat that? I didn't hear it."

Waddell: "I said for a point of information, the annual report of the Data Information Systems Commission has been distributed to the Members of the Legislature."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Motions, Representative Mahar's recognized. Representative Mahar's recognized on the Order of Motions."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At this time I would move that Senate Bill 943 be reported...the appropriate rule be suspended that Senate Bill 943 could be moved to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. It's a supplemental appropriation for the military and naval, and they tell me that they won't get paid on May 30th if this Bill isn't acted upon this week. I have talked to both sides of the aisle and the Appropriations Committees and have received no objections from anyone at this point."

Speaker Redmond: "Is the Bill on the table now? Is that where it is?"

Mahar: "The Bill is in the Appropriations II Committee, as I understand it."

Speaker Redmond: "Is the parliamentarian around? Representative Matijeovich."



Matijevich: "This has been cleared with Representative Barnes, Chairman of Appropriations II, and I raised some objection yesterday, but it was purely because both sides of the aisle did want to raise some objection to the volume of supplemental Bills that were coming over to the Senate, but we have all discussed it and cleared it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, Chairman of the Appropriation Committee. Is Representative...agreeable with you? Representative Mahar moves to discharge the Appropriations Committee and move Senate Bill 943 to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 943 will be on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Read the Bill. Read it a second time. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I was in my office, and I think I heard a word come over the speaker that a Bill was placed on the No Debate Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Yourell: "How do you get that...?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's hard to believe, but inadvertently the Clerk reported the Bill. It should've been on the... as being on the Consent Calendar, and it was reported as having been tabled, and it shows that it's tabled in the Digest."

Yourell: "Well, it..."

Speaker Redmond: "So, we checked the Clerk's records and found out that it should've been reported on the Consent Calendar, so we read it...we read it here. We read that corrective report of the Committee report."

Yourell: "The problem I..."

Speaker Redmond: "But, there isn't enough time to..."

Yourell: "The problem I have with that is that it was my understanding that at five o'clock...would be the deadline for removing any Bills from the No Debate Calendar. Is that correct?"



Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Yourell: "And if this Bill was placed on the No Debate Calendar 25 to 6 how in the world can we move it at five o'clock?"

Speaker Redmond: "The parliamentarian reminds me we asked unanimous consent to do it, and the unanimous consent was granted. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion on the Order of Motions, and I'm wondering if it would be proper to hear at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will you read the Senate Bill the second time? 943. Then we'll get to you."

Ewing: "All right. Thank you."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 943. A Bill for an Act appropriating for the military and naval Departments. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Representative Ryan would like to reconsider the tax freeze, but I told him I was too tired and so would go to a motion on House Bill 363. This Bill was heard in Agriculture Committee, and we appointed a Subcommittee to hold some hearings around the state. We weren't as up on the rules as we should've been, and when we put the Bill in Subcommittee, it died, because it wasn't referred to Interim Study. So, this motion asks that we take the Bill from the table and that we recommit it to the Interim Study Committee of the House Agricultural Committee, and I would like to hear that motion if we could at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to take House Bill 630...363 from the table and recommit it to the Interim Study of the Agricultural Committee. Does he have leave? No objection. Leave is granted. 363 will be taken from the table and recommitted to the Interim Study of the Agricultural Committee. Any further motions? Representative Peters."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule 66A I would move to discharge the Committee on Appropriations II from further consideration of Senate Bill 769 and ask that it be placed on the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Barnes has been informed of this and is in agreement."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to suspend a provision to 66A and discharge the Appropriations II Committee with respect to House (sic) Bill 769 and it be placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there any objection? Representative Domico, will you come up to the podium, please? No objection, leave is granted and 769...Order of Second Reading. Will you read it, please, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 769. A Bill for an Act appropriating for the Department of Public Health. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, there is one Floor Amendment we can adopt which has been agreed to."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Peters: "While the Clerk is looking at that, Mr. Speaker, I might indicate just to the Members of the House that all the Amendment does is make some technical corrections and attempts to straighten out the problem that we had with the Department of Public Health in regard to the contract which they let. The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee is apprised of this and both he and the staffs have looked it over and are in total agreement."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. That is correct. This Amendment simply corrects an error in the Bill relative to a



contract that the...was involved and much hearing in our Committee; and I would urge the support of the House on Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "You got a copy of the Amendment, Mr. Peters?"

I understand it was upstairs."

Peters: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "In Representative McBroom's office. He was studying it. Did you bring the Amendment down, Mr. McBroom? He has the Amendment."

Peters: "Mrs...is bringing it down for you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Peters, amends House (sic) Bill 769 as amended on page 2 by deleting line 31 and so forth."

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

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Did we move the previous Bill to Third Reading, Mr. Clerk? You'd better read 943. I guess we didn't remove that. We have? Okay. Then move 943 to Third Reading. Representative Taylor, will you step up here? Representative Taylor, will you please come up here? Taylor, will you please come up? Okay. Never mind. Never mind. Any other motions? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Catania has a motion to make which is...goes in concert with the...with the one I had made. There are two Bills, Both are dealing with public health."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to suspend the appropriate rules to discharge



the Appropriations II Committee from further consideration of Senate Bill 368 and advance it to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Lady's motion for dispensing the rule and to discharge...which Committee is it?"

Catania: "Appropriations II."

Speaker Redmond: "...Appropriations II with respect to consideration of Senate Bill 368. Does she have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a Bill I'd like to make a motion to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, why don't we wait till we finish with this one? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 368. A Bill for an Act appropriating for the Department of Public Health. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave of the House to take House Bill 2333, of which I'm the principal Sponsor, and submit it to Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman...?"

Ebbesen: "House Bill 2333."

Speaker Redmond: "Is it on the Calendar?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, it was on..."

Speaker Redmond: "All you have to do is to fill out a form down here. It will be done automatically."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was Sponsor of House Bill 1262, and I had made a motion earlier two weeks



ago to the...be put into Interim Study, and I renewed the motion again that House Bill 1262 be taken off the table and put into the Interim Study Committee of Energy and Environment. The Bill has never had a hearing before any Committee or Subcommittee."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that 1262, is it? House Bill 1262?"

Greiman: "1262, yes."

Speaker Redmond: "...be taken from the table and put into the Interim Study. Does he have leave? Is there unanimous consent? Hearing no objection, we'll use the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave. I've got a motion on the Calendar. I move to suspend Rule 25D, 27B, 66B, and 73 so the motions of discharge Committee, which appear on the Calendar May 11, 1979 on the Order of the Motions which were not considered prior to the House of adjournment on May 11, 1979, may be reinstated and considered immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "Are they on the Calendar?"

Telcser: "The motions on the Calendar. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Where?"

Telcser: "On page 40."

Speaker Redmond: "There's been objection."

Telcser: "Why?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yeah, I'm just raising objection, because I don't even know what Bills he's talking about or what was on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's all right. You were raising..."

Katz: "So, I was..."

Speaker Redmond: "...you were seeking recognition before that."

Katz: "Yes, I was seeking recognition. Mr. Speaker, there appears a motion requesting that certain Bills of



Sponsors, who have matters before Judiciary II...they wanted their Bills put in Interim Study, and the Bills are listed. I can read them from the Calendar of House Bills 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 606, 722, 936, 937, 1014, 1114, 1247, 1320, 1685, 1716, 1732, 1808, 1809, 2135, 2311, and 2532...all be placed in Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "Page 46. The question's on Representative Katz's motion to take the Bills enumerated from the table and recommit to the Interim Study Calendar of Judiciary II Committee. 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 116 'aye' and 3 'no'. The motion prevails. The Bills are back on Interim Study Calendar of Judiciary II Committee. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "You know, I'm all in favor of putting these Bills in Interim Study, but I think we're going to run into a problem. We're supposed to confine our activities to revenue and appropriations matter in the even-numbered year of the biennial Session, and now we're going to have this thing wide open again in 1980 in the Spring Calendar, and I think really we should not be doing that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take...I move to take House Bill 1821 from the table and put it in Interim Study."

Speaker Redmond: "1820, you say?"

Currie: "1821."

Speaker Redmond: "Is it on the Calendar now?"

Currie: "I'm sorry. No, it's not on the Calendar. It was in the Committee and instead of going to the Interim Study Calendar it stayed in Committee and was there before it tabled. It's on the Motion Calendar. This motion is on the motion Calendar."



Speaker Redmond: "It's on page 46. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Page...yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion to take House Bill 1841 (sic) from the table and place in the Interim Study. Does she have leave to...the Attendance Roll Call? Put 1821 in the Interim Study Calendar. What Committee was that?"

Currie: "And, I have...it's in the Elementary and Secondary Education."

Speaker Redmond: "Elementary and Secondary."

Currie: "And, it's all right with the Minority Spokesman and the Chairman of that Committee to do that. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave...leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing no objection..."

Currie: "I have anoth..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Currie: "I have another motion on the Calendar. May I do that as well?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Currie: "It's House Bill 2783 which just came out of the Leg...the Legislative Reference Bureau. I ask leave to discharge the Committee on Assignment and commit that Bill to the Interim Study Calendar of the Revenue Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave to use the Atten...? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "2783."

Totten: "I just...I wonder whether she's cleared it. Is that Bill also exempt from the deadline?"

Currie: "It was exempt..."

Speaker Redmond: "2783."

Currie: "...from the deadline. Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. J. Wolf...Committee on Assignment, is that correct?"



Currie: "The motion is take it from the Committee on Assign-
ment and put it in the Interim Study Calendar of the
Revenue Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Was it introduced...?"

Currie: "It was just introduced..."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, I see."

Currie: "...about three days ago."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduced after the deadline, is that right?"

Currie: "Because the Legislative Reference Bureau did not
bring it up."

Speaker Redmond: "The parliamentarian advises me it has to
go through Rules inasmuch as it was introduced late."

Currie: "No, it was requested in time to meet the rule re-
quirements the Legislative Reference Bureau have, who
did not bring it out until this week."

Speaker Redmond: "I see. It was requested prior to...what
was that date?"

Currie: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "April 15 or something?"

Currie: "March 15."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion is in order. Does she have
leave to use the...Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, I'm just...Mr. Speaker, having difficulty
believing that she just got it from the Reference
Bureau. What's the LRB number on the Bill?"

Currie: "I don't have a copy of the Bill right here, but
Mr. O'Brien checked it when I turned it in, and it
was within the rule requirement...the time...the time
frame."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave?"

Totten: "Okay, could you...no, could she...?"

Currie: "March 15."

Totten: "Could the Lady..would...could the Lady give us the
LRB number, and then we can come back to it?"

Currie: "I can get it for you. I don't have it here, but
I will."



Totten: "Okay. Then we'll just wait."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't have any objections to what she's doing, but I just want a question. Is there two codes of ethics here? I tried to do this several times, and I wasn't allowed to do it, and I'm...from here on in I'm going to object, not on her's, but anybody else that gets up and asks for Interim Study Bills, I'm going to object to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have consent? Hearing no objection...Representative Totten."

Totten: "On Representative Currie's Bill, what we would like first is to...the LRB number on it and then if it's okay, I...thought we'd take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. No. Representative Satterthwaite. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of information. I hear Bills going to Interim Study, and I hear reference to a Spring Calendar, and I wonder, for the information of the Membership, whether you would clarify for us what the distinction of those two Calendars might be?"

Speaker Redmond: "My understanding is the Interim Study that providing there is a hearing between the adjournment date...and what's the next date? And the Spring Session. There has to be a hearing, and it..."

Satterthwaite: "And, if it goes directly to the Spring Calendar, no hearing is required, but it will be considered by this Body during the Spring Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to give a final account on the Poppy Day receipts. First of all, we received a ten dollar donation from Chuck Hassell from the



Commonwealth Edison Company. Dave Carey from the State Board of Education gave us five. Representative Bernie Epton gave us five. Representative Dave Jones gave us five. Then we got ten from Jeff Holden from the Illinois Medical Association making a total of \$323.94. Oh, Chuck Hassell's was Bell Telephone. Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

DiPrima: "I want to thank all the Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Pardon me."

DiPrima: "We broke the record."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, if you're looking for something to do, I have two really rather innocuous Bills on Third Reading that I would be glad to do now. They shouldn't take over about three minutes apiece."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think we'd better, first off, clear this matter about the Spring Calendar. We have forms for motions to put on the Spring Calendar for Bills that are on the Calendar today, and we're putting those on the spindle here, and we intend to go to those motions at the close of business today. Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Two things, Mr. Speaker. One, I want to add to Mr. DiPrima's financial report. Even without the extra contributions that we receive from outsiders, I just wanted the Members of the House to know that the average contribution of House Members equaled about double that of the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, only half of those fellows get the pay raise."

Wolf: "Right. And, the second thing was for the benefit of the new Members with regard to the Spring Calendar. You may get a hearing but let me assure you the Senate is going to tube your Bill if it does pass the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."



Currie: "Thank you. I have the Legislative Reference Bureau number on the Bill that Mrs. Wolf (sic) requested. It's 8106098."

Speaker Redmond: "8106098. G-L-J-P. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, the number is correct. I mean, the Reference Bureau did just give her the Bill, so I have no objections there. I would hope that she cleared it with the appropriate Committee Chairman before she put it there, but I remove my objection."

Speaker Redmond: "She did. Now, the question's on the Lady's motion. Does she have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call in support of her motion? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 2783 in the Interim Study. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have some late precincts reporting. Pat Grossi donated five. Representative Pat Grossi. Ivan Petefish one of our guards here, donated five. Lee Daniels, as usual, came through with flying colors. Ten dollars. And Walter Kozubowski gave us five dollars. That just about completes it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Do we have anymore objections to hearing those two Bills, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman objects."

Van Duyne: "Schlickman, what are you...what have you got against me?"

Speaker Redmond: "Do you care to respond?"

Schlickman: "I have nothing against the Gentleman who just posed that motion, but I would object to any motion by any Member to take Bills out of the priority order unless there is a demonstrable emergency. Do you have a demonstrable emergency? That's a catastrophe, not an emergency."

Speaker Redmond: "On Priority of Call...well, first off,



we'll go to House Bills Second Reading on page 2. House Bill 100. Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels.

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 100 is the auto repair Bill. We have six Amendments present right now, and I talked to the other side of the aisle, and what my intentions are is to place Amendments #3, 4, 5, and 6 on the Bill, put it on Third Reading, and then file the motion to have it placed on the Spring Calendar. Regarding Amendment #2, which is the Amendment excluding the City of Chicago, I have told Representative Getty that in spring I will bring it back to Second Reading at that time for the purpose of his hearing that Amendment at that time. He has agreed to this process, and I wanted to state that for the record, because he would be withdrawing Amendment #2 right now and putting it through, so we can file the other Bill...other Amendments. And, with leave of the House, I'd like to proceed at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? You read the Bill, did you? Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Getty, amends House Bill 100 and so on."

Speaker Redmond: "Have we had a motion with respect to Amendment 1? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Relative to Amendment 2 in accordance with the representation just made by Representative Daniels, I'll withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty withdraws Amendment 2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Daniels, amends House Bill 100 on page 7 by deleting lines 28 through 30."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Amendment #3 is the request of the automotive industry, and it solves some problems and concerns



we had with the Magnet...Magnussen-Moss Act, and we just are striking out that provision of the Bill. So we don't have any trouble with it. I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear that explanation. I'm wondering if the Sponsor would repeat it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Repeat it, please."

Daniels: "Well, first of all, every Amendment that's been filed has been at the request of the auto industry and the new car dealers and Amendment #3 is an Amendment which would strike a provision of the Bill to resolve the questions and problems on the warranty section so that there were no questions on the Magnussen-Moss Act."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much. I have no objection."

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

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Daniels, amends House Bill 100 as amended as follows on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Amendment #4 deletes a Section on warranties in the Bill which again was at the request of the auto association."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment 4. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment 4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, Daniels, amends House Bill 100 on page 5 by deleting lines 19 through 25 and so forth."



Daniels: "Amendment #5 is at the request of the auto association, and that deals with the waiver of the consumer to receive replacement parts. We worked that out with the association. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. Representative Robbins. Robbins."

Robbins: "Will the Sponsor allow us to vote on these...bring it back so we can vote on all these Amendments next spring as well as Amendment 2?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will you repeat your question? Representative Daniels."

Robbins: "Will we be allowed to vote on all of these Amendments next spring when he brings that back from Third to vote on Amendment 2?"

Daniels: "The only agreement that I have on the Bill right now is to bring it back for purposes of Representative Getty offering his Amendment. In the interim period, if there are additional Amendments that you would like to discuss with me, I'd be more than happy to discuss them with you."

Speaker Redmond: "It may not even be the Bill if it comes out of the Interim Study."

Daniels: "No, it'd be on the Spring Calendar. That's..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I mean, the Amendments may change it significantly."

Daniels: "That's right."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, Daniels, amends House Bill 100 as amended in the title by changing Section 21.1 and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "We requested a fiscal note on the Bill from the Secretary of State's office, and we got a fiscal note that was U. S. Senator Dixon's campaign with the new car dealers of \$1,400,000 for registration. It was an absolute incredible fiscal note that's so out of line it's unbelievable, so we solved the problem by striking the registration provision, and that's what this Amendment does."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment 6. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Now, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I would move that this be placed on the...whoops!
I got to file a slip."

Speaker Redmond: "File the slip then."

Daniels: "All right. I'll file the slip."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "A parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible for me to, on the motion for a Spring Calendar, to put our... do I have to have one motion for each one, or can I put the list of them on one piece of paper? Save a little time and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't you discuss that with the Clerk? That's a clerical problem. He'll...Special Order of Business. Representative Madigan has moved suspension of the Rule to provide that the...where's the parliamentarian here? Will you state your motion, Mr. Madigan?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I now renew my motion that we suspend the provisions of Rule 11C to move to the Order of the Special Order of Business shown on the Calendar on page 47."



Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion for reasons I stated earlier in some remarks I made concerning another matter. The Gentleman moves that we go to a Special Order of Business and included among that special order are listed a number of issues which amount to the most serious, comprehensive, substantive issues of the Session. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't think that any Member upon reflection would deny that those issues would require every Member's input, every Member's understanding of those issues, and every Member having the opportunity to participate fully in helping to make those critical decisions that are going to have the long-range effect upon their citizens of Illinois. We've had an example today of what we're in for if we choose to hear those issues prior to the deadline of Friday midnight for other Bills. We wasted an entire afternoon today so that the Majority Leader could get the Members of his Party together, give them their orders, try and put 89 votes on the Roll Call to get to this Order of Business, and ram these Bills through the Assembly without any due process, without any input on the part of the Members of this House. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is for those reasons that I rise and oppose the Gentleman's motion, and I would like to inform the Chair now that if this matter gets 89 votes, I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. The Gentleman is moving to suspend the provisions of 11C. I'd like to know what effect that has. 11C deals with the calling of a Special Order by the Members or, as I understand it, by the suspension of the Special Order



by Members of the Rules Committee. That has been done, so whether you suspend 11C or not at this time, what is the effect of it?"

Speaker Redmond: "It suspends the suspension."

Collins: "You're just sent out for chop suey, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that you're talking chop suey. I would think the Gentleman's motion has no weight at all. I would think the proper motion would be to move within the provisions of Rule 11C to have 89 Members set a Special Order of Business."

Speaker Redmond: "The parliamentarian advises me that the ...proper way to do it."

Collins: "Well, the parliamentarian apparently is speaking chow mein. But, Mr. Speaker, then I...let me...if I may speak to the motion, I think that this is the most inconsiderate move that you have made in a long series of such moves in this Session. Here, as Representative Telcser says, we are asked at this late hour to...to attack the substantive measures of this Session. We have many Member Bills on the Calendar that have to be dealt with by midnight on Friday. If you are sincere about your Special Order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest then that you establish a Special Order at an hour where sober reflections can be given to each measure on this Special Order. There are many, many Bills on this Special Order, and I would like to know what you anticipate. Are you trying to wear the Membership down by keeping them here after midnight tonight, or don't you want a serious consideration of these measure, Mr. Speaker? We've seen your exercise of...not your's. You have not had the courtesy to be on the podium today, but we have seen the exercise of the raw muscle on the other side of the aisle as exhibited primarily by the Majority Leader. I would suggest that you're trying to ram something down the throats of every Member of this



House. I suggest that we would put it off until next week as Representative Telcsers suggested, Mr. Speaker. I certainly oppose your motion, and I think that any well-thinking Member of this House would oppose this motion. This motion is ridiculous, and it's an insult to every Member of this House and every citizen of the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, you're worthy of better things than this. I think that you bring shame upon this whole House by moving to this Order at this time, and I would ask every Member to vote 'no' on this motion and reject and move on to the Business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Speaker of the House is Chairman of the Rules Committee, and he called a meeting of the Rules Committee on Monday to point out to us that unless we took some kind of action there was very little chance of anyone getting their Bills passed this week. As a result and as...he was part of the deciding factor, we decided to go to the business of setting up the No Debate procedure and everything else on Short Debate, and this was going to give everybody a shot at getting their Bills out. Now, in addition to that, I joined with others in moving to suspend this Special Order of Business so that we could get to everyone's Bill on the floor of this House. Now, I don't know what's happened since then and the attitude of the Speaker. He seems determined that no one's going to get their Bills out, and I appeal to him now and the Minority Leader...the Majority Leader to back off of this motion that they're proposing, because this is the only way we'll ever have a chance to get the Members' Bills out of this House. Certainly, the items in the Special Order of Business are important to all of us. In fact, they're the meat of the whole Session, but they need to be decided in an orderly manner, and we can't do that



and pass the Members' Bills both. Now, if you've got Bills on the Calendar, you will vote against the Majority Leader's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, is that correct?"

Schlickman: "Would the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, the Gentleman requests you to yield."

Schlickman: "As I understand it, eight Members of the Rules Committee have filed a motion to suspend or...yeah, to suspend by objection the Special Order. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman, I have moved to suspend the provisions of Rule 11C."

Schlickman: "I know that, but you're not being responsive."

Madigan: "I know that, also."

Schlickman: "Well, I'll repeat it, and I think that was a very objectionable response on the Majority Leader's part. I think you are...I am entitled to get a direct response from you, Sir. We're not playing gamesmanship. We're here as a deliberative Body, I think. And, I'll repeat the question one more time. Do I understand correctly that eight Members of the Rules Committee have filed a motion to suspend, by objection, a Special Order? Yes or no?"

Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman, I am not prepared to answer your question."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may...and Members of the House. I think the Majority Leader has responded in a very objectionable...give me another word, Bill...obnoxious, and that comes from Representative Walsh, but typical fashion. I simply want to clarify, in my own mind, the object of what we're about to vote on, and it would seem to me that the Speak...the Majority Leader, if he wants to continue the role of responsibility in a responsible fashion, that to a Member who does



have Constitutional authority, he would respond in a direct fashion. I think Representative Walsh is right. It was an obnoxious response. I think it was an irresponsible response, and I don't think that his motion is entitled to an affirmative response, if, for no other reason, that he wouldn't give a direct response to a Member, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, apparently the Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle don't know that the Speaker and the Majority Leader are being the most responsible people that we've seen in Springfield in the Legislature for many years. Apparently, they don't realize that the issues that we're going to debate here...the Bills we're going to discuss are probably some of the most important we've discussed here in the last 50 years or perhaps in the history of the State of Illinois. What is more important to the State of Illinois that we see that our schools... have funds to teach the students? What is more important that we see that the institutions throughout the state to take care of the mentally ill? All those things...all these issues that we're going to debate today, and need I say that we've got school issues here. We've got every major issue here on this Special Calendar, and if the Speaker and the Majority Leader aren't being responsible, then there's never been a responsible leader in Springfield. We have to pass this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Representative Steele, will you please sit down? Representative Neff, sit down."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I use that as a formalized beginning. I'm not even attempting to speak to the Ladies and



Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to speak to the first-term Legislators that are here. Lady and Gentlemen first-year Legislators, you are now finding out the preposterous situation of this Legislature. You've been given a Calendar every morning. We suffer through a Calendar that's never followed. You find out that the Leadership says that there's rules, but nobody follows the rules unless the Leadership follows the rules. You have a dictator over on the other side that decides when things are going to be called. All I can suggest to you is this, my first term down here there was a Speaker by the name of W. Robert Blair. He did himself in, because he refused to abide by fair rules that apply equally to all Members of this House. Even the people in his district responded to this attitude. I don't know whether this particular group of people that are now forcing the issue today will be dealt with in this same manner even though they deserve it. But, let me only say this to you, the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and many of us have been down here more than one term will be gone soon. You'll be in charge of this House. Do not allow this to happen continuously. You're destroying any organization that this House has. It's grossly unfair to everyone. Privilege and prestige and power should not be the basis of a legislative Body and that's what we have. What we're doing today is wrong. You can justify it in a million ways, but no matter how they justify it, it's wrong. We have failed to follow our own rules. We have abridged them three times. I think this motion is preposterous."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, speaking in favor of the motion to suspend the Rule, the we are following the rules. The eight Members of the Rules Committee have followed the rules



and have objected. The Majority Leader is also trying to follow the rules and suspending that motion so that we can go to that Order of Business. I know one of the former leaders always had a saying that he didn't have any Bill that if we didn't pass it, that the State of Illinois couldn't live without. And, much has been said about the many Bills that are on the Calendar. However, we all know that many of those Bills the... people of the State of Illinois can live without. However, on this Special Order of Business on the Calendar, even one of those Members who spoke against this motion and who is a Member of the Rules Committee said, 'Let's face it. That's the meat of the Session.' If that is true, let's get with it. We do have the deadlines which is in the rules, too. We also have a Constitutional mandate with regards to the replacement of the corporate personal property tax. We've got to get through with this. I hope that no Member of this House is in favor of extending the deadlines, so we've got to get to that Order of Business and, therefore, I support the motion of the Majority Leader."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I happen to be one of those first-term Legislators. I've been used to living down on the farm when you get up in the morning, and you do something, and you work at something all day. Now, whenever you are taking the rules and deliberately trying to kill the Bills of the Legislators from southern Illinois to warp the will of the people, it's time that you take a good look at yourself in the mirror and start voting on the Bills on their merits and not in regards of which Party they come from. It's time that you think about the people. They're paying you, and there isn't any reason for this waste of time. I've got a wife and family I'd just as soon



visit with as fool around. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the motion has been adequately debated. It is designed to facilitate the movement of this Body to a serious and thoughtful discussion of the issues which are paramount to this Session of the Legislature. I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes. Somebody said we should've called this Friday so Mr. Schlickman wouldn't have been here. Have all vo... Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise to explain my green vote in relation to this motion. We announced this Special Order of Business approximately two days ago, and Bills have been posted for a day and a half. Not only have they been posted for a day and a half, but since 10 o'clock this morning at the Speaker's rostrum we have had Bills posted on No Debate that anybody could object to, and in the last eight hours, Mr. Speaker, over 87 Bills have been pulled off that No Debate Calendar. We've had Committee hearings on many of these Bills with full debate. And, in order to be a responsible Legislator, every Member of this Body ought to deal with the important issues that are facing the State of Illinois that are on this Special Order of Business like corporate personal property tax, tax spending limits and tax relief, and school aid. We will have the opportunity to cast each and



every single on each and every Bill. I encourage everybody to give this a green vote."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 89 'ayes' and 79 'noes'. The Gentleman's requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Everyone be in your own seat now. Leave Representative Collins' microphone open. I'm not too sure that's necessary, but..."

Collins: "Well, it probably isn't necessary, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. So, if you'd like to..."

Collins: "...to save time, why don't we have an Oral Verified Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "It wouldn't save any time."

Collins: "It'd give you time to get some of your folks back."

Speaker Redmond: "No, I think that would take longer. Why don't you come up here and as we call the names, why you point out..."

Collins: "Why don't you give me the gavel for a half hour?"

Speaker Redmond: "I'd be afraid to. Come on up here. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. No, there are no absentees that I'm worried about."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duynes and Bradley, please sit down. Christensen, Dunn, Beatty, please sit down so we can proceed with this verif...Mike, sit down. Representative Borchers. Representative Borchers, according to the rules, you're supposed to be in your seat during this verification. Does he have leave to stay here and visit his colleague? No objec...there's objection has been heard, Representative Borchers. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk Leone: "Balanoff. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin."



Speaker Redmond: "Mike, sit down."

Clerk Leone: "Brummer. Bullock. Capparella. Chapman.

Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson.

DiPrima. Domino. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn.

Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "Go slower."

Clerk Leone: "Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris.

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

Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz.

Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich.

Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian.

Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous.

Pierce. Pouncey. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite.

Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Henry.

Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne.

Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Williams.

Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

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

Is Farley here? Representative Farley. Awaken Representative Farley. No, it isn't. Monroe Flinn.

Monroe Flinn is in the center aisle talking to Emil

Jones. Representative Vitek. May he be verified?

Hearing no objection, verify him. Terzich here?

Jesse White? He's back there. Yourell's in the center

aisle. On this question there's 89 'aye' and 80 'no',

and the motion prevails. On the Order of Special Order

of Business appears House Bill 2569."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2569. A Bill for an Act to prohibit the levying of an ad valorem personal property tax. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Schlickman: "Point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your point?"

Schlickman: "This Bill is out of order. There are two Bills ...three Bills prior to it."

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Schlickman: "You've got House Bill 548. You've got House Bill 265...no, excuse me. You've got House Bill 548."

Speaker Redmond: "Special Order of Business, the parliamentarian advises me, there is no order of call and no Priority of Call. 2569. Not on Special Order of Business. Representative Collins. I wish it was Friday."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you won't take them in numerical order, shouldn't you take them in the order in which they appear on the Calendar? Now, you can't have...you can't have it both ways."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler...Skinner's correct. 2569. Representative McPike. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really don't know what you're afraid of. You've just proved that you got the 89 votes. Madigan stood back by the door to make sure nobody left. I really don't know what you're afraid of and why you don't do this with some respect for yourself and the rest of us here and call these in the order that they're on the Calendar. Certainly, I don't understand. They're on the Order of Special Business. The fair way to do this is to call them in order, and I would request that you do that."

Speaker Redmond: "In my judgment, this is the way to proceed."

Ryan: "Why?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...because..."



ing those rights. You're absolutely right. If I don't have them, Simms nor do you. Or Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to raise a point that if you persist in this ruling, I appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "That's your right, Sir. I will persist in the ruling. 25... 2569 will be the first Bill called. Now Representative Collins, do you appeal a ruling of the Chair? Representative Collins appeals the ruling of the Chair. The question is... shall the Chair be overruled? Those in favor of overruling the Chair vote aye, oppose vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Telscer."

Telscer: "I'd like to poll the absentees Mr. Speaker before you announce the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest that would be dilatory. There are only 79 ayes... There are only..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well let's no worry."

Getty: "If you added the absentees and the aye votes, you would not have sufficient to prevail. It is therefore dilatory."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I think maybe it is, but the Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 aye and 89 no. Representative Collins requested the poll of the absentees. Would you call the absentees Mr. Clerk? Representative Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Really, Mr. Speaker, I'm only a fledgling at this business but you know what Representative Collins is trying to do and you shouldn't really be so, so patient. You know, being a very tolerable fellow and a father of six children and six grandchildren, one more on the way, I'm a patient man too, but I can get very impatient myself. Now rule him out of order and let it go at that."



Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees. Representative Totten wants to verify them."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi. Dyer. Epton. Kent. Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Meyer, aye."

Clerk Leone: "Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Continue with the Roll Call. Now what is the count? 83 ayes and 89 nays. Chair... Motion to overrule the Chair fails. 2569, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you read the Bill Mr. Clerk? Yes, he has. Proceed."

McPike: "There probably is not much doubt in anyone's mind that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation and the most important topic for the 81st General Assembly."

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

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a motion that we consider all these at one time with the same Roll Call so we won't waste anymore time and at least some of these Members who worked all year long to try to have their Bill heard before 12:00 Friday night would have at least the opportunity having their Bills heard. This is going to be a farce. It's going to be 88, 89 everyone of them, because Taylor, Pouncey, Jim Taylor and Pouncey are back there the one man invasion at the door. Nobody could leave and I see you got the Parliamentarian up there watching to see who can leave. It would save an awful lot of time on the floor of this House if we consider all these Bills at one time. With the same Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we better proceed the way we are. We've already called this Bill and Mr. McPike has started his explanation."

McPike: "Maybe the previous speaker is not interested in this



topic, but I think the residents of our districts and every taxpayer in Illinois is interested in this topic. House Bill 2569 as amended does the following: There's a three percent tax on corporations. A one and a half percent tax on estates and trusts. A one and a half percent tax on partnerships. And a three quarters of one percent tax on invested capital on utilities. This will generate annually, the first year this will generate \$533,000,000. There is no cap on this as there has been no cap on the previous corporate personal property tax and as the Constitution of Illinois stipulates and, in fact, requires that no cap be placed on this. This tax will go into effect on August first of 1979. The first collection of this tax will be immediately following the end of the third calendar quarter, September 30, 1979 and the distribution will begin immediately. We will have quarterly distributions. I think this is extremely important and I think everyone should listen because this affects every school district and every legislative district in the state. All of our school districts, to some degree, operate on anticipation warrants. Those are issued in September and every month throughout the school year. When corporate, when taxes are collected the following June, July, or August, the school districts pay off the anticipation warrants. They begin again September 1, they begin the process all over again on September 1. Because their tax base has been depleted, since the corporate personal property tax is no longer a part of it, they can no longer borrow as much money as they could previously. It is absolutely essential then, that we begin replacement of that tax or replacement of the anticipation warrant moneys with state revenues as soon as possible. The school districts could not possibly operate next year, the entire year, under House Bill 2700 House Bill 2569 will allow cash flow to enable them to continue to operate. The distribution formula is based



on 1978 collections. 1977 taxes, 1978 collections. For the long-term depth we have required a priority usage and that is the proportionate amount of debts service formally financed by the CPPT will now be financed by this replacement tax. There's another important provision in this Bill that is not in the Governor's Bill and that is a hold - harmless provision. I think everyone on both sides of the aisle wants to go back to their local area and say, 'We have a distribution formula, but regardless of what you would receive under this, under no circumstances will you receive less than what you received in 19... in the 1978 collections. This hold harmless provision is in effect for two years. This is a complex piece of legislation was put together with the interest of business and the interest of all local taxing units in mind. I think it addresses itself to every problem raised and I think it adequately answers the needs of both the taxpayers and those who are in, are in need of use of this tax. With that I would move the, the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman yield for some questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leinenweber: "Representative McPike, how are people engaged in personal service occupations handled as far as the replacement tax is concerned?"

McPike: "What specific category are you referring to?"

Leinenweber: "People engaged in personal services such as doctors, lawyers, insurance people, real estate agents."

McPike: "Are you talking about partnerships or corporations. If they're corporations..."

Leinenweber: "Partnerships."

McPike: "...they're at three percent, the partnerships one and a half percent."

Leinenweber: "Alright, so is that on... what is that based upon? Take partnerships for example."



McPike: "That's based on income."

Leinenweber: "All incomes of the partnership distributed or undistributed?"

McPike: "No, there are exceptions and that is on..."

Leinenweber: "Well I may point out to you on page three there is what deduction called, "a reasonable allowance for compensation paid or accrued for services rendered by partners to the partnership". What is meant by those words?"

McPike: "That is correct. On page three the lines you just read, line 16..."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I'm asking you what is meant by 'reasonable allowance for compensation paid or accrued for services rendered by partners to the partnership'."

McPike: "Well it might be called a salary. It might be... a reasonable allowance is that amount due to the individuals in the partnership for the services rendered."

Leinenweber: "Who determines what's reasonable and what's unreasonable? The Department of Revenue?"

McPike: "Initially, the tax, the taxpayer himself determines that then the Department of Revenue would then determine if what he set aside was reasonable."

Leinenweber: "If the Department of Revenue determines that the compensation paid a partner is unreasonable, what basis would they make that determination?"

McPike: "I think it would be based on what is ordinary and necessary for that particular occupation."

Leinenweber: "Well Mr. Speaker, very briefly on the Bill.

I would ask that particularly the Democratic Members of the Legislature pay attention. House Bill 2569 for the first time seeks to impose the replacement tax on those engaged in professional services who operate through a partnership or a professional corporation. I suggest to you when you go home after voting for this Bill if this becomes law, you're going to run into people who are engaged in professional services and not just lawyers.



not just doctors, insurance people, farmers, real estate agents, and many, many other people who are engaged in performing services for people and they're going to find out that they are after the Department of Revenue determines what they consider to be reasonable services it may be a couple hundred dollars a week, maybe three hundred dollars a week, anything that they draw in excess of that by way of additional salary by additional draw or by bonuses or whatever, they're going to be paying as Representative McPike pointed out; four percent if it's a professional corporation and I think it was two and a half percent if it's a partnership. They aren't going to be happy about this and they're going to ask you why you did it to them and you're going to have to explain. I urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bet this Bill has two flaws that I can think of that we should all be aware of. One of the most important issues that we have to decide this year is the requirement in our Constitution which says that we shall replace the personal property taxes. Our Constitution says such revenue shall be replaced by imposing statewide taxes other than ad valorem taxes. Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what this Bill does is not just to replace personal property taxes. What this Bill does is to raise taxes. The personal property taxes according to the best information that we have, will produce some \$460,000,000 in revenue. This Bill, according to our staff analysis, indicates that in the first year the Bill will raise \$533,000,000 and in the second year, \$560,000,000. Now some of the same downstate people who came down committed, committed Mr. Speaker, to do something about easing the tax burden on people in this state are now finding themselves in a position where they're being asked, yes forced, to vote



for this Bill which raises taxes in the State of Illinois. Now we came down here with the expressed mission to replace the personal property tax. Not to raise additional revenues and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that's precisely what this Bill is going to do. One other message to my downstate colleagues. If your county is one of those counties which has been collecting 97 and 98% of the personal property tax like my county has, I don't believe we should be voting for this Bill because the Bill is designed in such a way that our business people who have been paying their fair share are now going to be asked to pick up an additional tax load in order to make up the additional revenues that will be created by the passage of this Bill. I submit to you that this is a ploy by the Chicago Organization to rip-off the rest of the state and I urge a no vote on what I think is a very dangerous Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now we all know that we have to come up with a Bill this session and one for replacement revenues. Not one for excessive taxation. And I'm really concerned about this and I think every Legislator should be because there are grave Constitutional questions with this Bill. In the first place, it generates thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars in excess taxation. And secondly, and most important to all downstate Legislators, is that it shifts the burden to downstate Illinois and when you consider those two main factors you will probably find that this Bill is unconstitutional and we're going to have difficulty then in financing local taxing districts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, in spite of the last speaker's objections as to the Constitutionality of this provision and Bill. I really think we really ought to move the previous quest-



ion and ask the Chair how many minutes are in every Member's entitled to explain their vote."

Speaker Redmond: "One minute."

Yourell: "I move to previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... Gentleman has moved to previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Representative... Vote. Vote aye. Vote aye and those oppose vote no. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker I thought it was at least the custom if not the rule in this House that we didn't get up and make some comment about the legislation and then move the previous question. Is that rule out the window too?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think when Mr. Piel did that earlier in the day that that's where Representative Yourell..."

Ewing: "I doubt that he learned it there."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, OK. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The leadership on this side of the aisle came up to me afterward and I apologized to the leadership on this side of the aisle afterward. I apologized to the Members of the House for what happened earlier today but I can see that that was probably a freshman error. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I didn't mean anything by that, I just thought that we had let it go before so. On this count, on this vote there's 86 aye, 68 no. Motion failed. Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor has told you all about what this Bill does, but I submit to you on the other side from the downstate areas he has not told you what else it does and that's very important point we have to stress. This Bill..."

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

Hallock: "This Bill's based on 1978 projections."



Yourell: "Is the timer on Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, it's on."

Yourell: "OK. One minute we're allowed to explain our vote."

Speaker Redmond: "We're in discussion. He's not explaining his vote."

Yourell: "What is he doing?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's got ten minutes. He's got ten minutes. He's got ten minutes. Proceed Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "This Bill is based on 1978 corporate personal property tax projections, not on collections. Accordingly, for you downstaters, you know that Cook County had been collecting only at a rate of about 50%. If you pass this Bill the bottom line is you're going to cost downstate at least \$26,000,000. I submit to you from downstate that that's the bottom line of this Bill and that's what this Bill does and I urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to add to the comments of Representative Hallock the fact that we're being asked here to vote upon a measure that is based not upon 1978 figures as he mentioned, but it's 1974. The Department of Local Government Affairs in supplying figures upon which the collections are based on this Bill were 1974. And I ask you how can we intelligently vote upon a Bill here in 1979, 1980 that based upon figures that are six years old. By the time that the, this amounts to a \$20,000,000 rip-off to the downstate interests of this state because of these six year old figures which are completely out-of-date. Now I submit to you that the time this Bill is six years old, we're going to have ripped off the downstate interests by not \$20,000,000 year but six years times that which is \$120,000,000. I tell you it's completely unfair and I don't see how any downstate Legislator can intelligently and honestly represent his people by voting for this Bill. I think



it's a rip-off for downstate, not only that but the area that we represent in metro-east Illinois, metro-east with the sponsor represents, also; there have been 12,000 jobs leave that area in the last ten years as evidence by reports from the Business and Economic Development Department of this state. And what we're saying here, we're placing additional burden upon corporations of this state that should not be placed there. Because this Bill is going to raise more money than is actually needed to replace the collections that we're mandated to replace by the Constitution. The collections for last year were around \$414,000,000. This Bill's going to raise over \$500,000,000 a difference of about \$100,000,000 and I submit to you that this is the largest tax increase Bill we'll be faced upon and have a chance to vote on here. It's a tax increase Bill of a \$100,000,000 more than necessary. I think it's bad for downstate, it's bad for business, it's excessive and it should be voted down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Will the Sponsor... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Abramson: "Given a situation where farmers own in partnership between a father and a son, father's retired requested a percentage of the profit. Under this Bill would the father then be liable for the one and a half percent tax on his profits from that farm operation?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Would the... Would you repeat that last question?"

Abramson: "OK. Given the situation where there's a farm owned and partnershiped by a father and a son, the father's retired and collects a percentage of the profit for his interest in the operation. Would his interest, his income from that interest then be taxable with the one and a half percent?"

McPike: "Yes."



Abramson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise in opposition to the present Bill under consideration. We are down here under a mandate by the Illinois Constitution of 1970. If those of you that have been interested enough to go back and read the verbatim text of the debate dealing with the replacement of the personal property tax by the Constitutional Convention at no place in the debate of that Convention did it indicate that the replacement tax was to be a gross tax by the State Legislature, in fact, it was the intention that the personal property tax and the tax would be, eventually be abolished. Very frankly, this legislation is contrary to what those of the Constitutional Convention intended by reading those debates. Without any question looking at the debate of what the members of the Constitutional Convention intended, very frankly, their idea by reading the verbatim text of the Constitutional Convention was to abolish the personal property tax across the board, but they had no mechanism in which to replace that loss of taxation. So they passed it on for an eight year period. But looking at the present Bill and those considerations, this runs in contrary to what the new Illinois Constitution mandated. This is a tax increase. It is a growth tax increase to all of Illinois. It's a growth tax increase especially to downstate Illinois which will help bail out once again the city of Chicago at the expense of downstate Illinois. And I don't think there's a downstate Legislator be he or she Republican or Democrat in good conscience that can go back to their district and say they voted for a tax increase to help bail a city administration and the city of Chicago and the county of Cook and to give them downstate tax dollars because of their lack of collecting the personal property tax which they have



failed to do adequately in the past years. I urge downstate Legislators as those... as well as those responsible, Cook County and Chicago Legislators that have a conscience to vote against this tax increase for all of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Members. In some detail it seems to me that Republicans on this floor from downstate have tried to paint the Democratic downstaters as somehow unconscionable. Somehow forgetting the roots. But I would point out to you that the same people who sat in that Democratic tax force from downstate McPike and myself, Doug Kane were the same ones who have stood here and fought for school aid and fought for downstate time and time again and we're fighting for it now. We worked many hours to come up with the figures from legitimate sources and I sit here tonight and stand here now and hear you talk about the '78 collections not being \$467,000,000 saying DLGA said that and I look at the DLGA figures you put out and you're not even talking about your own figures. I see a '77 figure that's incomplete of \$414,000,000. I don't see any '78 figures. Our Bill specifically points out that we're using a specific date in which DLGA submitted a \$467,000,000 figure to the Economic and Fiscal Commission. I would point out to you, secondly, when you talk about the percentage put in by Cook County, we ought to be fair. The hand out from the Republicans says we have to go back to 1972 to see what Cook County has put in over half of the collections. And I submit to you if you take your DLGA figures and update them which you didn't bother to do along the lines of what has been provided by the Civic Federation to DLGA, what DLGA has themselves you will see that the percentage of collections statewide for the years '72 through '77 in terms of Cook County are 54, 57, 53, 50, 49, and 48 percent and that just



happens to come to 51.7% of the collections on average over that period and we downstaters who helped put this together helped arrive at the 51.65% distribution to Cook County out of collections based upon '78 figures for collections. That happens to be virtually the same figure if you take your data, yes your base and update it as the Civic Federation has. It's been argued that our Bill would create \$800,000,000 this year. That's baloney and you know it's baloney. You sit there with the figures and you know what is generated on estimates of income by the various percentages against the states, the corporations and so forth in our Bill and your Bill and you know that the argument that was just made that we were going to be taking \$46,000,000 away from downstate is not attributable to our Bill but it's attributable to your Bill because that's exactly the short fall in 2700. Our Bill is specific. Our Bill considered every possible factor. We considered compromises among all the ideas. We considered I think what is the fairest possible proposal before us. We don't believe that you should say that '78 collections were less than they were because we dealt with estimates that are still being updated you dealt with estimates. You can take any set of figures and play ball with them but this Bill is specific in the figures that it uses. When we talk about collecting \$533,000,000 we're talking about collecting it specifically. We pointed out where we're getting it, how we're getting it, why we're making the distribution. I haven't heard the argument made on the other side that holds any water using any specific figures against this Bill. I've heard you say it's a tax rip-off to downstate. It's not. If you use the 467 figure and figure the seven percent growth to 1980 we arrive at a figure that puts us above those collections yes, but it does figure for the growth. It does not take away from downstate. It does not give a windfall to the city



of Chicago or to Cook County in any way. If you want to talk about real tax liabilities we did yesterday you'd be talking about what business would be paying on the extension. We're not trying to do that but that is the real tax liability. We're trying to reach a compromise that funds the taxing districts and the services in this state in every of the 102 counties. We're not trying to give anyone a windfall. This is the fairest proposal here and to go back and say that business has been soaked is to say in effect, that they shouldn't have ever paid their liability or anywhere near it. This is the fairest proposal possible in my opinion and we downstaters on the Democratic side resent the fact that the argument to be made that somehow we're selling out everyone when we set hour after hour and worked for the interest of downstate Illinois and our taxing districts. We're not trying to take too much from one or to give too little to another. This is the fairest proposal possible and it should be supported rather than demeaned by the downstate Republicans in this House and those in the Senate and I urge you to stand up for what is right and not to hear and speak for the shrill voices of the Chamber of Commerce and the others who've stood out the door in the rotunda today and lied about the figures. I've had seven different sets of arguments made to me about different figures that came allegedly to Democrat and Republican downstaters from business representatives. They can't even agree on their own damn figures."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After all those numbers were tossed out I'd just like to take a few percentages to refute what has been just said by Representative Stuffle. Now the Department of Local Government Affairs if you'll look at their annual reports since 1970 up through six or seven years



you'll find that every county a 101 counties in this state when it comes to real property taxes collected anywhere from 98 to 100% of the real property taxes. The county of Cook also does equally as well on real estate taxes, however; when it comes to the 101 counties on the collection of corporate personal property taxes you'll find that those Department of Local Government Affairs will show that the 101 counties other than the county of Cook in this state will also collect 98 to 100% of those taxes. The statistics show collection wise not what's extended, but collected, is 45 to 55% somewhere in there over the last ten years and who knows before 1970 what that percentage is and when you stand over there, Representative Stuffle, you downstate Democrats, and tell us over here that you are not giving more money to Chicago and the county of Cook than they deserve. It's based on collections. They wouldn't get that dollar that this particular piece of legislation proposes. There's legislation coming along with some of these other proposals such as House Bill 2700 that will make it more fair and more equitable and I for one cannot see how anyone could, the downstate Democrat or republican, could support this legislative proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard a lot of rhetoric tonight about how downstate is getting ripped off for the benefit of all of those bad people up in the county of Cook and that's coming from the downstate Republicans. The downstate Republicans are trying to fog the issue. And the issue is, are we collecting enough money to replace the corporated personal property tax. And the second question is, whether that money is being distributed equitably around the state. And then the Bill that we have before us today, the answer to both of those questions is a resounding yes. We are replacing the corporate personal property



tax and we're replacing it at a level that is adequate. There have been a lot of figures thrown around as to how much has been collected, how much will be collected. There have been a number of things that the Members on that side of the aisle have forgotten to take into account. One of those is what has happened to the corporate intent in the last several years. I've got a letter from the Taxpayers' Federation which goes back to 1976 and 1974 and details the amount of taxes collected six years ago. And the corporate personal property tax collected six years ago across the state was \$498,000,000. And what we have seen in the last several years is efforts by corporations to evade that tax to whittle it down as much as possible so that when we came down to replacing it that the rate would be as low as possible. And that with the rate as low as possible the tax would effectively be shifted to you and me to individuals, to individual home owners. If we go back to 1970 when we had the 1970 Constitution and the mandate to us to replace the corporate personal property tax, we were mandated to replace that tax not simply to replace the taxes of those who are honest enough to pay it. I think it's very important that we do not give those corporate interests of this state who have chosen to neglect their responsibility and increasingly so in the last year or two. And because of that, the Local Government Affairs Department projections have dropped and every time you turn around they come in with a new figure. If you go back to what they gave the Economic and Fiscal Commission last year and in March of this year, you see that their 1980 projections of what should be collected, collected and not extended, we're not talking about extensions, but what should actually be collected, for the year 1980 should come to \$532,000,000. That same year that will be the first year of the replacement tax we're expecting to bring in \$533,000,000. That's no rip-off of the



corporations. That's not a tax increase. That's a replacement of the tax. It's a replacement of the tax as it should be collected and not extended as some people would have us try to believe. The second question is whether or not downstate is being ripped off. We had a lot of discussion about whether the tax should be replaced on the basis of extensions or on the basis of collections. We chose to replace it on the basis of collections. We are not putting in a tax to replace extensions. If we were, the tax level would be doubled. But if you look at the Department of Local Government Affairs figures, what do you see? You see a comparison of Cook County..."

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

Yourell: "Yeah, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we've got 89 votes on this side. They've got 88 votes on that side and if we wanted to base this on a political kind of a thing, you know, wherever he gets a thing in I think we ought to vote. We know what we got. 89 to 88 let's vote. Continue the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll let Representative... Representative Kane conclude."

Kane: "You see the figures that have been produced by the Department of Local Government Affairs comparing Cook County with downstate. You have a comparison of apples and oranges. Because the figures..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "You know, really Mr. Speaker, we know what we got over here. We know what they got over there. 89 to 88. And if everybody wants to make a political speech, fine. Let's have a vote. I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, according to the rules the Representative is entitled to discuss and debate the matter and he's living up to his, as he sees it, as responsibility. Ten minutes. Ten minutes. Represent-



tative Kane. Representative Simms for what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "On a point of personal privilege just to remind Representative Yourell, we have the Governor."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is he? Representative Kane, continue. Continue Mr. Kane. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Hear what he had to say. What'd he say?"

Speaker Redmond: "He said we had the Governor and I said, 'Where is he?'"

Yourell: "Who said that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Simms wanted to know. He said..."

Yourell: "Oh, OK. We ought to continue then."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "If you want to compare collections in Cook County and downstate, you have to include, you have to take into account the differences in the way the tax is collected in Cook County and the way it's collected downstate. In Cook County you have a great deal of corporations who object to their taxes and all of the taxes attributable to one year are collected over a period of three and four years and five years. There's a great delay in the amount of the taxes collected. Downstate almost all of the tax is collected in the first year. And the DLGA figures only compare what is collected in the first year in Cook County with the first year downstate. And if you add in the collections in the next two or three years that are attributable to that first year, you will find that the distribution between downstate and Cook County in this Bill, House Bill 2569, is fair and equitable. I think that any of you who know those of us on this side of the aisle from downstate that we are not going to see downstate ripped off. We have not done it in the past. We are not going to do it now and we're not going to do it in the future. And I would urge the support of House Bill 2569."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."



Johnson: "Well I think it's a damn shame and a real discourtesy to this side of the aisle when the minority spokesman on the Revenue Committee has had his light on for a half an hour and you've called on everybody else in the chamber, half of whom don't even know the issue, and you haven't given Tom Ewing a chance to talk on the issue. I think it's a damn shame and I yield my time to Representative Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I thought you had a great deal to say and that's why I recognized you. Now if you want to let Representative Ewing have your time, that's perfectly alright with me. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you Representative Johnson. With that introduction performed I would like to ask the sponsor of this Bill some question if he'll yield."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewing: "Mr. sponsor, what is the amount of total funds that you expect to collect the first year with this legislation?"

McPike: "Approximately \$533,000,000."

Ewing: "Now that..."

McPike: "That is the first full twelve months."

Ewing: "Where do we hear the figure of \$800,000,000?"

McPike: "I haven't the faintest idea. The republicans are putting out a lot crazy figures. The extension level was around \$850,000,000 so I haven't the faintest idea where \$800,000,000 came from."

Ewing: "But you say we'll only have \$533,000,000?"

McPike: "Correct."

Ewing: "... or approximately. When does the tax become payable?"

McPike: "It goes into effect August 1, 1979 at the end of the first calendar quarter which will be September 30, 1979. It becomes payable along with the other quarterly income tax payments at that time."

Ewing: "Does that, when we talk about the... you say August 2?"



McPike: "August..."

Ewing: "You said August 1,"

McPike: "August 1."

Ewing: "Is that for tax years ending after August 1, 1979?"

McPike: "The liability commences August 1, 1979."

Ewing: "For tax years which end after that. There is a difference and I think we should point that out. I'm asking a question. Is it for tax years ending or for tax earned, money earned from August 1, 1979 on?"

McPike: "That is correct."

Ewing: "It is for money earned?"

McPike: "Based on income earned after August 1, 1979."

Ewing: "Mr. Sponsor, I think you better check your Bill on that. The, how amount of money is going to Cook County out of the \$533,000,000?"

McPike: "Approximately \$275,000,000."

Ewing: "And would, the percentage, is that 52%?"

McPike: "That's 51.65%."

Ewing: "And I assume the rest is going to downstate."

McPike: "That is correct."

Ewing: "Now we know how much is going to Cook County and to downstate. Now I want to talk a minute. I have some questions about the distribution figures. Upon what years are the distribution figures based?"

McPike: "1978 collections downstate. 1977 collections for Cook County."

Ewing: "When you say collections, that means for downstate if it's '78 collection it would be for the tax year '77."

McPike: "That is correct."

Ewing: "And in Cook County that would be then for the tax year '76."

McPike: "Right."

Ewing: "Why was the tax year '76 chosen? Why do we have two different years?"

McPike: "The downstate collections come in more rapidly. They're collected for all practical purposes the same year that



they're extended. In Cook County, such is not the case. Numerous corporations file under protest and it takes a longer period of time to collect so that in order to get the best most reliable and most up to date statistics we chose 1976 tax collections, I'm sorry, 1976 taxes collected in 1977 for Cook."

Ewing: "Does the fact had you used the same year for both downstate and Cook County, would there have been some difference, some shift in the amount of money going to downstate?"

McPike: "No. We used the same year for the original distribution, that is breaking the pie in half and that was 1978 collections for both downstate and for Cook County when we divided the pie into two portions. There was no difference. There would be no shift."

Ewing: "No, but if we used the amount of collections for 1977 for both Cook County and downstate, you're telling me there'd be no shift."

McPike: "I think if you used 1977 or 1976 or 1975 each year would vary depending upon the exact percent collected by Cook and the rest of the state for that year. For that reason we chose 1978 collections to make the division on."

Ewing: "Was there, because of the '76 collection rate used for distribution in Cook County, was there a shift between suburban Cook County and the city of Chicago?"

McPike: "Would you repeat that?"

Ewing: "With the use... if you compared the funds to be distributed to both Cook County, suburban Cook County and the City of Chicago and if you used the '76 figure as compared to the '77 figure that was used the rest of the state, was there a shift even between suburban Cook County and the city?"

McPike: "Well the problem is that we don't have a complete, a figure of collections for 1978. They simply haven't, that is '78 collections have not been collected yet. So



the most recent one we had was 1976 taxes collected in '77. We simply... Because it takes two or three years to collect taxes in Cook County, these are the most recent figures we could use."

Ewing: "Has the collection rate in Cook County on personal property gone down the last two years?"

McPike: "Yes."

Ewing: "Would that be one reason you picked the '76 date?"

McPike: "No I just stated the reason is because it has not.. the collections are not complete and the most complete, up-to-date statistics we could use were thà ones we chose."

Ewing: "The figures are upon what you based the amount of money to be replaced. Where does, where did they come from?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing, I wish you would bring your questions to a close."

Ewing: "I will when my time is up Mr. Speaker or when you shut me off. Whichever happens first."

Speaker Redmond: "OK. OK."

Ewing: "Would you please answer my question."

McPike: "Economic and Fiscal Commission."

Ewing: "And for what year?"

McPike: "1978."

Ewing: "Those are 1978 figures or are they adjusted to become 1978 figures?"

McPike: "1978."

Ewing: "You said 1978, but I didn't hear the answer. Are those '74 or '76 figures adjusted forward to 1978?"

McPike: "No."

Ewing: "Those are 1978 figures?"

McPike: "Yes."

Ewing: "Actual collection?"

McPike: "Estimated actual collections, yes. Although those would be updated as more money flows in and every, in each succeeding year."



Ewing: "Mr. Speaker,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a great deal of respect for the Sponsor of this Bill and consider him to be friend. But I think that he has given us some of the weakest, the poorest, and the misleading answers anybody could give to any question. He has done his homework. It is difficult when you have people telling you misinformation and I want to believe that the misinformation is not intentional, but we all know what a ruse is being pulled on us here today. By the use of the '76 figures for Cook County, we're going to give \$26,000,000 more to that county and by the use of those figures we're going to give the City of Chicago \$6,000,000 more than the rest of the county of Cook should have had. The figures which they've used are doctored figures. They're old and outdated and they've been brought forward with an amount which adds up to giving Cook County over 52%. Now we can all, we all know how we're going to vote. All of this isn't probably going to make a lot of difference, but I think the point should be made and re-made that this is not fair. It's not a fair distribution. We are more than replacing the amount of personal property tax loss. We aren't distributing it fairly, even as you, Mr. Speaker, have said was your intent. We are selling out to the interest in the City of Chicago. They wanted to have it on the amount of extensions, but since that was such a blantant robbery from other parts of the state they have come up with this Bill which gets around to it but by over taxing every business in the State of Illinois. Now downstate and downstate businesses have been paying their tax. Who is really to blame in the City of Chicago or Cook County. It partly, of course, is the businesses who haven't paid their tax over the years. It must partly be those officials who failed to



collect the tax over the years. But the blame cannot be put on those businesses across this state who have paid their tax over the years and that's exactly what you're trying to do with this Bill. It overcharges. It's a poor distribution method and I believe it should be resounding defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Sponsor yield Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will. Representative McGrew for what purpose do you rise?"

McGrew: "Would you please use the timer?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

McGrew: "Would you please use the timer?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will do. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative McPike, on page 19 of the Bill, Section 1-A. Can you explain to me what the effect of that Section is the language regarding the classifica... the reassessment of property as real property?"

McPike: "Yes. The... It was our intent not to allow any corporation that has property that has previously been classified as real property, that is in previous years, to switch that real property now to a new classification of corporate personal property tax and escape taxation, and likewise it was the intent not to have property classified previously as corporate now switched to real. So that no one, the local government unit, would not realize the windfall or the corporation would not realize the windfall."

Vinson: "Does that... Now, can you explain to me what the status of law is in Illinois right now? If you have a large machine that's taken into a plant and bolted down to the floor, is that properly classified as real property or personal property?"

McPike: "We're not changing the law. Whatever the law is, that's exactly how we're going to leave it. All we're



saying is that you can't switch back and forth to try to escape a tax or to try to levy an excess tax."

Vinson: "But would that bolted down fixture be properly classified now as real property or personal property?"

McPike: "However it was classified before will be classified that way in the future."

Vinson: "Yes, I understand that's the effect of the Section, but I'm asking you how it is properly classified now."

McPike: "Well I imagine that the various assessors in various counties do whatever they think is the proper. Maybe it depends on the size of the machine, maybe it depends upon how educated the local assessor is. I'm sure that we have had mistakes both ways. Classified wrongly both ways and all we're saying is that we're not going to allow someone to recognize, or to realize a windfall here. We're going to keep it as it was previously."

Vinson: "I believe that's an accurate answer. Now what I... what this does then is to say that if I have that kind of fixture bolted to the floor, part of the real property, but that if an assessor has improperly classified that as personal property and it should have been classified as real property then under this provision, it cannot be properly classified, we cannot correct the error of the past, is that correct, Sir?"

McPike: "No, if it was improperly assessed and it was contrary to existing law then it could be changed."

Vinson: "This language permits that? I thought you just said before that you can't make a change."

McPike: "The law remains the same. We're not attempting to change the law."

Vinson: "Yes, but I can fairly conclude from your remarks that if we have a piece, a fixture that has in the past been improperly classified as personal property that this grandfathers it in and we can't ever correct that mistake. We're stuck with that as personal property, can't correctly classify it as real property again. Is that,



is that the effect of your remark, Sir?"

McPike: "If it... No, that was not what I intended to say. Let me rephrase it. If it was properly assessed under the law, that is the assessment under the law was legal, then this language will not allow it to be re-classified, however; if the assessment or the classification was illegal, contrary to law, and we're not changing the law, then this language would allow proper re-classification."

Vinson: "Well Mr. McPike on lines 13 and 14 and 15 it says no property tax that's personal property under this Act prior to the date shall be classified as real property subject to assessment after the date. Now there's nothing in there about legal or illegal assessment. It just says the date and how you can classify it. Can you explain to me how a court could draw that interpretation from the language in this statute?"

McPike: "Now I explained the intent of this legislation and I don't think any further explanation would explain it any better. I think that the intent here is understood and there's not a lot more I could say on that particular subject."

Vinson: "May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Vinson: "There are many things in this Bill that have occasion partisan and emotional rhetoric and I'm not going to comment on those things. Everybody can draw their own conclusion from their conscience on those matters. What I do draw the attention of the Members of this House to is that language that we're talking about right now. It's a matter of substantial concern. It is a defect in other Bills before this House. Some Members have labored hard and in some other Bill made sure that this language doesn't appear, because what this language does, in clear terms, is to say that if you have something wrongly classified before, you can't ever correct it. We're



grandfathering and every mistake on that boundary line between personal and real property that's ever been made and we should not do that. That is wrong and we should vote against this Bill and any other Bill that contains that mistake until that's corrected and for those reasons, I would urge a no vote on the Bill until we can get something before us whether it's this Bill or something else that corrects that problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

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

Last year when the Gentlemen on the other side who are now such experts were predicting the Supreme Court opinion and weren't showing any interest in personal property tax replacement the House Revenue Committee was working on legislation, House Bill 2418, a Committee Bill succeeded by House Bill 548 this year which would have replaced the personal property tax in time on a Constitutional basis. Now all of a sudden we have many, many experts on personal property tax replacement especially since the Governor's tax force made up with an industry and Bar Association people came back with their recommendations. The Republicans told us for years we can't replace the personal property tax cause business isn't in agreement. Business isn't in agreement. It's not the citizens of the state, not the voters of the state that were to determine the personal property tax replacement, but the business interests had to get together before we could even consider the personal property tax replacement. Well the Supreme Court came down with the decision and the more I look at that decision the more I think it was the correct decision. We have here a Bill based on many of the elements that were in the Committee on Revenue Bill 2418 last year and 548 this year that Constitutionally replaces a personal property tax. If you don't sufficiently replace that tax, who pays the bill? I'll tell you who pays the bill.



Your real estate taxpayers. The Bill that you have, 2700, which doesn't properly replace the personal property tax will cause taxes to fall on real estate, on home owners, and on business real estate because the local government has no place else to go on a property tax extension. If you listen to a special business group that are on the Governor's task force and under fund the replacement as you're planning to do, your real estate taxpayers will make up that difference. That's who will make up the difference. That's why it's so important to have adequate revenue to replace the personal property tax. No part of my district is in Cook County. Not one precinct. I'm from so-called downstate. I've reviewed this Bill as have the gentlemen that have spoken here Kane, Stuffle, McPike, and the others. And we are in agreement that this Bill is fair to Cook County and fair to downstate. We're not out to use Cook County as a whipping boy, that's where most of the corporations are that are paying these taxes anyway. We think it's a good idea to get rid of the personal property tax and to put a tax, and to put a tax on those corporations and businesses that can afford to pay it in the years when they have an income. When bad years and tough years when they don't have an income they pay no income tax. This is a good Bill. It replaces the personal property tax adequately for the future. It will give relief to the real estate taxpayers who would otherwise have to pick up the burden of local government and the schools and I'm proud to support this Bill, this Bill as a successor legislation to that proposed by the House Revenue Committee both in 1978 and again in this year and I vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved to previous question."

The question is shall the main question be put. Those in



favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. Representative McPike to close."

McPike: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker. I think when we came into session this year we realized that the greatest task before us was to come up with legislation that would adequately and equitably replace the corporate personal property tax. There was two ways to address this problem. The Governor chose to put together a Committee of business executives. These were the same business executives who have done their best to avoid paying taxes year after year after year. There is no doubt that the tax liability in Illinois, the legal tax liability in Illinois, is somewhere around 800 in excess of \$800,000,000. And there is no doubt that each and every corporation has done their utmost to pay as little as possible of that tax. They have avoided it, avoided it and avoided it. Now these same corporate executives sat down in a Committee to decide how little they could now pay and that became the Governor's package. In contrast to that, the Democratic Party put together a group of Legislators from Cook County, from the suburbs, from downstate. A group of Legislators liberal, conservative, and moderate. A group of Legislators that had widely differing opinions as to what this tax should be. The Bill that I introduced required a 4.8% tax on the business community and would have generated \$850,000,000. A great majority of my colleagues disagreed with this level. They said no that it was inequitable to business. They argued that it was not Constitutional and that the only proper and fair thing to do was to go on the collections level and that is what we decided to do. We took 1978 collections, the most recent up-to-date data that we had. 1978 collections. Those are 1977 taxes. I remind you that 1979 collections are not in yet. They will be in excess of 1978 collections. We are replacing this for future years. In



effect for 1980. Now you can choose to ignore inflation and pretend like it doesn't exist and say that we should only replace those taxes collected in 1978 and that we in fact have had no inflation in this state or in this country for the last two years. Or you can take a logical pragmatic look at this and say no that's not correct. 1978 collections need to be updated. The most updated projections that we have put the tax at \$533,000,000. On top of this we put in an extremely important part and that is the hold harmless. Every downstate Legislator has to go back to his district and tell that taxing district, especially tell the school district, how much revenues are going to be returned to that district from the state. Now maybe some of you would like to go home and tell them that they're going to get exactly, perhaps they're going to get exactly what they collected in 1978. But I don't and most of my colleagues don't. They want to go back and say there has been inflation. There would have been growth in the corporate personal property tax and we're going to replace that growth as it would have occurred. The revenues that would have been lost the revenues called for in our Constitution that would have been lost to downstate. And we are in no circumstances going to give you less. Hold harmless for two years and no circumstances will we give you less than what you received two years ago. On top of this we addressed ourselves to the very critical issue of cash flow. Anticipation warrants to be issued in September and followed throughout the year. Those, those basic issues and that is inflation and cash flow and when the tax will go into effect were not addressed by the Governor's package. In effect, the Governor and the business executives said let's pay as little as possible and let's pay it as late as possible. We have said let's pay what is equitable and let's pay it as soon as



it's necessary. You now have a choice. You can pretend that there's a free lunch. You can pretend that if the corporations don't pay their fair share that there will be no tax increase. You can go home and try to sell that, downstate or in Cook County. You can try to sell it to your constituents, but they recognize, they are knowledgeable now. They recognize where the tax increase will be. It will be on their real estate taxes and year after year the home owner will pay what the corporations have tried to avoid. That is your choice. Protect your constituents or go home and tell them that you bow to the corporate interest in this state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. One minute to explain his vote. Oh that's right. The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye, oppose vote no. Representative Skinner to explain his vote, one minute."

Skinner: "The question I'd like to ask is what happens if \$800,000,000 is collected instead of the \$533,000,000 which the Republicans, or which the Democrats suggest?" Instead of Cook County getting \$275,000,000, Cook County will get \$415,000,000. Now what the Democrats from downstate who are obfuscating the issue don't want anyone to know especially who haven't been on the negotiations is that the estimates are that Cook County will only collect 41% of the corporate personal property tax in 1979. If we're going to use estimates we might as well use up-to-date estimates after all. Now I don't know why the Cook County officials can't collect personal property tax. When I was County Treasury of McHenry County I could collect it. I could make some suggestions. It's probably incompetence on the part of Cook County officials. Unwillingness on the part of Cook County officials. Corruption on the part of Cook County officials. Some of them are in jail



you know from the Assessors Office. Or it could perhaps be the real reason and that is that corporate personal property tax is the, is the way of gathering campaign contributions in Cook County. Why should we in downstate care if Cook County doesn't want to collect money. Well I'd suggest we ought to care this year because those of you who are downstate Democrats are about to be freed from your enslavement. At the 1970 census you're free oh Lord. Free. Massa can no longer crack the whip. The chains will be broken because Massa's going to lose about eight legislative districts from Chicago if we get an honest recount and we get a dishonest recount, reapportion it we'll probably get five districts in the suburbs. I would suggest that you've got something at stake here and I really, I really am sorry that the velvet hammer seems to have his arm lock on you. I would suggest that instead of, instead of waiting for the Indians to attack the pioneers from Chicago who have their wagon trains in a circle after the 1980 census that we not give them more weapons now before the reapportionment. Why don't we just let them stay behind their covered wagons and wait and see if we are brave enough to shoot flaming arrows in and demolish their fortification. You don't have 89 votes yet. I can keep talking if you like. I've got about five more minutes here if you can go scurry up..."

Speaker Redmond: "You've already gone through one minute."

Skinner: "Well until he shuts me off I'll keep talking.

Let's see. Page three. The Democrats have stood up here today suggesting that Cook County is going to 51.65% of the money and babble on about something about five year average. I'm not sure why we should talk about a declining five year average."

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

Braun: "Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of personal privilege.



I don't know what it is about replacement of the corporate personal property tax that engenders racist remarks in this chamber, but yesterday we had a reference to people of Jewish origin and a comment about the corporate personal property tax and Representative Epton rightly got up and reprimanded the person who made the remark. That person later apologized for it. I would caution Representative Skinner that the next time that he decides to make a remark about massa cracking the whip and people being free that he not make that comment in a derogatory or joking matter on the floor of this House. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "You've already exceeded your one minute."

Skinner: "... you didn't turn the timer on. I was merely talking about the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I expected you to be a man of honor. Now if you want me to shut it off I'll do it."

Skinner: "I was talking about the serf-like relationship between the master of the manor if I may use a European analogy and the, and the downstate Democrats. Now I certainly would not think that an independent Democrat from Chicago would raise a question about..."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If the previous speaker had been more alert during the debate I think he would be aware the problem with the collections in Cook County at this particular moment in time. The corporations aren't paying them. They knew that the property tax would be eliminated so they stonewalled it. Now who's going to get hurt in this? It's not just the City of Chicago a lot of red herrings have been throwing around here today but, but one of them that I'd like to call your attention to, especially you suburban Republicans, is that the Chicago and Cook County and the other governments of Cook County are not



all the same thing. Suburban governments in Cook County are going to be hurt unless we enact this Bill into law. The Evanston District 65 school district is losing \$600,000 a year and they're losing, they lost more this last year because the corporations up there stonewalled it just like the corporations downtown stonewall it and I see no reason why the corporations should be rewarded for their misdeeds. It seems to me, I'm not a lawyer but I believe that's a principle of the law that we ought to uphold and pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes Sir. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation is taking on the position of some of the Workman's Comp...Unemployment Comp.... legislation proposals of a few years ago. I have this gut feeling that tells me that if in fact we in the House do not pass a replacement for personal property tax at the corporate business level we would probably have to be looking at that Senate Bill that's across the way and I don't think that's agreeable to any of us on this House. And I think that this is probably one of the reasons that over the last nine years we have not been able to come up with a piece of legislation that is agreeable to all of the Members in this chamber and it's really impossible I think to do that. I also have the gut feeling that probably if we don't vote on this one we aren't going to be voting on any because it's not enough to do it either way so, therefore, after a lot of internal debate I'm going to vote for this and hope that my seatmate gets on there too and we can go back to our districts and tell the people that we have come to the fore on our responsibilities and are replacing the personal property tax. I vote aye."

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

McGrew: "Explanation of vote, Sir."



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McGrew: "Well Mr. Speaker, I've probably given as much thought to this as, as about any issue this session. Frankly, I think both Bills leave a great amount to be desired. A couple of very, very relevant points that I think should be in the record here and that is that this Democrat proposal as it originally introduced called for a 4.8% across the board for all three groups. That was originally the thought. It was the downstate democrats that stood up and and said let's ring the bell a little bit for taxpayers. Let's stop 615 or 16 million dollars and it was that agreement that finally pared this down to \$533,000,000. I think that we as downstate democrats or Representatives in that group did a good job with the Bills that they were working with. However, personally, I feel that both Bills extend too much in the income tax area and not enough in terms of the capital investment for utilities companies. I don't feel that this should be a 20% windfall for the utilities companies in the State of Illinois. As a matter of fact, I think that as the business climate goes and we hear that all the time at home and down here and everywhere else that both sides of the aisle are remiss to go home and say we're trying to help you folks only it's either a 50% or a 75% increase on your income tax. It seems to me that trying to do that kind of an adjustment while decreasing utility tax as wholly counter-productive I submit to you that Illinois Power that the telephone companies and everyone else will absolutely remain in Illinois. It is the businesses that have the opportunity to say, 'Look folks, we're paying too much. We're the ones that are going to the sun belt'. Both sides of the aisle, I think, have overlooked that point and I think it's something to be considered. However, I have to vote on one or both. I think that we have attempted to work within the frame here and I submit to you that



when this Bill gets to the Senate for further consideration, which it will, that we give serious thought to those types of problems and when the final agreement is cut over there that it comes closer to giving what we can for business in the State of Illinois and I'll cast an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker I have... and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have enjoyed this debate. I feel sorry for the people in the Chicago area that don't have a lawyer for their school board to file a suit to collect the personal property tax and if they don't have a judge that will hear the case promptly like we have in southern Illinois. I know that this tax maybe over figured a little bit because what they pay next year, if these companies will, will be deducted from the tax the following year and because they won't show as much profit so that will cut down more. And as the business climate goes, I know how it goes because we've lost a thousand jobs in our area since the primary election. Now they're gone and I don't necessarily say that which one is right or which one is wrong, but I think we should vote out more than one and give the Senate a chance to look them over and see if they don't think we've got a better, better Bills than what they have coming out of their group."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House. About twelve years ago I made a extensive study in relation to the non-payment of taxes in Cook County and downstate. For example, right in Sangamon County if you didn't pay your personal property taxes they would even pick up your car right off the street. Representative Kane well remembers that I'm sure. Take it right off the street and you paid it. They actually collected nearly



a hundred percent of the tax. In my county just last week they went to court and took \$4000 away from a gentleman who owed from about 1968. Now I found out a long twelve years that we paid the taxes downstate on personal property, Chicago, Cook County they did not. At that time when I added up and I quit because there's no use going any further I had already found that in back taxes, remember we collected just from 196...

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote as I analyze this new Bill, it gives 1/12 of the income tax that's going to be collected on the businesses. It's going to give 1/12 of that money to Cook County and the city of Chicago and to your respective counties which amounts to a large amount of money. Now there is nothing in the personal property tax that gives this type of money to the cities or the counties. So how is the school districts back home going to feel when they see all these big figures but yet they know 1/12 has to come out of that to go the cities, villages, and counties? Therefore, I vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted, you know, Mr. McPike said that he had contacted the and talked to the suburban Legislators on this side of the aisle about this Bill and I, you know, I have yet to hear from Representative McPike, my good friend and I resent the fact that he took me for granted and... but the Huskey just pronouncement convinced me I have to vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 aye and 73 no. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby... Representative Schlickman requests a ver... Come up here. Representative McPike requests the poll



of the absentees. To poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "The absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Veri... Call the Verified Roll Call.

Supposed to be in your seat Representative Ryan. Rules provide for you to be in your seat Representative Ryan. Representative Ryan. Come on this is a long night. Everybody sit down. Everybody sit down now. It's going to be a long night and we'll all be very tired. Respect everybody. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be quiet. Sit down Representative Hanahan and White. Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Shisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Henry. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Dyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions Mr. Schlickman? Representative Farley. He's in the back there. He's back there. Representative Farley. Garmisa. Right here. Kulas. Yeah, he's got his feet up. Doyle. He's always here. Representative Taylor Pouncey. Representative Henry. VonBoeckman here? Representative Flinn may he be verified. There's VonBoeckman. He's here, yeah. He's standing next to Mrs. Alexander. What's the score?"



On this question there's 90 'aye' and 73 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Having voted on the prevailing side by which this Bill has been passed, I move to reconsider the vote by which it was passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I move to table that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich having voted on the prevailing side moves that the vote by which House Bill 2569 passed be reconsidered. Representative Stuffle moved that that lie on the table. The question's on Representative Stuffle's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, I want to thank the other side of the aisle for accomplishing for us tonight what we couldn't do for ourselves today. I think this first Bill we've spent an awful lot of time. I just hate to wake up tomorrow and read the press or see the news media of what took place here today. Being a prime mover of the salary increases for the Legislature and the way we behaved ourselves here today, I'm a bit concerned. I'd like to renew my motion again for the balance of the Bills that are on the Special Order, that we use the same Roll Call, and take all the Bills at the same time. We would like to have leave to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that my great admiration for..."

Speaker Redmond: "Conti."

Yourell: "Representative Conti. I know his name. You don't have to tell me that. I prob...I probably knew him before you did, Mr. Speaker, but I...if we're going to



predicate our actions on what the press report or what the press thinks, then we've degenerated to something that I think that the General Assembly of the State of Illinois does not deserve. The General Assembly does not run this Body. We run this Body. They report what they want to report, and they report what they want to report, and we have no really control over the media, and so to suggest that we predicate any actions or votes on what the media might think is a good vote is really outlandish. The media has seldom been right... seldom been right. You know that, Mr. Speaker, and all of the Members of the House know that. They report what they want to report, not what actually happens on this House floor. And, so to suggest that we have to convey to them and to suggest that we do things that what might...you know, be really what they want to do or pleasing to those people, forget it. They won't report what we want to report. They won't report what we really did on this floor tonight, and so to suggest that we do anything that would reflect their point of view, is really outlandish."

Speaker Redmond: "I think the idea would be a bad one. It would be impossible for me to run the House under that circumstance. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did you say we were going to 1737?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that, Representative Van Duyne? I didn't hear you. Forget about it. 2730. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2730. A Bill for an Act to amend various Acts to adjust the units' authorized maximum bond indebtedness. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in presenting House Bill 2730 for



your consideration this evening. We just made a decision on a very significant piece of legislation that has implications far beyond any decision that, perhaps, we will be making this Session and in subsequent Sessions. House Bill 2730 deals with the short-term borrowing and long-term borrowing implications that were precipitated as a result of the abolition of the corporate personal property tax. Most of the districts that relied on that tax have seen a decrease in assessed valuation, and, consequently, needs some relief for short-term borrowing and long-term borrowing implications. House Bill 2730 will increase the bonding indebtedness for special districts, school districts, and most districts throughout the State of Illinois. The bonding indebtedness for most districts will be increased from 75% to 85% and in most instances, the percentage of levy will be increased $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ %. I think the Bill has been discussed on previous occasions. I think the Amendments that were offered yesterday do, in fact, put the Bill in the posture that all parties should find it acceptable. I think there is something in this Bill to help both downstate districts and Chicago districts. It should not be a regional debate. I certainly would respectfully ask for the support of the Members of this Body so that we can grant the necessary relief to those schools who are relying on short-term borrowing to open their doors in September, and, at this time, I certainly would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, in order for



this...this legislation is necessary so that schools can sell tax anticipation warrants and some local governments so that they can raise the funds until a corporate personal property tax replacement funds...income starts coming in. Without the ability to sell tax anticipation warrants a number of school districts, both in Cook County and downstate, will have problems. They will have severe financial problems, and I believe you should support this legislation."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the last speaker was absolutely right... Mr. Keane. The purpose of this Bill is to take care of the emergency situation on short- and long-term borrowing caused by the loss of personal property tax assessed valuation, and that, of course, has caused the loss of legitimate borrowing power. Not only on long-term bonds but, more particularly, on specific...on short-term borrowing on tax anticipation notes and tax anticipation warrants. It's a good Bill, and it's needed, and I, therefore, gladly support House Bill 2730."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 60 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yeah..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's too late now, I think. I've already declared it passed."

Yourell: "No, I asked you before you announced the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Well, I'm delighted to know that he's awake, but



I want to know what he's objecting to."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey, what are you objecting to?"

Huskey: "To his changing his vote on the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "He didn't change his vote on the Roll Call.

He requested a verification after I had declared it passed was the problem. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Obviously, he wasn't awake, so we'll let it go."

Speaker Redmond: "548."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 548. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "In view of the favorable action on the previous Bill...previous two Bills, I'd like to take this Bill out of the record for the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2092. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2092. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2092 as amended after consultation with people with Chapman and Cutler deals with the issue of the limitation of six and twelve percent on borrowing power. What we've done is that we've said that voters of the school district may approve any proposition for the issuance of bonds in excess of the limitations provided for a purpose stated in a proposition in an election called and held for that purpose. Notice of the election and everything else must be according to the way it is now, because as many of you know with the reduction in the...or the elimination of the corporate personal property tax we dropped that...many school districts significantly with that Bill. The other part of the Amendment provides for those school districts that



were caught between with some bonds issued prior to the elimination of corporate personal property tax, such as Mahomet...is one of their outstanding examples. And, it provides...in other words, it grandfathers them in so that they are protected and that they may issue those bonds. I'd be glad to respond to any questions. If not, I would request an affirmative vote on House Bill 2092. This is the result of considerable work by the School Problems Commission."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2092 responds to a need of school districts as it relates to the elimination of the corporate personal property tax. It makes no difference, you know, to anyone but school districts. The time, and the effort, and the work that we've put into it is an effort on our part to get the job done for those folks who need it. There was no debate on it. It seems to me that we're interested in schools. We're interested in boys and girls, and we're interested in making it possible for them to operate and, for that reason, I would appreciate a few more affirmative votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote I would echo what Representative Hoffman has done. This piece of legislation was put in basically as an answer to a particular problem within our own specific district, one which I think we mentioned something on the floor about yesterday. It's a school district which got caught in the



bind as the contract left, and as a result of the absence of the assessed value from the corporate personal property tax, they have no other way to go, and this was put in basically as a request to enable them to solve their own problems. I would urge a few more green votes up there. It's...those are the only districts that's going to affect them. As I said, it was put in at their request to help them solve their own problems. I'd like to see a few more green votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ebbesen: "Where is he?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Ebbesen: "Well, is there any difference between this Bill and the Bill we just passed? If you would explain it. I realize we're in..."

Hoffman: "This deals specifically with the issue of limitations on school districts of the six and the twelve percent limitation depending on the type of district providing that they can exceed this amount by referendum. This only applies as it would to referendum votes, and it also provides to the...or deals with the issue of those schools districts which have already issued bonds and were caught in the middle as the corporate tax...corporate tax came out of their assessed valuation as Representative Wikoff mentioned."

Ebbesen: "Oh."

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

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Bill came out of Committee sixteen to three, and you must remember with the estimated assessed valuation coming off the corporate personal property tax, it may be even become a greater problem to meet building costs through long-term debt."



You know, some districts will lose from 20 to 70% of their equalized assessed valuation. Now, whether you're a Democrat or a Republican this is not a party position. If you go home and there isn't something to cover this, we're all going to be in trouble, so I think this is a good Bill. It's something that's needed, and I do urge you to vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who...? Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kane: "As I understand this Bill, Representative Hoffman... Representative Hoffman, a question. The present law allows the issuance of bonds only for construction. Is that not true?"

Hoffman: "Pardon me?"

Kane: "The present law allows the issuance..."

Hoffman: "Six and...up to six and twelve percent, and this is what this applies to, Doug."

Kane: "But only for construction?"

Hoffman: "Right."

Kane: "Now, with this...with your Amendment and your Bill bonds can be issued for any purpose whatsoever?"

Hoffman: "It has to be if it relates to subsection A and B of the present law. It doesn't apply outside that, Doug."

Kane: "What is in Section A and B"

Hoffman: "All right. Section A deals with the question of the...the question of the limitation and Section B deals with the...with the annual indebtedness. That's all."

Kane: "But bonds would...would bonds still be limited only for construction?"

Hoffman: "The..."

Kane: "And permanent capital...?"

Hoffman: "The reference is back to those Sections in terms



of construction. It doesn't have anything to do with many other factors. That's all."

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

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Sponsor would yield to one question before we take a Roll Call. Representative Hoffman, would you...?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Hoffman, the question here and you related it to...you related your answer, Representative, to Section A and B, but would you look farther down to Section C where the stricken language...stricken language in Section C refers to acquiring or improving such needed school sites or construction and equipment and such needed addition to building facilities. That was in the law. You look at the Bill in Section C on line 19 through line 21. That language has been stricken from the law by this Bill...by this Bill and inserted before that is the new language which states that when the voters in the school district may approve a proposition for the issuance of bonds for the purpose stated in the proposition. Now, you struck out all of the language that relates to school construction and improvement of buildings following that. Now, does that imply that...does that imply that in a proposition that there could be something other than school construction? That's the problem with this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye' and 10 'no'. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I think in reference to the question raised by Representative Barnes, which I didn't get a chance to respond to, I believe you are looking at the



original Bill, not the Amendment which they have right next to you and that is all gone." That's no longer in there, and so it's not no. It's just the same. It's right in the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Put it on Postponed Consideration."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, could I poll the absentees, please? There's 88 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Capparelli. DiPrima. Doyle. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Kent. Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Gene Hoffman, will you answer the phone?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Kucharski. Pullen. Schisler. Stuffle. And, no further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "You were right, Mr. Speaker. Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "As usual. Postponed Consideration. 2700. 2700."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2700. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Revenue Sharing Act... Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know this is the Bill that everyone has been waiting for anxiously so that they can vote for it and then possibly depart for the evening. House Bill 2700 is the result of the Governor's Commission to study and to recommend a replacement for the now defunct corporate and business personal property tax. After some debate by a wide variety of business people across this state, they have recommended an income tax replacement Bill, which provides for a 2% tax on corporate income, a 1½% tax on partnerships... trusts in the state with a deduction for personal service income and a 75%... a



1% tax on capital...invested capital on utilities. This Bill is designed to replace the corporate personal property tax. Figures of the Department of Local Government Affairs show...and the Department of Revenue that it would be required to have 460 million dollars to replace the corporate personal property tax in 1980. This Bill is designed to raise that much. The tax rate is the most modest and the most fair of any of the proposals which you will consider. It has a built-in growth factor which is realistic...7% a year. With patience, we will all have the funds necessary for the finance of our local government without killing or running business out of the State of Illinois by excessive taxation. Besides the rate of taxation, I think important in this Bill is the allocation or the distribution of the funds which will be raised. Here again the byword is fairness. We don't have two funds; one for Cook County and one for downstate Illinois. We have one fund. We don't have two funds that will reallocate 26 million to Cook County and an extra five to seven to the City of Chicago, but we have one fund out of which all Bodies...all public Bodies in this state will take their just and rightful amount of personal property tax. We didn't use outdated figures which were incorrectly adjusted forward by two or three years to give the desired amount for any section of the state. We used 1977 figures...taxes collected in 1978. The most complete and the most up-to-date figures available. There's no cost in this Bill to the general fund, and I think everyone ought to listen to that, because we all have our divvies in the general fund for our pet projects. Other Bills which we have considered would require 30 to 45 million in the general fund, because there is no restrictions as to the local distribution fund that there is in this Bill...the tax



shield. When will people start paying tax under this Bill? They're going to start paying tax at the beginning of 1979, not August 2, 1978. We're not going to double tax people on this replacement. Certain estimates have been made that other legislation already considered by this House will raise 800 million dollars the first year. This Bill will raise 640 million the first year. The larger amount, which I just mentioned, the 800 million, there is no rebate. This could be a tremendous windfall to the local governments, and I'm sure they'd be glad to get it, but can you imagine the pressure on us the next year when that windfall disappears and they have gotten used to using that money in the operation of local government. The Constitution mandates a replacement. If we go beyond that replacement, we may possibly be in violation of the eight to five ratio. We shouldn't use the requirement of replacing the personal property tax as a guise to tax business for local revenue sharing for local units of government. We should be fair to the taxpayers, so that we have a good business climate in this state. We should be fair to the units of local government and replace all of the money which they are losing. This House Bill 2700 will do. I'll be more than glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kane: "We heard some rhetoric on the other Bill which indicated that we were raising too much revenue, and the revenue in that Bill was 533 million. Did I hear you correctly when you said that the revenue in the first year of this Bill was 640 million?"

Ewing: "If you heard that, it should've been 460."

Kane: "Does that include the accelerated collections?"



Ewing: "That would include them."

Kane: "That includes...how much of that is accelerated collection?"

Ewing: "Approximately 37%."

Kane: "So how much is the tax itself that you're putting in?"

Ewing: "It'd be..."

Kane: "Without the accelerated collection?"

Ewing: "It'd be 460 million less 37%."

Kane: "Could you give us some dollar figures? How much comes from the basic tax and how much comes from the accelerated collection?"

Ewing: "About 93 million from the acceleration."

Kane: "So how much from the basic tax?"

Ewing: "Well, I would assume then that if you took 93 from 460, you would end up with 377."

Kane: "So the basic tax does not cover the full replacement of the corporate personal property tax. It falls short by about 100 million. Is that not correct?"

Ewing: "With the acceleration we get 460 million."

Kane: "How often does the acceleration apply? Just for one year, is that not correct?"

Ewing: "For the first year."

Kane: "Let me ask one other question. Is...who was involved in putting this Bill together?"

Ewing: "There was a group of business people...fifteen in number appointed by the Governor."

Kane: "Which industries did they represent?"

Ewing: "They represented all...many...they were all from many types of industries...service industries, banking, manufacturing, utilities...all of the groups that are being taxed."

Kane: "Were there any representatives of ordinary people... homeowners, workers?"

Ewing: "I think all of them were ordinary people and homeowners."



Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to very briefly point out two things. One is that this basic tax does not cover the replacement of the corporate personal property tax. The only thing that is even going to bring it anywhere close is an acceleration that will bring in 100 million in the first year. What's going to happen in the second year? They're going to be missing that 100 million dollars, and where is that...where is that additional tax going to be shifted to? It's going to be shifted to the homeowner, who is not in on the group that put this tax together...the homeowner. What this Bill does... House Bill 2700 is a Bill put together by the large business interests of this state, and they've come up with a plan that will not replace the corporate personal property tax. They have a shortfall of 100 million dollars, and you and I know who is going to be paying that 100 million dollars...the ordinary average homeowner who was not invited by the Governor of this state to...into the deliberations of this blue ribbon group."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Yourell: "How many Democrats are in the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "89."

Yourell: "How many Republicans?"

Speaker Redmond: "88."

Yourell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we have to showcase the talents and abilities of both sides of the aisle. We all know the outcome of this thing, and we have a lot of Bills on Third Reading, and I ask that...now, the Chair has called for a vote, and it's going to be 89 to 88, and in spite of all of the...all of the showcasing abilities of both sides of the aisle, we ought to have a vote."



Speaker Redmond: "I secret..."

Yourell: "It should be 89 to 88."

Speaker Redmond: "I secretly agree with you, but my experience is that if I don't recognize all the Members seeking recognition, some threaten extreme measures like the Member of the Assembly in Boston. Representative Mugalian."

Yourell: "Well, if they want to drop their pants, Mr. Speaker, that's one for our side, because we're noted for that kind of activity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will my good friend and colleague, Representative Ewing, respond to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mugalian: "Representative Ewing, I want to inquire about the treatment of partnership income. It's my understanding that personal service income is not included in determining the tax. Is that correct?"

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

Yourell: "I move the previous question. This is a charade. You know that the outcome is going to be 89 to 88."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll put that question as soon..."

Yourell: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "...as Representative Mugalian finishes."

Yourell: "Fine." Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I guess Representative Ewing didn't hear my question."

Ewing: "Yeah...yeah, you said, 'Is it included in figuring the tax?'"

Mugalian: "I understand it's excluded in figuring the tax."

Ewing: "That is correct."

Mugalian: "Now, would you say that the income of a lawyer, or a doctor, or a dentist would be personal service income?"



Ewing: "If it was distributed to him. Yes."

Mugalian: "Does the Constitution provide that the replacement tax be on the same classes relieved of the paying the personal property tax?"

Ewing: "It has wording to that effect."

Mugalian: "Would not this Bill, in effect, relieve doctors, and dentists, and lawyers from personal property tax?"

Ewing: "Well, I think if you...it would not relieve them of the obligation to pay tax, but they do get a deduction for those amounts which they take home as individuals. This also, you know, gives the deduction for those poor little old widows that I've heard so many on your side cry about in trusts and estates."

Mugalian: "I'm not inquiring about poor little widows, Representative Ewing. I think what you said was that..."

Ewing: "Well, don't pick on the doctors."

Mugalian: "...personal service income is not included in determining income. Well, I have one other question if you don't mind. On page 51 the Bill says all machinery and equipment including that permanently affixed to real estate, and now or hereafter used in the manufacturing, processing, or refining of any product and so forth. Is...all such property in the previous line, line 18, will be reclassified as personal property. Is that correct?"

Ewing: "Yes, this is an effort to keep from double taxation of business property..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk, please do not... encourage anything here. Representative Yourell. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yeah, really, Mr. Speaker, I had a motion that would move the previous question. Now, we've gone a long way here with this thing, and we're in a dialog..."

Speaker Redmond: "I said..."

Yourell: "...and we really ought to move the previous question."



Speaker Redmond: "I said as soon as Representative Mugalian finished, that I would put the question."

Yourell: "Well, it's the dialog, Mr. Speaker. You know that's the dialog. We're just..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I know, but I've had my experience. Representative Mugalian, continue."

Mugalian: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for Representative Yourell's sake, I'll make this very brief. I have been asking questions that would elucidate the provisions of this Bill to all of our colleagues including Representative Yourell. I very briefly rise to oppose this Bill for only two reasons. There are others. One is that it reflects a very bad bias to a school from paying the replacement tax...doctors, lawyers, and dentists and all those whose income is from personal services. That is not only unconscienable, but it is probably unconstitutional. Secondly, the provision after the reclassification of personal property of property attached to buildings is one of the greatest rip-offs I've ever seen in this state. It will cost our local governments untold millions of dollars of real estate taxes, because these are items that are properly classified as real estate such as generating plants, transmission lines, overhead cranes and so forth. I can't believe that this provision will stay in this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the question be put?' Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Representative Piel. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I've always been under the impression that you were allowed to be called on once during debate. Mr. Yourell has been called on three times during debate."

Speaker Redmond: "So has Representative Ewing."

Piel: "Yes, but he happens to be the Sponsor. Representative



Yourell talked on the issue. Then he moved the previous question. You called on him to move the previous question. Then you called on him again to move the previous question the second time, and I just want a verification. How many times can you call on him? With the situation...with the situation..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, as many times as you counted..."

Piel: "...happened earlier in the day."

Speaker Redmond: "...that's the number I called on him. On this question there's 71 'aye' and 87 'noes'. The motion fails. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker? Tom, I'm particularly concerned about the replacement of the corporate personal property tax not becoming a tax increase, and I spoke on the other Bill, and I'm concerned to know about this Bill. How much revenue do you estimate will be lost through the abolition of the personal property tax?"

Ewing: "It is the intention of the drafters of this legislation that there not be any revenue lost as a result of the abolition of the personal property tax. In fact, they have taken the 1978 taxes...1977 taxes collected in '78, multiplied them times 111.1% to come up with a figure of the needed replacement for 1980...for 1979 taxes payable in '80. That's exactly what we have. We believe that we can meet it with these tax rates and maintain the business climate in this state."

Schuneman: "All right, and how much is that?"

Ewing: "460 million."

Schuneman: "And how much will be produced by your Bill?"

Ewing: "460 million."

Schuneman: "So there's no tax increase in this Bill?"

Ewing: "That's right."

Schuneman: "Okay... One other problem I had with the other Bill, it seemed to me that we were adopting one standard



for Chicago and another standard for the rest of the state, because replacement taxes in Representative McPike's Bill were based on 1970 for the year 1976 for Chicago but 1977 for the rest of the state. Now, do you have a double standard like that in your Bill?"

Ewing: "We surely don't, and we don't have two funds either. In the other Bill they had the Chicago fund out of which they put additional money from downstate, and we have the downstate fund. But, of course, that seemed to be very popular over there, and they all bought that. We have one fund."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill? Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

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

Pierce: "I don't like the way the Gentleman is badgering the Sponsor of this Bill and picking on him with those mean, tough questions, and I think you should have more respect for the Minority Spokesman of Revenue Committee than to badger him in that manner, and I'm ashamed of you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce, your point is well taken. Representative Schuneman, confine your remarks within the bounds of propriety."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, as usual, I am humbled by the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, and I apologize for any badgering that I may have done of Representative Ewing. May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again I want to call your attention to the two major differences in these Bills. One provides a tax increase, and the other does not. This is the one that does not. One provides a double standard, and the other one does not. This is the one that does not. This is the one that's



good for downstate Illinois, and by all means, any Legislator seeking to represent a downstate district in Illinois who campaigned on the strength of the argument that he's going to help reduce taxes or ease the burden on taxpayers, in all good conscience, must vote for this Bill, and I certainly urge an 'aye' vote on this very good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederick. Frederick. Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hallock: "Representative Ewing, how does this Bill treat the...?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson, please sit down."

Hallock: "How does this Bill treat the capital stock problem?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Are you talking about the capitol stock tax?"

Hallock: "Yes."

Ewing: "It eliminates the capital stock tax. That's part of the personal property tax that's eliminated."

Hallock: "But you can make up that revenue through this Bill as it stands now?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Hallock: "Okay, I have then one other question... This Bill causes the shift, I know, away from personal property to income. This Bill causes a shift away from personal property tax to income. Will you be able to make up that amount as well?"

Ewing: "I'm sorry, I don't know if I understand your question."

Hallock: "In terms of the corporation...those corporations who are heavily based in personal property. You're going to shift to the income. Will you be able to make up that tax as well?"

Ewing: "Well, there is a shift in any of the Bills that move to an income tax. Those who are paying the tax under



the...with the income tax base will be those that are showing a profit. That will mean that certain companies who paid may be considerably personal property who weren't in the...operating in the black will now not be paying any. There is a shift of the tax burden, but it's based on income, and it would make up the total amount of the tax."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leinenweber: "Representative, is there an increment to increase the amount of the replacement fund every year?"

Ewing: "Up to 7%."

Leinenweber: "How on earth was the 7% figure arrived at?"

Ewing: "It was an average growth...it was a compromise between no Amendment and an Amendment that would provide growth that would keep up with the inflation."

Leinenweber: "Is that to be compounded annually, or is that just a simple 7%?"

Ewing: "Compounded annually."

Leinenweber: "Doesn't that seem to be awfully lucrative for the school districts?"

Ewing: "Well, it's not near as lucrative as not having any limit."

Leinenweber: "What is the provision of the McPike Bill with reference to that particular...the increment?"

Ewing: "It has absolutely no limit."

Leinenweber: "And, so what would be the practical effect of the other Bills compared to 2700?"

Ewing: "Well, there's going to be a continuing and ever-increasing tax increase for business in the State of Illinois."

Leinenweber: "In other words, it will grow higher and higher and higher without any limit whatsoever?"



Ewing: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "My, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill. I'm not..."

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

Yourell: "Yes, the Gentlemen's addressing a lot of other legislation that's relative to what we're...under discussion presently. I think he ought to confine his remarks to 2700 and not legislation that's already passed this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Confine your remarks to 2700. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, I was going to mention some of the crossing problems that we have in the 42nd District, but inasmuch as that is not of interest to the Membership I will confine myself to House Bill 2700. I'm not satisfied with the 7% compounded annually figure. I think it's much too extreme and too costly for the businesses of this state. However, as pointed out by the Sponsor in his answer to the question, it is infinitely better than the competing approach. I think in this day in age, and we've heard so much about how we're driving business out of the state, and it ill behooves us to add the initial...one more nail in the coffin. I think this is a much superior approach to the other Bill, and I certainly urge all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle to support this particular approach. It's far superior in this aspect and many, many other aspects, including the so-called personal service income. I would point out that personal service income ought to be excluded and certainly would not be unconstitutional. In Illinois, corporations are separate entities, partnerships are separate entities, and if they have income in and of themselves it will be taxed under House Bill



2700 as under any other approach. What we're talking about is the salaries of employees and partners of professional corporations, subchapter S corporations, and partnerships who currently are not paying anything by way of personal property tax, because the personal property tax is currently on the partnership itself, not on the partners. I think it's certainly bad policy for us to add a whole new group of people to the replacement tax which would not be under that replacement tax under House Bill 2700. Again, I would tell my friends on the other side of the aisle who voted to tax the professional people, the personal service people, the farmers, the real estate agents, the real estate salesmen, the real estate brokers, the insurance people, and the doctors in their districts that they now have a chance to recoup themselves by voting for House Bill 2700."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, maybe I'll just explain my vote rather than..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ropp: "Representative Ewing, would you explain to me a little more clearly the amount of either dollars, either percentage-wise, that the state will actually require to administer the repayment of these funds back to the local communities?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I don't have an answer to that. The question has been raised and discussed before. There is a mechanism already in operation under the state income tax. I'm sure that you won't be able to take on a burden like this for no additional cost, but should should not require the establishment of a whole new



bureaucracy to do it. It will be done through the Department of Revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

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

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

Representative Ewing. Too late. Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing, to close."

Ewing: "Could I have some order?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. Representative Collins, please give Representative Ewing order. Representative Ewing, to close. Representative Ewing, to close. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'm close enough to you that I think you can hear me without a microphone..."

Speaker Redmond: "That's right."

Collins: "...as usual. We were asking for a Roll Call on the motion...on the last motion, which takes a two-thirds vote to prevail. Now, there's no way that you can determine that two-thirds vote by a voice vote, Mr. Speaker. You're running rough shod over the Members again, and I would demand a Roll Call on that last motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Representative Ewing was satisfied with the decision that was preponderated by the Speaker. Now, don't wave to me, Representative Collins. The fact of the matter is your request was not timely. Representative Ewing was closing, and I think he ought to be allowed to close."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to accept your ruling on that



and go ahead with it. I think the...what I am violently opposed to though, and I'm speaking on personal privilege, is the treatment from the other side of the aisle, and particularly my colleague, Bus Yourell. He's been nothing but an obstacle. He doesn't want to hear what's in this Bill. He doesn't want to be confused with any facts. It's too bad they don't want to know and give equal consideration to the legislation. We gave their Bill a very good hearing. I would've expected the same for this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'."

Ewing: "That was my personal privilege. I'll explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis, do you desire to vote? Let her talk? Do you want to hear her talk? Do you want to hear her talk or sing? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, just in the sense of what could've happened, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to explain my vote. I'm voting 'aye', because I think Representative Schuneman was 100% accurate when he expressed to this House that, you know, we're not talking about...we are talking about a replacement tax, and this Bill, House Bill 2700, does exactly that in terms of dollars. We're in...and what we just passed out of here represents a tax increase, and I think that there are some people that...in this House that have the...a chance to redeem themselves on this Bill by voting for it. You could've voted for the other one, but you should also probably support this one. I would just say that in terms of the delinquent taxes relative to the County of Cook over the last...on the corporate personal property tax represent millions and millions and millions of dollars. I expressed myself on the other proposal that was



similar to this but not nearly as good as this, and I certainly would encourage those who were a little bit... or who did vote for the other piece of legislation that here you have House Bill 2700 which really just replaces the taxes. There's not a tax increase, and I would encourage you to vote 'aye' on this particular proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, in examining the Bill, I see no so-called hold harmless provisions which will guarantee that our units of local government, be they schools, or townships, or county, or fire districts, will not lose revenue that they have been receiving under the personal property taxes that have been levied and collected in the past. I think it is important pursuant to the Constitutional mandate that we see that those units of local government do not lose taxes, that there be a hold harmless, and, therefore, I cannot vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday I alluded to one provision of this Bill that should kill this Bill. I talked to the Sponsor, and he told me that he didn't realize the ramifications of that provision and that he would take it out. Not one word was mentioned in debate that that provision, which now classifies real estate property and hereinafter will be personal property tax... property, will be taken out. He said nothing about it. This Bill under that provision, and it's on page 51, lines 21 to 30...31, has to be taken out. If your taxpayers knew that you voted for this Bill with that provision, you'd never come back to the Legislature, because it is a tax dodge. That is the danger when we allow the chamber officials, when we allow Commonwealth Edison, when we allow big business to write a Bill for us. It's a tax dodge. They should never be allowed to



get away with it and I say to the Sponsor that he should've said in debate that that provision would be taken out. I wouldn't take a chance of taking a Bill to the Senate with that provision in it. A tax dodge for big business."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to explain my vote."

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

Yourell: "The Gentleman has closed, and I don't think there's anymore need for any further debate, and the Roll Call is in order."

Speaker Redmond: "We're not giving him a debate. I recognized him. I didn't know whether he was going to tell me that the House was on fire. How do I know? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you. I don't really think it is. Thank you, Bus. Representative Matijevich, the... I do intend to have that corrected when the Bill gets to the Senate, and I would think that you would trust your own... are you listening, Representative? Trust your Senate with all of the plurality that you have over there. I'm sure that they wouldn't have any Bill that would rip-off the people. But, in explaining my vote, this is a fair Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I've taken the record already, Representative Ewing. You rose on personal privilege. Take the record. On this question there's 87 'aye' and 65 'no'. Representative Matula, for what purpose do you rise? Margalus, rather."

Margalus: "I wasn't here, and I want to vote 'yes' on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'yes'. Mr. Piel, may I recognize Representative Ewing again?"



Ewing: "I would like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "It's within your privilege. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "E. M. Barnes. Dyer. Ewell. Keane. Mautino. O'Brien. Ronan. Van Duyne. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane, 'no'. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would announce the Roll? We're through with the polling of absentees. Would you please announce the vote total?"

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, surely. Happy to oblige. Proceed. Have you fin...? Proceed with the absentees. Are you finished with it? Now, what's the count? 88 'aye' and 66 'no'. Take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye' and 65 'no', and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Post...skip it."

Speaker Redmond: "2653. Representative Schneider."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2653. A Bill for an Act abolishing the ad valorem personal property tax and replaces revenue loss with an income tax. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members. On the recommendation of the people who put the Bill together, although they are somewhat unhappy about the total dollars from the Bill that went out of the House, I think it's a generous offer on their part, and I concur that we hold this Bill or take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 2144. Representative Campbell. 2144. Representative Deuster, please sit down. Deuster, sit down. Representative Campbell. 2144."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2144. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for many years we've made the attempt in this Legislature to upgrade assessors in assessing practices throughout the State of Illinois. This series of Bills addresses that question and hopefully will provide more uniformity and fairness in assessing practices. House Bill 2144 sets up multi-township assessment districts beginning in 1982. Townships with less than 1,000 population combine assessing with other adjoining townships in the same county and jointly elect a multi-township assessor for an area with over 1,000 population. Each township is free to decide with whom to coordinate, and in a case that a townships cannot agree on boundaries, the county board will make the final decision. The multi-township assessor operates under the same rules for assessing and administration as a single township. The Bill is designed to produce assessment districts more likely to support competent professional assessing. While doing so, it is designed to be workable in actual practice. This is supported by the township officials of Illinois, the Illinois Assessor's Association, the Illinois Professional Assessment Council, and it does have bipartisan support, and I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Was this on the No Debate Calendar? It was wasn't it?"

Campbell: "Yes."

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 163 'aye' and 3 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2145."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2145. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2145 says that in all townships over 25,000 population an individual must have certain appraisal assessing qualifications to run for the office of assessor. Specifically, a candidate must have one of the following recognized professional designations: certified Illinois assessing officer, master of appraisal institutes, senior real property appraisers, senior real estate analysts, certified assessment evaluator, or a certificate of qualifications by the Department to assure that in the largest 59 townships, which have more complex problems, the assessor has professional education training. I would ask for your favorable support."

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 144 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2146 (sic)."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2147. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2147 says that the township boards may establish assessors' salaries at the following maximum levels. The reason they use the maximum levels was because of the fact they didn't want to get into the situation where they were mandating the local governments the limits that they could set or the minimums that they could set. But, they use this simply as a



guide, and it's up to the township boards. It's permissive. It does not mandate local salaries, but it establishes a maximum, and I ask for your favorable support."

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 140 'aye' and 15 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2562. Representative Brummer. 2562."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2562. A Bill for an Act...a new Act imposing a limit on the total amount which may be appropriated by the General Assembly in any fiscal year. Third Reading of the Bill."

Brummer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard a good deal of rhetoric tonight about the importance of the personal property tax replacement. I don't doubt the importance of that issue, but I know last year during the campaign as we were going through the district and talking to constituents that the question of reasonable spending limits on state government and local units of government was an issue that was foremost in the eyes and minds of the voters at that time. 2562 is a new Act that limits the total amount that can be appropriated by the General Assembly in any fiscal year from the general funds. That limitation...this Bill limits the increase in appropriation above the prior year to the average percentage increase in Illinois personal income over the five most recent years for which that information is available. It excludes from those appropriations the transfers that go to the local government distributive fund; which is the one-twelfth of the income tax that is received. It excludes the transfers that go to the



public transportation fund, which is a 3/32 of the sales tax from the six county area. It excludes the transfers that go to the downstate public transportation fund, and it also excludes tax relief grants paid from the general fund required by the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. In any fiscal year in which there is a greater increase in revenues coming into that fund than the appropriations, that excess goes into a tax relief fund, and it is deposited there. Each year the Comptroller determines the balance of the tax relief fund at the close of the fiscal year on June 30th. Subsequently, in the following year the amount in the tax relief fund is applied as a credit against the individual income tax liability as determined by the total number of exemptions that are claimed on individual income tax returns. There are emergency provisions by which the money that goes into the tax relief fund can be spent for other purposes, and that can only be done on the...when all of the following conditions are met. Those conditions are as follows: the Governor or both the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House declare that a state financial emergency exists. Secondly, the person or persons declaring the financial emergency specify the nature of the emergency in the dollar amount of the appropriation needed to overcome the emergency. Third, the General Assembly then declares that an emergency exists through the adoption of a Resolution so stating by a three-fifths vote of the Members of each House, and, fourth, the General Assembly approves the appropriation of the funds for that emergency by a three-fifths vote of the Members elected to each house. This is in partial response to the voters' results on the Thompson Proposition last year that carried by overwhelming majority. The...this would impose reasonable



limits on the appropriations of the State of Illinois, and I would be glad to answer any questions concerning it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question, my question is this, this is a law you're proposing, Representative Brummer. And, I imagine that we...if we wanted to next year, we could repeal this law. Is this correct?"

Brummer: "It is the legislative prerogative at any time, I suppose, to repeal any law. I think it would be a break of the...of confidence of the...with the public to repeal that."

Deuster: "My question is this, suppose...your proposal is that we can only appropriate so much money in the next Session of the Legislature, and that if we appropriate more money and, of course, there will be different people...some of us might not be here and some new faces might be here, but if we appropriate more money, then it goes for tax relief. Is that correct?"

Brummer: "No, that is not correct. To the extent that revenues that are coming into the State of Illinois exceed the amount by which appropriations are limited here, those excess revenues would go into the tax relief fund. In other words, the income tax would remain at the same level until after the end of the year until you determine whether the revenues exceeded the amount of the appropriations as limited by this Bill. Then in the following year that money would go into the tax relief fund and be available for credits on the individual income tax returns in the following year."

Deuster: "In the last three years have the revenues ever exceeded the appropriations by the amount specified in this Bill?"

Brummer: "According to information supplied by the Economic



and Fiscal Commission, in four of the last eight years the appropriations have exceeded the amount that would've been allowed had this Bill been the law."

Deuster: "Then what makes you think that in the future revenue would exceed the appropriations? How could that possibly be? And, if you don't have a quick answer, I'll ask you the next question. Suppose next year we find that we need to appropriate more money than you limit in this Bill to either fix up the roads or to educate the children in our schools. Couldn't we just appropriate that money and amend this Bill and do as we please in a future Session?"

Brummer: "I do not think that the Members of the General Assembly and the Governor would want to immediately repeal a law imposing limits on the level of state spending after the response of the voters to the Thompson Proposition last year and we enact that into law. I do not think any responsible Legislature and Governor is then going to ignore that."

Deuster: "If I might speak to the Bill very briefly?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Deuster: "If you want to put some strong limits on, you can amend the Constitution, but to pass a law today saying that next year, or the following year, or ten years from now we're going to appropriate a certain amount of money within limits, is absolute folly. All we have to do if we want to control government is to restrain our appetite for putting in appropriations Bills and for adding pork barrel Amendments to every Bill that floats by. I think that we can restrain ourselves. The Governor can also reduce, or veto, or line item out appropriations and exercise control and discipline in that manner. All this Bill is is window dressing... something that perhaps the Sponsors can send a press release back home and say we passed a law to limit



things in the future. Actually, there's no tax relief provided in this at all. It's an absolutely unnecessary, meaningless proposal that I would recommend that we vote against."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Talk about fraud. This certainly has to rise to the top here as most other Bills of no consequence have risen during this Session. Take a look at what they call nondiscretionary expenditures. The RTA expenditures are nondiscretionary. Now, that's the same language that the Governor uses in his budget talks when he explains how we can't possibly take any money away from the RTA. I'd point out in contrast that state aid education expenditures are not nondiscre...are not nondiscretionary. They don't get taken out, so we can give all the money that RTA's little formula allows it to get, and education will be shortchanged as it has since the RTA Act passed in 1974. This is a total fraud. It is not a partial fraud as the Sponsor suggests. It is a total fraud. Right?"

Brummer: "Wrong again, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Brummer to close."

Brummer: "Yes, I find it interesting that suddenly some Members on the other side of the aisle are not interested in imposing limits on spending. The figures provided by the Economic and Fiscal Commission indicate that in 1972 appropriations increased by 14.7% at a time when the...at a time when the personal income increased by 6.6%. In 1973, the appropriations increased by 9.9%



at a time when revenues increased by only 7.1%. In 1975, appropriations increased by sixteen two...16.2% at a time when revenues increased by only 8.4%. I have heard Members on the other side of the aisle repeatedly decry the decrease in the state balance and the state treasury during those period of years and that...and that the Republican Governor came in with a treasury that was in poor shape at that time, and I would suspect that had this...had this law been in effect at that time, the overexpenditures of revenues and appropriations in excess of the income coming in would not have occurred. This is a legitimate, valid limitation on state spending. It is a response to the Thompson Proposition, and I would request a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Representative Telcser, to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote let me remind the Members of the House that the years during which the Gentleman said that we appropriated far in excess of what the state revenue was this Assembly was controlled by the Democratic Party, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you took the Roll Calls out this Session, and I'd venture to say even those of the Gentleman who's sponsoring this foolishness, you would see that he and the...his colleagues have again this year voted for Bills far in excess of what the state can afford and far in excess of what the growth in collections is. This Bill is nothing but political hypocrisy. It's a fraud, and it's not going to save the taxpayers of this state one single penny."

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

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



the House. I most certainly have some reservation as to the impact of the revenue limitation that's imposed...or the appropriation limitation that's imposed here. Let me tell you that half a loaf is better than none. A limit such as this would have prevented what happened in the prior administration from happening, and in the long run a statutory limitation may help us to prevent that from happening in the future. Of course, many of us feel, including myself, that in order for really a limit to be most effective, it must be Constitutional. But, this proposal would be effective immediately, and it would provide some assurances to the taxpayers of this state that appropriations wouldn't be used wisely...would be used wisely, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers...Robbins, rather."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Bill. I have watched the appropriations being appropriated... coming through this House, and I think that we should have at least enough money to run the schools all of next year. That's what we've been talking about, and this law won't go into effect in time to keep us from going bankrupt if we keep spending money like we have been."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's 155 'aye' votes up there. There's only 89 Democrats in the House, and Representative Telcser has not voted yet. He spoke against the Bill, and he's acting more like Huskey everyday."

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

Borchers: "All I want to bring up, Mr. Speaker, was that for many years...twelve years I've watched with a very great deal of interest, amusement, and sometimes the



disgust of the Republicans and Democrats of this House.

Now, I know this Bill is absolutely worthless. I...it don't matter whether a Democrat Governor or a Republican Governor is in power. Now, I'm not naive enough to believe that this will ever get back to the taxpayers. I'm going to vote 'aye' just in case something...a miracle...lightning should strike. I know it won't strike. It's just another one of those peculiar things that happen here that don't mean a damn thing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to comment that I thought Representative Yourell voted for you for Speaker, but apparently he doesn't have the confidence in you to run the House. He keeps telling you how to run it."

Speaker Redmond: "He might as well join the rest of you. Representative Schraeder. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'aye' and 12 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2563."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2563. A Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman, please sit down."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the House is in a good mood. This is in a series of Bills just like the last five we passed...some of Campbell's and Brummer's, and I won't take very long to discuss it. I'll answer any questions, but it's a limitation on property tax to be extended in 1980. In subsequent years, to the amount in the immediate preceding year plus the average over five years in personal income. This is a taxpayers' Bill like the last ones were. Are there any questions? It does



not prohibit the payment of outstanding bonds, pension plans, or it doesn't affect any referendums. I would ask for a favorable vote just like the last one."

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 155 'aye' and 5 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2564. Representative Darrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2564. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retailer's Occupation Tax, Use Tax, Service Occupation Tax, and Service Use Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this legislation does is remove the sales tax from food and prescription drugs. Our surrounding states of Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan have already done this. We're losing business to the border states...the border grocery stores. On any Friday night you can come to Rock Island County and see the cars crossing the bridge over to Iowa to buy their food. This would mean tax relief, not only for the senior citizens, but for the young parent with the growing family. A family of four making \$11,000 currently pays \$175 in income tax a year and \$220 on sales tax for food. This re...this exemption on sales tax for food and drugs will occur over a period of five fiscal years. If we hit hard times such as a recession, we can come back to the General Assembly and continue the current rate of sales tax at that period. I would now like to yield to Representative Bowman, the chief... the other chief Sponsor of this legislation, to explain some of the more technical aspects."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, this is cash on the barrelhead tax relief. It's the one Bill that we're considering tonight that gives the taxpayer some of his hard-earned money right back to him. Let me give you some of the figures. For fiscal year 1980...1980, which is coming up, we would be able to put another 45 million dollars back into the taxpayers pockets. In '81, the additional tax relief would be 137 million. In '82, it would go to 120...it be 128. In '83, 151 million and in '84, when the last vestige of this tax is removed, 132 million. Now, that's significant tax relief, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I think that...that we can...and owe it to our taxpayers. I think that, moreover, that we can afford this. Some people have asked where the money is coming from. Well, there's several different answers to that. First of all, I'd just like to quote from the Governor's budget book from this year where he very proudly states that the state has or will generate 281 million dollars in increased resources or cost reductions over the next several years. We also are experiencing at the present time a very substantial rate of real revenue growth. I had the Economic and Fiscal Commission run out a few projections for me, and to give you an idea of what we can expect by the end of this time period when this thing is fully phased in, the...the increase in the general revenue fund that we can anticipate in fiscal year '84 over the prior fiscal year is around 863 million dollars. Not only that, we're generating revenues right now at a pretty good clip. I don't know how many of you have been watching the Comptroller's report, but for the last...roughly, the last year, we have been generating revenues or cash balances, I should say, about 200 million dollars in excess of the cash balances on hand of the prior



year, and that's been, not just one month...not just two months, but month after month. I think that we have a good solid revenue growth. I think we have good prospects for cost reductions without hurting programs, and I think it's about time that we gave the taxpayers of Illinois some real tax relief. If you're serious about limiting the size of government...if you're really serious about limiting the size of government, you want to take a whack at the sales tax on food, because you can't spend money you don't have, and...and I'd like to conclude on that note."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Birkinbine: "Mr. Bowman, as I understand...you made a case for money that might go to the state and the fact that the state probably has enough money to cover the loss in this. What about the state that goes to the local municipalities? As I understand it, the Village of Northfield, for example, gets one percent of that tax from...that would come out of the Dominic's food store in Northfield, and that money is going to keep up the roads, and plow the snow, and, essentially, run the village government. How are you going to replace that?"

Bowman: "We will replace that by increasing the shares that local governments get from the local...or the local government distributive fund from one...it's currently a one-twelfth figure. It'll go up to one-eighth."

Birkinbine: "Is that in this Bill?"

Bowman: "Yes, it is. It's in the Amendment to the Bill.

Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

Birkinbine: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Ebbes...

Representative Ebbesen. Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, I just wonder if the Sponsor would yield to one question for me?"



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Wolf: "What do you estimate that the loss in sales tax to the City of Chicago would be under this if this Bill passed?"

Bowman: "Let's see, the...well, the loss to, not only the City of Chicago but to all cities would be replaced by increasing the...their share of the local government distributive fund, so there would be no net loss to ...to Chicago or to any city."

Wolf: "How do you increase that...how do you make for that loss?"

Bowman: "I'm sorry. Would you please speak up, Sir?"

Wolf: "How would you make up for the loss in revenue?"

Bowman: "Amendment #1 provides for increasing the amount of money going into the local government distributive fund. It's currently one-twelfth of income tax collections. It would go to one-eighth, and that would be adequate to make up the...the loss in revenue to local...units of local government."

Wolf: "Okay. How much additional would that be then?"

Bowman: "That would...that would run 100...the cost, excuse me. The cost of removing the last cent...the municipal levy would be...we estimate, around 130 million dollars."

Wolf: "About 130 million dollars."

Bowman: "Incidentally, that is tax relief for the taxpayer, too. I think you're only looking at one side of the coin."

Wolf: "Well, I was just wondering, because we just passed a tax limitation Bill or two, and I was wondering how that would affect that."

Bowman: "Well, if we pass this Bill, we will be limiting our...our resources and, as a result, limiting our expenditures and so the...we will probably not have need of the provisions in the tax limitation Bill for several years down the road. But, I think the two go hand in hand, and like I say, you can't spend money you



don't have. This is the real thing."

Wolf: "That's the one appealing factor it has. If you can't spend the money that we don't have, then it might stop some of you guys who like to spend a lot from spending some."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker? Representative Bowman, maybe I wasn't listening. What was the estimated total cost now, after the phase-in is done, of the removal of the sales tax on food and drugs plus the reimbursement from state coffers to local governments for their loss?"

Birkinbine: "In fiscal year 19..."

Davis: "What's the total?"

Birkinbine: "In fiscal year 1984..."

Davis: "Yes."

Birkinbine: "...when it's entirely phased in, according to my estimates, which are actually slightly higher by a couple million dollars than the Department of Revenue ...660 million dollars."

Davis: "660 million dollars. In other words, you're saying that with your IEFC...Economic and Fiscal Commission's projections of 800 million dollars by that time in new growth that you're still going to realize the 200 million dollar surplus. Is that the idea? In new spending now. New spending...new growth spending... new dollars. Is that the figure you used? 800 million dollars projected in 1984 in increased revenue over what it...you know, normal growth revenue?"

Birkinbine: "Yeah, that's the new growth. Now, that did not take into account any cost reductions. Now, if you take the Governor's figure which he had in his budget book of roughly 281 million dollars in cost reductions which he's absolutely sure that we can achieve and phase those cost savings in over a five...the same five-



year period. You get a figure that is around 350 to 400 million dollars; because don't forget the savings that we realize today...the value of those savings that we realize today will be magnified five years down the road."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Sponsor, perhaps I'm going to lead you into something here. Let me ask you just another question. If the current inflation rate stays somewhere around, let's say, ten percent which it might be this year, to stay even with current programs that are in place at this point, the Governor's cost reduction program notwithstanding...we hope that it's successful, that would be roughly the twelve billion dollar budget... around 1200 million dollars this year. Now, and I realize some of those are federal funds, so the figures may not be quite fair, so I've got to ask you, Mr. Sponsor, in your closing if you would enumerate, and you must have given it some consideration...if you would just enumerate and you haven't taken into account, of course, the possibility of no growth or flat growth in recessionary activity in the ensuing four years or certainly next year when we're faced with one. I would ask you, Mr. Sponsor, that in your closing remarks to list the priorities of cuts in government by department or special interest group that you would cut when it's phased in and when your 600 million dollars is out of the budget and when those special interest groups come to this General Assembly and ask us for increased funding or stay even funding. I think you owe that to this General Assembly."

Birkinbine: "Well, Representative, I'm not going to do your job for you. That's the job of all of us. We've got to make the hard choices that are necessary to limit the size of government. Now, if you're really serious about limiting the size of government, you'll take a



whack at this and eliminate this tax and give the revenues back to the people."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to get into the dialog, but to speak to the Bill for a moment if I might?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Davis: "I think that liars...what the old phrase about figures lie and sometimes liars figure. Anybody can produce figures that do what you want to do, and I'm sympathetic with the idea of removal of sales tax on food and drugs, but it's obvious that we're going down a path that, unless you prioricize and you're the Sponsor of the Bill, I'm not...necessarily don't have to prioricize unless the Bill becomes law and then I will. You're putting us in a situation without prioricizing, Representative Bowman. You're putting us in a situation of an increase in the income tax in this state to replace the sales tax on food, and if that's what you wish to do, then fine. Then we should all vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the figures have been adequately brought out here, but one thing hasn't. In serving on the Revenue Committee, and I think every Member of that Committee would agree with this, we have a number of Bills that come in there to take off sales tax on everything from food and drugs, which is one of the most worthy of them all, down through field tile, and farm machinery, and machinery for business and industry. There is no way that we can continue to give it away. I think the figures that Mr. Bowman has cited here today will prove that you can't replace local government's loss, give tax relief to the taxpayer, and not raise the income tax or some other tax, because 600 million will use up the growth in the budget...maybe even use up more than it



without leaving anything for inflation. And, it's doubtful with the ability of the administration in Washington that we can expect anything less than 12% inflation, and we have two more years of that to go."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Darrow-Bowman...Bowman-Darrow to close. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Representative Bowman has done an excellent job describing this Bill, answering the questions and indicating that in the event that we do have difficulty with this Bill we will have to cut some priorities. We will have to look to the need, but until that time we can continue to give some relief to our small constituents...our people who have no voice in Springfield other than ours. Not big business, not the people who came down here and asked for us to remove the sales tax on machinery last week...last year, not the Chamber of Commerce, but to the mom and pop. To...not to the mom and pop store, but to mom and pop themselves. To the parents, to the older people, to the children. We can remove the sales tax on the food...to the sick with skyrocketing medical bills. We can remove the sales tax they're paying on those drugs. This legislation is long overdue. We've all campaigned on issue such as this. We've gone around. We've told the...our constituents...our voters that we would vote in favor of this type of legislation. This is a piece of legislation that has bipartisan support. There are Sponsors on this from both sides of the aisle. All I'll do now



is ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Representative Vinson, to explain his vote. Timer's..."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a good Bill, and we all ought to get on it and pass it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is worth about as much as this banana peel. It's empty, and when I throw it in front of Representative Darrow or Representative Bowman's desk and they slip on it, that will be...that will definitely define their position. One of the Representatives said you can't have it both ways. No, he didn't quite put it that way. He said you can't spend money you don't have. I'll say you can't have it both ways. You want it...if you want to get sales tax relief, there's a Bill that's floating around that's in Amendment #2 which you don't dare bring it back for, because it might pass. That would increase the sales tax on everything but food and medicine to six percent on October 1st of this year and totally eliminate the sales tax on food and medicine this year. Not the gradualist approach of the Democrats but the direct, immediate approach of the Republicans, but you don't really want relief, because you're not willing to give the money back that you're taking away from state government. The Sponsors voted for Representative McClain's Amendment. His Bill and the education Bill will take up the cost by 53 million dollars. The Sponsor voted for Representative Hanahan's Bill to hike the amount we're spending for education. Okay, show us how you can have it both ways. Show us how you have..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins, to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I urge everybody to vote 'aye'. This is really a good Bill. What we really need."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will have to concur with what Representative Robbins says. This is a good Bill. It's a good Bill to go back to your district with and say what you've done for the people and have them hope that nothing will end up... and we know that nothing will end up happening later on. What disturbs me is that we've got a number of Republicans on there who are attempting to be responsible as usual and will probably have problems getting re-elected. I would suggest that everyone...that everyone end up...everyone end up making this an absolutely nonissue by voting 'yes'. That would be my suggestion, and I hope the Members would follow that suggestion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Watson."

Watson: "Right. I've had my light on for quite a while."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you're recognized."

Watson: "Can we still vote? Did you lock it up?"

Speaker Redmond: "Let's see, did we take the record? Okay. Proceed. Explain your vote."

Watson: "I would've liked to address it and asked some questions on a Bill, but I'm go...I've got a problem with this. Particularly, because they mentioned in the Bill that it says that prescription drugs will be exempt from four percent state tax and one percent local tax, which is not true. And, I'm sure they're aware of this that tax on prescription drugs is only two and a half percent, and it's also, I'd like to have known, whether or not they have looked into the fact whether drug stores actually charge sales tax on prescription medicine? We...we do not, so what they could possibly be advocating in many instances is windfall profits for business, which I'm surprised, from that side of the aisle, that they would be advocating such a thing. But, I would've



~~liked to have voted 'aye', anyway."~~

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Hallstrom. Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I be recorded as 'aye', please?"

Speaker Redmond: "May she be recorded as 'aye'? Hearing no..."

Hallstrom: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "...objection, record her as 'aye'. Representative Reed."

Reed: "Change me to 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reed desires to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'. Does she have leave? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'no'. I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Ewing as 'no'. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, I have another issue. I want to make an announcement if I can, but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Ryan: "...I don't want to...I'll do it when you're finished..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Ryan: "...if you'll give me a chance."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? What's the count? What's the... Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, we live in a day of what's known as the living Constitution, extendable statutes, and flexible words, so...it's all right. It's very short. I'm amazed at the absolute concern of some Gentleman on the other side of the aisle for what we call trust, partnerships, doctors, and lawyers. This Bill is in the interest of no special interest group but the interest of the people at the bottom of the ladder. The deprived, the sick, the old, the children, and those who are most economically depressed. And, Gentlemen, this ought to be a 177 vote Bill, because it's the only reasonable



thing that we've done here and shame on you people who

are over there holding out for the special interests

I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 150...Representative
Yourell."

Yourell: "Change me from 'aye' to 'no'."

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

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate it if you wouldn't
recognize Representative Ray Ewell. I've heard all of
him I want to hear for one day."

Speaker Redmond: "You know it's recorded, and we're sending
a copy to you. 153 'aye', 13 'no', and the Bill having
received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared
passed. Five...2153. Representative Reilly. Oh,
pardon me. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I would like to point out that this morning I
had excused Mary Lou Kent for...excuse me...an illness
in the family. Her husband has gone through major
surgery today and has completed it. He had five
bypasses in open heart surgery. She and her son, Roger,
are here tonight, and he's doing well and coming along
fine. She wanted to make that report or wanted me to
and to let everybody know that he's coming along all
right. She's got a few more hours to wait, but hope-
fully it's going to be okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, did...Representative
Ryan, did we excuse Representative Dyer today?"

Ryan: "No, I don't think we did, but I think we should."

Speaker Redmond: "I think so, too."

Ryan: "Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer. She's sick."

Ryan: "She's sick today or we'd have passed that...2700."

Speaker Redmond: "Why do you think she got sick? 2153. Rep-



representative Reilly. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inadvertently we did not place House Bill 2155 on the Special Order of Business. With leave we'd like to place that on a Special Order of Business now by the House. Both sides concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly, do you agree with that? Do they have leave to have 2155 called on the special order? Hearing no objection, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2155. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "With leave of the House we'd like to have 2565, 2153, and 2155 all heard together..."

Speaker Redmond: "Same subject matter?"

McClain: "Same subject matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Do they have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative...2565. We haven't heard that one yet, have we?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2153. A Bill for an Act in relation to legislative budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "We're hearing three. 2153, 2155, and 2565."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2565. A Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Comprehensive Budget Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for yourself, I'll open on 2565 and Mr. Reilly would open and close on 2153 and 2155, and he would also close on 2565. Just for your own knowledge. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2565 creates the Illinois Comprehensive Budget Reform Act. It changes the date by which the Governor is required to submit his budget to the Illinois General Assembly. It'd be phased in



over a three-year period. The three-year period would be...first-year he would submit his budget February 20, 1980. That would be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981. Then the succeeding year it'd be February 11, and the following year after that it'd be February 3. The import of this reform Act is for us to create a Budget Committee. The Budget Committee would be appointed with three Members of the Majority Leadership, three additional Members and the Chairperson of the Appropriation and Revenue Committees. The Minority Party would be represented by two Members from the Minority Leadership, the Minority Spokespersons for the Appropriation and Revenue Committees and two additional Members. The import would be...we would have...the Budget Committee would submit a budget Resolution to the Body submitting available revenues, estimated expenditures, programmatic suggestions and priorities. That would be done the Friday after the Governor submits his budget. If both houses do not concur on the available appropriations for expenditure that year, then a Conference Committee would be appointed and presumably things would be worked out. If things did not work out from that Conference Committee, we would revert to the preceding fiscal year on its final budget message. Lastly, that budget...second budget Resolution would be proposed by the Budget Committee June 17, which then hopefully both Assemblies would concur with on available revenues and expenditures or appropriations. So, therefore, we would not overspend or overappropriate like we have done in the past. The purpose is that typically Governors have to us, in the General Assembly, budgeted and then when they introduced, they introduced some far greater. Plus, as we all realize, in the appropriation process and later on in the Session what we're faced with is not knowing exactly what we have indeed



appropriated or how we match up with the Governor, so this is to get the General Assembly to have a handle on what exact, this exactly is budgeted and how much available revenues we have. For instance, this Governor and it happens in every Governor, so not just Governor Thompson. This Governor appropriated or budgeted this year seven billion, eight hundred and thirty-three million, and once he introduced it, it ended up being one billion dollars more than that. His introduction level was eight billion, eight hundred million, forty-nine million, so it was one billion more than his budgetary message. This, of course, did not include like Board of Higher Education or Elementary and Secondary, and I think this gives the General Assembly an opportunity to get a handle on the appropriation process, and I would move for the success of the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bradley in the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Representative, what does this Bill do?"

McClain: "I guess I didn't explain it very well."

Ebbesen: "You sure didn't."

McClain: "It sets up a Comprehensive Budget Reform Act whereby the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, the Minority Leaders of both houses would set up a Budget Committee to review according to the Economic and Fiscal Commission estimated revenues, would then pass a budget Resolution whereby both Assemblies would try to match up our appropriation process. If the budget Resolution did not match from both houses, then a Conference Committee would be appointed by both houses to work out the differences. Then before June 17 of that appropriation year the



Budget Committee would again have to pass a final Resolution so that, hopefully, we would have any changes that would come about with like additional revenue that was...been bothering the state that we did not estimate, so it's really a budget estimate from both houses so that both Appropriation Committees would have something to match up their appropriation process."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Ebbesen: "The only heard...thing I've heard out of it is that the two things is...I heard the word Conference Committee in June, and those two words or three words frighten me. It probably is a very good piece of legislation, but...and I may...I haven't made up my mind yet whether I'm for it or against it, but it does frighten me, but if you'd explain it again sometime as you're asked some additional questions here, maybe I'll grasp it and decide whether to vote 'yes' or 'no'."

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

Leinenweber: "I have some questions for the Sponsor. Representative McClain, in the likely possibility that the two houses wouldn't get together, you say that some estimate or some number from a preceding year is used. What does that figure...what is it derived from?"

McClain: "It would revert to the last fiscal year's final budget Resolution."

Leinenweber: "In other words, the funds available for the last fiscal year?"

McClain: "No, it'd revert to the last budget Resolution passed by that Budget Committee."

Leinenweber: "Which would be for the preceding fiscal year?"

McClain: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "So, it would have no relation whatsoever then with the either the Governor's proposals, or the Governor's estimate, or the estimate of the Economic and



Fiscal Commission? Is that correct?"

McClain: "Well, obviously, it'd be a little bit lower. Yeah."

Leinenweber: "All right. Now, what happens if I, as a duly-elected Representative from the 42nd District, put in an appropriations Bill that happens to come after you have put in the appropriation Bills that total the total amount that is going to be available? What happens to my Bill?"

McClain: "Absolutely nothing. All the Budget Committee would do with that budget Resolution is inform the General Assembly as to how much money they believe is available for appropriation that year, one. Two, they would be setting up some sort of priorities. For instance, like elementary and secondary corrections, etcetera. I would..."

Leinenweber: "Would...?"

McClain: "...they would not take positions on specific Bills."

Leinenweber: "All right. Then there's nothing in the Bill or the Amendments which would eliminate in any way the right of any Member of this Body to bust that Resolution. Is that correct?"

McClain: "Yes, Sir."

Leinenweber: "All right. Now, does the provision in the Bill which was originally in there which appears to allow the Governor to introduce legislation...is that still in the Bill?"

McClain: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "How...do you think that's Constitutional? How in the world can we delegate to an Executive officer the power to introduce legislation into this Body?"

McClain: "Mr. Leinenweber, right now the Governor is...has the right to submit the budget Bills..."

Leinenweber: "He doesn't. He tries to find somebody to sponsor them, and I can tell you that there have been occasions when he has suggested ideas that he couldn't



find a Sponsor for. Now, are you saying that under your Bill that he can require a Member of this Body to introduce a Bill which might...for practical purpose...?

McClain: "It mandates that the Governor has to submit his budget by the Friday after he gives his state budget message."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just very briefly on this Bill. I...to answer Representative Ebbesen's question, this Bill is totally, absolutely useless. It's a pint or perhaps a quart of snake oil. It won't do a thing. I can just point to this very Body. About a month ago Representative Totten proposed a Resolution in line with Article 8, Section 2 of the Constitution suggesting an estimate of a revenue and the Members of the Democratic side of the aisle tore into that thing. This would be a...make it embarrassing for those of us who wanted to put in appropriation Bills which were in excess of the revenue estimate. It will do absolutely nothing. It will make the people back home think we are doing something, which is phony and false, and I urge a 'no' vote on this very bad, unconstitutional Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. McClain, did you want to close on...?"

McClain: "Mr. Reilly, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Reilly. We're taking these three Bills together now. All right. Mr. Reilly, on..."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In response to the last speaker and in closing on these three Bills, these Bills are not unconstitutional. They're not useless. In fact, they're probably the most important Bills in many ways that



we're going to consider in this Session. The guts of this Bill is to implement finally nine years late the Section of the 1970 Constitution that says that we cannot appropriate more money that we think is going to be available. We cannot spend more than we're going to take in. The difference, and Representative Totten, by the way, supports this Bill and I believe he's going to say so on an explanation of vote. The difference between the way that Representative Totten's Resolution, which I supported, was treated and what would happen under this Bill is that under this Bill we could not move to appropriations. We could not appropriate money until we had done this. It's become a cliché to say that since the 1970 Constitution was passed Governors... Governors generally have taken power from the Legislature. That cliché is not true. We have given them power by our own irresponsibility. The problem is the fact that we, in the Legislature, have not equipped ourselves to respond effectively to the executive budget concept which we now have and properly have. We have not modernized our shop in the way the Executive Branch has through the Bureau of the Budget, and that's what these Bills are all about. For the first time we will have the entire budget picture before us at two different points in the appropriation process. When we start, we will have targets to look at. Then we will go through the appropriations process, and perhaps we will pass too many appropriations, but under the terms of the Bill, before we can quit we have to pass the second Resolution which brings into conformance, either the budget Resolution, the budget total, or else requires cuts in appropriations so that the two match. Now, there's no magic formula here. These Bills by themselves will do nothing. But, these Bills with discipline and with some guts and with some foresight



on the part of the House and the part of the Senate can for the first time make us full partners with the Executive Branch. For the first time we can meaningfully talk of setting priorities. For the first time the process will make explicit what is explicit anyway. That the important questions are, number one, how big is the pie? And, number two, how should it be divided among the competing special interests who will now have to compete with themselves? I think these are very important Bills. I've been working on them for a long time. I commend Representative Madigan and Representative McClain for presenting them...for presenting their Bills and for their fairness to me in allowing these three Bills to be called together. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall these three Bills pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to explain his vote."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'aye' vote, I happen to be a Cosponsor on one of these Bills along with Representative McClain. But, I would like to acknowledge the initiation of this idea by Representative Reilly. I would like to compliment him and congratulate him upon the fine efforts that he has put into this program for the last two years and to thank him for allowing Representative McClain and myself to join with him in this effort."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook...or have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 147 'ayes', 12 'noes', 4 voting 'present', and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "My light was on, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure you could see it."



Speaker Bradley: "Explain your vote, Sir."

Barnes: "There were three Bills that were being called here together. I wanted to vote 'aye' on two of them and be recorded 'no' on one."

Speaker Bradley: "Which two, Sir?"

Barnes: "2153 and 2155, 'aye' and 'no' on 2565."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 147 'ayes', with the exception of Mr. Barnes on one Bill, and 12 'noes', and the Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. House Bill 2566."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2566. A Bill for an Act to amend various Acts to require notice of a hearing for a proposed budget or appropriation ordinance that includes property tax revenues. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2566 is a simple, straightforward Bill. It is a mandate for local governments in the State of Illinois for all local taxing units of government, but it does not limit their ability to raise taxes nor will it cost them any additional monies...additional money. The point of 2566 is a...it's a truth in taxation proposal which is meant to give local governments the opportunity and the obligation to explain intended increases in local tax rates to the people whose tax rates are being raised before the local governments impose that increase. Under the provisions of the Bill when every local taxing unit organizes its potential budget for the following year if that budget is likely other things being equal to require an increase in taxes then the budget hearing notice must so...let people know so that people have an opportunity to come and find out the explanation the government is offering for the increase...have an opportunity to object. The Bill says that the local government may not act upon



the budget until such a hearing with appropriate notification is held. It's an accountability Bill... a truth in taxation Bill. I urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will 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 168 'ayes', 3 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2567."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2567. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2567 is a companion Bill to the one we just heard, House Bill 2566, and this also is a truth in taxation Bill and provides that in all counties in the State of Illinois that state property tax receipts...or property tax receipts must show the assessment, the equalized factors imposed by the county and the Department of Local Government Affairs and the equalized assessment. But, one other thing that is just as important, House Bill 2567 provides that property tax receipts show the total tax and amounts by which the taxing body's bill would differ from the prior year. I feel that this information is extremely important for our taxpayers, again, in terms of accountability on various units of local government, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will 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 166 'ayes', 2 'nays', and one voting 'present'. The Bill having



received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed... The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, for what purpose do you arise?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, there is a major tax relief Bill that was not listed inadvertently on this Special Order of Business, and I ask leave to add House Bill 1387 to the Special Order Calendar."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any objections? We've heard objections. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Well, I don't know if I object. I'd just like to know at least a brief description of what the Bill is."

Pullen: "It repeals the inheritance tax."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's see if we...let's take that out of the record, and we'll get back to it. We'll come back to it. There have been objections heard, and maybe we can take care of those. House Bill 2032. Mr. Getty, for what purpose do you rise?"

Getty: "I have no objection."

Speaker Bradley: "No, but Mr. Yourell has an objection. So, we'll go with 2032."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2032. A Bill for an Act to change the maximum amount of an...the method of calculating the homestead exemption. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year this Legislature passed a Bill that granted a universal homestead exemption to people regardless of age of fifteen hundred dollars on increased assessment. Now, in certain areas of the state, and that's on equalized assessment. In certain areas of the state with township multipliers, state multipliers, property assessment we're running through that fifteen hundred dollars in one year or at least in two years. In Lake County, where I am, we're running through it in one year. We'll have used up that fifteen hundred



dollar homestead exemption by increases in assessed valuation. I came up with a Bill earlier this year... I came up with a Bill earlier this year that would've increased that fifteen hundred dollars to five thousand dollars. However, on further reflection. On further reflection in working with the Illinois Public Action Council, it seemed...it seemed to be more sensible to set up a permanent formula in the universal homestead exemption that would save us the need for coming back each and every year or every two or three years to raise that universal homestead exemption. But, we'd set a formula that would take care of both the senior citizens and all...people of all ages by indexing the homestead exemption on a formula that provides that to the extent that home values increase more than...the market value of home values increased more than five percent. The homestead exemption will increase to... so that the val...so that the assessments will not go up more than five percent in any year. The purpose of this is to, as I said, to prevent the necessity of us coming back every two or three years and raising the homestead exemption. We'll have with this Bill, House Bill 2032, and this was approved overwhelmingly in the Revenue Committee, a formula by which to the extent that home values increase more than five percent...the homestead exemption will be increased to eliminate the increase in assessed valuation. In other words, your assessed valuation can go up five percent a year but no more than five percent a year, and in some of our areas home values have been going up ten and fifteen percent a year. Therefore, House Bill 2032 sets up a formula that indexes and increases the homestead exemption to... as inflation increases in this country, to protect the homeowner. No commercial...no benefit to commercial... property. No benefit to industry. No benefit to



shopping centers, high rise office buildings, high rise apartment buildings. The benefit is to homeowners of all ages."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is exactly what I tried to put across on the floor of the House this afternoon when Mr. Richmond asked the State of Illinois to pick up a 10 million dollar tab to help the maintenance of the traffic signals. This is a good example of stripping some more money from local governments, and then next year we'll have to be coming back here again, and we're going to have to ask the state to pick up the difference that these municipalities...these local tax governments are going to be losing with a Bill such as this. It's just a vicious circle. You want to help the poor people back home, and then you're going to mandate programs like this on them, and then we're going to come back to the state and ask you to help us pay for what you've mandated on us this year. Anybody who votes for this Bill is...certainly doesn't know anything about economics. It sounds like one of Bowman's Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Pierce to close."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill only affects increases in assessed valuations. It doesn't reduce, in any way, assessed valuations as they currently exist. All it says is they can't go up more than five percent a year on homes. Now, if the Gentleman's worried about local government, he should've voted for McPike's personal property tax replacement Bill which passed here earlier. That will take care of local governments for all time. There's no cap on it. I can say that now. It's passed here. There's no cap on that, and as the income tax goes up, believe me that three percent income tax will take care of most of the needs of local government."



At least, to replace the personal property tax, and this Bill says that increases in assessments will not take place at more than five percent a year by providing a homestead exemption for senior citizens and people of all ages, and I ask that you support House Bill 2032."

Speaker Bradley: "I overlooked Mr. Friedrich from Marion. Sorry, Sir."

Friedrich: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Bradley: "He..."

Friedrich: "He said it didn't include high rises. What if the high rise was a condominium?"

Speaker Bradley: "Turn Mr. Pierce on."

Pierce: "The Gentleman is absolutely correct. If it's a condominium, it does benefit from it. Not a high rise rental apartment building. The landlord reaps no benefit. You collect, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 'ayes', 32 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 710. White. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

White: "Mr. Speaker, since we're dealing with taxes and tax relief, I have a Bill...House Bill 2735 that deals with that subject, and I'd like to have leave to...for that Bill to be heard."

Speaker Bradley: "We're going to take those after the call. We had objections on the last one, Mr. White. We'll go through the call and we'll come back to it."

White: "All right. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 710. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is real tax relief that we have in Sen...in House Bill 710. It allows the homeowners to deduct from their state income tax an amount equal to a hundred percent of their real property tax payments with a maximum of a thousand dollars and for renters to deduct up to 25% of their annual rent with a maximum of 750 dollars from their state income tax, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In all fairness, I would like to know what's the revenue loss of the state on this Bill?"

Ryan: "What's the question, Representative?"

Lechowicz: "My question is, what's the revenue loss of the state on House Bill 710?"

Ryan: "I don't know if there's a revenue loss, but there'll be about...somewhere between 56 and 80 million dollars."

Lechowicz: "From 56 to 80 million dollars?"

Ryan: "Somewhere in that neighborhood. Yes, that's right. Very moderate tax relief in comparison to some others we've had here today."

Lechowicz: "Now, is there any loss to...?"

Ryan: "...effect the people would have..."

Lechowicz: "Is there any loss to the units of local government?"

Ryan: Pardon?"

Lechowicz: "Is there any loss to the units of local government?"

Ryan: "No."

Lechowicz: "Well, how about one-twelfth of 80 million?"

Ryan: "Had some bad information. You're right."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just want to speak on behalf of House Bill



710, but I just wanted it for the record as far as what the possible revenue loss is to the state. I, for one, believe that the state can afford this program, and I would hope that...I know initially when the income tax was passed, it was *sancto sanctorum* that there could be no changes as far as any adjustments or any subtractions from the...from the base, and it was supposed to be a very simple and equitable tax. Unfortunately, I don't believe that that's been the case. I believe this Bill should be supported, and Representative Totten's Bill should be supported in reference to taking into consideration the unfortunate increase that we've all been exposed to in inflation. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly recommend your support of House Bill 710."

Ryan: "Thank you, Representative Lechowicz. Would you like to reconsider on the property tax freeze, too?"

Lechowicz: "I've never changed my position on that. In fact, I've got a Bill on the Calendar...in the Interim Study Commission."

Ryan: "I thought you might want to reconsider on Tom Ewing's Bill earlier today, but I appreciate your support on this."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

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

Kornowicz: "I support this Bill. The only thing...the only thing that I ask that great man from Kankakee if there's another 30 million dollars for the pothole Bill? Is there 30 million dollars available yet, George?"

Ryan: "Well, there may be 30 million available, but I don't know if it's going to be for potholes or not, Representative."

Kornowicz: "Well, we got a lot of potholes. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Do you wish to close, Sir?"

Ryan: "No, I think it's all been said."



Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and opposed
by voting 'no'. Mr. Greiman, did you want...?"

Greiman: "I had a question really about where a husband and
wife or where..."

Speaker Bradley: "Were you asking Mr. Kornowicz."

Greiman: "No, I had hoped to ask the Gentleman from Kankakee
about when there are two people living in an apartment.
Do they both get...you know, let's say they're not
filing a joint return. Do they both get the deduction,
or does just one get it, or if they split the rent,
how does that work?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think we're already past that point."

Greiman: "Okay, well then I'll vote 'no', because I can't
get any..."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his
vote."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly. You know,
I'd just like to make one observation in explaining
my vote that I'm voting against it, and that's the
reason I want to explain the vote. You know, we
talked about the outstanding balance of the state
revenue...general revenue fund right now. It being
400 or 500 million dollars is much better off than it
was a year or two ago, and that's all great, but
everybody that's gotten up...we spent that...those
dollars about 17 times in the last 24 hours, and I'd
just like to remind everybody that all that money is
not available anymore, and for that reason I'm voting
'no'."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. Mr....what's his name? Collins. Phil, what's
that guy's name behind you? Oh, Ryan. Yeah, Ryan."



I probably would've voted for this Bill, but when I was sleeping, you came by and banged on my desk so you know what you can do with your Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Just go back to sleep, Bernie. Everything will be all right."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 24 'noes', 2 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 197."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 197. 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. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 197 addresses itself to the concept of the effect of inflation on tax burdens. For ten years the State of Illinois has been a partner in reaping the harvests of a modern version of taxation without representation. The effects of inflation have made us partners rather than foes of inflation, and that partnership has resulted in a gross inequity of our state income tax system. House Bill 197 corrects that inequity. In 1969 when the Illinois income tax went into effect, a personal exemption was allowed equal to a thousand dollars. Since then, inflation has climbed at a rate of 91%, and that one thousand dollars does not buy the same things it did in 1969, and that thousand dollar personal exemption has nowhere near the same tax advantage as it did when the income tax was enacted. If the Legislature wanted today's personal exemption to give the same advantage as the one thousand dollars did in 1969, we would need to raise the exemption to \$1900 based on that 91% rise in inflation. While the



individual relief may not be significant, the present unindexed Illinois tax system results in an effective tax increase on Illinois taxpayers every year and provides a twenty million dollar windfall to the state. To correct this inequity the personal exemption should be increased to reflect the change on inflation, and this can be done very simply by multiplying the exemption each year by an inflation factor, and that's what House Bill 197 does. If the rate of inflation was seven percent this year, the...the exemption would be one thousand and seventy dollars next year and would go up by the rate of inflation each year. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would appreciate your favorable vote, and I would be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Mr. Totten, which of the major revenue producers for the state...all of the different taxes that we levy... which one would you consider to be the fairest?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Probably the cigarette tax."

Kane: "Which was that, Sir?"

Totten: "The cigarette tax."

Kane: "Is the fairest? What's the second fairest?"

Totten: "Liquor tax."

Kane: "And the third?"

Totten: "Race horsing."

Kane: "Of sales taxes and income taxes, which would you consider the fairer?"

Totten: "Both about equal."

Kane: "Why don't you index the sales tax then?"

Totten: "Next year."

Kane: "Next year." Thank you."



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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Totten's Bill. I served on the Revenue Committee when he came forth with this bold and innovative idea, and we also extracted from him an ounce of blood. He agreed that he would, in fact, one day see the light and join this pew over here and support Cook County Hospital increase ... support a cost of living increase to aid recipients, and for all of those reasons I'm going to urge my friends to give him an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten, you wish to close, Sir?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not prepared yet to commit myself on the Gentleman's proposal, but I appreciate his support on this Bill. To close, under the present unadjusted system, the state is receiving ever-expanding revenues as taxes rise automatically. No Member of the Legislature ever has to vote for the inflation tax. And, since few taxpayers understand what is happening, we are not accountable for the tax increases. We can even vote popular tax cuts that really aren't tax cuts at all since they are all set or exceeded by the increases caused by inflation. House Bill 197, this proposal, corrects that dishonesty, and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Before the Chair forgets it there's a pot of coffee right outside one of the doors, and you're welcome to come down and have some. The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, after voting for and seeing all of you vote for these Bills tonight, I want to thank you. With the home-



stead exemption, the senior citizen homestead exemption, these two income tax exemptions, and sales tax off of food and drugs, the State of Illinois is going to owe me money, and thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 'ayes', 16 'noes', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, arise?"

Yourell: "There's really no purpose. I had my light on a long time ago. You failed to recognize that, but I'm delighted to vote 'aye' for the rea...the only reasonable tax limitation and spending proposal that's been presented this Session of the General Assembly. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 44... the Republicans failed to recognize last Session, is finally becoming a reality. I'm delighted to be a part of that package."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 2148."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2148. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a...one of the series of the assessors' qualification Bills that we didn't complete, and this is the final in the series, and this sets up post-election qualifications for assessors under 25,000 population, and I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will signify by saying 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 154 'ayes', 5 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. The Bill having



received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared

passed. House Bill 2305."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2305. A Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I wonder if I might have leave of the Body to have House Bill 2305, 2306, 2307, 8 and 9 heard as a package. They are a package of Bills. They are a recommendation of the summary and findings of a special Joint Committee to investigate revenue loss in the State of Illinois. There are several Members of this Body that were involved in the task force... Representative Ewing, Representative Abramson, Representative Epton, Representative Pierce, and Representative Ralph Dunn. These are the results of the Sun Times and BGA investigation."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, we'll hear those five Bills together. Would you read ...I'm sorry, there are objections. We'll take them one a time there. Mr. Schlickman. Turn on Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I just don't want 2305 to be considered with the others."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, you want to go with 2305 and then we'll go with the other four. Is that all right?"

Schlickman: "That's all right with me."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's take 2305 now then, Mr. O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien. Turn Mr. O'Brien on."

O'Brien: "Yeah. The Clerk read 2305? Very simply, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2305 is the result of the Sun Times and BGA investigation of tax skimming in the State of Illinois and one of the most important recommendations that came out of the task force that was created, that was served by both Members



of the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle, the House and the Senate, was a Bill that would increase the statute of limitations in relation to criminal procedures taken against those who negligently or knowingly file fraudulent tax returns. Both you and I and every Member of this House are liable for criminal proceedings against us on our IRS tax returns up to three years, and we feel that anybody that is part of any tax scheming program that is going to cause the taxpayers of the State of Illinois and the State of Illinois to lose revenue, ought to be held accountable under the same laws that both you and I adhere to right now. I'd like a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion?"

O'Brien: "I'd answer any questions that anybody might have."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is ...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Are you extending the statute of limitations?"

O'Brien: "That's what the Bill says."

Beatty: "What from two years to three years?"

O'Brien: "That's correct."

Beatty: "Thank you."

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

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this...the Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 135 'ayes', 19 'noes', and 2 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now, the Gentleman has asked to hear 2306, 2307, 2308, and 2309 on one Roll Call in a package, and I...do I hear objections? Hearing none, the Clerk will read the Bills."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2306. A Bill for an Act to increase the penalties for violation of certain Acts pertaining



to revenue and taxation. House Bill 2307. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Coin Operated Amusement Device Tax Act. House Bill 2308. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. House Bill 2309. A Bill for an Act reinstating the requirement of the annual information returns to the Service Retailers' and Hotel Operators' Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of these Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, on these Bills."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd be happy to answer any questions that any of the Members might have."

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

Brummer: "Yes, I don't have a copy of the Bill in front of me. I'm looking at the Digest on 2306. The Digest indicates that there's an increase in the penalty from a misdemeanor to a Class 4 felony in certain instances. My question is, does that apply to the preparer or does that apply only to the taxpayer?"

O'Brien: "Well, the intent of House Bill 2306 is to include the individual, the CPA, or the individual who prepares the tax form fraudulently which will cause loss of revenue to the State of Illinois also to be eligible for a nice Class 4 felony so that this will prohibit them from undertaking that type of adventure. I'd like to point out to Representative Brummer that as a result of the recommendation and findings in the report eight of the ten accountants that were contacted by the mirage advocated some form of tax scheming ranging anywhere from 20 to 65% in terms of scheming."

Brummer: "I have no quarrel with providing a severe penalty for those who induce tax fraud, as I think was occurring in the mirage situation. They were actively going out and telling taxpayers how to commit fraud. My question



is and many times a tax preparer may suspect that someone is providing them questionable information. They do not know with certainty. I have no problem with providing a penalty for someone who knowingly engages in the preparation of a fraudulent tax return, but to provide the same penalty...a felony penalty for the preparer, I think, is extreme. Representative Leverenz amended his Bill previously to provide for a severe misdemeanor with regards to that. That was the most severe penalty that was available with regard to the taxpayer, and I do not think the penalty should be more severe for the tax preparer than the taxpayer."

O'Brien: "Well, in answer to Representative Brummer's question, I don't think that I know or that Representative Brummer knows any CPA's that would actually go out and advise individuals to scheme and tax cheat on their filings, but quite frankly, there are people that do exist that will go out and take a certain fee, probably a percentage of what they're able to cheat the government out of just to encourage the individuals to cut on their reporting of their legitimate income. They, also, receive a fee for their services, I indicated."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brummer, have you completed?"

Brummer: "Yes, I think the penalty on the tax preparer, and keep in mind we're affecting tax preparers all over the State of Illinois, not just those in the mirage situation who were actively going out and scheming on a percentage basis with regard to fraud, I think that penalty of a Class 4 penalty is too severe for that situation."

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

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he will."

Stearney: "My question is, is there any particular mental state required of the tax preparer before...in preparing



such a statement before he may be prosecuted and found guilty of such an offense?"

O'Brien: "Would you repeat the question?"

Stearney: "Well, let me just back track and say the criminal code in Chapter 38, Section 4-3 requires a mental state to be set forth in the Bill, and I noticed by reading this particular Act there's no mental state required here. There appears to be a deficiency."

O'Brien: "Well, quite frankly, the only deficiency appears to be a deficiency that you recognize yourself in your own mind. What we're trying to do, Representative Stearney, with this Bill..."

Stearney: "Well, no, Representative. You know, the criminal code is quite specific, and if you hope to circumvent it..."

O'Brien: "Well, what we're..."

Stearney: "...so be it, but I'm just raising this question. Okay, since you cannot answer that, my next question is..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Sir. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, on a point of order."

Kane: "This should be limited to not shouting back and forth."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll ask the Gentleman to watch his questioning, and the dialog is getting out of hand, and Mr. Stearney will, I'm sure, take care of that."

Stearney: "My next question..."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker..."

Stearney: "Speaker..."

O'Brien: "No shouting."

Stearney: "Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "May I have the opportunity to answer the Gentleman's first question."

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly. Proceed."

O'Brien: "You should take the time to read the Bill. The



Bill indicates that anybody that willfully prepares a fraudulent tax return would be liable for a prosecution of a Class 4 felony. I think that would answer his question."

Stearney: "No."

O'Brien: "It does have a mental state, also. It's on page..."

Stearney: "Well, I...disagree with you..."

O'Brien: "...2 of the Bill."

Stearney: "...because if you read page 1, lines 8 through 13, you do not come across the word, willfulness. Willfulness is used in violating any rule of the Department, and this is a statutory measure."

O'Brien: "It's on line 10, Representative."

Stearney: "My next question is, in raising..."

O'Brien: "Thank you. Thank you."

Stearney: "...the penalty from Class 4..."

O'Brien: "Did I answer your question?"

Stearney: "...in...no...no. In raising the penalty from a misdemeanor to a felony, I ask you this. Has anybody ever been prosecuted for the misdemeanor?"

O'Brien: "We don't have any results at present."

Stearney: "Well, that's my question. Why are we raising the penalty if no one's even being prosecuted for misdemeanor violation?"

O'Brien: "Because...the reason we're raising the penalty is because of the 20 million dollars in lost revenues to the State of Illinois as per the findings and recommendations of the special Joint Committee."

Stearney: "But has anybody...?"

O'Brien: "And Representative Schwartz or Eric Schwartz indicates to me that there is case law, and you're probably well aware of it, which does indicate that there have been people who have been convicted of misdemeanors for willfully misrepresenting the accurate tax returns."

Stearney: "Well, do you think that will recoup the money by increasing the penalty? And, if so then, why not



make it a Class X felony?"

O'Brien: "Next?"

Kane: "This is degenerating into a dialog. The Members should either address the Bill or sit down."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Kane, you may think this is dialog, but it's questions. It's... ~~dialog~~ *Socratic dialog.*"

Speaker Bradley: "Would you bring your questioning to a... a quick end?"

Stearney: "I have no other questions."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield to three questions?"

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

Leverenz: "Is there now...is there now a penalty for the preparer?"

O'Brien: "No, not for the preparer."

Leverenz: "If there isn't a penalty, then there is none that have been...been penalized under a misdemeanor?"

O'Brien: "No, the individuals that filed a return..."

Leverenz: "You said that there have been..."

O'Brien: "No, the individual..."

Leverenz: "...precedent cases..."

O'Brien: "You...the individual..."

Leverenz: "...when, in fact, there has been none."

O'Brien: "I'll answer that for you, Representative. The individuals that filed a return have been convicted of a misdemeanor. This Bill puts in the individual that helps prepare the tax return in addition to the individual that files the return."

Leverenz: "So, in fact, there is no penalty now?"

O'Brien: "Correct."

Leverenz: "Second question. Would it provide only under a situation where they do it for payment?"

O'Brien: "You want...you want to repeat that again?"

Leverenz: "Would it cover a situation only where they do it



for a fee or for payment, or would it also include those who give advice for free?"

O'Brien: "Well, tax preparer is defined as an individual who prepares or advises a taxpayer on the preparation of filing a return or keeping the books and records as required under this Act."

Leverenz: "For a fee and free, or one, or the other, or both?"

O'Brien: "It does not say that, but I would imagine that if someone did it for free, that they would also be liable under this Act."

Leverenz: "Would it cover...? May I have a little order, Mr. Speaker. Would it also cover any attorney that advises some member of his family then, also?"

O'Brien: "Would you repeat that, please?"

Leverenz: "Would it cover an attorney that gave information for free or for payment?"

O'Brien: "Well..."

Leverenz: "Pointedly, there are a number of ward organizations in the City of Chicago that provide free tax consultation to people in the ward."

O'Brien: "This isn't negligence. This is willful violation and misrepresentation of your tax return. This is by design. The investigative report indicated that there numerous people that were in the business of advising by design to tax scheme and tax cheat. This isn't negligence."

Leverenz: "So it could hypothetically cover a ward organization that provides free tax consultation?"

O'Brien: "I indicated that if an attorney..."

Leverenz: "I specifically...I'm sorry I interrupted you."

O'Brien: "I would indicate to you, Representative, that if an attorney indicated that he did it, and gave the advice, and helped prepare the report for free, that he probably would not be involved in a Class 4 misdemeanor...would probably not be liable...would probably not be involved



in willful misconduct and misrepresentation."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the principal Sponsor of 1703, we amended that Bill to specifically cover where a fee was paid. This could, under the Sponsor's suggestion, possibly include every ward organization in the City of Chicago that gives free tax consultation or advice. And, I would suggest a 'present' or a 'no' vote, and I'm very sorry to do that, but that provision should've been there it would only be done or it would be a violation or come into a situation where it applies where it is for payment only. Every lawyer that gives free advice will also be included under this Bill, and I would seriously ask for you to think twice before you act."

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

Borchers: "I...will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Borchers: "On House Bill 2308, right at the end it says raises license fee for certain licenses issued by Commission. I'd like to know what those particular licenses are and how much it raises them to."

O'Brien: "The license...the licenses in question, Representative, are the distributors' license, the wine makers retail license, the retail license..."

Borchers: "I don't hear what he's saying."

O'Brien: "Distributors' license, the wine makers' retail license, the retail license, the nonbeverage license class 1, 2, 3, and 4..."

Borchers: "And, how much does it raise them to?"

O'Brien: "It raises the distributors' license from 150 dollars to 300, the wine maker from 25 dollars to 50 dollars, the retailers' license from 50 dollars to 100 dollars. It is approximately a 100% increase, and the fees have not been increased in relation to this category for a good number of years."



Borchers: "In no way does this affect the homeowner? This is just for retail. It doesn't affect the homeowner that might make his own wine?"

O'Brien: "No, it would not, and I might add to you, Representative, that the additional revenue that is generated from the increase in the license fees will go into the liquor fund, which will help, we hope, to investigate the liquor industry and to clear up any problems that they may have and help administrate the law that is on the books a little bit better."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor will say 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to close."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, these are Bills that have been in this Revenue Committee, and they are a result of the investigation the special Joint Investigating Committee investigating revenue loss. All of the Bills had a full hearing in the Revenue Committee. They passed out of the Revenue Committee 23 to nothing. In relation to Representative Leverenz's concern with House Bill 2306, I might just indicate to him that there are, by design, certain tax CPA's operating in the City of Chicago that are encouraging tax skimming and tax cheating, and there are no political organizations that are advising and preparing, that I know of and I happen to be involved in a political organization, individuals that own bars, to willfully misrepresent their tax returns. I'd encourage everybody to vote 'aye' on these measures. They're good Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' All in favor will signify...the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"



Daniels: "I rise for the purpose of a division of the question, and I realize you gave leave previously, but the debate has shown that House Bill 2306, which substantially increases criminal penalties and was not suggested by the Department of Revenue, is a Bill that really should be addressed separately from 2307 and 2308. So, I would move that we divide the question and take a separate Roll Call on 2306."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien."

Daniels: "I think you just gave leave to discussing it one time."

O'Brien: "I have no problem with taking House Bill 2306 on a separate Roll Call from 2307, 8, and 9."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall 2306 pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to belabor this question, but really, you know, the Department of Revenue as charged presently has been for a long, long time with enforcing law relative to the situation that has developed with the mirage scams and so forth. Now, if we're trying to bail out the Department of Revenue, I think we ought to make that very clear. The Department of Revenue has been responsible for the enforcement of the law relative to the situation that has developed, and I think that we ought to make that very well known, and we're going to increase the penalties for these kinds of things that have been taking place, and that's going to solve the situation? No, because the Department of Revenue is the Department of Revenue. They're still obligated with the responsibility of enforcing the law. They don't do it. There's nothing that we can do. New legislation's going to determine what we're going to do with that situation, so really..."



Speaker Bradley: "Are those people bothering you?"

Yourell: "No, they're not bothering me. They never have."

They never will, because they don't know anything."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Yourell: "And, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Yes, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, to explain his vote."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'aye' vote, I wanted to comment on some of the points raised in debate. It's important to realize that there is a mental state in this Bill. You need a willful violation, and it must involve fraudulent acts. Now, the issue as to whether or not someone would be included in this Bill if he did it...prepared a tax for free, well you have to consider that for a second. If the Bill said that you had to be paid to be covered by the Act, then all the fraudulent preparer would have to say is that he did it for free, and then he would be exempt from this Act. It doesn't make sense. It...when you talk about the ward organizations throughout the City of Chicago providing free tax information for the constituents, that's fine, but that doesn't say that that activity would end under this Bill. Not at all. It's only a fraudulent willful violation of the Bill that would... of the Act that would make the Bill applicable. Thank you."

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

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In explaining my 'aye' vote, I would just like to mention that when the mirage scandal investigation broke out in the Sun Times quite a few years...quite a few months ago, everybody was aghast and asked for relief and for something to be done to rectify that particular situation, and I believe House Bill 2306 is an attempt to do that,



especially if anybody watched 60 Minutes shortly thereafter when one of the preparers who had advised one of the business people was interviewed. I think it was an incredible interview on 60 Minutes which pointed out some of the abuses which are addressed by 2306. A lot of time and consideration went into the summary, and findings, and recommendations of the Joint Committee, and I believe House Bill 2306 deserves our support, and I vote 'aye'."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're talking about some real criminals in this case, not just people who rip-off the Welfare Department for a few dollars and you make a big charge about it. We're talking about professional fees. People who make a living and who intend to make a living...who want to turn a dollar... an illegal dollar at the expense of all of the people of the State of Illinois. These are what are known as white collar criminals, and they, too, deserve to go to jail. Now, theirs is not just a crime of accident or a crime of chance, but it is an intentional and deliberate crime which we will find to be repeated over and over and over again. And, if we are to test our sincerity in the prosecution of crime...if we are to measure it against the equality in the prosecution of crime, then this Bill would get about 150 votes simply because..."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that this kind of Bill is going to have to be passed if we're going to have any effective enforcement of the Income Tax Act. As a misdemeanor, there is an eighteen-month statute of limitations as a practical manner. By the time the return gets in and is audited,



the period is already passed, and so there's no enforcement. Even with this Bill in effect, the federal statute of limitations is five years with regard to criminal prosecution. This Bill would only make it three years. As the penalty similarly for a violation of the federal Income Tax Act for a criminal violation, is already a five year penalty and is already longer than the penalty that would be provided here in Illinois as a Class 4 felony raising it from a misdemeanor. Accordingly, it seems to me that the last speaker's suggestion that if we're serious about doing something about white collar crime, that we pass this Bill is entirely correct, and I would urge an affirmative vote."

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

Deuster: "The only reason I'm explaining my vote is I'm a little fearful that some of the proponents might talk this up. What is wrong with this Bill, if you read the Bill, is it could make a person guilty of a felony for signing a piece of paper without having a criminal intent. It does not say that you sign a return fraudulently. It does not say that you sign a return knowing that it's false or intending to deceive anyone. It just says if you sign it. Now, the...I think the Sponsors have a good idea and are well motivated, but the Bill is poorly drawn, and I think that's why so many people are properly voting either 'present', so as to indicate you're not against the punishing bad people or red against the Bill, which is just poorly drawn and could result in either a court construing the law to be unconstitutional and unenforcible or putting innocent people...or making innocent people guilty of a felony."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraedery to explain his vote."



Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we've done a lot of things today. Mainly, we've tried to ease the burden on the taxpayer, and I'm speaking about the little guy on the low totem pole and the guy on the top. We've eased the burden for the taxpayer. But, here now we have someone who willfully cheats the state out of the state tax. Now, it seems to me we have to stop that. If we can stop this willful evasion of taxes, we can help this...the guy that's paying his tax, and I think this is an extremely good Bill and the Representative that worked so hard on this to correct an evil certainly deserves 89 votes, and I would say give it to him."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 72 'ayes' and 31 'nays', 45 voting 'present'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Now, we'll go to 2307, 2308, and 2309. The question is, 'Shall those Bills pass?' All in favor will signify by...will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed signify by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this...on this question there's 138 'ayes', 9 'noes', 10 voting 'present', and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared...are hereby declared passed. House Bill 513. Whoever is in charge of the coffee, we need more in the hall."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 513. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, House Bill 513 is one of the two Bills alive on the floor of the House that amends the state school aid distribution formula. House Bill 513 is, I believe, the most equitable of the two



Bills...the more equitable, if you will. It is, I believe, an affordable program for state school funding for the coming fiscal year. It is the only Bill of the two Bills here that reaches to help all school districts in the State of Illinois, not just some of the school districts. It addresses a number of important and crucial issues raised by educators in this state. It addresses the issue of negative adjustments on state school aid, of access tax rates, if you will, which, in effect, is a formula change that will provide tax relief at the local level by not making school districts provide such high tax rate to reach maximum state aid. It provides an increase in the guarantee per pupil from thirteen hundred and ten to thirteen hundred and sixty-three dollars in the coming fiscal year. It deals with the Title I factor in terms of the bottomweighting that will help many, particularly the downstate school districts in the urban areas, and it helps. And, it is the only Bill that helps the 229 districts out of 1,013 that continue to receive their state school aid under the old Strayer-Haig formula option. I would point out to the Membership that there remains 48 Strayer-Haig districts in suburban Cook County alone. On the other side of the aisle in Representative Ebbesen's district, there are 13 Strayer-Haig districts. In Representative Ropp and Vinson's district there are 23. In Representative Reilly's, 6. In Representative Johnson and Wikoff's district, 11. In Representative Ewing and Hoxsey's district in one county alone there are 20 Strayer-Haig districts and 13 in another. In terms of the Strayer-Haig districts, I reiterate, it is the only Bill that helps those districts. I would point out as well and reiterate that there is an equation between local tax relief and the formula provisions of this Bill by providing more money at the state level that I believe to



be affordable. I would point out as well that it is the only district (sic) that helps every downstate school district. It is fair to Chicago and the suburbs as well... It provides the City of Chicago school district with basically the same amount of formula funds as a percentage of all school funds as have been provided consistently in '76, '77, and '78...31% of the funds. I know there's much talk on the floor tonight about the available balance in the state, but I would point out again that last year on May the 21st there were 197 million dollars in available balance funds in general revenue. This year in contrast to 197 million there are 470 million dollars on May 21st. There are 89 million dollars in other special funds, and last year there were only 39. That's 323 million dollars in increased fund balances over last year. Many have talked about the priority of funding education. This Bill will go a long way to do that. It will go a long way to see to it that we don't go back to the local property taxpayer in the coming fiscal year to ask for more funds. So, I urge you, for the reasons I have cited, to vote and vote affirmatively on House Bill 513."

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

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "What is the total cost of your package?"

Stuffle: "The total cost of the package? Well, I can speak..."

Friedrich: "Well, I want the year. I mean what'll be the total expenditure under your plan?"

Stuffle: "Under this Bill the total expenditure would be \$1,431,000,000. \$1,431,751,000."

Friedrich: "I think it's near a billion and a half, but anyway compare it...now, I know we're discussing your Bill and not the Hoffman Bill, but we're...we're going



to be discussing both. What is your estimate of the difference between your total and the Hoffman Bill?"

Stuffle: "The difference as the Bill is amended..."

Friedrich: "In dollars."

Stuffle: "The difference as the Bill is amended is about 23 million dollars difference between the two Bills."

Friedrich: "Well, somewhere I'm getting some wrong figures, because I think there's about a hundred million dollars difference."

Stuffle: "Between the two Bills? Is that your question?"

Friedrich: "Yes."

Stuffle: "Representative Hoffman's Bill cost a billion four hundred and eight. This Bill costs a billion four thirty-one."

Friedrich: "He tells me you're right. Thank you."

Stuffle: "Thank you."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill spoke accurately. He's right. We need a downstate vehicle alive so that we can insure that our interests are taken care of equitably, and I urge a favorable vote on this Bill."

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

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill is 65 million dollars over what the Governor says we can afford, and I feel it's much too early in the game to be starting out at this level. Therefore, I urge all the Members of the House to vote 'no' on this."

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

Daniels: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question I think. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion ...let's hold that motion for one minute. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and



Gentlemen of the House. I won't take much of your time, but the Sponsor of House Bill 513 has accurately indicated to you the contents of the Bill and the cost, and true it is 23 million dollars higher than House Bill 1742. I would like to point out to the Members of the House that House Bill 513 embodies all three factors developed by the School Problems Commission dealing with the inflationary issues in the school increasing the thirteen ten guarantee to a higher number. Ours went to thirteen fifty-eight. He went a little higher than that. Most significantly, I think, in his Bill, he has included the elimination of over-underpayment adjustments or what we call O adjustments and phase it in over two years which in terms of the cost is reasonable. Also, he has stretched out the access issue not to the four years that we suggested but to the three years and that does not make a significant difference. The increased cost in his Bill is found in additions of five million dollars cost to Strayer-Haigs and about six million in moving the waiting up and increasing the dollar amount by about five dollars. This Bill, 1513 (sic), has a very good foundation. It's built on the Commission proposal. I think that financial support of our schools is too important an issue to get involved in Sponsorship squabbles. Those of us who have been here any length of time at all know that history will little note nor long remember that we were here or what we did here. School Problems Commission attempts to approach the problems, not as a partisan issue, but as a school problem, and I certainly have nothing...or no intention of doing anything here tonight to suggest anything different. I am going to vote for House Bill 513, and I'm not going to call the Commission Bill... House Bill 1742, because, in fact, it's embodied in House Bill 513. When the appropriate time comes, I will



request that House Bill 1742 be placed on the Spring Calendar."

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

Stuffle: "In the spirit of compromise with which Representative Hoffman made those very fair and equitable remarks, I would ask leave of the House to add Representative Hoffman as a hyphenated principal Sponsor of House Bill 513."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine gesture, and it will so be recorded. As you heard Mr. Stuffle to close...or the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'aye'...or opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Yes, just to clear up one misconception. This Bill is not 65 million dollars above the Governor's level. The Governor did not break out his education funding amount. It is 65 million dollars above last year's amount. It is nowhere close or could it be to 65 million dollars above whatever the Governor may in the ultimate end decide to put into the school aid formula."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 153 'ayes', 11 'noes', 4 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hoffman, on 1742. Now, Sir, did you want to...? What was your druthers, Mr..."

Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave of the House to place House Bill 1742 on the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, we'll place it on Interim Study, and Mr. Jones wishes to be recorded as 'aye' on 513. House Bill 22...Spring Calendar, I'm sorry...on 1742. House



Bill 2201."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2201. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2201 is the common school fund appropriation. It's 1,434,451,000. I believe the Bill was adequately discussed yesterday when we amended the appropriation, and I would move for its passage."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After all that has been said and done the earlier part of this evening, hopefully some of us can return back to a little bit of sanity, and I would ask again that those individuals that are somewhat concerned over the total budget process, and although we did what we did on other Bills we know that education is going to end up coming back for some kind of final Resolution. The other Bills that walked off to wherever they walked off to probably never to be heard of again. But, this one will come back, and this one is important, and it's important, I think, that we establish some posture for some fiscal responsibility and restraint in this particular area. I would not ask the Members to vote 'no' on 2201, but I would ask that they cast their 'present' votes on 2201 to indicate, at least, our intention to do what we can to bring the total amount down. It is now 57 million real dollars over what we have allotted for education, not the monopoly money, not the political money we played around with in the other Bills, not the rhetoric money, not the public relations money, but real cash



that we're going to have to end up spending, and we ought to start being serious about this one, and I would respectfully request the Members to vote 'present' on this Bill."

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

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I had just one question for the Sponsor. Represent..."

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

Leinenweber: "Representative McClain, is this the type of Bill that wouldn't be introduced if your budget reform Bill was law?"

Peters: "Harry, all I could say to you is I'm sorry that I didn't vote for your landfill Bill."

Leinenweber: "You should be."

Peters: "I'll give it a hearing."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McClain, to explain his vote."

McClain: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just for your edification, you just passed out House Bill 513. House Bill 513, especially for those of you that voted for 513, without this appropriation, 513 is meaningless. This is the appropriation for the substantive Bill that you did pass out. For those of you that are following Mr. Peters' suggestion, this is the appropriation by which Mr. Peters is interested in negotiating on. The Comptroller's available balance now on May 17, 1979 is 430,226,000. May 17, 1978 it was only...it was 172 million. Some 208...250 million dollars better off than we are...we're better...250 million dollars better off this year than we were last year. So, because of that, I think that, especially you folks that voted 'aye' on 513, you ought to be



aware that without this appropriation all those substantive changes that were made on your Strayer-Haig districts and resource equalizer districts would be meaningless, and I'd ask for you to reconsider and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, to explain his vote." Mr. Ryan. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor has incorrectly stated a situation on the available balance of state government, and I repeatedly hear that coming from the other side of the aisle. Quite frankly, after tonight's actions on tax relief there is no available balance. But, more importantly, they are overlooking the fact that there are two large state payments that have to be paid. One on special education and the two payments that have to be made in June on the education fund, and that available balance is going to be down under a hundred million dollars. There is no four hundred and some odd million dollars available balance. They know that. They ought to recognize it, and they ought not to use the false rhetoric to try and get support for a Bill that, at this price tag, doesn't merit the favorable consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Mr. Totten knows that obviously if last year there was only 155 million in the bank in surplus and now there's over 400 million dollars, and we made the same payments last year that we make this year that we would've been bankrupt to the tune using his argument of over 150 million dollars had that been the case, and it obviously is not. Representative McClain indicated well that if you voted for 513; if you don't vote for this, you're simply saying I voted to distribute



the money, but I'm not voting for the money. And, I reiterate that the balance is there. The balance is \$323 million dollars above last year in all funds on May the 21st. And, if his argument were true, we would not be in business today, because we would've gone out of business last year."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, to explain his vote. The Lady...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, if this gets 89 votes, I want to ask for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, Sir. All right. The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's interesting to hear the Minority Spokesman for the Appropriation II Committee tell us tonight how much this is above the Governor's budget. The Governor, I thought, indicated all along that he was not going to allocate the distribution of the education dollars. He was, instead, giving only the bottom line, and while it may be true that this will end up being above the Governor's appropriation, this Bill in and of itself does not exceed that limit. I think those of you who are listening to that line of argument need to realize that the education community has been given the responsibility for paring down their requests. We are attempting, as the Democratic Membership of the House, to come to a compromise between what the Governor's Office has indicated is available and what the educational community indicates their needs to be. There is the money to fund this. We have passed the formula that is going to require this amount of money. I urge you to vote in support of this measure. We need to provide the funds for our local school districts."

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



Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really don't know why we're voting any other way but green. My red vote up there does not reflect my feeling on this Bill, because when we voted on 513, you've got to realize my colleagues from the 8th District voted 'aye' on 513 as did I, and if you want to vote for the substantive, you ought to really vote to be responsible fiscally to vote for the appropriation to make 513 possible. I'm delighted, and privileged, and honored to vote for...for this Bill, 2201, and I would ask that Representative Huskey and Representative Barnes vote likewise."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'ayes' and 21 'nays'. Well, Mr. Telcser had asked for a verification. Do you persist, Sir?"

Telcser: "Yeah. Hey, is..."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 91 'ayes' and 21 'nays', and they're all here. Art, do you persist or not? Oh. Mr. Stanley..."

Stanley: "Yeah..."

Speaker Bradley: "...for what purpose do you...?"

Stanley: "I'd like to be recorded as voting 'present', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. There are 90 'ayes' and 21 'nays'. Mr. Boucek, for what purpose do you rise?"

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, would you vote me 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Please record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. Art. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Please change me to 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Lady as voting 'present'. There are...the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, for what purpose do you rise?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, if there aren't 89 votes, would you poll the absentees, please?"



Speaker Bradley: "All right. We're at 89 votes right now. 89 'ayes'. Whatever the nay says, Art, do you persist in..."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Poll the absentees. Can Mr...Art, can Mr. Van Duyne be verified now? All right. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt. Dyer. Pullen. Schlickman. Walsh. And, J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Bradley: "Call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Balanoff. E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Preston. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Kulas. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Henry. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the affirmative?"

Telcser: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Brummer. Is he in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Darrow... Representative Brummer just returned to the chambers, so put him back



on the Roll. Now, Representative Darrow. Is he in the chamber? How's he recorded?

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: "He just walked down the aisle."

Telcser: "Representative Farley."

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

Telcser: "Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Garmisa is in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Getty."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Getty's in the aisle."

Telcser: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm..."

Telcser: "Greiman."

Speaker Bradley: "Greiman? He's on your side."

Telcser: "Representative Huff."

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

Telcser: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "He's back conferring with Matijevich."

Telcser: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Kane is conferring with the press."

Telcser: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Bradley: "He's been here. Representative Marovitz.

Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How's he recorded?

He's here."

Telcser: "There he is. Representative McGrew."

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

Telcser: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Bradley: "Mulcahey is in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "He just walked in."

Telcser: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "Laurino? Is Mr. Laurino in the chambers?

How's he recorded?"



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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "That's it, Mr. Speaker. You took off two Members."

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

Lechowicz: "Well, how am I recorded?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, you took off two..."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Here is Mr. Laurino and Mr. Darrow, the two that you took off. They're back on...put them back on, and that...we have...what's the count, Mr. Clerk? There are 89 'ayes', 21 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2649."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2649. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for grant-in-aid and the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry...for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, rise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, for the poor people back home and for the good of the taxpayers, I move we adjourn. We just passed a Bill for a formula and then we refuse...we're refusing to pay for it."

Speaker Bradley: "No, we paid for it, Sir."

Conti: "Now, we paid for it, but we pay for it the hard way."

Speaker Bradley: "We're moving..."

Conti: "For the good of the people, I move we adjourn.. Let's come back tomorrow morning."

Speaker Bradley: "We're moving along very nicely. We don't have very many more Bills. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, on 2649."

Hanahan: "Yeah, we got a little bit more, Representative Conti. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2649 was amended very drastically. The Bill as presently before you reflects about 275 million...900 million in



the mandated GRF funds of the grant programs for special ed, private tuition, extra services, specialized personnel, orphan tuitions, deaf-blind centers, visual materials, regular transportation and school foods. For the other general revenue fund operations and other grants, we have in this Bill presently before us a total of \$87,852,800, and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Mr. Peters, the Gentleman from Cook."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Hanahan by his Amendment to this Bill did bring this Bill down by 49.2 million dollars. Again, a much more realistic approach. I know some of the Members have looked at that Amendment. They are in... ranging from total agreement with what Representative Hanahan says to partial agreement on various of the issues. I would suggest to the Membership on our side of the aisle and for those who are interested that at least from out point of view that the Amendment is in order. At least from the dollar point of view. We might have disputes in terms of the dollar amounts on the particular line items. There's been a question as to whether textbook has gone down too far, whether gifted has gone down too far, and a few other items which are of concern to some Members. My suggestion on that would be to those Members who are in... basically in agreement to a vote in favor of the Bill. It does bring it down, as I said, by 49.2 million. Those who have objections to particular line items probably will vote 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Do you wish to close? If not, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will 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 we

have 123 'ayes', 12 'no', no; 124 'ayes', 12 'nays'.
This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is
hereby declared passed. House Bill 2650."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2650. A Bill for an Act making
appropriations to the State Board of Education. Third
Reading of the Bill."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.
2650 is part of a package of four Bills which I explained
in the Second Reading level. It's a...an attempt to
evaluate programs in the area of resources and objectives
and eventually and hopefully to see how those resources
and objectives are used. I know it's a minimal budgeting
tool, but it's one that I think we need as Legislators.
Basically, my aim in putting together four Bills was to
make a decision as a Body as to whether or not we have
reached the child that we have targeted for...various
kinds of programs. So, this proposal...the first of the
four, deals with the school aid formula. It contains
the same dollar total of that of Representative McClain's
Bill, and I would ask for its passage."

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

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Yourell: "In the suburban districts I represent, what would
be the percentage of increase and decrease in dollar
amounts?"

Schneider: "The...I don't have the printout, Bus. I think
you saw it and have maybe some information on it that I
don't have right before me, so on that question, I
think, you have that information. I don't have it right
here."

Yourell: "Would then there be a decrease in dollar amounts
from 1978 to the 1979-80 budget in dollars available



to those school districts, or would you suggest that

in the main that there would be an increase?"

Schneider: "I think uniformly it would have to be an increase because of the Stuffle Amendment. Now a lot of the suburban schools have experience varying problems and it's hard to say, you know, uniformly as to how districts will benefit or suffer. My guess is the majority of those will benefit."

Yourell: "In the suburban school districts that...in southwest suburban Cook County, would this be the best state aid appropriation Bill that we could vote on?"

Schneider: "Absolutely."

Yourell: "I'm delighted to vote 'aye'."

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

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting...I'm sorry. I thought you spoke on this one. This is a different one? Okay. Mr. Peters."

Peters: "This is another one, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for the attention. Again, Mr. Speaker, the same argument I would make on this Bill, at least for the Members on this side of the aisle as was made on Representative McClain's Bill so that we can draw a clear distinction. I would trust that the Members that are concerned with the fiscal end of it vote 'no' or 'present', preferably probably 'present' on this Bill as presented by Representative Schneider."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr...the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 89 'ayes', 13 'nays', 68 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2651."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2651. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."

This Bill, now H. 2651, deals with special ed transportation, private tuition, extraordinary services, and other GRF mandates. The totals once again are identical to 2649. However, it is the proposal that deals with what, I think, are mandates that can be more accurately calculated than other types. I would ask for its passage."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would just make the same statement in regard to all of the following Bills that come up by Representative Schneider. Let the individual Members be guided by their best instincts and conscience. It does not appear that it's going to make too much difference in the long run in regard to these Bills, anyway."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Sorry, Mr. Speaker. We do need one more vote to...thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Marovitz wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Okay. The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 89 'ayes' and 18 'noes', 59 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2690."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2690. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2690 deals with operations and other grants."



Included in the proposal are the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Office of Education, Adult Ed, Bilingual, Voc Ed, Tech, Truants, and others. It's a reduction from my Bill basically across the board. It increases from last year. I would ask for your, again, favorable vote."

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

Johnson: "To those of us who still recognize the first Amendment, is there anything in here for aid to parochial schools or textbooks?"

Speaker Bradley: "Turn Mr. Schneider on."

Schneider: "Textbooks, Representative, . . . 22 percent increase over last year to 11 million dollars."

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 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "...point out to the Members of the House that the Mayor of the City of Chicago has called a special emergency Session to appropriate funds to bail out the state. It's a unique position, and we appreciate her help."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain your vote."

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. . . . did I understand the Sponsor of the Bill indicate that there was an increase in the appropriations for textbooks for private schools?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schneider."

Yourell: "Text...yeah."

Schneider: "The increase was 22.2 percent."

Yourell: "Twenty...an increase of 22..."

Schneider: "That's right."

Yourell: "Twenty-two percent?"

Schneider: "Over last year. Right."



Yourell: "Is that right?"

Schneider: "That's absolutely..."

Yourell: "Twenty-two percent, Sir?"

Schneider: "The President hasn't talked to me either."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk wasn't fast enough. Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Just to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker and Members. Of course, as you...no, he hasn't taken the record. Well, you want to be concerned about, I think, in part as you look at budgeting is that there are programs that need to be evaluated, and I appreciate the...those of you who are exercising that freedom right now. More importantly, I think you ought to be aware of the need to send the Bill to the Senate to see what kinds of objectivities they can bring to light on their evaluation of these programs. I think it's a good concept. You're voting for that more than the dollar question, and I would solicit two more votes."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brummer wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. What's the count now, Mr. Clerk? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a conflict, because I have a lot of children who benefit from the textbooks in these appropriations, but I would like leave to vote my conscience. I would like to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 89...Mr. Mautino wishes to be recorded as 'aye', and on this question there are 90 'ayes', 21 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2691."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2691. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Schneider: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. This is the last in a package of four. This total is, again, identical to that of Representative Hanahan's Bill. It's ones that we don't have much adjustments to...many adjustments, rather, to make because the money is allocated by the feds. We have to appropriate it. It's money that is yet to arrive. We do not know what the exact expenditures will be, but I do, again, ask for your favorable support."

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

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I just had a question of the Sponsor. Did I read this correctly that the Bill originally appropriated one million dollars and then Amendment #1 raised that to 774 million? Is that correct?"

Schneider: "This Bill?"

Leinenweber: "Yeah."

Schneider: "My original figure, Harry, was 773,473,401."

Leinenweber: "But the original Bill is introduced was 1,100,000. Right?"

Schneider: "That was my shell Bill. I'm sorry. Thank you."

Leinenweber: "Okay. I just wanted to point out to the Members that the Bill...Amendment #1, which apparently was adopted in Committee, did raise this from 1 million to 774 million."

Schneider: "A small jump."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 21 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2208."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2208, a Bill for an Act authorizing fiscal assistance promote cultural and racial integration. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines. Just a minute, Mr. Gaines. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, arise?"

Peters: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; if the Chair would extend it to me. And that's just to thank the Members who did vote present on the two Distributive Formula Bills. I know it was difficult for a lot of Members to make that vote. I appreciate their assistance and their support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill authorizes the State Board of Education, the Illinois Office of Education, to make expenditures to aid local school districts to comply with the desegregation decision. Many of you probably have been reading in the paper that it's the 25th anniversary of the Brown vs. Board of Education Decision where the Supreme Court, which was bipartisan Supreme Court, a Republican Chief Justice, gave a unanimous decision declaring desegregation to be the law of the land. And this merely authorizes the Illinois Office of Education and the State Board of Education to expend funds to help local school districts to comply with this Supreme Court decision and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Is this to pay for busing for desegregation?"

Gaines: "This is to help the school districts do whatever they want..."

Friedrich: "... Does it include busing across town?"

Gaines: "There's nothing specifically designated as a way of



doing it. The local school district is expended funds..."

Friedrich: "Can it be used for busing?"

Gaines: "It can use anything the local school district feels necessary to comply with the Court Order."

Friedrich: "Well, may I speak on the Bill then?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Friedrich: "I don't think you really have a choice because the man from Massachusetts will be telling you what to do, that's what he did in our town. We've already spent about \$5,000,000 trying to placate him and now it's come up, we have to take all the kids from the 5th grade down out of a school, even though they don't want to go, including the Blacks, and I tell you, anything that has to do with segregation for transportation purposes I'm opposed to."

Speaker Bradley: "Sit down, so we can see Mr. Friedrich. Thank you. I'm sorry, Mr. Friedrich. Go ahead. Proceed. Are you finished?"

Friedrich: "Well, I am.. if I knew how to finish with Mr. Cronin and his bureaucrats, I'd do it. But I don't know how. But I'm not going to promote it with this Bill."

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

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates that he will."

Anderson: "Mr. Sponsor, does the Legislation include any requirements in order to receive funds? "

Gaines: "No. There was a provision in there that says that half of this money, half of the expense, in districts, most of whom are down-state, that have already complied with the State's desegregation plan."

Anderson: "I see. Well then, a district must submit a proposal to receive funds, but it doesn't have to include any specific date at all, just a proposal. "

Gaines: "This can be used to help them draw up a plan."

Anderson: "I see."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage,



Mr. Schneider arise?"

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, the issue is a critical issue. I think it's an injustice to the Sponsor to have the dive-bombers out this early. I think it's fair just to give him a shot on the issue. If we disagree we have a way to vote on that and I think that's the way to do it, rather than to begin a less than subtle form of badgering. I, at least, would like to listen to it."

Anderson: "Well, let me go on with my questions. Well, the absence of any rules then Mr. Sponsor, or regulations or requirements for the proposal would make it difficult, won't it, for the State Superintendent to determine which district should receive any funds."

Gaines: "Well, that is part of the State Board of Education's job."

Anderson: "Yes, but you don't give him any guidelines in the Legislation to set-up, to distribute the funds. This is what I can't understand. And until you do that Mr. Sponsor, I'm afraid I'm going to have to vote present on this."

Gaines: "...Part of it, part of this will be to advise staff to give us technical assistance and not just giving money out 'willy-nilly'. This is not designed to be giving money out 'willy-nilly'."

Anderson: "Well, that's the way I read the Legislation, though."

Gaines: "Well, that's not what the Legislation says."

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

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The hour is getting nigh and biologically we have all probably degenerated to something less than that cruelty to animal Bill that Representative Schneider proposed the other day. I think Representative Gaines deserves consideration on the matter. The matter deals with an issue that is probably more crucial than anything we have discussed here this evening. And that is a matter of education. I think if you take a look at House Bill 2208 you'll see that



this Bill in and of itself, will aid the State of Illinois to meet an obligation that it presently has under Federal mandate, not necessarily by choice of this Body, but by choices of bodies in Washington. At present there are about 6 districts in the State of Illinois that are under litigation, 44 districts in the State of Illinois are attempting to the best of their ability and resources to comply with Federal fiat. Representative Gaines alluded to the Brown vs. Board of Education Supreme Court decision which we all have attempted in some small way in the last 25 odd years to uphold. I think that you do yourselves a disservice, and certainly you do the constituents of your district a disservice, when you make a mockery of the issue of integration. I submit to you today that whether you do it here or not in these Chambers, it shall be done for you in Washington D. C. and once again you will yield to the degree of moral bankruptcy that this country underwent for 25 years. I see no mockery in the matter. I see it of grave seriousness because the only thing, as has been said in these Chambers before, that is more expensive than education, it is ignorance, which perpetuates our prisons and perpetuates our welfare roll. I submit to you today that this Bill is far reaching and it will attempt in small measure to help us meet our Constitutional obligation. I stand and rise in support of Representative Gaines' Bill and I would hope that all progressive thinking individuals from both sides of this aisle will support him. It is probably the most significant piece of legislation that we've dealt with this evening because it deals with the youth of our society and the minds of our young people who are trying to grow-up in bi-racial in a progressive society. We digress when we make mockery, when we make light, when we act facetious about the matter of education and the integration of our society. And I respectfully and urge that we support House Bill 2208."



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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall the main question be put: All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines to close the debate."

Gaines: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Many of you have various ideas about desegregation. But it's the law of the land and you can play ostrich if you want to, but the longer the State takes to take action, the more likely it is for the Federal Government to step in and order what you don't want. So I'm going to ask for a favorable Roll Call in order to keep the Federal Government from doing more of what you say you don't like."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year two years ago when Representative Emil Jones had the Title One Funds there were a lot of us that ended up supporting him so that the proper Federal dollars would in fact follow the child for education. There are a lot of us that are very much interested in this particular topic. A lot of us interested in solutions to this topic that does not involve actions in communities which all of us may be ashamed of. I certainly understand the intensity of the remarks made by Representative Bullock and the dedication of Representative Gaines and others on this particular issue. But let me also suggest that there are individuals who feel as you do but who have different approaches, or different answers as to what we should be doing. I have supported in the past FEPC Legislation, EO Legislation and other Legislation, one piece of Legislation that I have not supported and have never supported and cannot support now, is any Legislation which would involve the



mandatory busing of children from one place to another.

I don't think that accomplishes anything; I think that causes tension in communities that we should not have. I think it brings children into the battlefield of racial tension, into the battlefield that should be settled by discerning adults. I suggest to no one how they should vote on this. I just wanted..."

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

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'no' vote I think that this issue of integration is just a dead horse and it's not going to do us any good to kick it for the next 25 years, or the next 25 minutes. I wonder, I feel that the issue is as anachronistic as the dodo bird and it's not going to do our kids any good to bus them, or to have them spending half the day on a bus going out as far as the far reaches of the metropolitan stretches of the government, of the county. I think that what we should be concerning ourselves on quality education and we're not going to get it on a bus. Our kids can't read now for that very reason. I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, I fully agree with the last two speakers. I'd like to point out in a sense it's a reverse discrimination. All it will do is cause trouble in the various communities. And I certainly suggest a 'no' vote."

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

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The obviousness of one very simple fact that is before us and that is school districts that have gone to the compliance route, have gone the compliance route consistent with American traditions of equality of education for all children are being penalized if we deny them a chance to share in some of the



monies that were passed out just a few minutes ago in both Bills. All I'm suggesting to you is no matter what your attitudes are about future references to integration or racial balance or questions of culture, those to me are almost irrelevant in the face of the fact that many communities dealt with the hardship; they dealt with what they considered a hardship, but when people were given the opportunity to face that challenge, they did it. What we're saying to them, to the places like Alton and Springfield, to Cairo and other communities throughout the State of Illinois, we realize it cost almost all of you about \$500,000, but because you complied with the law and because you adhered to what we consider the principles of our culture,....."

Speaker Bradley: "The Timer's on. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Very briefly Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to share with you a personal experience. When I was coming up in the school system of the city of Chicago, I was bused. But I was bused in another way than the way that most of us think about the issue now. There was a white school four blocks from where I lived. But instead of allowing me to attend that school, that high school, I was forced to attend school across town, so that I could go to a school that was black, so that I would be denied the opportunity to participate in the educational opportunities that were nearest to my home. The real issue here is one of quality education. Busing is no more and no less than a solution to that problem. It is not a perfect solution. But this issue, the issue raised by this Bill, is not one that relates just to busing, but rather, to fund the efforts of school districts to address the problem that we have defin.." (Timer)

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

Katz: "When I grew up in Nashville, Tennessee, we rode one bus,



the whites rode in the front of the bus and the blacks rode in the back of the bus. There's nothing in this Bill that provides that any of the money is supposed to go a particular way. It simply provides for cultural integration and that kind of thing. A lot of the Members of the House, including myself, are very skeptical of busing. If the Sponsor would like to take his Amendment, his Bill back, and specifically exclude the use of these funds for busing, I think that he could do so and that the Bill might pass the House. But unless he gets 70 votes as I recall the rules, the Bill cannot be put on Postponed Consideration. I hope that enough Members will vote for this Bill so that he can get 70 votes so he can take it back to Second Reading, add an Amendment to specifically prohibit the use of any of this money for busing and at least have the money available for many useful and necessary functions that are needed in order to have equality in our schools. And so I would urge enough 'aye' votes for that purpose."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I would join in asking that 70 people vote for this to give the Sponsor that opportunity. There certainly are many many instances where this kind of integration can be achieved without busing. In my own District, the people from IIT who didn't want to send their children to the Douglas School, three blocks away, went down town and got a special provision so they could send them to South Commons. The people from Lawn Grove had 'Dan Levin', a very influential developer who didn't want their kids to school to the school they were supposed to send them to, so they got a special re-districting and sent them to South Commons. People at Prairie Shores didn't want to walk across the streets, across King Drive, to Douglas, to the Drake School. They said that was a black school and they didn't want to go there."



So they got a re-districting. All their kids had to do was walk across the street. There are all kinds of studies we could do to find out how we could have cultural and racial integration without busing. And I think the Sponsor would be delighted to put that kind of Amendment on so we can find out how to do it; how to give children these opportunities. You know, a lot of people came to Springfield to the Legislature and discovered that people who speak Polish, and people who had difficulty..." (Timer)

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

Taylor: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I rise to solicit your support for this measure. I've been reading the Bill and I don't see where it says this money is going for busing, even though a lot of people here tonight have alluded to that. And I am particularly surprised that many of my friends from the city of Chicago that are not voting for this type of Legislation. It's important to all of us that you join with us tonight and show your good faith in terms of trying to help us pass this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I have voted consistently against some of the excessive increases in funds that we have had tonight. Now, I am voting for this Bill and I urge several others of you to give Charlie enough votes to put him up to 70 on Postponed Consideration because we want to develop this to where they are all American and we are working all together and it don't make any difference whether you bus, whether you ride a horse, or whether you walk, as long as you're proud to be an American. It don't make any difference what color your skin is, or where you live. Now, let's give Charlie 12 more votes so he can put it on Postponed Consideration."

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



Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that Representative Taylor is absolutely correct in reference to this Bill. I believe that if you're going to promote any type of harmony, not only in this State, but in this country, you're going to have to start with the generation of students in promoting harmony and really explaining the greatness of this country. And I for one, can't understand why anyone would be opposed to a situation providing funds in compliance with the Federal mandates and the Acts in compliance with the State mandates for promoting this type of harmony. My child goes to a public school for a very specific reason. They have the "access to excellence" program at that school. There are students from all Sections of the city of Chicago attending that school. I think it's good for the well-being of a person to come from all walks of life to be exposed to different walks of life and to create a harmony and an understanding between one and another."

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

Henry: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I agree with most of the things that I just heard, but I also agree with my own personal convictions and some of the thinking of the people in my District. Why do we have to use the kids for some things we have failed to do as leaders and adults? The people in my District are sick and tired of the side issue. What we want and what we need in my District is quality education. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell to explain his vote. One minute."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are looking for a measure of good faith. I, for one, am not in favor of busing, but I want to point out that it was my understanding that the State Board of Education did not intend to use any of this money for the purpose of busing but more so into the



field of teacher training and other areas that would indeed help us. I think at this time we have to look for a little more leadership from our leaders and I think that this is the time that we, if we do believe and try to help the people who have been trying to follow the law, now is the time and I would urge a request that at this time leaders who exert more leadership, step forward into the breach."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I didn't really plan to get into this and I think, I'm not sure that I should. But I think all we need there is three votes to put this Bill on Postponed Consideration. There have been an indication that the Bill would be Amended. I would assure the House that if this Bill is given the 70 votes necessary, that that amendment would be drafted to insure that the language relative to the transportation of the kids by buses would be on this Bill when you see it again. So given the necessary 70 votes to afford this opportunity to have that Amendment drawn so that we can clear up this matter."

Speaker Bradley: Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'aye', and 72 'nays'. This Bill having failed toThe Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Put that on Postponed Consideration. I would be happy to put the Amendment on as suggested by...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has leave to put it on Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objections. Let it be on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2209."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2209, a Bill for an Act authorizing financial assistance promote cultural and racial integration of students between school districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Goodwin: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is somewhat similar to the last Bill you just heard. The only difference is this, this is the experimental program where we will be able to work out the problems that we were just discussing. This Bill allows Districts to accept children from other Districts where we can get a racial balance. The Illinois School Code, Section 10-22.5, says that we have to desegregate the schools so let's do it the easy way. This is a voluntary Bill. All of the Districts have to agree, the parents or the guardians of the children have to agree. And all we're doing here is setting up the mechanism to find out how this works. Also, as Mr. Schneider told you before, we are losing millions of dollars of Federal money because we haven't set-up any plans. This gives us the opportunity to set-up the plan to do it. We have 25 Districts that are already receiving about ten million dollars. And we, the other money is just sitting in Washington and all we have to do is set-up the plan and start it up. All they want us to do is work it out. Now, let's do it the easy way. Why should we wait and let some Federal judge hit us over the head and make us do it? This is not just a matter of busing, this is a matter of getting quality education. We just had it.., Ted just told you. Everybody should be exposed to the different cultures so that we can work this thing out smoothly and stop being on the defensive. Let's get the job done. And I'll ask you for an affirmative vote for this Bill. This is purely voluntary. There's no forced busing or any-



thing else. Thank you."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, once again I am in the unfortunate position of having to rise in opposition to this Bill. Where the first Bill dealt with busing within a District, this particular Bill deals busing between various Districts so that, as example, in the city of Chicago we would have students bused from Chicago to one of the out-lying suburban areas, or from the suburban area in to the city of Chicago. I am in opposition to the concept of busing. Again I think we put the kids on the battlefield. And the time that is involved, the loss of education, and certainly the arguments made by Representative Huff, I could not state better and would just again for the record indicate my opposition to this particular piece of Legislation."

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

Friedrich: "I hate to keep bringing up my home town but we've just gone through a very trying experience there. We have one school in our grade school system that is so-called racially imbalanced. We have eliminated the 6, 7, & 8 grade so it's a 5th grade on down. Out of that school, 6 of the 8 teachers have masters degrees. We have one of the best buildings in town. We have the same educational programs as the other school. And out of that school has come our State Comptroller, the first man to be elected to a State-wide office came out of that school. Out of that school also have come doctors and lawyers and teachers. I think what we ought to be talking about is good education and not worrying about whether you're black or white. The truth of it is, and I know these people very personally because they're friends of mine, they don't want their kids taken all over town. They want to be in the neighborhood school closer to home so they can go home for lunch. If they've got a problem, they can run home to their mother. Now, you keep on insisting and nagging on this kind of thing."



It's something even the people don't want. Why do we insist on doing this? I can't figure it out."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. According to the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Goodwin to close the debate."

Goodwin: "Yes, I want to inform the last speaker I have repeated it three times, that this is a voluntary thing. And he keeps saying that the parents don't want their children to be bused, then they just don't have to agree. That's all. That's simple. The Bill puts in it that it is voluntary. If the parents don't want their child bused, that settles it. This is the experiment that we can use now. Some people might want their children bused. Then they can agree to it. This is the one, this is the Bill that we'll get so that we can do this job the easy way. And I'll ask you for an affirmative Roll. This is purely voluntary. Let's get on the Board and let's get something done. This goes only for three years annually. The IOE has to report to us on the progress of it then we can look at it. We can look at it again and again. But let's get something started and quit hiding and running behind this busing issue. If they don't want to be bused, they will not be bused. So forget that, drop it. And let's go on and get something started here. The Federal Government, the courts have already told you to desegregate the schools. Let's do it the easy way. I ask you for an affirmative Roll."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. But very briefly, and I'm not going to get into whole harangue. Everybody knows



what they're going to do. But this is purely a voluntary program. I, myself, as parents, you all are parents here, I have three youngsters who's been bused voluntarily on my part since they were in kindergarten. And they were bused to a black school. They could have went to a white school. But I wanted them in the best school that was in my community. It hasn't hurt them, the bus hasn't bothered them whatsoever. They have survived. We will also."

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

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In explaining my continuing 'no' vote on this issue, is that we need quality education. One of the speakers in the earlier debate said we need a generation or a decade of kids who can understand harmony. I submit that what we need is a decade of kids who can first spell the word and who can first read it with some comprehension. That's how you achieve harmony. And I think we need to look at one real 'salient' fact about the educational situation in Chicago. And that is that 88% of the students making up the educational system are minority kids. And yet, of the one billion, three hundred million dollars that composed that budget, " (Timer)

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

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just for a moment, I think this is a reasonable and rational way to approach this problem. It is totally voluntary, I think the Gentleman in his first Bill before the Legislature has made a honest attempt to deal with this problem and in the spirit of compromise I'm going to vote for this voluntary plan. And I would like to see some more green lights up there so at the very least, we could put this Bill on Postponed Consideration and give the Gentleman a chance to pass his first Bill, at least, have another hearing on it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to



explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what is it that we're afraid of? Are we afraid of having, of allowing our children if they want to and if we want to, to go and take part in a voluntary program? There's nothing here to be afraid of. We've had yellow school buses running all over the State of Illinois for I don't know how many years and we're going to spend about sixty million dollars this year on forced busing. There's nothing here that has anything to do with forced busing or busing. It's purely voluntary. It's time that we put our fears behind us and gave this good Bill. It's a step in the right direction, let's vote aye."

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

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in explaining my 'aye' vote on this Bill. I would like to suggest to those Members on the Democratic side of the aisle in particular, and to those progressing, progressive thinking Members on the Republican side of the aisle, that I stand here this evening as adequate evidence of integration. For most of my adult life, and all of my high school and collegiate life, I went to integrated schools. As a matter of fact there was a time in the early 60's in the South, when I was burned in effigy for integrating a white college as the first black to attend that college. And I came out and I was fortunate enough to break many other racial barriers as the first black in many instances. As a matter of fact, there was a running joke throughout the community that I was sort of one of those revolving-door blacks that integrated many athletic events, and educational institutions, and of course, professional opportunities when I graduated from college. So if there's any testimony to what integration can do, I certainly.." (Timer)



Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, to explain her vote."

Braun: "Mrs Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you just voted against what was perceived as a forced busing issue. Now, it appears that we're going to vote against what is perceived as a voluntary busing issue. I say again to you, busing is an imperfect solution but it's the only thing that we've gotten so far. This does not mandate busing, it is purely voluntary. I think it's time that we take our head out of the sand and begin to address this problem and stop looking to the Courts to force it on us. The only reason we have the problem and the limited solutions we have so far is because the Courts have been required to pick up the ball that the Legislature has dropped. And I suggest to you a vote against this Bill will be continuing to drop the ball, and continuing to turn over to the bureaucrats our responsibility to address and solve this problem, the problem of quality education in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

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

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I represent the 11th District, which is partly in the city of Chicago and partly in the city of Evanston. I have received correspondence from the school superintendent of the Elementary School District in Evanston urging support for this Legislation. It is good Legislation, not only for the cities of our state, but also suburban areas as well. We're undergoing 'wrenching' dislocations in the suburbs as enrollments decline precipitously. This particular program would be of good benefit to cities and suburban areas as well. It is supported by the suburban areas and I would urge your support as well."

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



Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, all I want to remind you is the cost in relation to gas, we're running out of gas. This kind of addition, we're going to be out of gas a lot sooner."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. It would not be in good conscience for me to vote 'no' on this Bill. I know in my District, that many people can go back and simply say they voted against the forced busing Bill and people will believe that. It's not a forced busing Bill. I stood here tonight and passed a Bill for all students in this State, black or white, regardless of race, or creed, or religion. I'm a down-stater. It's not a popular vote in my District. But I would urge others to have the moral conscience to stand up and vote for this Bill and come out of the dark ages and cast an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander, to explain her vote."

Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain, to say that I, too, support this Bill. I feel that we are taking a very bad attitude of the situation. We are continuously screaming about we want to see quality education everywhere. We continue to scream about the excess money that is being put into the relief rolls. But I feel that until we can get ourselves on one accord, that we will be able to equally divide this situation among our school students. We will continue to have rising crises on relief rolls. I also feel that we must act as thinking persons at this day in time give this Bill an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 83 'ayes' and 64 'nos', 9 voting present. Mr. Goodwin wishes to poll the absentees. Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Absentees: Daniels. DiPrima. Donovan. John Dunn. Dyer. Flinn. Getty. Griesheimer. Hoffman. Dave Jones.



Leverenz. McGrew. Kulas. Oblinger. Robbins.
Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Slape. Walsh. Willer.
And, Sam Wolf."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 83 'ayes', 64
'nay', and 9 voting 'present'. Mr. Goodwin? He asks
for permission to place it on Postponed Consideration.
Hearing no objection, the Bill will be placed on Post-
poned Consideration. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr.
Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn
until 9:30 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say
'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and we're
adjourned. 9:30 tomorrow morning. 9:30 this morning.



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 23, 1979

PAGE

HB-0100	2ND READING	PAGE	222
HB-0140	3RD READING	PAGE	14
HB-0224	3RD READING	PAGE	58
HB-0226	3RD READING	PAGE	28
HB-0317	3RD READING	PAGE	58
HB-0363	MOTIONS	PAGE	211
HB-0501	3RD READING	PAGE	11
HB-0513	3RD READING	PAGE	361
HB-0530	3RD READING	PAGE	59
HB-0602	3RD READING	PAGE	60
HB-0630	MOTIONS	PAGE	211
HB-0660	3RD READING	PAGE	61
HB-0681	3RD READING	PAGE	65
HB-0710	3RD READING	PAGE	339
HB-0746	3RD READING	PAGE	67
HB-0765	3RD READING	PAGE	82
HB-0882	3RD READING	PAGE	95
HB-0918	3RD READING	PAGE	39
HB-0975	3RD READING	PAGE	96
HB-0982	3RD READING	PAGE	102
HB-1011	3RD READING	PAGE	114
HB-1019	3RD READING	PAGE	128
HB-1039	3RD READING	PAGE	8
HB-1063	2ND READING	PAGE	207
HB-1142	3RD READING	PAGE	129
HB-1143	3RD READING	PAGE	129
HB-1187	3RD READING	PAGE	139
HB-1211	3RD READING	PAGE	142
HB-1213	3RD READING	PAGE	143
HB-1218	3RD READING	PAGE	148
HB-1223	3RD READING	PAGE	41
HB-1262	MOTIONS	PAGE	215
HB-1324	3RD READING	PAGE	154
HB-1334	3RD READING	PAGE	37
HB-1344	3RD READING	PAGE	4
HB-1345	3RD READING	PAGE	156
HB-1393	3RD READING	PAGE	158
HB-1408	3RD READING	PAGE	158
HB-1431	3RD READING	PAGE	160
HB-1495	3RD READING	PAGE	171
HB-1541	3RD READING	PAGE	9
HB-1619	3RD READING	PAGE	32
HB-1620	3RD READING	PAGE	32

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 23, 1979

PAGE 2

HB-1673	3RD READING	PAGE	43
HB-1742	MOTIONS	PAGE	366
HB-1821	MOTIONS	PAGE	216
HB-1841	3RD READING	PAGE	38
HB-1852	3RD READING	PAGE	51
HB-1853	3RD READING	PAGE	51
HB-1878	MOTIONS	PAGE	56
HB-1912	3RD READING	PAGE	21
HB-1915	3RD READING	PAGE	40
HB-1996	3RD READING	PAGE	41
HB-2032	3RD READING	PAGE	336
HB-2092	3RD READING	PAGE	280
HB-2093	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-2097	3RD READING	PAGE	56
HB-2144	3RD READING	PAGE	304
HB-2145	3RD READING	PAGE	305
HB-2147	3RD READING	PAGE	305
HB-2148	3RD READING	PAGE	346
HB-2153	3RD READING	PAGE	326
HB-2155	3RD READING	PAGE	326
HB-2194	3RD READING	PAGE	15
HB-2201	3RD READING	PAGE	367
HB-2209	3RD READING	PAGE	393
HB-2305	3RD READING	PAGE	347
HB-2306	3RD READING	PAGE	348
HB-2307	3RD READING	PAGE	348
HB-2308	3RD READING	PAGE	348
HB-2309	3RD READING	PAGE	348
HB-2333	MOTIONS	PAGE	214
HB-2420	3RD READING	PAGE	20
HB-2562	3RD READING	PAGE	306
HB-2563	3RD READING	PAGE	313
HB-2564	3RD READING	PAGE	314
HB-2565	3RD READING	PAGE	326
HB-2566	3RD READING	PAGE	334
HB-2567	3RD READING	PAGE	335
HB-2569	3RD READING	PAGE	236
HB-2590	3RD READING	PAGE	35
HB-2615	3RD READING	PAGE	29
HB-2649	3RD READING	PAGE	374
HB-2650	3RD READING	PAGE	376
HB-2651	3RD READING	PAGE	377
HB-2653	3RD READING	PAGE	303

HB 2547

>

<42

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 23, 1979

PAGE

HB-2678	3RD READING	PAGE	44
HB-2690	3RD READING	PAGE	378
HB-2691	3RD READING	PAGE	380
HB-2700	3RD READING	PAGE	285
HB-2730	3RD READING	PAGE	277
HB-2736	3RD READING	PAGE	16
	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-2783	MOTIONS	PAGE	217
	MOTIONS	PAGE	217
368 2nd 214	SB-0368	MOTIONS	PAGE 214
	SB-0709	2ND READING	PAGE 212
	SB-0943	MOTIONS	PAGE 209
	SB-2547	3RD READING	PAGE 42

943 2nd

211

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 23, 1979

PAGE

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	4
SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS	PAGE	205
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	207
SUSPEND RULES 25D, 27B, 66B AND 73	PAGE	215
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	400