

1.

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Samuel Taylor Coleridge observed: I have often thought what a melancholy world this would be without children, and what an inhuman world without the aged. Let us pray. Almighty and most merciful Father, we Thy humble servants give Thee most hearty praise and adoration for the abundant gifts which Thou, in Thy good providence, hast set upon the face of this earth. Particularly are we grateful for the mystery of life, the creation and well-being of our bodies, minds, and souls. We pray Thee, O Lord, to fill us with a sense of understanding for the process of Thy creation that we who do serve in this House of Representatives may enact only such laws that are consummate with Thy laws for the beginning, the nurturing, the preservation, and the consummation of human life that the people of this State of Illinois may live without fear and may be able to share in the joy and ecstasy which is alone Thine to give; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of Allegiance, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I Pledge Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "The regular Session will stand in recess to the call of the chair. This Committee is in Session as is the Revenue Committee. The hour of 12:15 having arrived, the Special Session will come to order. Members please be in their seats to be lead in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord bless this House with Thy service this day. Amen. Henry Ward Beecher said: God asks no



man whether he will accept life. That is not the question. You must take it. The only choice is how. Let us pray. Almighty God from Whom all good gifts do come, we bow our heads in adoration this hour as we convene this Special Session of the House of Representatives. As we consider the issues to be made before us, enable us with Thy grace to perceive that which is for the good of Thy creation and to discharge from our consideration that which is incongruent with Thy divine law. Hear us, O Heavenly Father, as we plead to Thee for Thy direction so that we may accomplish only that which is pleasing to Thee and for the ultimate welfare and good of the people of the State of Illinois. We ask this in Thy name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle, the Pledge of Allegiance."

Stuffle: "I Pledge Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Special Session will stand in recess to the call of the Chair. Representative Leon. The House will come to order. Former Representative Ben Harpstrite is in the chamber. He is looking over his old seat. I brought back the regular Session. Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Leon, Chairman of the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken October 30, 1979, reports the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 2811 and 2818."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for Attendance. House Bills, Second Reading, page two. House Bill 2789. Out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "Out...oops."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk or Bell. Representative Bell."

Bell: "Yes, this is 2789? Right. Just one minute. 2789 is the Appropriation Bill for the East Moline...conversion of the



East Moline Mental Health Center to a 60 bed...work release center and a 200 bed minimum security facility."

Speaker Redmond: "Move the adoption of the Amendment? Is that..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2789, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations of capital development improvements, grants, and related purposes, Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment...Amendment number one was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number 2, Kane, amends House Bill 2789 on page one lines seven and eight by deleting capital development fund and inserting in lieu thereof general revenue fund. On page one, line 18 and 19 by deleting capital development fund and inserting in lieu thereof general revenue fund. And on page one, line 18 and 29 by deleting capital development fund and inserting in lieu thereof general revenue fund."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane on the floor? Representative Bell."

Bell: "Alright, as I said before, this is the...capital development project for renovating the existing state facilities in East Moline. This is to put a mini-correction facility out there, 60 bed work release, 200 bed minimum security facility and also a Department of Law Enforcement."

Speaker Redmond: "There are no Amendments except the Committee Amendment and the one that nobody has moved the adoption. Is that correct?"

Bell: "Correct...correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk...Third Reading. 2790, Representative Chapman, out of the record. 2792, Representative Giorgi. 2792."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2792, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No



Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2794."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2794, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number one, Bowman, amends House Bill 2794 on page one in each of line one and seven by deleting Section four and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bowman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman on the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "I'm sorry, it's Representative Braun."

Bowman: "Braun, yeah..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Braun, okay."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment...What's the number of this Amendment? Amendment one withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2795. Out of the record. 2797."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2797, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Environmental Protection Agency, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number one, Matijevich, amends House Bill 2797 on page two by deleting all of line 25 and 26..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, on Amendment one."

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



this is an agreed Amendment that we discussed with the Department. It's \$300,000 for feasibility studies involving reclaiming, recycling, and waste prior to disposal. I move for the adoption of the...Amendment number one to House Bill 2797."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number two, McDonald, amends House Bill 2797 as amended on page one, by inserting after line one and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McDonald."

McDonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The following named amounts are appropriated to the EPA for the following designated agencies as matching funds for federal grants to meet requirements of Federal Water Pollution Act; Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, \$105,000, Greater Egypt Regional Planning Commission, \$35,000, Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan and Regional Planning, \$50,000, totalling \$190,000. We are very anxious to see that this is passed due to the need for our water quality programs, and we will be turning back federal funds unless we are able at this particular time to pass this Amendment. So I would ask for your favorable vote on Amendment number two."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Are you ready for the question on the...Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, is any of this money going to be used to mandate an increase in taxes by local units of government under the 208 implementation...implementation of 208 water quality management plan."

McDonald: "Not that I understand. I think the answer is no to that, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I fervently hope you're right."



Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? "The question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment two to House Bill 2797. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2798."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2798, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Bond Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment number one was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Oops, wait a minute. Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "I believe that there was a motion filed on that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there a motion, Mr. Clerk with respect to Amendment one?"

Anderson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I believe that you will find that Amendment number one was adopted in Committee and there was a motion filed to remove that Amendment from the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Your records don't..."

Mautino: "...Did it by myself."

Speaker Redmond: "Your records don't conform to the Clerk's records."

Mautino: "The Amendment was adopted. It was Sponsored by myself and Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Right, and I filed the motion in my name and Representative Mautino's name."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay..."



Mautino: "We would like to have brought..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, who's going to Sponsor the motion?"

Anderson: "Both of us."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, Representative Anderson and Mautino are recognized, both together."

Anderson: "Alright, we'd like to...withdraw..."

Mautino: "We'd like to remove that Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you open both microphones?"

Anderson: "Withdraw Amendment number one, please."

Mautino: "I agree."

Speaker Redmond: "Both Representative Anderson and Representative Mautino jointly move to withdraw Amendment number one. Yeah, you have got to move to table it. They move to table the Amendment. It has been adopted. question's on the motion to table it. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment number one is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading, 2799."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2799, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number one, Bowman, amends House Bill 2799 on page 34, line five and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There was an oversight in the drafting of Amendment number one. I would like to withdraw it and go with Amendment number two which is virtually identical."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Bowman, what was your motion?"

Bowman: "Well, I wanted to withdraw one and go with number two which is virtually identical."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman, has one been adopted?"



Bowman: "No, no, it is withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, one is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number two, Bowman-Collins-Blüthardt, amends House Bill 2799 on page one, line 13, page two, line 11, page three line 11 and so forth."

Bowman: "That's the one. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of Amendment number two. This Amendment was worked out...in consultation with the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners, with the Cook County Clerk, and is supported by the downstate County Clerk's Association, and the State Board of Elections. It is a clean up Amendment to the basic Bill. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment number... this has to be two, doesn't it?"

Bowman: "Two. That's right."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment number two. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment two is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number three, Totten, amends House Bill 2799 on page one lines two and seven by inserting 7-10.3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment number three..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman, for what purpose do you arise? Bowman."

Bowman: "Question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. We'll find out. Has Amendment three been printed? Evidently it has not been printed."

Bowman: "If it has not been printed I suggest we should not take it up at this time and..."



Speaker Redmond: "Well, we can't take it up at this time if it is not printed."

Totten: "It would be held on Second Reading until it has been filed properly."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have typically allowed the Sponsors to move their Bills if other Amendments have not been properly been..."

Speaker Redmond: "What is your pleasure, Sir?"

Bowman: "My pleasure is to move the Bill, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, I believe that the Amendment was filed timely, and it is probably being printed now. It was filed a considerable amount of time ago, and if he'd just hold it there we'll hear on the Amendment."

Bowman: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, maybe we can clear somebody. I move to table Amendment number three."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, Representative Totten has moved the adoption of Amendment three. Representative Bowman has moved to table Amendment number three. The question's on..."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "How can you table something we haven't seen?"

Bowman: "Are you...suggesting we should proceed and move the Bill?"

Totten: "No, I think that the motion that the Gentleman makes is inappropriate if you are going to persist in call...in calling his motion to table something we haven't seen, then I'd like to talk about something we haven't seen."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think it is a matter for you and Representative Bowman. It has been the policy of the Chair to...accede to the wishes of the Sponsor when an Amendment has come in rather late date and is not ready for consideration. Now, I am perfectly willing to put that to



the Body and let them decide what they want to do with it. I would hope that there would be some way that Representative Bowman and Representative Totten could straighten this thing out and...Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that there really isn't any way that we can straighten it out.

Representative Totten, as usual, is full of good ideas, but I have given my commitment to the people I have worked with in developing this legislation, and I...as much as I respect Representative Totten, I cannot accept his Amendment, and that is why I would like to move the Bill. And so I would either remove...renew my motion to table, or with your permission simply advance the Bill to Third Reading and not consider Amendment number three."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised it was only a half an hour ago Representative Totten, and under the circumstances I think probably the way to get at this is to move it to Third Reading and you appeal that ruling, and if you get 89 votes why then it will be held on Second Reading. I don't like to get caught in the middle on this thing, but... Well I'll move it to Third Reading. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, we just went into Session a half an hour ago. There were no other times to file Amendments unless we're in Session, and I filed the Amendment as soon as we went into Session...and if you...if the Gentleman persists in the motion to table, then I would persist in my right to explain what the Amendment is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been on the order of Second Reading for two weeks. It was reported...or it was brought to the floor last...two weeks ago. I see no reason why we should have to hold everything up now just because Representative Totten has only filed within the last half an hour even though we've only been in continuous Session for that time, we did convene, I believe, at an earlier period and then stood in recess, so I think Representative



Totten has had ample opportunity, more than ample opportunity, and as Sponsor of this Bill I would like to move it to Third Reading at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I've moved it to Third, now if Representative Totten desires to appeal that ruling...appeal the ruling moving it to Third Reading, then we'll put that question. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it is an awkward position that you put me in when you ask me to appeal the ruling of the Chair. As you have indicated, maybe I have put you in an awkward position by trying to properly offer an Amendment. I don't know whether you leave me any recourse but that. If the Sponsor would be willing to bring it back to Second Reading for the Amendment when it is distributed, I would be more than willing to do that, and I know he is a fair minded Gentleman and would see no difficulty in that once it is distributed if we could bring it back to Second today for hearing the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Totten is indeed flattering. If I were to give my word, yes I would keep it. In fact, that is my problem right now. I have given my word to the State Board of Elections, to the County Clerk's Association, to the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners, and to the Cook County Clerk that I will not tamper with this legislation nor allow it to be tampered with. Since I have already given my word to them, unfortunately, I do not have any word left to give to Representative Totten. So I will insist on moving the Bill to Third Reading, and if it goes to Third, I will not move it back to Second for his Amendment. I regret that very much, but that's the way it has to be. Let's go to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you finish your last sentence again?"

Bowman: "Yes, I just suggested that I have given my word to others that this Bill will not be tampered with, and I can-



not now give my word to Representative Totten that I will move it back to Second if it goes to Third. I want it to go to Third, and I want it to stay there for a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I just want to assure Representative Totten that the Chair doesn't take any offense if you move to appeal my ruling in this particular case. In fact, I might even vote for it."

Totten: "How would you vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "I might vote yea."

Totten: "Well in the case, you offer me unique opportunity... and I will proceed to appeal the ruling of the Chair and then maybe I can explain the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I think we find ourselves in an awkward situation. We've...as you stated, from the Chair, it's been the policy of the Chair to move these Bills to Third Reading consistently when an Amendment has been a little bit late, and I definitely feel that the Amendment has been late, and I would hate to see Representative Totten make the type of motion he's going to make, I'm afraid, on this particular situation. Why don't you walk over to Mr. Bowman and see if you can't work something out regarding... regarding his Bill and your Amendment. It seems like we're taking a long time here this afternoon with an Amendment that certainly was not timely in my opinion and in the opinion of the Chair. We've done this consistently. What I'm afraid will happen, if you appeal the ruling of the Chair on this occasion, then on every occasion when we get ourselves in the same situation where we have a Bill that is at the Amendment stage and the Amendment is not filed timely, the Speaker whoever it may be at that time moves the Bill on to Third Reading, and then we have an appeal to the ruling of the Chair. An appeal to the ruling of the Chair is really a motion that none of us like to see come before this Body, and I'm sure you agree with that. And for this type of motion to be



considered at this time, it...it over...exemplifies or over...brings this thing to meaning to the motion that is simply not there, and I would appeal to you, Mr. Totten, your...your...spare play that you've always exhibited on the floor of the House before you make that motion, because we might have that motion time and time again on this situation. The two of you as the Speaker's suggestion might get together, move the Bill to Third Reading where the Speaker already has it, and let's go on about the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, I'll only just comment on the Gentleman's remarks.

I have sat here for a number of years, and especially for the last year, and in some cases been treated unfairly by the Chair, and the only case...the only time that a Member has recourse to try and remedy that injustice is to move the rule. Now I wasn't intending to do that till the Chair indicated that the Chair may vote with me to appeal the ruling of the Chair. And so with the posture from the Chair, I would like to proceed on the motion to appeal. If he'd said no, I would not have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley. Why don't we get to the question."

Bradley: "I think he misinterpreted the feeling of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, you were busy and he suggested that you might vote with him in the appealing of the ruling of the Chair. I can't imagine that happening, but I think you might have misinterpreted what he said."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, let's get the question then. The question is Representative...The Chair moved 2799 to the order of Third Reading. Representative Totten has appealed that ruling of the Chair. Representative Totten on the motion."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment the I have filed to House Bill 2799, and I'm appealing the ruling of the Chair so that we can hear the Amendment. It is an Amendment that has to do with



changing some inadvertent language that was put into the Election Code. That language had to do with depriving the voters of this state with the right..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you arise?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I have a... I think we could clear it up maybe by asking you to rule on the germaneness of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't do that. It is not before me. I think what we ought to do is get to Representative Totten's motion appealing my ruling that the Bill be moved to Third Reading. Those in favor of Representative... The question is 'Shall the Chair be overruled?'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Totten to explain his vote...two minutes."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment that I am trying to have heard is one that would do away with the blind primary that is affecting the Republican Party. I am trying to correct the language that was so inadvertently put into the law that precludes the voters from knowing who they would vote for. The Amendment that I want to hear that was filed timely has to do with that language, and I would ask for your support on the motion to hear it."

Speaker Redmond: "You've all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 33 'aye', and 77 'no'. The Gentleman's motion failed. Third Reading. 2800."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2800, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any...Representative...any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2804."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Transfer Tax Act, Second



Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading, 2805."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2805, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation of the Department of Revenue, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, shouldn't we deal with 2804 before we go to 2805?"

Speaker Redmond: "We've already moved that to Third Reading."

Yourell: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "If you want me to. Sure. Okay. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2805 was at the direction of the Department of Revenue who thought that the original appropriation of \$150,000 would not be sufficient enough to take care of the counties that have found themselves in a bind because of their failure to adopt an ordinance for the...after the passage of House Bill 367, and this is a...the Amendment is an upgrading of the figure supplied by the Department of Revenue in the amount that they think is necessary for the implementation of House Bill 2804. I move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2805."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. The Amendment is adopted. Representative Yourell...All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'aye'."



l 'no', and the motion carries. The Amendment is adopted.
Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2813 out of the record.
Senate Bills Second Reading. 1439."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1439, a Bill for an Act making an
appropriation to the office of Auditor General. Second
Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills Second Reading.
2790. Read the Bill. Representative Chapman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2790, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of an Act making appropriations of the ordinary
and contingent expenses of the Board of Vocational Re-
habilitation, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Kempiners, amends House
Bill 2790 on page one by deleting lines one through four
and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. He's not on the
floor. What's your pleasure, Representative Chapman?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I wish I could see the Amendment. It is
not on my desk. It very well may be, but I support the
Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you've got to make up your mind pretty
soon."

Chapman: "Oh, I...I will support the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman has moved the adoption
of Amendment one. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed
'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment
one is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. When are we going with
Senate Bills First Reading? Any Sponsor on Senate Bill



1443? Representative Regner. It has to go to Rules, but it needs a Sponsor. It is dying for a Sponsor. Oh... Where is the... Introduction of First Readings."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2826, Breslin, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retail Installment Sales Act, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendatory veto motion appearing on page seven. Senate Bill 32, Representative McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe. Senate Bill 32, Amendatory veto motion. What do you do? Representative McAuliffe moves moves to accept the Governor's...what's that? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 32 by the adoption of the Amendment?'. All those in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Representative Geo-Karis maybe United States Senator Geo-Karis, maybe United States Congressman Geo-Karis. Maybe Mayor of Zion Geo-Karis. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. And may come back to the House and sit next to Conti...voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113 'aye', and 2 'no', and this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate in accepting the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 32. Senate Bill 50, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change on Senate Bill 50."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate in accepting the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 50?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113 'aye', and eight 'no', and the motion having received the Constitutional



Majority prevails...receives a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate in accepting the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 50. Senate Bill 58, Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 58 is listed incorrectly as being under my Sponsorship. The Bill really belongs to Representative McMaster, and I would pass to him at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Kozubowski: "McMaster."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to sustain the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 58. The Bill has to do with intergovernmental cooperation. The point of his Amendment was to be sure that we were not affecting the federal law that we're speaking only in regard to the state law, and I move to sustain his amendatory veto. I accept his specific...specific recommendation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate by accepting the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 58 by the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. What's the next one? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 58. 65, Representative Katz. Out of the record. 93, Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate in accepting the Governor's specific recommendation for change in Senate Bill 93."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Ewing. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, I wonder if we could have just a little more explanation of that."



Speaker Redmond: "Will you explain it, Mr. Flinn?"

Flinn: "Sure. I thought everybody knew what it said but me.

The...all that the Governor did was point out by striking out one of the Amendments that was put on Senate Bill 93 that the county boards already have the authority to grant their chairman veto power, and this would force one specific county to have it whether they wanted it or not. And he felt that the state should not put itself in the position of dictating that much to the county boards. This is whether the county chairman should have veto power or not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson. Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, this is the...the Governor... I have a question of the Chair. This is the amendatory veto, or...on 93. Has any vote been taken? I saw some green lights up there. I wondered..."

Speaker Redmond: "No, it hasn't been taken."

Hudson: "The vote has not been taken. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hudson: "Representative Flinn, is it..."

Flinn: "Yes, go ahead."

Hudson: "Representative Flinn, is it my understanding that you are supporting the Governor's amendatory veto on this Bill?"

Flinn: "Yes, I told Representative Dyer when she was able to put the Amendment on there that the Governor did indeed use his amendatory veto power to strike this Amendment down, that I was not going to move to override the Governor. I was going to accept. As true and simply as you understand, something that affects DuPage County only, and the Governor is absolutely right. We are dictating that they have veto power, the chairman, whether the County Board wants it or not."

Hudson: "Thank..."

Flinn: "So this strikes that out of there."

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Representative, and I would like



to add my words in support of the Governor's amendatory veto. I think he has acted responsibly and very reasonably in this respect, and I would urge my Republican and Democrat colleagues and even Lee Daniels to support the Governor in his amendatory veto on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 93 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye', and one 'no', and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 93 by adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 133, Representative Daniels. Representative Daniels, Daniels, Daniels, 133."

Daniels: "Do you want to pass that for a second?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 176, Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 176 and join the Senate in so doing. Under the amendatory veto, the Governor has provided substantially that the enforcement and administration would be at a local level. Although this was not the full thrust of the Bill, I think it is keeping strongly with the intent, and therefore I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 176 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Congressman Nimrod is in the chambers. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye', and seven 'no'. The motion having received three-fifths Constitution-



al Majority prevails, and the House does concur with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 176. 228, Representative MacDonald."

MacDonald: "I wasn't quick enough to get down to my switch. Could I be recorded yes on this please?"

Speaker Remond: "May the Lady be recorded yes. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. 228, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill ... on Senate Bill 228. The changes are the date of when it becomes active, and that's 1980 to 81 due to the fact that it is too late to start this program this year. And also he cut the number from 4,000 students to 2,000 students and I agree with this change and ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 228 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye', and no 'nay', and the motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate with respect to accepting the Governor's recommendation for change by the adoption of the Amendment. 244, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would move to concur with the amendatory veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 244 as the Senate did. The amendatory or the effect of the amendatory veto is to change the effective date from 1980 to 1981 to work on some inequities that were present when the Bill was originally passed. I would move to concur with the Senate on Senate Bill 244."



Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur...Representative Skinner.'"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly significant Bill with regard to giving special privileges to areas which are historic districts. As an example, the east side of Lake Forest is all a historic district, and what this Bill says is that even if someone buys a piece of property that has had ocelots running around in it as my in-laws did, and then turns it back into the splendor that it originally was, that if this were done after the effective date of the Act, there would be no increase in assessments for ten years. Now, it is a pretty serious thing to suggest that one is going to be giving tax breaks to people just because they own old homes. Now if this Bill passes, I probably will try to get my neighborhood declared an historic district so my assessment won't go up for ten years regardless of the improvements I give to it. This House has been very parsimonious in the tax relief that it has given. It has refused to give sales tax relief to people who need it the most, and now we are going to give property tax relief to many people who need it the least, to upwardly mobile families who have decided to settle in the City of Chicago for example in neighborhoods which will be redeveloped whether or not this tax rebate is given, or this tax relief is given. It will do what the Sponsor says it will do, in my opinion. It will improve the neighborhoods which are declared historic districts, but it will also cut local governments income, and it will be given as tax break to people who probably would do... would spend money to improve their homes whether or not the tax break was given. In the mean time, it is driving people out of these neighborhoods who are typically renters who can't afford to stay and buy their house. It is a fairly significant issue. I think that people should be giving it some attention. I am sorry that they are not."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representa-



tive Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to point out and add my support for this Bill, that this Bill requires the concurrence of the municipality in the event that the tax relief is granted. The local taxing authority must, by Resolution or ordinance, concur in this, and if they don't want it, the tax relief won't be granted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I opposed this legislation when we passed it. I think you should know one thing very pertinent about this. To qualify, historic properties must have been built prior to July 1, 1939. If it was built before July 1, 1939, it's a historical...has historical value. I question very very much that date. I think it is bad legislation. I think we should defeat it. We should never have passed it in the first place."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, thank you very much. In relation to some of the comments of some of the Gentlemen from the other side of the aisle, I'd like to point out, as Representative Meyer said, that this is purely permissible, and any municipality that wants to opt in can opt in. This is landmark preservation. The Governor amendatorily vetoed the Bill and just moved the effective date back one year so any inequities in the Bill that may be present at this time can be worked on before the bill actually takes effect. I'd like also to point out to Mr. McMasters that in order to qualify for this, you have to be in an already landmark designated area. With those explanations, I would just move to concur with the Governor's amendatory veto as the Senate did and ask for a favorable Roll Call. It is an important piece of legislation that has merit, and we passed out of this House."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 244 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to encourage 'no' votes. This is another subject that is a little complex. It might be compared to the consolidation of elections. This is a subject where we passed a Bill, the Governor discovered some defects. Many of us realize those defects were here before, and the Governor's solution is to say 'Well, let's postpone the effective date for one year so we can try and patch it up'. I think if we're going to try and patch it up, the proper thing to do is to let this Bill fall through the cracks by voting 'no here and voting 'no' if any other motion is passed, then the Bill can be written properly in the first place the way we ought to legislate. I think many of you who object to the Governor writing laws ought to vote 'no' on this because the Governor here has tried to write law by saying 'Well let's put this off one year so the Sponsors or somebody else can straighten it out'. The proper thing is to pass it right in the first place. Let's not put it into law while it is defective. I know I have received many expressions from my district, including the Mayor of Lake Forest, to stop this Bill and to vote 'no', and I would encourage more 'no' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification. The mayor of the respective town to which the Gentleman referred does not have to opt into this. The City council does not have to opt into it, and they do not become eligible for this break, this landmark preservation break if they don't want it. I think that we've got some



erroneous information spreading around the House floor, and this is an important piece of legislation. It provided tax relief for landmark designated buildings, single family landmark designated buildings, and in order to restore these prime pieces of property that go back and deal with our heritage and so forth, I think it is important that each and every Member stop what he's doing, take a look at the Bill, and give it an 'aye' vote. It is an important measure. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I've been long interested in history, and in my area we do have structures of various sorts that should be given a tax break, should be...everything should be done to preserve it, and preserve them for the future. One is an old office building that was built around 1878 called the Milliken Building. There used to be bank in there, and then a community college has got it now...or did have it now they've moved, but the point is that it is a very old building out of very rare type of architecture. We have some 'Floyd Wright' houses in my community, and I think that the taxes that are...that have been put on these houses, these historical houses, as of 1979 is not too unreasonable. I think we should move in the direction of preserving the Illinois heritage. Now...as I recollect, around 18...1801 or 2, the people of Massachusetts created a historical survey of what they had at that time. Now that is already over a hundred and some...they're going on 200 years ago in Massachusetts. I think certainly Illinois should begin to think about our own heritage, our own background in relation to historical homes, buildings, and whatever it may be. I think we should go ahead and support the Governor in this and do what we can in the future to even make it more important to pre-



serve our ancient heritage."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...Representative O'Brien. This question there's 88 'aye', and 52 'no'. Representative O'Brien has requested a Poll of the Absentees. Representative Huskey...Representative Huskey 'aye'. On this question there is 89 'aye', and 52 'no', and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 244. 293. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we accept the Governor's specific recommendation on Senate Bill 293. This Legislature has previously allowed people who sign retainer agreements under stress to rescind them within a certain limited period. However, many of the people are not aware of that privilege, and the Governor has amended the Bill so that a copy of the Act will also be given to the individual when he signs up relative to a personal injury. The Act itself is only one paragraph, so it is no hardship on the adjuster involved. And I move that we concur as did the Senate in the specific recommendation."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 293 by adoption of the Amendment?' All 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 no 'nay'. The motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 293 by adoption of the Amendment. 294. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, this is indetical to the previous...I move that we concur with the Governor's specific recommendation. In this case it applies to fire insurance claims. Very often when a fire occurs, public adjusters are on the scene and then assured signs without knowing that there is a possibility of recision. The Governor simply, again, asked that the Act be handed to the individual, and I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 294 by adoption of the Amendment?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye', and no 'nay', and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the spe...Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 294 by adoption of the Amendment. 359, Representative Gaines. Gaines. Out of the record. 511, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 511 was introduced to take care of an oversight during the...those...some employees who retired during the fiscal year of 1978 and were not covered under the Collective Bargaining Act which was made retroactive, and it was made to take care of those. The Governor did revise it to read that the state comptroller shall give reimbursement to the retired during that year, but prior to June 30, 1978. I would move that we concur with the Senate in accepting the Governor's recommendation for Senate Bill 511."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 511 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor



vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye', and no 'nay'. The motion having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the second... with the Senate in accepting the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 511 by adoption of the Amendment. 514...the Treasurer of Cook County is over there with Representative Kozubowski. 'Eddy Rosewell'. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. The specific change that the Governor is making in this Bill is to provide that a court may, with approval of the Illinois Commission on Delinquency Prevention, order a minor into the Pilot Project known...and to allow temporary services to be provided to the minor. The change that the Governor makes is to allow the Commission on Delinquency Prevention...rather to require that they approve and cooperate with the court in the placement of the minor. The Governor feels that this will make the program work better, and I think that it will, and I would urge your support of the amendatory veto language. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 514 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye', and no 'nay'. The motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 514 by adoption of the Amendment. 514, Representative



Bowman."

Bowman: "It's my Bill right now...thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: Representative Capparelli, will you please sit down?"

Bowman: "He wants to get in the photograph. No, this is..."

Speaker Redmond: "Good idea. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 642 amends the Civil Administrative Code on the Purchasing Act with regards to multi-year lease arrangements. It implements recommendation number 12 of the Governor's cost control task force. However, the original legislation included some language in the Section that has since proved to be somewhat controversial within the administration, and since the Governor could not find any agreement among the interested parties as to exactly what the language ought to be. He simply recommended that we delete the language. I move to accept this because I think 80% of the loaf is better than none, and once we do get an agreement among the various agencies to exactly what the language should be, I think we can come back with new legislation. So I move at this time to accept his specific recommendation for change."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 642 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye', and no 'nay'. The motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate in accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for chage with respect to Senate Bill 642 by adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 666, Representative Oblinger. Out of the record. 674, Representative Bower."

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



House, this amends the Medical Practice Act. This is to correct an error that the Enrolling and Engrossing made, and will merely strike what we already struck by Amendment, but floor action, but the Enrolling and Engrossing did not catch the error. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would you...what is it striking? Can you explain it a little bit beyond that?"

Bower: "Yes, when the Bill originally was voted on, an Amendment was voted by the House that would strike the Voluntary Surrender Provisions of the Bill. The Department of Registration and Education agreed to do this administratively, and the Governor is merely putting it in to the same form which it passed the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 674 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All 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 one 'no', and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 674 by adoption of the Amendment. 696, Representative VonBoeckman. Out of the record. 732, Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 732. Senate Bill 732 changes the name of the Mobile Home Privilege Tax Act to the Mobile Home Local Services Tax Act, and places procedural filing requirements under the offices of county assessor or supervisor of assessors. The Governor amended the Bill by deleting a Section of the Bill that was included in another Senate Bill that was passed. I move to accept the Governor's amendatory



veto on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 732 by adoption of the Amendment?'. Those in favor say 'aye'...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 147 'aye', and no 'nay', and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 732 by adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 1000, Representative Gene Hoffman. Out of the record. 1061, Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1061. The Governor did...was expand the definitions of both customer and financial record and placed...had the burden placed on the banks for notifying customers regarding their confidentiality of their record, and set forth a uniform mechanism for a notification for mail part of disclosure of customer records. I think this represents an improvement to the Bill as passed by the House and the Senate, and I recommend that we accept the Governor's recommendation for change."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 161...1061 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner, pardon me."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, is this the one that the director of the Department of Revenue will become apoplectic over?"

Abramson: "No it's not."



Skinner: "468...good, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye', and no 'nay'. The motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1061 by adoption of the Amendment. 1341, Gene Hoffman. Out of the record. 1344, McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1344 is an extremely important Bill. The Governor made a strong statement in support of the Bill. He added clarifying language to make sure that fire investigation...investigation of arson that is, stays with the appropriate criminal investigative authorities whether it's state or local. And I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change to Senate Bill 1344."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Vinson. Now make up your mind, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Is this the Bill that would impose the new tax on insurance policies for fire purposes?"

McPike: "Alright, yes. This is the Bill that increases the amount of revenue coming up from insurance companies. There was no opposition from the insurance industry either in the House or the Senate Committees, and there has been no opposition to date. I think that they foresee that by spending money to educate people in fire prevention, that over the long run, both the homeowner and the insurance companies will save money."

Vinson: "Does the money in fact come from the insurance companies or from the insured party?"

McPike: "Comes from the insurance companies."

Vinson: "What assures us that it won't be passed through?"



McPike: "I have no assurance whatsoever that part of it won't be passed through. I hope that...I hope that as I said, in the long run, it leads to a reduction in the cost to everyone involved, and I think the insurance companies, the House, the Seante, and the Governor all recognize that fire prevention more than pays for itself. It probably pays for itself ten to one in the long run, and most people would acknowledge that fact."

Vinson: "If that's the basis, I think we ought to consider the Bill; not on the possibility that the insurance companies will absorb this cost. I think it's clearly a cost that will be passed through like any other cost of doing business, and if you think that's advisable, then I urge you that you support the amendatory veto, and if you don't think that's advisable, then on that basis you might reject it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall the House concur with the Senate and accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1344 by adoption of the Amendment?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye', and 13 'no', and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House concurs with the Senate and accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1344 by adoption of the Amendment. VonBoeckman, do you want 696? Senate Bill 696. Out of the record. Total veto motions on page four. Senate Bill 5, Representative Marovitz. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, could we pass this for just a moment while I get the file out?"



Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 47. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives. I would move to concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 47. The Governor's specific recommendation for change notwithstanding. I would also like you, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the other Sponsor of this motion, Representative Harry Leinenweber, who would give some opening remarks on Senate Bill 47."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly yields to Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to join the Gentleman from Cook in urging this House to join with our colleagues across the rotunda in voting to...to override the Governor's total veto of Senate Bill 47. Senate Bill 47 is, most of you will recall, the Bill relating to regulating the practices of abortion in the State of Illinois and was somewhat a omnibus Bill and included a number of provisions in it which the majority, a vast majority of the Members of this House, felt should be in it and a vast majority of the Senate felt also should be in it. And I might add, a very vocal group of your and my constituents feel also ought to be in the law. Now the Governor has used some rather strong language, in his Message on this Bill, expressing his view and I would point out that, I guess, the Governor certainly is a lawyer and has a view of what the Constitution says. I'm a lawyer and certain other Members of the Legislature are lawyers and certain other people in this state are lawyers. We also have views of what the Constitution says on this rather important subject. The Governor has listed about



five or six specific objections to Senate Bill 47 and he raised some Constitutional objections to Senate Bill 47. I had examined, in detail, his Veto Message, as well as I have examined, in detail, the case law which has been cited by the Governor in support of his Message and I find that the Governor may, I'm no authority as to what the Federal Courts of this state are going to do but the Governor may ultimately be accurate in some of his views, he may ultimately be inaccurate in some of his views, because... I stand before you, giving you my opinion that the specific provisions in Senate Bill 47 have not been ruled on by the United States Supreme Court. They are not Constitutional, unconstitutional, per se, as based upon prior rulings of the Supreme Court. I cannot stand before you today and say some Federal Judge, who's appointed by life, for life...for his lifetime, might not find some of these provisions unconstitutional. But I would suggest to you that there is a Supreme Court and this Supreme Court has actually ruled very few times on the subject of abortion. And there are a great many areas which are unclear. And so I come before you as a Joint Sponsor of this motion to override, to urge you to override the Governor's veto, because these provisions in Senate Bill 47 are not clearly unconstitutional based upon anything that the United States Supreme Court has said in the past. Some of the provisions may be objected to, as I pointed out, by some Federal District Judge sitting somewhere out there in this land of ours. But I would just point out that these people are subject to review by the United States Supreme Court. Now, very briefly,



Members of the House and Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go through the specific objections that the Governor has...has made that he feels are unconstitutional. Initially, there is the parental and spousal notice provisions. The Governor says, in his opinion, these are clearly unconstitutional, based upon the case of 'Balloti vs. Beard'. I would suggest to you that 'Balloti vs. Beard' did not have the same facts before it...that...before you today on Senate Bill 47. 'Balloti vs. Beard' did, in its opinion, rule that a certain spousal consent provision was unconstitutional because it did, in some way, shape or form, give a veto to the spouse or...and to the parents. Now this Bill, Senate Bill 47, specifically does not give a parent or a spouse a veto over the abortion decision of the pregnant woman. Very specifically, it does not. All it requires is that the parents in the case of a minor, be notified that their daughter is contemplating an abortion. It also requires that a husband be notified, and there are certain exceptions based upon medical emergencies and unavailability. I would suggest to you that this is a vital distinction, because the Supreme Court, in 'Balloti vs. Beard' did say that we could not legislate and give a veto power to a third person over the abortion decision. Senate Bill 47 specifically does not give the veto power. And specifically, I'd like to point out that Mr. Justice Stevens from our 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, specifically pointed that out. He did not want to answer the decision whether or not a pure notice provision would be unconstitutional. Senate Bill 47 is a pure notice provision and in my opinion and the opinion of many lawyers



and other people, it's clearly Constitutional. The second provision that the Governor raises in his Message is the provision relating to saline abortions. Now he says that, in his opinion, these restrictions are not justified by any legitimate state interest. I would just suggest to you that this Bill, Senate Bill 47, merely says that another method ought to be used, unless in the medical judgement of the doctor, saline abortion is the best way to go. We have time and again specified particular procedures which doctors cannot or should not utilize except in some particular circumstances. I would merely point out that our own Federal Drug Administration has said that we cannot use enzymes in order to eliminate a back condition, in favor of a laminectomy. And I would suggest to you, if we can legis... if the Federal Drug Administration can legislate that a laminectomy is better than using chemo-papain, then we can say to a doctor, 'You should not use saline solution unless, in your judgment, this is the way to go. Clearly that issue...this Bill does not specify that the saline abortion cannot be utilized but merely specifies that it ought not to be unless in the judgment of the doctor it should be. Nothing could be more reasonable than than that, in my opinion. And the state certainly has an interest in the maternal health and it is...it is this Bill which specifies, and there are many medical individuals who say that this is a rather dangerous procedure to utilize. Another provision that the Governor claims is unconstitutional is the provision which requires the physician who performs an abortion use the same standard of care towards the fetus as he



would if he intended the child to be born. The Governor claims that this is unconstitutional on its face because, in his view, that provision applies in the first trimester. Well it's very clear that he's in error, if you read the Bill, because we're talking about a viable, or possibly a viable fetus and to my knowledge the Supreme Court itself, in the famous abortion decision of 1973, specified that the first trimester was special because the fetus was not viable. So I would suggest the Governor is just plain wrong on that particular claim of unconstitutionality. Finally, he claims that there are certain provisions which he feels are unconstitutionally vague. He cites medical emergency as being unconstitutionally vague. I would suggest to you this is the same words that we use in the Illinois Good Samaritan Act, which has been held Constitutional, which we have used time and time again. The final provision has to do with the standard of care the physician must exercise regarding whether a doctor can or should take the welfare of the woman into account and...and the standard of care in protecting a fetus. He's wrong there. There's a specific provision which says that he need not take any measures to sustain the life of the fetus, which would increase medical risks to a woman. So this... this virtually reduces this provision to a meaningless but, however, it certainly does not make it unconstitutional. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would suggest to you that we do need Senate Bill 47. We do need to tighten up the procedures in this state in regarding abortions and I am proud to join the Gentleman from Cook in urging you to vote 'aye'



on the motion to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 47."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Greiman: "Okay. On the question of changing or stretching the point of viability there is a case...a 1979 case by the Supreme Court, 'Coletta vs. Franklin', which would clearly refuse to recognize any change or stretching the point of viability. How does this Bill get around that in Section 2.2? Supreme Court case?"

Leinenweber: "What...what page are you on now?"

Greiman: "Well it's Section 2.2. It would be on page...on page 2. You changed the definition of viability which, way beyond the 1979 Supreme Court case, 'Coletta vs. Franklin'. How do you get around that? How does Section...how does Senate Bill 47 get around a 1979 Supreme Court case that says that that's wrong? Can you tell us?"

Leinenweber: "Yes. The... As I understand, the 'Coletta' case, that that...that related to, or eliminated the question of whether or not the doctors should take into consideration the medical risks to the woman. This Bill, and this is the Governor's... one of the Governor's reasons why he felt it was unconstitutional. The Governor is wrong there. This particular provision specifically relates, or specifically requires that a physician need not take any measure to sustain the life of the fetus which would increase medical risks to the woman. It's read in that context and I can't see how, therefore, there could be any possible Constitutional infirmity there."

Greiman: "Well, except that it changes the definition well



beyond that. On Section 3.2 it informs consent. How do you distinguish Planned parentage vs. Danforth' to provide to require that kind of consent? That clearly in the Danforth case and in the Fitzpatrick case, both Supreme Court cases, they said it was improper. As a matter of fact, in 'Wynn vs. Scott' also. I don't raise that because that's only a Court of Appeals case, but the other cases are Supreme Court cases. How do you distinguish those? Can you?"

Leinenweber: "You're talking about informed consent?"

Greiman: "Yeah."

Leinenweber: "Well, there were... Mr. Justice Stevens, as I understand it, in the Danforth case...and there were a number of opinions. And you kind of have to total up what everyone said within the context of that opinion and actually..."

Greiman: "But they all say the same...they say you can't have it... Don't they all say the same, Harry?"

Leinenweber: "Pardon?"

Greiman: "They say you can't really impair the...the right by informed...by imposing an informed consent provision. Isn't that the bottom line of all those cases?"

Leinenweber: "No. As I understand it, informed consent, there is nothing in here which inhibits the woman in any way in going ahead with whatever decision she makes...may make. All it requires is that she be told certain things..."

Greiman: "Well that's right... Which cases...which cases have allowed informed consent provisions?"

Leinenweber: "Pardon?"

Greiman: "Which...which cases have imposed an informed consent? Now we're not talking about spousal consent or parental, we're talking about informed consent. Which one has allowed that? Any case



you can cite me?"

Leinenweber: "I would say to you that no Supreme Court decision has said that what this statute requires the doctors to do, as far as informing the woman, has been held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. It does not specifically reach this particular type of language."

Greiman: "Would this Bill...would this Bill..."

Leinenweber: "The Danforth case governed, as I understand it, parental consent in addition...and specifically was decided on the..."

Greiman: "But also...but also informed... But also have informed consent. Would this Bill be..."

Leinenweber: "The pleading of the case...it related to parental consent and I would suggest there were a great number of opinions and whenever the Supreme Court is widely divided, as you know, you really don't know what five of them are going to do when they receive something else."

Greiman: "Well they've had a pretty consistent record. Would this Bill prohibit the use of I.U.D. devices... intrauterine devices, which are birth control methods?"

Leinenweber: "No."

Greiman: "Section 2.10 would not...that's not an abortifacient... abortifacient? Isn't it an abortifacient? Wouldn't this Bill, in fact, prohibit the use of I.U.D.s?"

Leinenweber: "No, it wouldn't. It would relate to the rest of the Bill, which has nothing to do with outlawing any particular choice a woman or doctor may have during the first trimester."

Greiman: "Well, I think... All right, on the Bill... Thank you for your answers. On the Bill, I think I heard the Sponsor of this Bill speak... usually with great force, when he speaks before us and is sure of himself, generally. I find that he's



less sure this time when he speaks to us, when he tells us about how this Bill will certainly meet the Constitutional test. The fact is, the Supreme Court time and again has taken this and said, 'This kind of legislation is unconstitutional.' On the matter, for example of spousal consent... consultation, here's what the Danforth case said. The marital couple is not an individual entity with a mind and a heart of its own, but an association of two individuals, each with a separate intellect and emotional makeup. If the right to privacy means anything, it is the right of an individual, married or single, to be free from unwarranted government intrusion in a matter so fundamentally affecting a person as to decide whether to bear or beget a child. So that the fact is, that the Supreme Court has not had...the Supreme Court has not fudged on all of these. The Supreme Court has been very clear, it's been clear that 47 is going to be unconstitutional. It's not going to see the light of day. Now, when we debated this initially, Representative Kelly, the other Chief Sponsor, told us that the BGA and the Sun-Times had run this...abortion investigation from which many good Bills, of which I'm a principal Sponsor, came from. And that S.B. 47 was also somehow a result of that abortion expose'. I hold in my hand here a letter...a statement of the Better Government Association, dated October 30, 1979, which disassociates the BGA from S.B. 47. Which says that S.B. 47 is not the kind of legislation that will have anything to do with their series on abortion profiteers. And...so that...if you hear that later on this debate, it just ain't so. The last point, I guess



I would make is that we pass these biennially, it has become now one of the great traditions of the Illinois General Assembly to pass an unconstitutional Bill dealing with abortion. The American Civil Liberties Union files a Bill... files a lawsuit the minute this...we override the Governor's Veto, that is also our tradition. Except now we are required to pay attorney's fees to the ACLU so that at this point the ACLU's best fundraiser, the best fundraising device is our abortion Bill, which is found unconstitutional. It is a grand tradition, which I'm sure we'll probably continue. However, maybe this is a moment when we should stop and think. The Senate almost defeated it, perhaps it's time for us to say, 'Let's pass legitimate, sensitive abortion reform that touches on the problem and the issues of young women in our society.' And let's just not pass one just to bring something home for the folks.' I support the Constitution in this case."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schoeberlein."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "I think there's only one more, we'll let her...let's let her speak. The Lady from Cook, Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield? Who is answering this?"

Speaker Matijeich: "He indicates he'll yield. Representative Kelly."

Willer: "Representative Kelly, I find in the very first Section, more or less like a Preamble or statement of purpose. Would you please refer to the words, 'The General Assembly of the State of Illinois, do solemnly declare and find...'"



Kelly: "Which page are you on and what line?"

Willer: "I'm on the very first page, Section I."

Kelly: "Okay."

Willer: "Okay, be it enacted...you know, the enacting clause in a sense. The words, 'find in reaffirmation of the long standing policy of this state, that the unborn child is a human being from the time of conception and is therefore, a legal person for purposes of the unborn child's right to life and is entitled to the right to life from conception, under the laws and Constitution of this state.' Why did you write that?"

Kelly: "Representative Willer, this is the law already in the State of Illinois, which was passed in 1973 in the Spring. This is not at all in the legislation which is before us today and therefore, I don't... you know, I don't think you want to ask me that question."

Willer: "Okay... Well...well, I'm sorry. I just was curious. I just got the Bill for the first time last night and saw those words and find that...as long as you got away with it in '73, okay. I would like to speak to the Bill." I read the Bill for the first time last night and as far as I'm concerned this is nothing more nor less than a less...really a way to harrass women who want abortions. I agree with everything that Al Greiman said about what the court is going to find. I supported the Bill in 1975 when I was brand new and I supported the override of the Governor's Veto. I can say, 'Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.' It's simply a rehash, but even worse in many ways than the 1975 Bill as far as being unconstitutional. There is no way abortion clinics can comply with the requirements of this



Bill. And I would call to your attention something no one seems to talk about. And that is the movement on the part of the anti-abortionists who keep hospitals from performing abortions. They can't have it both ways. A hospital in my district, I've found out just four weeks ago, that did first trimester abortions were pressured and coerced and so they gave in because it meant money for the hospital. They no longer perform first trimester abortions. 'Gottlieb' Hospital does, they're under constant picketing and harrassment and pressure to stop doing first trimester abortions. Northwest Memorial Hospital also underwent the same kind of pressures. The anti-abortionists keep saying no abortions shall be done in hospitals, where I believe they should be done. And abortion is nothing more nor less than the old D and C that every woman went into a hospital for. I realize a lot of women can't afford it but I think that's where they should be done. But the anti-abortionists say, 'No abortion in hospitals' You drive the woman to the clinic and then you write Bills like this where they can't possibly comply, even if they were Constitutional and that's the whole point of it in your mind, I'm sure. Make it impossible for any number of women to have abortions. I agree with the Supreme Court, a woman should confer with her physician, she should talk over an abortion, it's a very serious matter. But she can't do it because her doctor is not allowed to do it at the local hospitals, according to the anti-abortionists. So it's a bad Bill, it harrasses women, it harrasses the abortion clinics, where they do perform some good theraputic abortions. I'm



opposed to abortion, but it is the law of the land and I think this Bill is nothing more nor less than a thinly disguised attempt to stop abortions being performed simply by the logistics of it if nothing else."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schoeberlein has moved the previous question. Those in favor...shall the main question be put? Say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no' and the main question is put. Representative Kelly, to close."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I will just close by reminding you that this legislation, contrary to some of the opponents arguments, could prevent the destruction of millions of unborn children, not only in Illinois but certainly in this nation. This legislation could be a model legislation. Hopefully, it will be ruled Constitutional regardless of what the question might be when the Supreme Court addresses it. Yes, it's a comprehensive piece of legislation. It does require a 24 hour waiting period before the abortion procedure can begin. It does require the physician to notify the parents of a minor, and I think that's an important item. We're getting away from that...that structure where the family joins together. And certainly parents should be included and considered in their opinions on making...not only making decisions but being aware that a decision is being brought forward. It also requires that a spouse be notified if his wife is going to go forward with an abortion procedure. It prevents kick-backs from abortion clinics and this was brought forward in the Sun-Times and I



might add that this particular provision of the Bill does relate to the Sun-Times expose', which detailed the atrocities that were taking place in these abortion clinics. It does impose restrictions on use of these saline type of abortions. It doesn't prevent the saline type but it does say that only under certain circumstances can this be used. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is probably the cruelest way that any human being, and an unborn baby is a human being, can be destroyed, and that's by burning them with this saline solution in the very late stages of development. The question here is if you respect life from the moment of conception until...until the final stage then you should be in support of the legislation. The Pro-life Organizations throughout the State of Illinois, and I'm speaking of everyone of them, are very strongly in favor of this legislation. I think this is an important for you to vote your conscience on this issue. If you really feel that you're against abortion, I can't see how you can possibly vote 'no' on this motion. Because this is a question, right now, of whether or not you would protect the weakest element in our society, and that's the unborn child. I ask you to vote 'yes' and a vote for the unborn."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kelly has moved to override the Governor's Veto with respect to Senate Bill 47. The question is, shall Senate Bill 47 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty, to explain his vote."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to quote



briefly from the decision of Justice Stevens from Illinois, who's on the Supreme Court, in the 'Danforth' case, and his quote is, 'Whatever choice a pregnant young woman makes, to marry, to abort, to bear her child out of wedlock, the consequences of her decision may have a profound impact on her entire future life. A legislative determination that such a choice will be made more wisely, in most cases, if the advice and moral support of a parent play a part in the decision making process, is surely not irrational.' And so I say to you, in agreeing with the Representative from Joliet, that it is good for parents to be advised by the doctor that a child is considering abortion. I would like to...it keeps the family together, as Representative Kelly has indicated. And I would like to let this...remind this Legislature that we do have three Branches of Government, we're the lawmaking part. Why don't we let the courts decide the part their suppose to decide, not the Governor, not the Legislature. This is an important Bill protecting unborn children. I know of no important... more important thing in our society and I ask a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Macdonald, to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am opposed to abortion on demand and my voting record has been very consistent in that manner. However, in this particular instance I would ask that you uphold the Governor's Veto of this particular Bill. I too want to reiterate what Representative Willer, who is also an anti-abortion...Representative in this House,



said. And I would quote to you, regardless of where it came from and in what year, obviously we made a mistake. And I would like to read the statement of this particular Bill and tell you that in my opinion it is not to be found in the Constitution of the State of Illinois. 'The General Assembly of the State of Illinois does solemnly declare and find in reaffirmation of the long standing policy of this state, that the unborn child is a human being from the time of conception and is therefore a legal person for purposes of the unborn child's right to life and is entitled to the right to life from conception, under the law.' And that may be true, from what we've heard, in 1975. And quote, 'The Constitution of this state.' Now I was a Member of the Bill of Rights Committee in the Constitutional Convention and both in the Committee of the Bill of Rights Committee and on the Committee of the Whole floor, we debated bitterly and long the rights to life Amendment to go into Section 2 of the Bill of Rights of Article 1. And at no time were we able to get that right to life Amendment in the Constitution and I see no viable reason at all, or no justification, for misinterpreting the Constitution of this state in this particular manner. And I would say that I will uphold the Governor in his veto of this Bill because I think the Bill is fuzzy, to say the least, and I think that there are better ways that we can evaluate Bills and come up with something more reasonable in the State of Illinois and I urge you to uphold the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sandquist. Your light's not working but I think you



want to explain your vote, go...proceed."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm really surprised that some of my colleague lawyers here on this floor are trying to say that this Bill is Constitutional. It just makes no sense to me at all. And all I think this Bill, and I suppose I've got a conflict of interest as a lawyer, all you're doing is making more work for lawyers to defend this Bill, to go up on a legal test, because you know and I know this is not going to be upheld and you're just making this to get your right to life vote. This is a bad Bill and I certainly hope we all vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 119 'aye', 44 'nay', 3 voting 'present' and the motion, hav...the Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, for what purpose do you rise?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, a verification of this vote, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The Lady persists in a verification. There are 119 'aye', 44 'nay', 3 voting 'present' and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, has asked for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Balanoff. Ebbesen. Garmisa. Griesheimer. Hoffman. McBroom. McGrew. Oblinger. Polk. Schneider. Stearney. No further."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The Lady has asked for a ... the verification. The Clerk is going to call the Affirmative votes. Remain in your seats as the Clerk calls the Affirmative vote and raise your hand."



Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Anderson. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Bradley. Breslin. Brummer. Burnidge. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Friedland. Friedrich. Getty. Giorgi. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huff. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Keane. Kelly. Kent. Klosak. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pullen. Rea. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Schisler. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sharp. Simms. Slape. Stanley. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Sumner. Swanstrom. Terzich. Totten. Tuerk. VanDuynes. Vinson. Vitek. Von Boeckman. Walsh. Watson. Williams. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Questions of the Affirmative vote by Representative Braun."

Braun: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jane Barnes, in her seat."

Braun: "Bower."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who was that?"

Braun: "Bower. Bower...Bower...okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in his seat. Bower."

Braun: "Capuzi."

Speaker Matijevich: "Capuzi is standing near his seat."



Braun: "DiPrima."

Speaker Matijeich: "DiPrima is in the middle aisle."

Braun: "Darrow."

Speaker Matijeich: "Clarence Darrow is way in the back."

Braun: "Giorgi."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Giorgi...he's over there."

Braun: "Doyle."

Speaker Matijeich: "Doyle is in DiPrima's seat."

Braun: "Leverenz."

Speaker Matijeich: "Leverenz is in the aisle right
down here."

Braun: "McClain."

Speaker Matijeich: "McClain. Mike McClain. I hear his
voice. There he is..."

Braun: "Matijeich...oh, sorry."

Speaker Matijeich: "I'm here... Sorry about that."

Braun: "Sorry about that... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeich: "He just peeked his head. He told
me to vote him 'aye'. He's peeking his head
right out here."

Braun: "Terzich."

Speaker Matijeich: "Terizch. I don't see him in his seat.
How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijeich: "Remove him."

Braun: "Walsh."

Speaker Matijeich: "Who was that?"

Braun: "Walsh."

Speaker Matijeich: "Walsh is in his seat."

Braun: "Ropp."

Speaker Matijeich: "He's right here."

Braun: "I can't see Ms. Sumner."

Speaker Matijeich: "Sumner...no..."

Braun: "She's there, okay."

Speaker Matijeich: "Oh, here she is in her...different seat."



Braun: "Matula."

Speaker Matijevich: "Matula is waving his hand."

Braun: "Meyer."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ted Meyer. In his seat."

Braun: "No further questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further questions. The Clerk will give me a count. 118 'aye', 44 'no', and this motion, having received the Constitutional Majority...three-fifths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 47 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Senate Bill 111, Leverenz. the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 111 was vetoed by the Governor, and I would move to override the Governor's veto. This Bill allows the emergency patrol vehicles that operate in Cook and St. Clair County to utilize red lights instead of the current amber lights. These are emergency vehicles. There are 62 vehicles in all. The Governor did admit to the fact that it would improve the visibility. It would cause a safer operating condition for the employees in the Department of Transportation. If anyone has any questions I'd be happy to answer them. There have been a total of 70 accidents of state employees in these emergency vehicles. I think we can reduce that and further reduce workman's compensation claims on these people that are approaching \$100,000 a year. I would move to override the Governor's veto to Senate Bill 111."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 111. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich on the motion.'"

Terzich: "Yes, Representative Leverenz, is this the Bill that



provides red flashing lights for toll road vehicles?"

Leverenz: "Yes Sir, that is a...correct. I did say it would put red oscillating lights...or permits red oscillating rotating flashing lights on the emergency patrol vehicles that in Chicago and Cook County patrol a limited number of highway, expressway miles and are in emergency situations whereas they are stopped blocking a line of traffic where an accident has occurred, and the answer again is yes."

Terzich: "What is your definition of an emergency vehicle?"

Leverenz: "Well, there's 62 trucks that operate both in Cook and St. Clair Counties are equipped with the larger first aid kits. They are equipped with equipment that is much the same as some of the ambulances that operate in the City of Chicago. They do and are trained in EMT. They are receiving additional training. They have equipment to cut cars, to remove the people that are trapped in them, and that would be my definition. As a matter of fact, for the five or six different areas that are in the statute now, I would think they comply, but they do need special legislation to include them."

Terzich: "Is there any...why...why couldn't they use white lights, or pink lights, or orange lights, or any other color?..."

Leverenz: "Not on the expressway."

Terzich: "Why don't they have to be red lights?"

Leverenz: "First, it is called, and properly so, an emergency vehicle in itself. It is the emergency patrol. And emergency vehicles should use red lights. Would you agree?"

Terzich: "That's their definition. They said it was an emergency. It could be auto patrol vehicle, or accident patrol vehicle, or traffic control vehicle. It doesn't have to be an emergency patrol vehicle."

Leverenz: "Yes, Sir. On the side of the truck it does say emergency, and I think you'll find that these are not operated or outfitted as a normal tow truck. You will



find equipment there much like that of a rescue vehicle and as a matter of fact, they are used for that, the 62 used in Cook and St. Clair County."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I spoke originally on this Bill, and I would have to be in favor of the Governor's veto. The Legislature and local units of government had this problem. There were so many different colored lights you didn't know whether it was an ambulance, a police vehicle, a tow truck, a traffic control vehicle, or what. The emergency light designation now are red and also blue which provided for ambulances, police vehicles, and fire vehicles, and although the patrol...toll way patrol trucks do perform a service of traffic control, this is an after effect situation. I don't believe this would be considered an emergency or life-saving emergency task. As a matter of fact, I guess you could be going down the toll road and be pulled over by a emergency patrol vehicle because you see a red flashing light. Now if they are having problems with people not seeing this type of vehicle, we're all aware that probably a strobe light is the most noticeable type light that you can have for any type of a vehicle, and I would suggest they would go to that and leave the designation of emergency vehicles to police vehicles, ambulances, and also fire emergency vehicles and not to proliferate the use of red emergency lights on any type of vehicle patrolling our highways. And I would urge a no vote in substituting the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 111."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Terzich is probably defending his...his own job as a fireman thinking that we're going to run up and down the streets and highways with the red lights on. The problem is that these are state vehicles clearly marked with emergency vehicles."



on their side, and they're in highly, heavily traveled areas in Chicago and East St. Louis. And the problem is, a yellow light doesn't mean anything, the amber light doesn't mean enough to people who are driving in this heavily traveled area, and we're not going to be running up and down the highways and pulling people over as he suggested. We're simply trying to protect the people who are helping some lady fix a flat tire, or something of that sort. It is to keep from having an accident is why we're asking for the red lights. And are we...put... blue, or pink, or any other color on there, and it wouldn't do as much as the amber would. I think that the Governor has been misguided in his veto, and I think we should override it. It is a very important thing from the safety standpoint."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Matula."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I may at this time, I would like to add on to what Representative Leverenz said regarding the emergency patrol. Representative Terzich stated that this was not needed for fact of an emergency, for fact of life or limb. I have some figures here that I have talked to a Gentleman at the present time...at one particular time there were seventeen men in the hospital due to the fact while trying to do some good for some injured people in an accident, they themselves had wound up in the hospital. There were two...two men killed in the last ten years. Five men in the hospital are now patients. One in the hospital that is there now has been there since last October. One had his legs amputated due to the fact trying to help somebody else that's in danger. I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to consider this very carefully, and I hope you will override the Governor's veto. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. You know, it's not too often that my colleague from the Fifth District comes up with a good Bill. But this time he did. You know, it makes more sense to me to have the emergency patrol vehicles have red lights on them so they can arrive safely to the scene of an accident to save a life, than it does to have a squad car have lights on, and the squad car, most of the time, is a police squad car. Cars are usually...you're going to, you know, answer a burglary or some household fracas or something that does not involve life and death in most instances. It seems to me it makes as much sense to have red emergency...lights on these emergency vehicles as it does to have them on the fire trucks. If anybody has experienced the back up that you'll find on the Illinois toll road, 294, 94, and the Stevenson Expressway, and the Eisenhower Expressway about five o'clock in the evening, you'll know why these men who are driving these emergency vehicles to the scene of an accident to give first aid or to extract a person from a vehicle before he gets burned to death, you'll know why it is necessary to have those red lights. I think it makes a lot of sense. I think it is almost a necessity to have those vehicles properly equipped to assure not only the safety of the occupants of the emergency vehicle, but to help them extract those who are trapped in their cars to prevent them from loss of life. I would urge you to vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz to close."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and certainly thank the prior speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me explain a few details to those who aren't convinced. The number of emergency vehicles that we operate in Cook County is 51. In East St. Louis, we operate 12. In 1978 they responded to 69,700 calls in the Cook County area, and 16,300 in East St. Louis. Of that number, 11,800 were



actual accidents, 42,800 were some type of vehicle disability problem where you have a car or a truck, and in Chicago we have these trucks falling off the expressway that...where you have people walking around on the expressway. The trucks that we're talking about pull up and block so that nothing else can actually hit that accident scene, and our people that drive these trucks and ride in these trucks are being hit. A former Representative spoke of the number that we have in the hospital. We have had on these expressway areas 58 fatalities in the Chicago area and six in the East St. Louis area. The vehicles are operated and equipped and the men are trained as an emergency patrol unit and deserve this protection as well as the people that are driving on the expressways and the people that they are saving. And for that, I would ask that we support that with 107 plus votes the override of the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 111. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 111 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski, to explain his vote."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was the Bill that insured that rescue vehicles on the state highways, those vehicles which tow, would have the privilege of having red lights on them. Now historically as a driver, I have always been cognizant of red lights meaning ambulances, fire departments, or squad cars. I can't imagine, nor 'countenance' a situation where I would pull over to the curb for a red light and find some vehicle towing a Volkswagen. I think it's wrong. I am in agreement with the Governor which may not be a constant situation. I am in agreement with the Governor on the total veto of this issue. No matter what the Senate



did on this. I think we should restrict red lights as drivers to those vehicles who are just thoroughly and completely emergency. I would seriously recommend that we agree with the Governor, the Department of Law Enforcement, which is objectively against this, and not agree to override this veto. The Governor is right."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Steele, did you want to explain your vote? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my yes vote, this legislation is very very important for a very select needed emergency type of situation. These are emergency vehicles in only two counties in the state, doesn't apply to the rest of the state, but they're out there trying to help people who are in distress, whose cars are immobilized, and the yellow lights just do not slow down the traffic. They're in extremely dangerous situations. They need the red oscillating lights to protect both the passengers who are stranded and the emergency vehicle people that are trying to assist them, and I think it is vitally important that in these emergency types of situations which affect only about 12 or 14 trucks in this state but in very critical situations that they'd be given the right and privilege to do so, and I urge more yellow...more red light...more yes lights rather to permit these red lights on these vehicles."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan to explain his vote. Ronan, Al Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that more people reconsider their vote on this very important issue. The transportation studies that have been taken up in the Cook County area show that the Dan Ryan Expressway and the Kennedy Expressway are some of the most busy routes in the state, and not only in the State of Illinois, but in the United States as a whole. These expressways are overburdened because we don't have a crosstown expressway, the need is tremendous up in this area, and the number of accidents is



unbelievable. These emergency vehicles get the large trucks that get in accidents off the expressway, and the men who work in these emergency vehicles risk their life every day. I hope people take this into account. We need more green votes up on the Board so that these men get the safety that they so justly deserve. Please vote green."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are only 79 votes up there. I don't think we can change very much, but if I could have the attention of the House and let them understand that we slaughter some 53,000 people a year on the highways, and I put on close to 2,000 miles a month on my car. And there are many nights that I have to drive in the fog and inclement weather, and whether it is a tow truck or whether it's a police car, I notice the line that follows me, or the line that I'm following slow up every time they do see a red light. If we could save... if we could save one life in every county by having a red light on these emergency vehicles...travelling from the suburbs into the City of Chicago...driving on the 'Congress Street' Expressway. Many a time I come on a state highway truck, and inadvertently I would have to swerve in a different lane. Fortunately no one is in that different lane. But if we could be pre...forewarned, and if we could save one life in every county, what difference does it make, and how important is it that we do not have...or we infringe on the rights of the police department because they don't want the red lights on any other vehicle other than a police vehicle. I'm hoping...I'm hoping that we can reconsider and put 107 votes up here just on a trial basis. If we find that it causes too much of a problem in the future, the General Assembly isn't adjourning sine die. We'll be back here next year; the following year. So let's save ten to twenty to a hundred lives in the State of Illinois alone."



Bring down that 53,000 to a respectable figure, if it could be called respectable."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 'aye', 73 'nays', and 2 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I don't know whether to Poll the Absentees or put it on Postponed. I think Postponed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to place on Postponed Consideration. Leave, and Senate Bill 111 will be placed on Postponed Consideration. The...Senate Bill 5, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 5, which was Sponsored by Senator D'Arco in the Senate is a Bill which creates the Hospice Study Commission that will study the feasibility, present and future needs, and the cost of construction of financing hospices. Now for those of you who don't know what hospices are, we went through this when the Bill was up the first time. That is a facility for terminally ill patients, terminally ill citizens of our state to help them cope with the inevitability of death in a more humane way. It is something that has begun throughout the country and is growing in magnitude and support. And it is important that we study this and make sure that hospices that are created and built in the State of Illinois are done so under the proper scrutiny and circumstances. We sit here and deal day in and day out with money for projects for pork...for political reasons. this is something for people, for people in need, for friends, for families, and I would move to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 5."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."



Leinenweber: "If I recall correctly there was a companion appropriations Bill os somewhere in the neighborhood of \$50,000. Is that correct?"

Marovitz: "That is absolutely correct."

Leinenweber: "And what did the Governor do with that Bill?"

Marovitz: "The Governor vetoed the \$50,000 appropriation. It is our feeling...as a separate Bill...is our feeling that this Commission is still needed whether there is a \$50,000 appropriation or not. The appropriation has been vetoed. That's in a separate Bill..."

Leinenweber: "Is there a mo..."

Marovitz: "That has been...that has been overridden also, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Is there a motion on file in the House to override the...I believe it is Senate Bill 6 for the \$50,000?"

Marovitz: "Yes, there is."

Leinenweber: "And is that your motion?"

Marovitz: "That is my motion."

Leinenweber: "Well,, Mr. Speaker, briefly on this Bill, this is a Bill which sought to create...or seeks to create a 12 member Study Commission to study hospices. There was a lot of questions last spring when the Bill was before us on Third Reading what hospices was, and it was pretty well agreed that at least as far as the Sponsor's explanation I guess it was the same as it was today. It is a Commission which will seek to study a subject which I can't imagine we have less ability to understand or to examine. There are agencies of the State of Illinois and departments of the State of Illinois who would presumably...do regulate this type of institution and is in a good position to decide whether regulations are...what regulations are needed and so forth. I really can't see why at this time when we've all been talking about trying to preserve costs of the state...trying to preserve the scarce revenues of the state, and as a matter of fact, even trying to provide some meaningful tax relief to the people of this state, that



we ought to be voting on creation of new Commissions which in the first year plan to spend at least \$50,000. I think that is somewhat inconsistent with some of our expressed positions that tax relief is needed. That expansion of government is not needed, and consequently, I do urge support of the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marovitz to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, the previous speaker said he can't imagine the subject that we are... we have less ability to examine. I hope that none of us in this room, in this chamber ever have occasion to have a family member or a friend in this position to be in a hospice, but I think it would be a abdication of our responsibility to say that we should stay out of this area. Is that true for nursing homes? Is that true for mental health? Is that true for welfare, or for juvenile delinquency, or for problems of children? That is our responsibility. That's what we're elected for to take care of problems, of people in need. And who could have greater need than people who have received the unfortunate news that they are terminally ill? They have to deal with that day in and day out. We deal with politics. We deal with money. Let's deal with people. I would ask for an 'aye' vote and an override on Senate Bill 5."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Marovitz has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 5. the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 5 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? MacDonald, 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 54 'nays', and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz. Poll of the Absentees. the Clerk will Poll the Absentees. 94 'ayes', 54 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. Wyvetter Younge, 'aye', whenever you... Speaker 'aye'. Senator D'Arco said open it up again. On



this motion we're going to take another count. On this motion those in favor signify by voting 'aye' on the override. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 59 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook asks a Poll of the Absentees. And while the machine is taking out the Roll Call, Representative White...Jesse White tells us he's lost two attache cases. If anybody has seen two attache cases, please let us know. Representative Giorgi found them. The Clerk will proceed with the Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. E.M. Barnes, Daniels, Grossi, Hannig, Kane, Kucharski, McAuliffe, McBroom, Molloy, Oblinger, Peters, Piel, Polk, Schneider, Stearney, Telscer..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kucharski 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "And Winchester."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bluthardt, the Gentleman from Cook...the Gentleman..."

Bluthardt: "No...change me from yes to no."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Bluthardt from 'yes' to 'no'. Who? Epton from 'no' to 'aye'. Huskey. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Change me to 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Huskey to 'no'. Piel, 'aye'."

The count is 100 'aye', and 60 'nays'. And this motion... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz asks leave to place the Bill on Postponed Consideration. Leave, and Senate Bill 5 will be placed on Postponed. Senate Bill 147, Getty. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty on Senate Bill 147. Out of the record. Senate Bill 296, Representative Younge. Out of the record. Senate Bill 459, VonBoeckman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 468, Keane, Jim Keane back there? Out of the record. Senate Bill 798, Bus Yourell. 798. Out of the record. Senate



Bill 909, Totten. Does that mean out? Out of the record. Senate Bill 910 out of the record. Senate Bill 1137, Hoxsey. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1328, Bower. Where's Bower? I don't see him. Out of the record, I guess. Is the Parliamentarian around, Dave Epstein, for a moment? Come here. On the order of item veto motion there appears Senate Bill 157... Representative Rea. Is he here? I don't see him here either. Oh... alright, Representative Rea is here. On the order of item veto motion Senate Bill 157, motion number one by Jim Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This has to do with an Ethacoal Amendment to Senate Bill 157. There were \$25,000 that was appropriated to the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University to prepare a detail proposal to demonstrate the technical and economic feasibility of Ethacoal. Ethacoal is 60% high sulfur coal and 40% alcohol. This would make a blend that will burn clean and may be the solution that we have been looking for in terms of being able to burn Illinois coal. In the... in the Governor's veto, I think that he made a mistake when he said in his veto message that the Institute of Natural Resources is the logical agency to coordinate the state's efforts in energy related research, and that they have the money there. In checking with them, they do not have and cannot provide it for developing a proposal of this type. So I ask at this time that we do override this... this veto and would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Rea has moved with respect to Senate Bill 157 to override the Governor's veto at page five line 15 to 22. On that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this override attempt, and I hope that Representative Rea, when he is closing, will tell us how this will allow Com-Ed to burn Illinois coal. If I understand correctly, this is a fairly effective way of removing sulfur from coal. And actually,



we are creating the first new liquid fuel, or we have created the first new liquid fuel since oil was discovered. This is a very important Amendment that is much more important than the \$30,000 would make it seem and, I hope, given the energy crisis, whether one believes it is contrived, or actual...this is something that should be explored full blast. And there is no reason whatsoever to wait for some other unit of state government to do it. SIU has a way of taking things by the horns and getting it done one way or another. And I think we ought to give them the chance here."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "...Gentlemen of the House, there is one thing I want to point out. The German army ran their...army on alcohol totally. Now this is...process is patented and owned by the Rockefeller family is one reason that alcohol is not being promoted in the United States. Now this is...this is one way that if we can come up with this to use the alcohol and go ahead and use the coal that we have in Illinois and quite having to pay such high interest rates and such high costs because of the fact that we're spending too much money for foreign oil."

Speaker Matijevich: "There appears no further discussion. The question is 'Shall the item on page five line 15 through 22 of Senate Bill 157 pass?'. Just one moment. Representative Borchers, the Gentleman from Macon."

Borchers: "I would like to ask...I would like to ask a question of the..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Borchers: "...Sponsor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Your light wasn't on, but proceed."

Borchers: "Is this Bill the \$200,000 still in this Bill for a statue of Daley in Chicago, and is there also another \$200 for the statue of Ogilvie in Chicago? Is that the Bill?"



Rea: "That's...that's another Amendment. That has nothing to do with this Amendment whatsoever."

Borchers: "Well, I was just curious as to the override in relation to those things. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The question is 'Shall the item on page five line 15 through 22 on Senate Bill 157 pass notwithstanding the item veto of the Governor?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'.
Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'aye', 27 'nays', one answering 'present', and this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the item on page five, line 15 through 22 of Senate Bill 157 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Also on Senate Bill 157...on item veto motion number two, the Lady from St. Clair, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record? Alright, out of the record. House Bills Second Reading. House Bill 2795. Alright. Point of order. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, how did we get to Second Reading? Doesn't it have to sit on the Calendar for one day?"

Speaker Matijeich: "These Bills have been on the Calendar."

Skinner: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "They...they were just taken out of the record. We're getting back to them. In fact, we've taken everything else out of the record...Representative Collins, don't go too far. We need you on another Bill right now because Taylor's not here. Senate Bill 2813, Representative Collins on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment is not mine, but I don't think it is on the Member's desks yet either. It hasn't been distributed. The Amendments have not been distributed. I'm not objecting to the Amendment, as a matter of fact, I favor it, but we don't have them yet."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Amendment's being passed out right now if everybody will just hold for a moment. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2813, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Totten, amends House Bill 2813 on page one, lines one and five and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor has indicated that he would accept the Amendment. It is a technical Amendment correcting some inadvertent language in the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Totten has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. House Bill 2795."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2795, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity to awards made by the Court of Claims, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Taylor, amends House Bill 2795 on page three by deleting lines 23 through 26 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Jim Taylor on Amendment #1."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #1 simply is a...Amendment that was adjudicated by the courts after the Bill had been filed, and one of those Amendments we had taken out because the Attorney General wanted an opportunity to look at it, but it was \$45,000



And that particular Amendment will come up later on because they have had to cohere it. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill...House Bill 2795."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Taylor has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2795. No discussion. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Taylor, amends House Bill 2795 as amended..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Taylor on Amendment #2."

Taylor: "Amendment #2 puts back in what Amendment #1 has taken out in terms of the construction company that had a \$45,000 approved after a rehearing and the Attorney General and all have agreed to that now, and I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2795."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Taylor has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. If no discussion, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading."

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

Schlickman: "Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just a few minutes ago House Bill 2813 was read a second time, and an Amendment, Amendment #1, was offered by one of the Members from Cook, and he described that Amendment as simply being technical in nature. Just as the Amendment was adopted by oral vote, a copy was given to me, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2813 is far more than technical in nature. And on that account, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted to House Bill 2813."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Bill has already been advanced to Third Reading, so besides that, it was adopted on a voice vote, and I don't think a motion to reconsider is in order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster,...it would be a motion to table if it were on Third. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that Representative Collins point...points out, it is true that this Bill has gone to Third Reading, and the Sponsor of Amendment #1 did on fact, as I heard it, indicate that this was a technical Amendment which would lead the Members to believe it was not substantive. As it turns out, it is a very substantive Amendment that makes a major change in the way the delegates to the National Nominating Convention would be selected and the way their names would appear on the ballot. For the reason that I think the Membership should not be misled on a subject, I move that...that House Bill 2813 be returned to the order of Second Reading so that Members will have an opportunity to reconsider what was railroaded through here on the basis of a misrepresentation. And I respectfully move that House Bill 2813 be returned to the order of Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Deuster: "I think the rules allow for a motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "...With the Parliamentarian. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for once I do agree with the Parliamentarian. I'm the Sponsor of the Bill, and I would like to point out to the Chair that I asked that the Bill be held...I asked that the Bill be held until...until the Amendments were distributed, and it did. The Sponsor of the Amendment describes the Amendment as technical, and it is highly technical, and I...and everybody accepted that argument, and they had the Amendment in front of them. I don't want it back on Second Reading, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to..."



Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me the motion to return it to Second Reading is singularly within the province of the Sponsor of the Bill. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I'm rising simply as a matter of personal privilege. I would think that the Sponsor of Amendment 1 in order to maintain his high record of credibility and respectability, would want to talk to the Sponsor of the bill and have this matter brought back, and I respectfully relay that suggestion to my colleague on this side of the aisle. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "What do you recommend we do? On the Supplemental Calendar #2, House Bills Third Reading. 2789."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is now being distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "That diagram you have on the podium, did Mrs. Skinner draw that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Dunn... 2789, Representative Polk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2789, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Capitol Development Board from the Capitol development fund for certain projects, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bell. Bell. Representative Bell."

Bell: "Mr. Speaker, could we hear 2789 and 2798 together? They are companion Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to have 2789 and 2798 heard together. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Will you read 2798?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2798, a Bill for an Act to amend a Section of the Capital Development Bond Act of 1972, Third Reading of the Bill."

Bell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2789 and



2798 are companion Bills. 2789 is the appropriation. 2798 is the bond authorization. What this is, we have in East Moline the East Moline mental health facility which is being phased out. We have intentions of remodeling this facility for the use of Department of Corrections with a 60 bed work release center, a 200 bed minimum security facility, and also to remodel part of the facility for the Department of Law Enforcement for State Police Headquarters #7. This is an issue that is quite important in our district. There are over 300 jobs at stake and a state owned existing facility that needs to be used. And for this reason I would ask for your support of this measure that passed the House in the spring. It got caught up in a Conference Committee. It is something that is desperately needed in the East Moline area."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall these Bills pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye', and seven 'no', and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. 2...2790, Representative Chapman."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2790, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2790 amends the appropriation for the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation adding \$151,000 to the Illinois School for the Deaf Association. This would start up a program for deaf children with multiple handicaps. The appropriation provides for ten children. The program would be ready to start in January, and unless we take this action, they will be children who do not have appropriate educational facilities. I accepted Mr. Kempiner's Amendment earlier in



the day and believe that there is no opposition to the legislation."

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

Skinner: "I would like to know if this is in the Governor's budget?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Skinner, this is not in the Governor's budget, but we've worked with BOB and have taken their Amendment. It is an important program to be offered now, because otherwise children are being offered inappropriate educational opportunities and in some instances are being sent out of the state or being provided for at state expense in the state at a cost clear in excess of what we are asking. The Amendment says that the dollars spent will be federal dollars."

Skinner: "Oh, marvelous. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Skinner: "Free money."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. I'll get there. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye', 25 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 2792, Representative Giorgi."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2792, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this...House Bill 2792 was passed in the regular Session, and it was incorrectly enrolled. And what it provides...it provides that if the administrative or supervisory experience within the Illinois Office of Education or an education service region fulfills the administrative experience requirement of the superintendent's endorsement to the administrative certificate. This was passed during a Session of the General Assembly, and it was inadvertently dropped from the true Bill, but I urge the support of the House."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye',...Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I'm sure I missed something, but I didn't understand the explanation. What does it provide? Was this a Resolution commending someone?"

Giorgi: "I know, Brummer...Brummer's only kidding. This provides that administrative or supervisory experience within the Illinois Office of Education or an education service region fulfills the administrative experience requirements of the superintendent endorsement with the administrative certificate. This passed...the regular Bill in the regular Session that was incorrectly enrolled and was dropped from the original Bill. This is the intent of the General Assembly, and we're only correcting an error."

Brummer: "I think that's the same thing I heard the first time, and I still don't understand it. Would you reduce that to language that I understand?"

Giorgi: "There is no fee involved. You can't take this into the courts because there is no fee involved in this case."

Matijeich: "DiBrima will handle the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to inquire of the Sponsor of the Bill. When we talk about administrative experience in the Illinois Office of Education, have we defined that in terms of the various classifications in the Illinois Office that would qualify as educational experiences, or is it just a general reference and somebody else is going to decide what administrative experiences are?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Hoffman, what the Bill provides is that administrative or supervisory experience within the educational service region office. There is only four



or five people in an educational service region office, and they're either administrative or supervisory. This serves in the same capacity as being a member of let's say a...Board of Education."

Brummer: "Mr...Mr. Sponsor, I wasn't asking about the educational service region. I was asking about the Illinois...the State Board of Education as it is now called. What did we define what we meant by administrative responsibilities in that office?"

Giorgi: "Administrative or supervisory. Now I'm not familiar with the Illinois Office of Education's various departments and divisions. You might be more familiar with that than I am. You felt that there is a division or department that doesn't deserve the experience credit?"

Brummer: "My point is that there are many responsibilities in the office...the State Board of Education which are functional offices but they...they in fact are not responsible for anyone else, or do not direct anyone else. And my question was, is this any more narrowly defined in this Bill? It either is or it isn't. You see, there is a significant difference between administrative responsibilities in a school system as opposed to administrative responsibilities in the State Board of Education, and I just wondered if there was a clarification. That if not, there isn't, and we'll just go with it that way."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "I thought...I'm going to rephrase Representative Brummer's question, and who is it in Rockford who can't meet the requirements without going through all this malarky?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, prior to the passage of this Bill in the last Session, all this was hashed out during the last



Session of the General Assembly, an individual seeking to obtain a superintendent endorsement to an administrative certificate was statutorily required to have at least two years experience as an administrator or superintendent in either a public or non-public school. What this says... does is allows a person...an educational service region officer to gain that same experience and that same credit towards a superintendent certificate."

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 122 'aye', 17 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2794, Representative Bowman."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2794 is a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Children and Family Services, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2794 is a supplemental appropriation. It appropriates an additional 5.2 million dollars to the Department of Children and Family Services from the local effort day care fund for day care services in the current fiscal year. I would like to first point out that the local day care fund is all Federal money. It is a pass through fund. We have just started to appropriate this fund...from this fund. In the past, the money has not been appropriated, so this year in keeping with the... a general policy for appropriating all funds, we did so. Now, there was a mistake made, unfortunately, because an insufficient amount of money was appropriated. How do I know it's insufficient? Well, because if the local governments, for example, if Chicago, the City of Chicago, wants to have a certain amount of day care services provided



within its day care centers, and it puts up so much money, then we have to appropriate three times that amount of money from the federal pot in order to allow them to proceed with their program. So, in this case, we are performing administrative functions, and I regret to say that when the budget was considered, everyone underestimated what the request would be. So what happened after the appropriation was passed and signed, the Department of Children and Family Services signed 12 month contracts with Marion, East St. Louis, and Evanston, but can only sign a six month contract for the City of Chicago. So unless this money is appropriated, all the centers in the City of Chicago will have to shut down on January 1. The city does not want that. The Department of Children and Family Services does not want that, and I'm sure you do not want that, and I ask your affirmative vote on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join to support the request made of the House by Representative Bowman in regard to the passage of this fund...these funds. The facts are as accurate...are exactly as he has indicated they are, and these funds are needed. Miscalculation was initially made as indicated by Representative Bowman. These funds are pass through funds, and we ask that the House give its overwhelming support to this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is...Representative Bowman, do you want to close?"

Bowman: "I ask an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "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 100 'aye', and seven 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2797, J.J. Wolf."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2797, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency, Third Reading of the Bill."

Wolf: "Mrs. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill,...Sorry, you caught me a little flat-footed here. This Bill originally requested \$1,166,500..."

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

Wolf: "...In federal funds only..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll get back to it."

Wolf: "...Which are federal grant awards in excess of the amount approved in House Bill 1656 in the FY '80 appropriation for additional funds which have come our way through the federal government. There was an Amendment put on earlier which adds \$190,000 in general revenue funds which would go for distribution of 208 monies to NIPC, Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan Planning Commission and the Greater Egypt Planning and Development Commission in the total amount of \$190,000 to continue... as a part of a local match...to implement the completed plans for water quality and sewage management, and I would ask a favorable vote of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Aye 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 123 'aye', 16 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2794. The Chair made a mistake. We had a quick gavel on that one. I've all had them...they've all had them. I called this one back. Representative Peters, you move to reconsider the vote? Is that, I guess, what we do? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 2794 received 100 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "The problem here is that I called for the Roll Call before it had the 107 votes. It was on its way,



but... The question's on Representative Peters' move to reconsider the vote by which 2794 passed. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', and opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask now that we vote once again on House Bill 2794. It is a Bill which was explained adequately by Representative Bowman which does appropriate five point two million dollars in federal funds for the day care programs and the Department of Children and Family Services."

Speaker Redmond: "Question...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 134 'aye', and 10 'no', and the Bill having received the extraordinary Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Three to the House Calendar is now being distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "2799, Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Could you record me 'aye' on that last...Mr. Speaker, could I be recorded as voting 'aye' on..."

Speaker Redmond: "2799, Representative Bowman."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2799, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is needed to implement...Senate Bill 1146 which passed with bipartisan support in the last...in the spring term. After it passed, the County Clerk's Association brought some administrative problems to light with the administration of the Bill, and we sat down and worked out the problems with the County Clerk's Association, with the State Board of Elections, with the League of Women Voters who also had some technical objections, with Project LEAP in Chicago, and then Amendment #2 which was adopted today was..developed in conjunction with the Cook County



Clerk and the Chicago State Board...Chicago Board of Elections Commissioners. This is a clean up Bill. I'll be happy to answer any specific questions, but it is predominantly technical in nature. It has bipartisan support. Representative Collins and Bluthardt are also joint Sponsors on this Bill with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

I think I know the answer to this, but I just want to be sure. This Bill contains no Amendments sponsored by Representative Totten, does it? Mr. Speaker, could we " turn on the mic for Mr. Bowman?"

Bowman: "Bowman...Thank you. Okay. There are...no. That Amendment...Mr. Totten's Amendment is not on this Bill."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we get embroiled in another thing like somebody started to get us on before, could you be...give us at least a synopsis. What does this relate to?"

Bowman: "Okay, the main thing that created an administrative problem is...first of all, the original Bill that this legislation addresses itself to provides for a method of supervised passing of absentee ballots in nursing homes. In the legislation that was passed in the spring, there was a requirement that the binders, the permanent voter's registration records be taken to the nursing home. This Bill deletes that requirement, because when the person makes an application for ballot, they...their signature is checked against the records in the Board offices, or the Clerk's offices, and then when the vote is counted on election night, the signature is once again checked against the permanent record. So it superfluous or redundant to have the signature checked yet a third time in the home. That is the main change in the Bill. There are a couple... other miscellaneous ones, but that is the main one."



VanDuyne: "That would only have to do with...have to do with when there is an actual voting booth in the nursing home, right?"

Bowman: "Well, only when people who are registered from that address wish to vote by absentee from that address. Not if there is a polling place in the home. If there is a polling place in the home, then they would be expected... if they were...could get out of the bed and come down and vote in the booth, then they would be expected to do that."

VanDuyne: "It still has...they still have to make application to the county clerk,..."

Bowman: "Yes."

VanDuyne: "And then the county clerk sends them the ballot, then they vote, send it back to the county clerk, and then the county clerk delivers it to the polls on election day."

Bowman: "If they wish to vote absentee, yes, but they have to make the application."

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? I know it. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 153 'aye', and no 'nay', and having received the extraordinary Majority is hereby declared passed. 2800, Representative Daniels. 2800, Representative Daniels."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2800, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2800 amends the Municipal Code to provide that water commissions may use the name indicative of the area. This would be an example where there are more than two, or three, or four municipalities in a water commission, and they might decide to have the name other than just the names of the municipalities, and as long as it is indicative of the area,



it would be approved. There is another provision of the Bill which relates to adding members to the water commission that was specifically requested by a municipality in a portion of Cook County. This Bill is identical in the form that passed this House in spring. There was an enrolling and engrossing problem, and this Bill would correct that problem that was created in the spring, and I would move for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a few questions."

Daniels: "No."

Bluthardt: "Yeah. I've had a few phone calls from various attorneys who represent water districts who are opposed to your Bill and have been opposed to it. Can you tell us why there would be opposition to this Bill of yours? That's the annexation part that they are opposed to."

Daniels: "Well, I think that very possibly they may be from the community that is affected by this legislation. The additional language that's on page four of the Bill would be for the addition of a member to the water commission area, and that would provide that a member may be added if a municipality has been a continuous customer of the same water commission for a minimum of 20 years, receives at least 90% of its water from the water commission, and the population of the municipality exceeds 25% of the population of these incumbent members. Now my understanding is there's only one area in the State of Illinois that fits that requirement, and that is an area around LaGrange and Lyons Township. Fairly correct Representative Walsh says, and they have been continuous users of the water system and desire to be a member and could fall within this Amendment. It could be, without knowing the names of the people that called you, that they are people that are concerned in that municipal area. But this was heard in Committee and heard on the House floor, and it was decided



in the wisdom of the Legislature to enact this into law, and it was unfortunately only out of an enrolling and engrossing problem that it was messed up, and we're trying to correct that now."

Bluthardt: "But you admit this is tailored for one particular municipality in the State of Illinois."

Daniels: "In that one Section which was an Amendment to the Bill. That is correct. It was amended in the Senate."

Bluthardt: "And one of the persons who called me is the attorney for the...for that water commission who was opposed to this Bill. What the reasons are I'm not sure, but they feel... they seem to feel that the Bill is unfair in that it allows a municipality to become part of the commission, but I'm not too sure why they do that or why they're opposed. I thought perhaps you could tell me."

Daniels: "Well, Representative, they're opposed because..."

Bluthardt: "We don't want to stick another Amendment through... or Bill through like earlier."

Daniels: "They don't want...they don't want to...that particular municipality to become a member of the commission. Now what I would point out to you are the following facts if Representative Bower would sit down, I could talk to you. Glen, if you would sit down I could talk. The following facts are this, that this particular municipality has been a member of that water commission for 20 years. It receives 90% of its water from that commission, and it has a population which exceeds 25% of the total population of the water commission users. They want to become a member of that water commission and are being blocked. And it seems to me that it is unreasonable when they have met that kind of criteria to block their membership, and that's what we've addressed here in this particular area. We are also addressing that the joint concern of the Legislators from this area that we're trying to respond to, and that is the reason. I think the people that contacted you were operating on behalf of that particular



water commission."

Bluthardt: "Yes, under the enabling statute that establishes the water commission, does it empower the election or appointment of commissioners based on population, and would it be possible because this municipality has been allowed to come in, or been brought in against the will of the commission, that they could conceivably then take over control of the commission and operate the commission?"

Daniels: "No."

Bluthardt: "Not possible."

Daniels: "They could not take over the commission."

Bluthardt: "What advantages then would there be to...to allowing them to become part of the commission?"

Daniels: "The advantages would be to the municipality that would be coming into the commission because then they would have a member vote. They would be able to vote."

Bluthardt: "Would it result in lower water rates?"

Daniels: "Very possibly. That doesn't necessarily mean that, but possibly it could result in lower rates."

Bluthardt: "I see. Okay, Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye', and one 'no'. The Bill having received the three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed. 2804, Representative Yourell."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Transfer Tax Act; Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the past Session we passed out of here and out of the Senate, was signed into law, House Bill 367 which clarified constitutional language allowing counties to retain 25¢ for every 50¢ collected on a \$500 transfer tax



stamp. And there was a little difficulty with that legislation because counties were supposed to pass an ordinance as soon as the legislation was signed into law which was...prior to the time of the passage of the Bill which was May 17, and by July 5 to...when the Governor signed it into law to pass an ordinance to make that action necessary so that the counties would retain charged 25¢ for \$500 worth of value on a transfer tax stamp, and the state would retain 25¢ for a total of 50¢ per \$500 value. Some counties in Illinois did not have the foresight to pass the ordinance in recognition of House Bill 367, and so now we've presented House Bill 2804 which allows them the period of time from May 17 to the time the Governor signs the Bill and to provide with a subsequent appropriation Bill 2805, a sum of \$250,000 to pay back to the counties for their lack of revenue derived from the proceeds of House Bill 367. This Bill is...House Bill 2805 was amended so that the original appropriation of \$150,000 was increased to \$250,000 at the direction of the Department of Revenue, and the Department of Revenue feels that 2804 and 2805 are necessary, and I urge your favorable vote on 2804."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "We...May I ask the Sponsor a question, please? Or will he yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Do I understand correctly that we're talking about appropriating from the general revenue fund to counties who do not act in a timely fashion about \$285,000?"

Yourell: "250,000."

Schlickman: "250,000, a quarter of a million dollars. What is the position of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this Bill?"

Yourell: "Well, I would...I would assume, and I don't know that, but the Department of Revenue suggested Amendment #1 to House Bill 2805 increasing it...the amount...the original amount that I presented, in the amount of \$150,000



because they thought that that was the amount necessary to satisfy the counties. The Department of Revenue is in complete agreement with both of these Bills, and I suppose they've checked with the Department of the Budget. I have not."

Schlickman: "What is the justification in correcting or giving money to counties that didn't take the initiative under the enabling Act. Perhaps they didn't need it. Why should we be forcing money into their treasury?"

Yourell: "No, that's not quite accurate, Representative, because the counties that we're trying to take care of are the ones that initiated the action with the Department of Revenue in promulgating House Bill 2804."

Schlickman: "They were responsible for the...the enabling Act, but didn't take advantage of it."

Yourell: "That's right."

Schlickman: "How many counties are involved?"

Yourell: "I believe there's 14."

Schlickman: "Would you give me the name of the largest county?"

Yourell: "It isn't Cook,"

Schlickman: "It is not? 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye', and 15 'no', and the Bill having received the extraordinary Majority is hereby declared passed. 2805, Representative Yourell."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2805, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Revenue, Third Reading of the Bill."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I explained, I believe, House Bill 2805 when we were discussing House Bill 2804. 2805 is the appropriation Bill to 2804 in the amount of \$250,000. I ask your favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2805."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall this



Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye', and nine 'no', and the Bill having received the three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3. 2795."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2795, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity with the awards made by the Court of Claims, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor. Out of the record. 2813. Representative Phil Collins, 2813. Out of the record. Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of moving to the order of Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading. I have been...I have been patient and waited my turn, and I have constantly been ignored as to that order of business. The Governor today has come out with a message to all of us in regards to tax and spending limits, and I think we ought to read it although in no way does he want to talk about a legislative limit that is before this House. Mr. Speaker, I have properly filed a motion. It is on the Calendar to move to the order of Constitutional Amendments Third Reading, and if you don't choose to move to that, as a matter of course, then I would press the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "I move we adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Bowman: "I move we adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Supplemental Calendar... Supplemental Calendar #2 you finished up with 2805 with Representative Yourell, but then below that there were four



motions, and I wonder what posture that these last two conversations would put those in?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "You...Mr. Speaker, you recognized me. I have properly filed a motion, and I would like to move to that order of business." Under Rule 10B I have filed the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, you didn't answer my question."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your question?"

VanDuyne: "On Supplemental Calendar #2 there are four motions, yours being one of them, and I wondered if you went to any other order of business. That...that would seem to me to be..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we went...we'll get back to them. We had to go to the order of House Bills Third Reading in order to get them over to the Senate. We...they're waiting for them. We will get to your order motions. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I believe Representative Totten has a motion before the House, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's right. I was going to let everybody talk. Now you want to talk? According to Rule 10, Representative Totten has moved that the House go to the order of Constitutional Amendments Third Reading. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye', and five 'no'. The order is Constitutional Amendments Third Reading."

Continued...



Speaker Redmond: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #13. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring before you at this time a proposal to amend the Illinois Constitution to put a limit on both state taxes and local taxes. And I submit that I bring it before you at a time that could be not more appropriate. For we have seen, not only in the last Session of the Legislature but in the recent days of the Special Session and in this Session of the Legislature, a continual preponderancy on the Legislature to spend and spend and do nothing about tax relief or limits. I think the Governor, very appropriately, has brought it to our attention in his message to the Members of this General Assembly. But I think he has brought it rather inappropriately in that there is more measures before this Body than his alone. Let me point out to the Members of the Illinois General Assembly the situation that exists in Illinois today. In 1966 it took the State of Illinois five hours and seven minutes to spend a million dollars. In 1976, just ten years later, it took one hour and five minutes to spend that same one million dollars. And if that same trend continues, in 1986 the state will spend that same one million dollars every forty minutes. It is no wonder that in 1979 we have a revolt over taxation with representation. There are many who agree with me that there is a serious flaw in our state Constitution and that flaw must be corrected. It is the flaw that permits government to collect an unlimited amount of the resources of the people. Our document, especially that portion of the document in relation to revenue or fiscal, is an incomplete document. It gives us the power to tax but in no way does it limit that power. H.J.R.C.A. #13 completes that



document by putting limits in the Constitution. The Amendment has several provisions. And for those who are concerned about the flexibility of putting such limits into the Constitution, let me point out that the proposal that is before us today is complex, it is ...it recognizes the fact that it is a Constitutional Amendment and it provides some leeway for the Legislature should unforeseen circumstances economically come before us. Briefly, the major provisions of the Amendment are these. First of all, it puts a limit in relationship to the economy of the state on the state's ability to raise revenue. It says that that limit, that ratio, shall be no greater than 8% of the total personal income for the three prior calendar years. The average ...it provides for the ups and downs in the economy and it is only a little less than the present ratio of state taxes to total personal income. And it is a little less so that we could trigger two other important ingredients into the Amendment. And those are these. First of all, 2% of the revenues in excess of the revenue limit go into a budget stabilization fund or a rainy day fund. That provides some of the flexibility. It sets aside some money so if there are unforeseen circumstances, the Governor can ask that we spend those and the Amendment provides that three-fifths of the Legislature must concur. Secondly, revenues in excess of the 2% go into a distributive fund. And that fund can be spent by the Members of the Legislature in three ways and they are spelled out in the Amendment. Those three ways are to retire state debts, to fund the actuarial reserve deficiencies of the state pension systems or for tax relief. And let me point out, and I think no more appropriately, the debate that has echoed in these halls for the last few months regarding tax relief, can we afford it or can we not? This



Amendment by this provision on the set aside fund would give us a definite amount of money that we could set aside for tax relief and we do not have to debate whether we can afford it or not because it would be there for all to see. The only question is, in what form do we want that tax relief to take? Third, because we recognize that a Constitutional Amendment does provide some rigidity, there is a provision in the Amendment that says that should the limit imperil the state's ability to provide the services that we think are needed, the Governor may ask to suspend the limit for one year and if the Legislature concurs by a two-thirds vote we can so do. That cannot be done two years in a row, it must go to the voters. The state limit assures the people of this state that their taxes will not be raised or the ratio of their income going to support state government will not be raised more...more than the level it is now without their approval. Secondly, at the local level it...it establishes a limit for local property taxes and says that they cannot rise more than 75% of the rate of increase in the CPI for the prior calendar year. Local property taxes in this state have risen on an average of over 16% in the last...last year that we have records for. Many Bodies have increased limits above what this would allow, many have not. But those who desire to do so, under this Amendment, may increase their local property taxes by bringing the issue to the voters and by referendum going over the limit. That seems only right. It puts the key back in the voters hands. It does not allow local taxing Bodies to grab on to the windfall profits that escalating real estate values have afforded them in the past. There are other provisions in the local limit. One, says that if the state mandates programs on local units of government, they must pay the cost or



the mandate is void. Programs transferred from the state level to the local level or vice versa, the limit can be changed accordingly so that the burden is not increased on one unit or another. Third, it guarantees that the proportion of state revenues going to local units of government must remain at the proportion is at the time that it is at the time that the Amendment was adopted so that local revenue sharing to local units of government cannot be reduced. It does not prohibit it from being increased. It can be increased in any amount that this Legislature so sees fit. In addition, it exempts the monies raised by the corporate personal property tax from the limit. Those are basically the major provisions of the legislation. Let me point out also that local units of government are exempt from court orders or federal mandates for programs that are foisted on them. That would come ...U.C. benefits, in pension increases that are mandated, they would be exempt from the cost of those so that they could increase local taxes without coming under the limit. I believe that the Amendment is both reasonable, logical and timely. I think, as you has found out, that the people in this state want some assurances that their taxes are not going to go up as fast as they have in the past. I think in November of 1978, the taxpayers and the voters of this state so gave us that mandate when they overwhelmingly passed the Thompson Proposition. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I submit to you that H.J.R.C.A. 13 is a proposition whose time has come and I respectfully solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman might yield to a question? I couldn't hear your explanation, and I'm sure it was a good one, on the local...at the local level as to...I thought you said something about



75%, I couldn't hear that. I wish you would explain how this is going to control the local spending and also what the effective date would be if this would pass next November."

Totten: "The local...thank you, Mr. Speaker. The local limit provides that the extensions cannot increase more than 75% of the rate of increase of the CPI from the prior calendar year. An example, if the inflation rate was 10%, the tax extensions could not increase by more than 7.5%. There are three exemptions to that, new construction annexations and broadening the base of ...the tax base are exempted. So that new communities and growth areas could provide for the services that would occur so that they're not necessarily impaired by the limit. The Amendment would be...if it passes both this Chamber and the Senate by May of this year it would be on the ballot in November of 1980 and it would take effect in July of '81."

Bradley: "So the extensions that were used in 1980 would be those...that would be the base for '81 extensions, correct?"

Totten: "I believe that would be correct."

Bradley: "Okay, fine, thank you very much. If I might just speak to the Amendment very briefly, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bradley: "I think that the Gentleman is absolutely right. The time has come, the people have asked for tax relief. This not only gives tax relief at the state level but it addresses itself to the issue that I've been concerned with for some time at the local level, what we're going to do with tax rates, tax assessments. And it seems to me that when we're talking about the extensions as this Amendment does and if it controls the extension, it definitely control...in limit taxes that can be collected. And that's the intent of this Amendment."



I think it's something that should be on the ballot in November of next year to give the people the opportunity, as we did a year ago, to voice their opinion. A year ago it was an advisory referendum, here they've got something...that has teeth in it that they can vote for and can put it in the Constitution...limits on spending. And I would urge everybody on floor of the House to vote 'aye' on the Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Currie.
Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to speak against the Constitutional Amendment Representative Totten offers. The experience of enshrining the Constitutional language limitations on the ordinary and everyday activities of government has not been a sanguine one. The 1870 Illinois Constitution was filled with debt limitations with requirements that so hamstrung local government that we ended up in this state producing an excess number of local governments. A Legislature will not, in fact, be nearly so constrained by this Amendment as Representative Totten is hopeful it will be. Merely, it will find back doors. It will find other ways to do what, in fact, is its primary task, fulfill essential services the government requires. I think there is a better way to achieve the end Representative Totten would like to achieve which is to limit state spending and that is perhaps to limit the amount of revenue the state government collects. We're having an opportunity this Session to look for some kind of meaningful tax relief which will mean that the state has, in fact, has less money available to spend. I think that is a much more sensible, much more responsible way to go. What we're really doing with this kind of...of proposition is to take what are basically legislative decisions, that is, how should government act, how should



money be appropriated and enshrine them in the Constitution which is not what Constitutions are about. The hard questions are which programs to cut, where can we save. The Amendment goes no way toward insuring that we respond responsibly to that mandate. I say let's vote against Proposition 13 and let us see what kind of tax relief, what kind of reforms in government we, ourselves, can make that will mean that we are behaving more responsibly with respect to the people and with respect to the taxpayer's money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in support of the House Joint Constitutional Amendment #13. This is my seventh year in the Illinois House of Representatives and it's been an enjoyable experience. But unfortunately, one of the lessons that I have learned as I've campaigned and as I've served in this Body is that many people do not connect governmental services with the taxes that they pay for those services. And people will come to us demanding that we provide very expensive services and then will come to us ask that we cut their taxes. I joined Representative Totten as a Cosponsor on this particular proposal because I feel it is a very responsible approach to the problem that we in government face today in trying to responsibly address the apportionment of money that is in the state's coffers. He basically provides that the personal income of this state will indicate what our revenues will be in the State of Illinois and puts a limit on them. It is not an unreasonable limit, in fact, it's a little bit above what we have today. He is basically notifying units of local government that you take the Consumer Price Index and use that and your growth cannot be more than 75% of that growth. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House, one thing I have learned is that the Consumer Price Index is one of the higher indicators of growth. So he has not picked a bad indicator for units of local government to use. There can be arguments pro and con on any proposal facing us today, but I for one, feel that Representative Totten has worked out a reasonable proposal for tax limitation in the State of Illinois. And I join him in asking your support for House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's motion. As he said, this is an idea whose time has come. I'd like to point out to you that government, federal, state and local now take something between 40 and 46% of our gross national product. Government has grown beyond all the expectations of any of the founding fathers of this government who believed in the representative form of government which was supposed to hold government growth in check in some way. I suggest to you that our representative government to a great extent represents special interests now rather than the individual taxpayers who have to foot the bill. Government should not be permitted to grow at a rate faster than the rate of growth in the personal income of its citizens. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 will see to it that government does not grow faster than the income of our citizens. There's been a lot of talk on the floor of this House this Session about tax relief and about Governor Thompson's Thompson Proposition that appeared on the ballot. There's been a lot of misstatements made about that proposition. And...I'd like to point out to you that the proposition did not say that there should be some reduction in sales tax. It did not say that there should be some



reduction in income tax or property tax. What the proposition asked was shall legislation be enacted and the Illinois Constitution be amended to impose ceilings on taxes and spending...ceilings on taxes and spending by the State of Illinois units of local government and school districts. Now that's the proposition that was overwhelmingly approved by the voters in Illinois. And that's the proposition that would be enacted into law by this Constitutional Amendment. I suggest to you that this is what the people of the State of Illinois want and I stand in support of the measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

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

I would like to echo the sentiments that have been expressed. But I think probably in expressing my sentiments I would like to read a quotation from the Governor's Message to you under this date. I think it contains very well what has been demanded by the taxpayers of Illinois...and I would like to read from the Governor's own Message. 'One year ago many of you and I campaigned vigorously on the need for government to respond to the citizens' outcry for limits on spending and taxes. Through their ballots, the same people who elected you and me, overwhelmingly demanded ceilings and taxes and spending at both the state and local level. To date, none of the proposals introduced in the General Assembly to answer that demand have passed. This Message is to urge that this debate be broadened once again, that we act to meet the demands of the voters for ceilings on all taxes and all spending. And that this single, most important piece of unfinished business on your agenda not be ignored in the closing Session of the General...81st General Assembly.' Ladies and Gentlemen, that is the Governor of the State of Illinois responding to the dictates of the voters in the



last general election on his petition. It is mandatory that at this...late stages of the game of this Session that we enact this meaningful legislation. This Constitutional Amendment must go to the people for their ratification. And I would urge everyone in the House to vote 'aye' as they have in the signing of the Resolution itself."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It happens to be the opinion of this Representative that this probably is the most important piece of legislation that we will address at least in this Session of the Legislature. This is our chance, I think maybe our one and only chance, to bring some meaningful tax relief to the citizens of our country. It has been truly said that the power to tax, my colleagues, is the power to destroy. And I think this is very, very fundamentally true. Representative Totten has made the point before in his discussions that as long as we can tax an unlimited rate, we will find a way to spend. And government seems to have a tendency to do this, they will spend up to the limits of their income. And some of us have come to the conclusion that the only way to stop this ever escalating expenditure, government spending, is to limit...limit the ability that government has of extracting money from the tax...from the taxpayer's pocket. If this money is limited, not cut drastically... that point was just made as in Proposition 13, but if this ability of government to reach into our pockets and extract that money is limited, then so will the...the spending government...spending be limited because the money simply isn't there to spend. I think this may be the only route we can go, the only protection we can have against excessive government spending. I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, when I came down here first that



our annual budget, our budget was 3.75 billion dollars. We're now working over an annual budget of over 11 billion dollars. I know that arguments can be made for this increase. I know that inflation has entered into this. But I still say we're spending, in spite of the Governor's commendable efforts to keep our expenditures down, we are spending more than we should and we're spending it because we're taxing more than we should. Let's reduce the taxation to a reasonable level. Let's keep it within limits and keep our spending down and we will be the growth of government down, or at least have a chance to keep the growth of government down. And I repeat, Ladies and Gentlemen, as we limit this, we will be taking a step in the direction of making sure that a government does not have the opportunity and the chance to tax us out of everything that we have and throw our people into a never increasing dependency upon government for their substance. I urge you and I employ you to give a favorable consideration to this tax limitation Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "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 indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'...the 'ayes' have it. Representative Totten to close."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me first point out after hearing some of the debate that I recognized some of the difficulties of the 1870 Constitution when we took into consideration this proposal. There is a provision that would obviate what happened under the 1870 Constitution in regards to bonding powers in this Amendment in their creation of new local districts. Let me point out also that interest



groups around the state are mixed on their feeling on this. And it was rather interesting the other day when I received a press release, which many of you may have seen also, that the pre...the Illinois Professional Educators have endorsed this proposal because they recognize as many of us do that they are taxpayers and there must be reasonable limits. I do confess, however, that a limitation Amendment may impair government's ability to grow. But I would also point out that should state government want to exceed the limits that such a device imposes, that they need only go to the voters and tell them that for these reasons and these programs we want to amend the Constitution to increase taxes at the state and local level. Then the voters will have the key to any future tax increases and that is where the key should have been a long time ago. The purpose of Constitutional tax limitation is to guarantee that that key remains in the proper hands. Each item that people want is a good item. There is no pressure on the Congress or the Legislature, or very little, to enact bad legislation. The problem is there is an infinite number of good and desirable proposals and you have to have some device to limit the appetite. That is the function of tax limitation. It is an idea whose time has come."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 107 votes. Representative Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, seeing 'Northcut Parkinsan' in the Law and the Profits said the following: 'Expenditures... expenditure rises to meet income!' That's the reason I'm voting for this. The only re...the only way you could cut government expenditures is to cut government income. Now this Amendment, I believe, speaks to the



Thompson Proposition, those people who voted for it. And I think it does so responsibly. If we can go back to the people every two years to renew our mandate, I see no reason that local governments cannot go back to the local people every so often if they need more money to get a renewal of their mandate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hesitate to rise on the issue because I can...I know it's going to pass, I guess. But I really think that we're making a mistake here. What we're doing is amending the Constitution. And I think that is a significant matter for us to be doing. I think in fact for us to get the full impact of this proposition, what we should have had is a Committee of the Whole...and have experts come in and explain to us, Chapman & Cutler, and explain to us what affect this would have on...by limiting bonding authority for local government. What are we going to do here? Are we going to have a lot of local governments bonding so that they can provide their services now and let the next generation worry about it and then twenty years from now have that local government have a crisis? I just think there are a lot of...there's a lot of impact here that we're not really giving our thoughts to and I think we ought to be careful whenever we amend the Constitution and ask that...I mean we have a full weight here. We have the responsibility of...arduously look at the issues before us and putting this stamp of approval on this proposition to be placed on the ballot ...gives a stamp of approval of at least the Illinois House of Representatives and because of that and without more information, I think that we really ought to hold this up and let Don have a Committee of the Whole so the experts can come in and explain all the ramifications. I think it's a very serious matter and I'd ask you to



consider it heavily. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Each one of us have made our way down here to Springfield through the feelings of the people of our district placing confidence in us. It's truly amazing to me now to see how little confidence we have in the people who elected us. All this is asking is that we place this before the voters for their vote. A learned friend just adjusted the question, why are we afraid to place this in the hands of the voters? I would suggest that every red vote up there shows a complete lack of confidence in the Democratic-Republican system that we have in this nation. I think it's about time that we return the power to the people from the politicoes. And if the people wish to terminate, stop or modify taxation we give them that right. That's all we're asking. And to those of you who say the Legislature has the power and the right to control taxes, then why haven't we done it? We can't pass a tax limitation of any type through this Legislature because of the cheap and petty personal politics that goes on every day of our lives down here. I suggest to you we should give this power to the people, and if we don't, each red vote should resign."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree with the previous Speaker that it's obvious that this proposal is going to pass the House. But I also submit to you that H.J.R. 13, certainly the Sponsor's intentions are perhaps honorable, but H.J.R. 13 is based both on a myth and it's also incomplete. It's a myth because the people who will vote on whatever referendum is proposed to them are voting to consider this in some way associated with that



infamous California Proposition 13 which no more reduced state spending or local spending than this proposition would attempt to do. We know that the windfalls of that proposition were to big corporations and ultimately the local property tax owners suffered the heaviest burden. But this proposition that has been proposed here today is also incomplete because the proponents of this idea would not dare place on the referendum ballot the areas that they propose to cut or the areas that they propose to specifically limit spending. And because of that I am going to continue to oppose it and vote 'no' even though we recognize it is going to pass because I think that the citizens of this state are being fed both myth, fallacy and incomplete information."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know how hard Representative Totten worked to try to get this on the ballot. I'm going to vote 'aye' on it but I couldn't imagine anything more true than what my colleague, Representative Currie, said. In my long term of office in the local government, I remember the Hodge-Hill Bills and Mr. Speaker I think you were around and that time when we had the Hodge-Hill Bills, were a municipality of 30 thousand charged the maximum tax rate of...and they can collect 45 thousand dollars for fire protection and it costs them 185 thousand. The maximum we could charge was 68 thousand dollars for garbage collection and it cost the village 200 thousand. What happens...on and on and on, all along the line item budget of our appropriations year after year. We came in with a hidden tax. Some are calling it users tax, that's not deductable. And this is reason why I was for taking limitations off of local government spending, that they're spending more money than they're taking in,



then throw the rascals out. Buy by putting a limitation of them, you're hamstringing every municipality. It's just like taking federal revenue sharing funds away from them now, after they've got the money to spend. I'm going to vote for this to put it on the ballot and let the people, if they want mass hysteria, to vote for it. But as I'm voting for this I'm going to dedicate what little political life I've got left going up and down the highways and the byways of this state to tell them how terrible and how horrible it is to have legislation by mass hysteria. Tax limitations on local government...if more of us would have spent more time on the school board or a local village board or some kind of a local board before they came down to the General Assembly, we wouldn't be calling taxpayers and taxeaters, we would know the difference. We who have been in office for a long time know what our...the pulse of the people are back home and by hamstringing us like this, we're putting every municipality in jeopardy. I know the sincerity of the Sponsor, I know the pulse of the people of the State of Illinois, but unless we come up with an educational program which I intend to dedicate myself to in defeating this proposition, I will vote 'aye' today to get it on the ballot but I will work hard to see that it is defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkenbine."

Birkenbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Several prior Speakers have made reference to the idea that we're dealing with a proposition 13 California style Bill here. That is simply not true. Proposition 13 was a specific cut in property taxes. This Bill, which is more a kin to Proposition 4 which is presently up for consideration before the California electorate, simply puts a ceiling



on how much the state can tax. It says roughly that right now we are taking a certain percentage of the income of the state's residents in taxes. That cannot increase. The scary part about our present tax system is that not only are the dollars that we're paying out to taxes increasing, which is natural because of inflation, but the percentage of our income that we're having to give up in taxes is increasing. Secondly, you should be aware that if we pass this tonight, it does not automatically become law. Rather, we are simply putting it before the people where they and the newspapers and all elements of the community will have full rein to discuss it and decide on election day whether or not they want it. I urge you to vote in favor of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, this was legislation that was certainly demanded by the public in response to the Thompson Proposition. I think we're irresponsible if we do not put that proposition back on the ballot and let the public decide whether they want to pass a tax limitation in this form. One comment, we have heard a good deal of discussion about hamstringing the units of local government. I would point out that this proposal provides that the local citizens can decide by referendum to go beyond the limitations imposed by this Constitutional Amendment. So if the local people want tax themselves at a higher rate for their schools or their park district or for their municipality, they are able to do so under this proposition. I think it's a good proposition and ought to be placed on the ballot."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, all we're saying here is that government in Illinois should not continue to take a bigger and bigger bite out of our



personal income, percentage wise. That's all there is to it. It doesn't say the cost of government can't go up if we have continued inflation. The other thing we're not doing..we're just submitting this to the people. You people over there...on both sides of the aisle who are voting red have no confidence in the people or you're unwilling to let the people have any voice in their government. That's all this is. This is just saying, let the people decide. It's submitted to the people. Now if you don't have any confidence in self-government, maybe you're in the wrong country."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

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

A lot has been said about what role the Constitution should play in this process. I'd like to point out that what we had in the 1870 Constitution...was a Constitution that was clearly an anti-government Constitution that limited the Governor, it limited the Legislature, it limited local units of government. The 1970 Constitution reversed all of that. It gave it...Legislature carte blanche, it withdrew the home rule provisions, it gave local government carte blanche and it created a very strong executive. All that Representative Totten is trying to do here is provide one small measure of balance in that 1970 Constitution so that it is not entirely a pro-government Constitution. So there is some limitation and some protection for the citizen and for the taxpayer. I'd urge adoption of this Amendment."

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

Campbell: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 as I did in November of 1977 when Don first passed his other



proposal out of this House. It was an answer to California's drastic cutback. It's the most sensible approach that we've come across. And I'll tell you this, that if we don't pass something of this nature you're going to find a proposition 13 and a tax revolt by the people in the State of Illinois. Now this is not a complete, drastic cutback in local services or state services. But this is simply letting the people determine whether they want to make this determination to whether they want to limit what we can do in taking their tax dollars...and this country went to war for taxation without representation at one time. And I certainly think that there's no fear in letting them decide now what we should do. And I would urge everyone to get on this vote and vote 'aye'...and there's plenty of flexibility here for both state and federal government. And I ask you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I support this measure and I just can't understand the red votes up there. I think...I'm sure that many people that are voting red here don't realize that what they're saying here is that they don't trust the people. And that's just about what this means. We're not passing anything here. But we are letting the people have a choice and I...and the people last fall said they wanted the chance...on voting on something like this and we're giving them this chance. And I just don't understand why any of us would vote red and say, well we just don't trust the people. I would appreciate more green lights."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, now I'm a producer, I am not a receiver except as a Member of the Legislature. And that I can't help because



I was elected by the people to represent them. But I'm just sick and tired of seeing my money and the people that I represent...their money being spent for unnecessary grants, increased payrolls, increased individuals added to the payroll, to all of the ways and things that we do in government to increase the cost of government. We never have seen anyone turning back any money into the general funds. They spend it all, all the time. And I, for one, am ready to lead a revolt against it because it's my money, my people's money...that this outfit, this State Legislature, for one, is taking. Now I don't like it. I want to see it change about. For example, we have in Decatur now the fifth generation on welfare. No longer do they say, 'Do...we need help,' like it should be. They say, 'It's our right to have help.' Well that's my money they're taking without my consent and the money the people that are...the blue collar, the white collar...of people that are working in our factories and in our office. It's their money they're taking without consent...and expect it's their right. Well it's not their right. I resent all of this very much. I certainly think that...we had an example just lately made of the 18 thousand people proposed to be added to the federal payroll by the President of the United States for the Department of Education which in turn will try to control the thinking and the teaching of our children. I resent that. I think...I recollect in the budget there are 8 billion... oh, let's see, it's 4 billion dollars that they estimate this budget will be. I don't want to pay that. I...I'm perfectly satisfied with my school board, my local affairs and they've...our own council of our own city. I do not like the idea of this continued...addition of the cost of government. I remember very well when I came here the...our budget was around 3 billion dollars.



It's now near that alone for welfare in our state. Where are we going to end? This is one way to end it and I intend to vote for it and help pass this through so that the people themselves will have the right to make a decision."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a green vote up there. This is...I signed the proposition. I feel...I have felt like that taxes should be limited. The question that I have...recently a company, you might say, went broke handling garbage on a five-year contract. Another company took it over at double the price. The city has to pay this, and they have to pay for it with tax money. Whenever you have students who are going to school, the teachers have to be paid a...a reasonable salary so that they can go ahead and teach...and when we don't have strikes ...and this requires tax money. Now if I hadn't promised the people that I would vote green on this Bill, I would be voting red because of all of the Members of local taxing units which should be funded, and have to be funded, to make a...a government function. And my mail in the last two or three weeks on this Bill have been run...have been running totally in opposition to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ten years down the line, after the Constitutional Convention and after the ratification by the people of Illinois, we realize that there are some improvements that can be made on the new documents. I would submit to you that there is nothing wrong with allowing the people of this state to properly address themselves to tax limitation, which is what this



Constitutional Amendment does. It is not an indebtedness ceiling which caused so many problems during the last hundred years before the 1970 document was passed. I think it is extremely important for us to realize and to give confidence back to the people if they indeed will have a proper amount of time to carefully examine both the pros and the cons of this particular issue. And I think that it is undeserving that they should have us in this General Assembly unwilling to give them the opportunity to speak at a time when they have evidenced such great interest in tax limitation or in tax relief. This is an issue whose time has come and I urge you to cast your green light and let the people decide this most important issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Lechowicz. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I had my light on, maybe you just missed it....I can see...I can understand, you know when you're up there you may have your calendar over there. But very briefly, I know this is very...typical ...is the record taken, Sir? Then I am out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "It is, but go ahead. Maybe your light was on...I didn't see it."

Lechowicz: "May I just point that I know that this is an item that has been discussed for sometime...as far as House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #13. But I don't know how many of the Membership has actually read the Resolution. And for the record, I'd like to ...and maybe the Sponsor could also clarify this, but under Section H on page 5, line 27, this is...language that I am...and I have studied this issue for a number months with the principal Cosponsor, Representative Totten, but I believe that the language that is contained in this Resolution is not clear to me after months of



study. And I know that if this issue is brought to the voters of Illinois, in all good faith, they will only read Section 11 which will say...Article 9, 'Limitations on total of state taxes, on the share committed to local governments and ad valorem property tax, prohibition of mandate of local programs without state funding, provisions for the transfer of programs.' And if that matter was addressed to any voter in this state in that manner, I'm sure they would support this Constitutional change. But there's more to the Resolution than just that small paragraph. And on Section H, it says, 'The state shall appropriate funds for each unit of local government and school districts to reimburse it for the full costs for mandates enacted after the effective date of this Section. However, where the General Assembly is required to enact legislation to comply with a federal mandate, the state shall be exempt from the requirement of reimbursing a unit of local government or a school district for the cost of the mandate.' I'm sorry. I do not understand that paragraph. But I think it's a very important paragraph that should be clarified. We're talking about federal mandates and as long as my term here in the General Assembly has been, I don't require...I don't recall a federal mandate. I do require...I do recall a carrot and a stick when we were required to pass a 55 mile an hour speed limit or else we would lose the federal funds for the Department of Transportation. That is not clearly spelled out in this Resolution. And I would like to know the definition of a federal mandate. And if the Gentleman could inform me as far as when it... when it was proposed to this General Assembly and what the dollar cost...possibly lost to units of local government under Resolution 13? I think it's a serious question and I would hope that the Gentleman



would respond to it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I had my light on to explain my vote. May I proceed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Dunn: "I would just like to call attention to people who don't happen to be in this room, that unless I'm mistaken, you sent us back here to do something about tax relief in the form of sales tax relief...to take a tax off...to provide concrete relief. This Bill has nothing to do with that. This legislation which would put an item on the ballot simply provides that all we need is three-fifths votes to do whatever we want in here. We have that now. The 1970 Constitution authorized bonding with three-fifths vote. We have over 2 billion dollars in general obligation bonds. Is this the kind of tax relief the people want? Do they want to be hoodwinked once again with Proposition 13...type proposals in the State of Illinois? All this will do is hamstring your local governments. Those of you who feel that local control is best, take notice to the fact that if this becomes law of this state, every local government will have to be over here on the knees begging. Local control will be gone. Those of you who are fundamental and believe in that should take note of the fact that every local government will be over here for every dollar they need. We had a chance and we still have a chance to provide tax relief to the citizens of Illinois. It's simple. It's not complicated. It doesn't take a lot of bureaucracy. All we have to do is take the sales tax off. Those who wouldn't vote to take the sales tax off are holding off on this. It's a strange alliance. We shouldn't pass this...we just shouldn't put this on the ballot. This is another joke.



It's a cruelhoax on the public. Five years after this is adopted by the people of the State of Illinois, you won't be able to detect one change in the operation of government in the State of Illinois except there will be three-fifths vote needed which only means that there will have to be different deals cut. That's all, Ladies and Gentlemen of the State of Illinois.

H.J.R.C.A. 13 simply means new and different deals. It doesn't mean any savings to you. You wait and see. You watch and see. You pay and see."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "I vote against this Resolution. And I would change it to 'no' if you'll let me change my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Record Representative Dunn as 'no'. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Would you please change my vote to 'yes'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski, 'yes'. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien as 'aye'. Anyone else desire to seek recognition and change their vote? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 116 'aye' and...41, you say...41 and House Joint Constitutional Resolution...House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 is passed with a three-fifths majority. On Supplemental Calendar #1...Representative Johnson. No, they don't want them."

Johnson: "I was wonder what the Chair's intention is with respect to this order of business. We're on the order of Constitutional Amendments, and there's two others on the Calendar. As long as the House is in the mood that it's in, I'm interested in pursuing my..."

Speaker Redmond: "The intention of the Chair to go to the two Bills on Supplemental Calendar #1, recognize Representative Ryan, and then go to House Bills Second Reading First Legislative Day."



Johnson: "Your decision then is not to proceed any further on this order of business. Right?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. There is no deadline on those measures. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I filed earlier today a written motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 33A of the House Rules, and move that House Bill 2796 be placed on the Calendar under the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. And I would like to have that motion considered at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order, at least a point of parliamentary inquiry. Are we in the third Special Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "This is the regular Session. These Bills are not in Special Session."

Skinner: "That's funny. It says House Bill 2796, and on my Calendar..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's a Special Session, but we're addressing 2811 and 2818. We're going to go into the Special Session..."

Skinner: "Well maybe they should be put on the Board."

Unknown: "Well, he called...he called Calendar #1...Supplemental #1..."

Speaker Redmond: "Switch the Board correctly."

Unknown: "Thank you."

Ryan: "Now, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman if right. I would like to suspend the Rule 33A so that House Bill 2811 and 2818 can be read a second time and held on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he's got a right to make a motion."

Hanahan: "Oh, is he making a motion? I thought he asked leave."

Speaker Redmond: "He made a motion. Any discussion on the motion?"

Hanahan: "I'd like to discuss the motion."



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think that if you're going to have, first of all, some wisdom put into perspective of where we're going on the usury limitation, there isn't any real great need to rush. After all, we've had the usury law since Abraham Lincoln has been a Member of the General Assembly here in Illinois. In fact, it was the Republican Parties...part of their platform when they used to have platforms, and to a move of Bills through this House that calls for an out and out repeal of the usury limitation law because at this moment there happens to be a skyrocketing rollercoaster ride in our economy is not using good sense. If you want to accelerate that, just go ahead and push it through, manipulate, work it fast, don't let anyone talk about it. Don't let anyone have any deliberative process take hold and people to sit down and reason, and compromise. I predict that, you know, it is awful odd that when the people need tax relief or when the people need other things, it takes a long time to pass a Bill in this General Assembly. You have to go through all sorts of machinations, and rules, and regulations. Nobody tries to really manipulate facts. But it's odd when the Bankers, and the Savings and Loans, and those who want to charge usurious...rates of interest from working people. When they want something, all of a sudden all sorts of doors are opened up, accommodations are made, and all of a sudden we're all supposed to be bowed over somehow to the will of the money lenders. I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we can deliberate with good reasonable cause on this issue. We don't need to rush. There is no hurry. We're not going to change one damn mortgage in this state by our fasthaste here tonight. We're in trouble nationally, not just in Illinois. This isn't an Illinois problem, but I say to you, you know, why don't you just stop and think of where we're going. Is there any rush to increase the rates paid to passbook savers?"



Is anyone standing on this floor saying it is unfair to pay five and one half percent to a savings account? Is anyone saying that's wrong? No, but there's people here saying that we got to raise the rates to charge the working man to buy a house. I think that's pretty... in fact, I think it's odd that somehow that money lenders can control the process of legislation, that deliberation is not really what it's all about. It's what pressures, what politics, what push could come behind. I think we ought to just...you know, slow down. I'm not really that concerned..."

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

Kempiners: "I rise for a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are on a motion here, and I believe that the speaker is not addressing that motion, and I would ask that he confine his remarks to the motion that is before this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, please confine yourself to the motion."

Hanahan: "I'm explaining my position on the motion. I think I'm deliberating very cautiously on that, that many remark I make will be pertaining to my deliberation as a Member of this General Assembly on that motion. I want to know what the haste is. Where is the haste? Who's showing all this haste? How many homes will not be built? How many men will be unemployed? That's the issue you should be asking yourself. Not to manipulate with undue speed just to move this Bill through the process. Let's take it easy. Let's at least...you know, let's at least just go around with the regular rules just like any other Bill has to go through. If this was a Bill in favor of people giving them tax relief, nobody would be opening these doors and manipulating the rules for it. I think it's just a little too fast for us. I would suggest that the motion should be defeated, that a regular process should take place, and then we'll deliberate on the amount of



relief that is necessary during these times of economic unrest. I don't think we have to join the skyrocket to the moon on 'usurious' rates that are charged citizens of Illinois. I think we could deliberate on this issue in a calm atmosphere and come up with a good conclusion, possibly a reasonable length of time of a moratorium in nature, but to just push it through on a repeal just to accommodate the money lenders of this state, I think it is awful odd because nobody pushed anything through to accommodate the taxpayers. Nobody pushed through to accommodate those people seeking tax relief. I think we ought to just slow it down, and Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think it should be taken in a little more calmer atmosphere and allow the regular process to take place here on this major issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There is no doubt in the mind of thinking people that we have an emergency on our hands. If you had to go out and borrow money at 12 to 15 percent and then turn around and be expected to lend it back at 11, they'd call you crazy. And that is exactly the position that we find lenders in Illinois in today. One of my very close friends is a builder and he says he is shut down. His... his employees aren't working. His carpenters aren't building. His plumbers aren't plumbing. Now if you can, in good conscience, say that we don't have an emergency at this time, I would make one other point to you, and that is, over half of the states in the union don't even have a limit. Over half of the state don't even have a limit, and very few states have a rate as low as we do. There is an emergency. This motion should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Stuffle: "Representative Ryan, I don't have the motion in front of me. Is the motion to move the Bill to First Legislative or Second Legislative Day Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "It's to be read a second time and held on Second Reading."

Stuffle: "So you won't pursue the Amendments until tomorrow."

Ryan: "That is correct."

Stuffle: "Okay, on the motion itself, there is indeed a crisis. I think even the people who oppose the Bill in its current form, and many do, have the opportunity today to speak to the Bill in its current form and also to speak to potential Amendments in nearly a three hour hearing of the Financial Institutions Committee of the House. Representative Leon, the Chairman, gave ample opportunity to pro and con positions on the Bill. It was heard in great detail as I indicated, and I think even the opponents of the Bill clearly indicated that they knew that there was a problem in this area. For those reasons, both pro and con, recognizing the situation, but differing as to what approach to take in its final form, this Bill should be in...the Bill ought to come out on the floor for our consideration. Representative Ryan has been fair in the consideration of potential Amendments to the Bill. He has said that he wants only to solve the problem as most of us do, and I would urge that we vote in the affirmative on Representative Ryan's motion at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, anyone who questions the necessity for moving this Bill as quickly as possible is either ignoring the realities or is blind to the realities of the real estate situation in Illinois today. The whole reason this Bill has been introduced is because of the need of timeliness of action. In Champaign-Urbana there is only one Savings and Loan out of the number that we have, is making loans at all, and they're making loans



at a rate of about five percent of what they normally do. Young people who are looking for homes, for their first home, aren't able to buy. Lenders aren't able to loan because the money they have to pay on money maker certificates is almost 12 percent, and the usury rate is lower than that. So in order to make a loan they've got to lose money on its face. Builders, laborers, the Trade Union Council, everyone from the real estate industry to the labor movement is going to be affected if we don't move this Bill as quickly as possible. If you don't believe that's happening and you don't believe there's a crisis, then you just haven't looked at the statistics and you haven't looked at your own areas to see what's going to happen. Because if this sector of our economy dies, and it is going to die on the vine unless we may take immediate action, the rest of the economy is going to suffer along with it. This is not a Bill for the money lenders. This is a Bill for the people. This is a consumer's Bill to allow people to be able to purchase real estate in the absence of which we're going to see a total destruction of the...of a major segment of our economy that affects everyone from the labor people, to the business community, to the Savings and Loans, to realtors, and to all those employees and auxiliary personnel in that area. So I certainly urge a 'yes' vote...or a 'no' vote on this motion, and I urge you to support Representative Ryan. A 'yes' vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Ryan."

Kane: "Your motion states that the Bill would be advanced to Second Reading Second Legislative Day and hold there..."

Ryan: "No, just read a second time and held on Second Reading."

Kane: "For how long?"

Ryan: "I suppose till tomorrow."

Kane: "When tomorrow?"



Ryan: "Well, you'd have to address the Chair with that...that question to the Chair. What time did you want it tomorrow, Representative?"

Kane: "Well, it would be preferable if it could be held until sometime late in the day for possible Amendments or to be prepared and those kinds of things. If that would be agreeable."

Ryan: "Well, I said when I introduced this Bill that I had no desire to short circuit anybody's desire to put some Amendments on here. I am absolutely amazed that you and the Gentleman from McHenry failed to attend the Committee hearings this morning for two and a half hours. I didn't see the Gentleman from McHenry there this morning. He's concerned about this Bill, but he wasn't in the Committee hearing. I'd be glad to hold the Bill until tomorrow afternoon. Sure."

Kane: "The...all of the testimony was on the squak box."

Ryan: "I will be happy to hold your Bill...hold this Bill until tomorrow afternoon, Representative."

Kane: "Thank you."

Ryan: "Whatever is fair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "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 indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Ryan to close with respect to 2811 and 2818. Is that correct?"

Ryan: "That is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the rules be suspended, and that House Bills 2811 and 2818 be moved to the order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89... Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye', and 12 'no', and the motion



carries...House Bill...the rule is suspended, and 2811 and 2818 are on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2811, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sales on credit and lending of money, Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2818, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act, Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "These Bills will be held on the order of Second Reading. Now on Supplemental Calendar #2 there is a motion with respect to Senate Bill 1436, Representative Lechowicz is recognized."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration is to suspend the Rule 66B relating to the Calendar requirement, will advance to the order of Second Reading First Legislative Day, Senate Bill 1436. Senate Bill 1436 is a Bill that provides \$15,000 as the reimbursement for the printing expenses that were incurred in the Senate in this past Session. The supplemental appropriation was recommended out of Rules Committee today, and I would ask that the House now move to suspend Rules 36A and B and place the Bill on Second Reading First Legislative Day."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. 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 153 'aye', and no 'nay'. The Rule is suspended, and Senate Bill 1436 is on Second Reading on the First Legislative Day. Read the Bill, John."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for expense of the Senate of the 81st General Assembly, Second Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, you move to recess the regular Session till the call of the Chair?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the regular Session now stand in recess till the call of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The regular Session will stand in recess till the call of the Chair. Now the Third Special Session will be in order. Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Pierce, Chairman of the Committee on Revenue, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 30, 1979, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do not pass' House Bill 1, 'do pass as amended' House Bill 2796."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, will you answer your phone? This is seven..."

(continued)



Speaker Redmond: "On House Bills Second Reading First Legislative Day appears House Bill 2796. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier today I filed a written motion to suspend the provisions of 33A. The House rules that House Bill 2796 will be placed on the Calendar under the order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day, and I would like to have that motion considered at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't see it printed on the Calendar anywhere. I don't..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Supplemental Calendar #1."

Skinner: "I don't see the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know."

Skinner: "Do you see the motion, Sir? Doesn't it have to be printed?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me that the motion to suspend the rules...it's not necessary to be on the Calendar."

Skinner: "Well then I would like to argue against that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "Members of the Illinois General Assembly, if we really want sales tax relief, what we need to do is make sure that the Chicago Members and the Suburban Cook County Members, that one or two that deserted our ranks, go back to Cook County this weekend after the sales tax has increased 20%. On November 1st, the sales tax, the RTA sales tax will be imposed and that means that the sales tax burden in Cook County will be increased by 20%. I think that Legislators who succumb to the Mayor's enticements and or threats might have a different opinion when they come back after the weekend, after having talked to some of their constituents perhaps at church, then they would have this week. In fact, I suggest that the RTA has conspired with the people who want to kill sales tax relief in Illinois to postpone the implementation of the RTA sales tax which, when we debated..."

(continued)



the issue, was supposed to be imposed on October 1. Had it been imposed on October 1, there would have been incredible pressure that had already...that would have already built up on Chicago Legislators who did not vote in the best interest of their constituents. For that reason I don't think that we ought to expedite passage of this Bill, in fact, I don't think this Bill should be passed this week. I think we should pass this Bill next week, and then if the Chicago Legislators still wish to play the role of eunuch to the court of Mayor Byrne, let them, but let them have a chance to know...have some clue as to what reaction their constituents will have prior to the election as a result of this 20% sales tax increase. It's conceivable they might even change their mind and decide they want two cents before next November's election. I hope that's the case, so I hope that you will not vote for Representative Ryan's motion to speed up passage of this Bill. If anything we should slow it down, at least for a week. Then if people are willing to vote against their districts best interests, fine. Then we'll give them a penny and a promise, but let's not do it this week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Speaker, I hate to interrupt right in the middle of a proceedings but my desk is being inundated here with Resolutions, and I would like to bring up a point of order that the Rules Committee says that each Member is entitled to five Resolutions...Agreed Resolutions, and then they can go in with the citations. Now there are many good Resolutions that are coming up here. I don't want to be put in the position to not put them on the Agreed Resolution...Consent Resolutions. I wish the Members would help Representative Zeke Giorgi and myself by not embarrassing them, as I noticed the last six that come on my desk are very good Resolutions, and if they go ahead with the citations they can achieve what they are trying to do, but I must have at least 30 Resolutions here today, and I know some of these Members have



- exceeded the five allotted to them under the rules of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on Representative Ryan's motion that House Bill 2796 be advanced to the order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day. Those in favor of the suspension of the Rule indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The motion to suspend the Rule. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye', and 20 'no', and the motion carried. The Rule is suspended. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2796, a Bill for an Act to exempt food for human consumption and prescription and non-prescription medicines, drugs, medical appliances, and common household remedies for human consumption from certain taxes, Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, what is your pleasure, Sir? They tell me that the Committee Amendment which was adopted is not printed."

Ryan: "Pardon?"

Speaker Redmond: "They tell me the Committee Amendment which was adopted in Committee is not printed."

Ryan: "We've had all day, why isn't it printed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Senate couldn't pay the printing bills. That's why we had that \$15,000 appropriated."

Ryan: "I believe that Amendment was Representative Madigan's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I think that Representative Ryan's question is a good one. The Amendment was adopted in Committee earlier this morning. Why wasn't it printed?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's in the print shop. It's not finished. I don't know, Mr. Madigan. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, do you have any idea how long it's going to take them in the print shop?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, how long will it take in the print



shop? I understand that it is now finished, and it's on the way up."

Ryan: "Well, we could stand at ease for five minutes, Mr. Speaker, if you'd let us do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's alright. We'll stand at ease then."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is the desire of the Chair to recess the Special Session to allow for consideration of motions on the regular Calendar, and I so move."

Speaker Bradley: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion...at the... at the call of the Chair we'll go back to the Special Session. We want to pick up a couple of motions while we are waiting for the printing. All in favor of this Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The Gentleman's motion carries, and we're now in the regular Session. On the Supplemental Calendar #2 under motions...there appears a motion relative to Senate Bill 563, Mr. Yourell. Do you wish to pursue that motion, Sir? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to suspend the provisions of Rule 68E for the consideration of Senate Bill 563 on the order of the Speaker's table Conference Committee reports."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there any discussion? No discussion, the question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 89 votes for the suspension. Senate...Senate Bill 563. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes', one 'nay', and one voting 'present', and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Senate Bill 1444. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 66A, I move to discharge the Committee of Appropriations II from further consideration and advance to the order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day, Senate Bill 1444."



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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if the Vice-chairman would just indicate one line of what it is. I don't have my sheets here, Lee. I'm sorry."

VanDuyne: "This is the federal money that has been allocated to the Department of Education in total of \$161,000."

Peters: "Okay. Okay."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', three 'nays', three voting 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Under motions on Senate Bill 1445, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I make the same motion for Senate Bill 1445 to discharge the Committee on Appropriations II. Senate Bill 1445 appropriates \$50,000 of federal money to the Board of Higher Education to do a study that they received a grant to do."

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

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman yield for question?"

Kane: "Happy to."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "You went pretty quickly. What kind of a study is this \$50,000 to be used for?"

Kane: "I think it has sort of a facilities use."

Leinenweber: "A what?"

Kane: "A facilities use. Board of Higher Education."

Leinenweber: "What facilities?"

Kane: "Higher education facilities."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, the question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion 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



116 'aye's', seven 'nays', eight voting 'present', and the Gentleman's motion prevails. On page ten of the regular Calendar appears Senate Bill...under motions appears Senate Bill 1183. The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 68E for the consideration of the Bill on the order of Speaker's table Conference Committee report."

Speaker: "I would like to correct. I said 1185. I would like to call 1183. Change the Board. Mr. Clerk...discussion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I don't even know who the Sponsor of this motion is, much less what the motion is. Would the Sponsor identify himself and explain what the motion is?"

Speaker Bradley: "We clearly called on Mr. Christensen, and he explained it, and it moved."

Leinenweber: "What was the explanation? If the Gentleman would yield maybe he could answer that."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "This...this is to...this is to take the consideration of the Bill on the order of Speaker's table Conference Committee report. It is in regards to an easement Bill, and there is no opposition from either side."

Leinenweber: "Regards for what?"

Christensen: "Easement Bill."

Leinenweber: "Oh."

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

Robbins: "What this is is a combination of Bills, several of which I helped Sponsor, and the Senate put them all together in one Bill, and then it didn't get on out of Committee, and these easement Bills, these should be passed because this just turns right away and easements of unsafe and unused Department of Transportation stuff back to the people."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ryan, did you wish to..."



Ryan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. I...there's enough votes here. I don't need to speak. I favor this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', two 'nays', 11 voting 'present', and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Under motions appears Senate Bill 185. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 185, I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 68E for consideration of that Bill on the order of Conference Committee reports Speaker's table, for the purpose of appointing a second Conference Committee."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of that motion. I think at the first Conference Committee there was a problem with one Section, and I'm quite sure and have been assured by the Sponsors that that problem would be cleared up in the second Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, then the question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. I understand that the Amendments that we were waiting for are being distributed around the desks, and if they are, the Chair will go back to that Bill. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'ayes', no 'nays', two voting 'present',... Marovitz, 'aye', and the Gentleman's motion prevails. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr Ebbesen arise?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, could you advise the Membership as to what the program is for the rest of the evening? Do you have any idea?"

Speaker Bradley: "You would wait till I just got in the Chair and then ask that. The Speaker will be back out. I think we're going to go right now to the Amendments on Mr. Madigan's Bill. So..."



Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan now asks that the...we recess the regular Session until...on the call of the Chair and go back to the...Third Special Session. So moved. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. And now we're back in the Third Special Session."

(continued)



Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 2796, Amendment #1, Mr. Madigan. Is that your Amendment, Sir?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2796, this Bill has been read a second time previously. Committee Amendment #1 failed. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Any motion relative to Amendment #2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 2796 by Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber on your motion to table."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, as I understand Amendment #2 which was adopted in Committee, it stipulates that the state sales tax reduction on food and medicine shall not carry over to affect sales tax collections by any unit of local government. And that appears to me to be absolutely absurd why we should excuse local units of government from having their sales tax on food and medicine not reduced. In fact, there's a great deal more reason to reduce or eliminate the sales tax for local governments than there is from the state. You can recall that last...the previous Special Session whereby we adopted a replacement tax on...for the personal property tax on corporations, trusts, and partnerships. It was pointed out that without a cap on revenue to be replaced, that units of local government are going to receive a tremendous windfall a few years down the line when the income tax on corporations, trusts, and partnerships far outstrips whatever increase there would have been on personal property tax. Units of local government are going to get a tremendous windfall. As a matter of fact we all know that many units of local government have not even abated their real estate tax in order to take... because of the replacement tax they are going to receive. So why in the world, when we're facing a revenue loss should the state be the only Body to receive a revenue loss? It seems to me that if sales tax on food and drugs



ought to be eliminated, that the first place for elimination ought to be on units of local government that are getting this tremendous windfall from personal property tax. So Amendment #2 seeks to make certain that units of local government would not have their sales tax on food and medicine reduced. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever, and I urge an 'aye' vote on my motion to table it."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion to table. The intent of the Bill is to remove the first penny of the state sales tax without impingement upon the local sales taxes collected for local government. The purpose of the Committee Amendment is to clarify the language of the Bill to insure that there is no question in the Bill, that there would be no impingement upon the revenues of local government. The Committee Amendment is technical in nature. It ought to be adopted to the Bill, and the Gentleman's motion ought to fail."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes; I have an inquiry of the Chair. How many Amendments are filed with regards to this Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Twelve...twelve Floor Amendments."

Brummer: "Have they been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I assume that they are, but if they are not, I think you'll have to make...bring that question up on each separate Amendment. I...we're not through those Amendments yet, but if you ask that question when we're on that Amendment we'll certainly find out."

Brummer: "Well, it may affect my vote on this particular Amendment here, and I'm not sure if we can intelligently vote on any of these unless we know the other Amendments that are...been filed and are going to be heard for consideration."



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

Telscer: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am reluctant to rise and speak against a Member on my side of the aisle. But I am...would like to mention that I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #2. It seems to me that those in the Assembly, regardless of how much sales tax relief they feel the general revenue fund can afford, have in their mind to provide that that tax relief come from the state's general revenue fund and that it not be provided for by any unit of local government regardless of what unit of local government one may have in mind. Amendment #2 simply has technical language to reinforce and to provide that that rationale is in fact what would happen if and when the Assembly does pass sales tax relief. So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Leinenweber to close. I'm sorry, Mr. Yourell, the Gentleman from Cook."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion to table Committee Amendment #2 since I have been engaged in budget discussions with the County of Cook relative to that budget. And I have been told by the Comptroller of the County of Cook that the premise raised by the Gentleman from Will, and that since the replacement tax will be more than units of local government received before through the application of the personal property tax will be in the area of a two and a half or a three million dollar shortfall to the County of Cook. We've already passed out of this House House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #13 which will restrict the taxes and the spending by units of local government and now to restrict units of local government through this device and through the tabling of this Amendment would not be in the best interests of those units of local government. I know for a



fact that there is going to be a shortfall in this initial year and a replacement tax...revenue...personal property tax in the amount of about three million dollars. And I am sure that other units of local government in the State of Illinois are going to experience the same kind of shortfall, and I think this Amendment is important and should be passed."

Speaker Bradley: "Now the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to close."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kempiners, the Gentleman from Will."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion."

I probably have a unique distinction as being the only collar County Legislator to oppose the override attempt of the Governor's veto, but one of the strong reasons of motivations behind my action was this very issue that Representative Leinenweber is attacking. I felt very strongly that the amounts of money that we would have if this Bill passed to reimburse units of local government was extravagant on our part. What we do at the state level is up to us as far as removing a tax, but then when mandate the removal of a tax on a unit of local government, and then have to spend money from the general revenue fund to replace that tax, I don't think it is absolutely necessary. We have to take the responsibility for the actions that we do here in the General Assembly and face the voters of our districts, and I see no reason why we should not offer that opportunity to those in local governments. Let them have the option as to whether they want to remove this tax or keep it on. Let them be responsible for the loss of revenue and for the decision that they make. That is something that each of us ought to have to do as elected officials at the state level, and I think it is something that they ought to do as locally elected officials. I feel very strongly that this is a good Amendment, and I would ask that we oppose the motion...that this Amendment be taken



off."

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

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you can see that the hotline has had the Mayor of Chicago speaking here, and if you watch that Board in a minute, you'll find out how they dance to her whistle. The next election you'll see more independents out of Chicago than the ones you have now, and many of the present will be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber...the Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Well, I don't know whether I should ask a question of Representative Leinenweber or Representative Pierce who is the Sponsor of the Amendment, but it is quite a lengthy Amendment, and I'd like to know where it refers to local governments."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber...Mr. Pierce...who wants to... Mr. Pierce to respond."

Pierce: "I understand the...part...the new part of this Amendment is Section Five, and the last page which would be page fourteen. The language on page one merely clarifies language that is in the Bill already, House Bill 2796, and words it a little more artfully than it is presently worded, technical only. The real...new language is not underlined. It is Section Five on page 14. And Representative Madigan is very capable of explaining just what it does. I just know where it is."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to support Representative Leinenweber in his motion to table. I think after today the...I saw the Revenue Committee was pretty well wired up, and I don't think that I would trust an Amendment that was put on. I really would like to know what these technical changes are. I've been reading... reading it over here, and I fear that there is something trying to be snuck by us here, so I am going to support



Representative Leinenweber in...in his motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber to close."

Leinenweber: "Well, after that great...declaration of support from Representative Bowman, I almost hesitate to close. However, I would just reiterate the fact that we're talking about removing sales tax on food and non...prescription medicines, and for the life of me, if it ought to be removed, then it ought to be removed, and I don't know why we should sit by and say we already re-
moved the sales tax on food because it is a very regressive tax and falls the heaviest on those least able to pay it and then turn around and say, 'Yeah, but units of local government who the general public doesn't even know levies this tax because it is collected the same time as the state tax is collected. You're...you can really believe that they're going to step right out and remove their tax when they aren't blamed even for having it.' What I've said is absolutely true. Down the road when the replacement tax takes full effect, units of local government are going to receive a tremendous bonanza, windfall, pot at the end of the rainbow. Not only that, many of these units of local government have levied...have continued with their same levy that they did in previous years not taking...even into effect, and I'm talking about home rule units, the fact that they are going to get this replacement tax. So the people's real estate tax is going to go up. The sales tax will stay the same, and units of local government will receive tremendous windfalls. This is absurd. The sales tax ought to be removed from food, and it ought to be removed whether it is a local unit of government or the state, and I urge an 'aye' vote on my motion to table."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. 43 'ayes', 99 'nays', and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amend-



ments?"

137.

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 was withdrawn, and Floor Amendment #2, McCourt, was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3, Greiman, amends House Bill 2796 in Section 1."

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

Ryan: "I think...I think it is Representative Greiman's Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, Greiman. I thought they said Ryan. I'm sorry. Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "They mix us up so many times, so often. I think that Amendment #3 comes up on a symbolic day. It comes up on the day that we have voted on Proposition 13. In California, the people voted for Proposition 13, and not really because of high taxes, high expenditures, but because of an immense and incredible surplus in the treasury. And so that is what Prop...that's what Amendment 3 addresses. It takes off the point now, as does the major Bill, but it says that automatically when there is a surplus at a certain level that a point will come off the sales tax on food and drugs. It provides annually for the Bureau of the Budget to estimate what our surplus will be. If they are wrong by \$150,000,000, in other words if, there is a surplus of \$150,000,000 over the surplus that they anticipate, then one point will come off the sales tax on food and drugs. Only one point in a year, in any given year, so that even if there is three or four or five hundred million dollars error as there was this year, still only one point will come. Why do we do that? Why do I suggest it? Because it tells us when it is automatic, but that is the priority for us. That is the tax relief priority so that we cannot say look there is going to be a surplus of \$200,000,000, therefore, let's spend, spend, spend. Under this Amendment, we know if there is going to be a surplus, that surplus will go to tax relief for people in Illinois on food and drugs. Amendment #3 is another approach. I think it is a sensible approach, and I ask you to adopt Amendment #3."



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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Amendment does address the issues that were raised in the veto message. I plan to vote for this because I support the maximum amount of tax relief that we can possibly get on the...eliminating the sales tax from food and medicine. I would like to point out, however, that Amendment #1 which was offered in Committee was put together by the same coalition that was supporting the override, and that has been reintroduced as Amendment #12. And I would like...I just want to kind of go on record that Amendment #12 is the one that is being supported by the coalition, however; I'm sure that they would be happy to see this pass as well, and I think that those who are committed to achieving the maximum amount of tax relief possible would find this an acceptable Amendment."

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

Telscer: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me first say that the Gentleman who offers Amendment #3 is not only a close friend of mine, but an exceptionally competent innovative Legislator. I think Amendment #3 indicates the thoughtfulness and the consideration and the time that was put into creating an innovative type of Amendment. But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #3 has some built in problems. It has some defects, and with Amendment #3 adopted and become law, the Members of the House and the Senate, I think, could possibly be sorry for what they did. I have had a short time to peruse to Amendment #3, and two or three items come to my mind. In the first place, what if the Bureau of the Budget predicts a deficit? Does the Gentleman then suggest that we add a cent to the sales tax? How...how do we provide to make up for that deficit? Another thought occurs to me. What if the estimate from the Bureau of the Budget, and I remind you it



is merely an estimate, what if the estimate is wrong? What if at the end of the fiscal year the true balances are far less than the director of the Bureau of the Budget estimated? Everyone who serves in the House knows full well that the Fiscal and Economic Commission comes up with an estimated figure. The Bureau of the Budget comes up with an estimated figure. The Comptroller comes up with an estimated figure, and rarely, if ever, do they agree. I don't think it is fair to the people of Illinois, to the taxpayers of Illinois, or to the people who are asking for state services to base those services on estimates. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would also like to remind you that Amendment #3 would bind the Legislature and bind the state government now for the possibility of how we would be determining to spend, or how...what type of tax relief the Legislature wishes to give back to the people in advance. Perhaps there are other forms of tax relief that a Majority of the Members of the Legislature would prefer to give back to the taxpayers. I personally agree with the Sponsor of Amendment #3. I agree that the sales tax is the worst tax of all. It would be my personal preference to first of all give tax relief on the sales tax, but my friends, it takes the Majority of votes in the Legislature to determine what we're going to do. Perhaps if at some future date there in fact is a budget surplus, the Legislature would choose to give some other form of tax relief. Why determine what type of tax relief to give it...which we may give in the future, why determine that now? And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while I commend the Gentleman for his innovative thoughtfulness, I think the Amendment has some serious defects, and it is for those reasons that I rise to oppose Amendment #3."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "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'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from...Mr. Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Well, I certainly thank Representative Telser for his wonderful words. I would have been even more appreciative had he read the Amendment since it did...has been hanging on the books for the last week and a half. And the fact is that he misconstrues it completely. The fact is that if there is no surplus, we do not take anything off so there will be no ambiguities, I'll explain just briefly how the Bill...how it works. The Bureau makes an estimate in the future of what it's going...what kind of surplus we're going to have. Let's assume that they say 'We think there is going to be \$100,000,000 surplus'. At the end of the year we see what the surplus is. If it is \$150,000,000 more than the estimate, that means if there's \$250,000,000 in the...in the treasury, \$150,000,000 off of what their estimate was, then we take it off. Then we take it off. Otherwise, nothing comes off. As far as tax planning is concerned in the future, we took...we took it off machinery and equipment over a four year period. That's kind of looking forward in advance. We do lots of things for more than a half an hour in advance. We once in a while do planning in state government. This does it, this Amendment, and I thank you. I think it is imaginative. I think it will handle it. I think it will give us two considerations for tax relief for Illinois, and I ask you to adopt it."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I am voting 'present' on this because I really don't think it is the best idea. I think the administration will make sure there is never a surplus that approximates what is in the Amendment, however, I would like to answer one of my Leader's questions. She (sid)



said, "Why commit the Legislature in the future?". That's what he said. The reason to commit the Legislature in the future is because the Legislature is untrustworthy. Let that sink in. If we could be believed in our promises, there wouldn't be any need not to pass a four or five year phase out plan. But we...we just don't do what we say we do, or what we say we will do. And that is the reason, Representative Telscer."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 50 'ayes', 97 'nays', and the Gentleman's motion failed. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Greiman, amends House Bill 2796 on Section 1 by deleting Section 3 and so forth."

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

Greiman: "With the adoption of Amendment #2,...Committee Amendment 2, Amendment 4 is out of kilter, so I have adopted... I have gone to Amendment 11, and I will withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #4. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, Williams, amends House Bill 2796 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof..."

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

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think there is any secret as to what this Amendment does. There has been no issue to my knowledge in my district, or indeed in the State of Illinois that has had the overwhelming support of all the citizens, indeed of the media,...let's see, the Illinois Tax Federation, the League of Women Voters, and the proposed Amendment we had to eliminate sales tax on food and medicine on non-prescription items, because there is no tax on prescription items. I'd like to make that thing absolutely clear. It is on the non-prescription items and all other medical supplies. It seems to me it has taken about 40 years, I understand, to get a Bill like this that has been passed by



both Houses. How are we to agree then that if we let this go by that we'll ever see this issue ever addressed on a one cent by one cent reduction? Unless, and I do intend, and I will say up front, that I do intend to vote for some of the others that are coming up, especially that... Amendment #12, but I think here before us is now Amendment #5, and it does actually put the Bill into the same posture as at least 96 of those of us from downstate and suburban Cook County and the Collar Counties did support with 96 votes. It is generally agreed that there is a sufficient amount of surplus now, and the revenue predictions, I think, indicate that there will be sufficient revenues.. due to us over a four year phase out. We have heard that this measure is irresponsible. I would totally disagree with that. I think it is a most responsible measure that this General Assembly can actually address itself to. I think now is the time to end the inherent inequities of a regressive tax that we have seen here on food and medicine. We all know that the poor could spend a much larger percentage of their income on these...on the food and on the medicine. I look at the tax on medicine as a tax on illness and on sickness. I think removal of this tax would be the most substantial tax relief that we could give the people of the entire State of Illinois regardless of income. In conclusion, I think people of all incomes actually are asking and crying out for tax relief, and government should serve the will of the people. Also keep in mind that the people of Cook County beginning November 1 are going to have another 20% increase in their sales tax, and the people from the Collar Counties are also going to get that quarter percent, or a five percent sales tax the day after tomorrow. If this is not the time to get rid of this regressive tax, I'd like to know when the right time is. I submit to you that now is the time I would ask those 96 who supported this issue a couple of weeks ago, I think they should put this Amendment on. There are some others



that are coming up that I do intend to support, but I think right now this will put the Bill into the posture that we all agreed was the real way to address, actually sales tax relief for all of the people, and I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would submit to you that if it was not irresponsible to support the override, to support this Amendment is the height of irresponsibility. We all know what is going to happen if this Amendment is adopted. If it goes to the Governor's desk it is sure to be vetoed. He's promised that. What you're doing is cruelly fooling people into thinking that you're trying to give them tax relief, when if you support this Amendment you are going to give them nothing. Now maybe you think that the override was a better plan, and the 96 of you, I commend you for the fight that we all made on opposite sides of a question a short time ago. But the fight is over, and now it is time to get together. If you can't get the whole pie, then let's take part of it. If we support House Bill 2796, we are going to extend to the people of the State of Illinois some much needed tax relief. There is no argument whether we want to get rid of this tax or not. It is how we go about it, and I say to you, let's take the one cent that is in House Bill 2796. Let's defeat this Amendment and all the Amendments that will follow it, and then let's join together and work together to remove this regressive tax over the next few years. I sat on the floor of this House in the initial debate, and I say again, the Governor has thrown down the 'problem' to us. He has said stop spending, stop spending, and we can stop taxing. He is saying take taxes off this year, take one cent off this year, next year if there is a surplus, obviously we'll all proceed further. Representative Lechowicz has introduced a Bill that may be a vehicle to provide relief next year. And he said to us



just this morning in the Rules Committee, 'Let's have hearings. Let's look at this problem and let's approach it in a reasonable fashion'. I submit, that is the responsible way. If we are to adopt any Amendments to this Bill, we have killed any sales tax relief for this year, and I say that that is totally irresponsible. We've got to get together. Let's support House Bill 2796 and the shape that it's in now, and let's give the people of the State of Illinois some tax relief. Let's quit fooling them with these phony arguments. Let's beat this phony Amendment and all the phonies to follow it."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Friedrich: "When you're...getting your figures for the surplus, whose figures did you use, Mr. Burris' or Mr. Consentino's?"

Williams: "I don't think it makes any difference...whose that you look at, it is anywhere from \$550,000,000 to \$640,000,000 right now, and we're not even taking into consideration the surplus that is in other funds that could be transferred. So I don't care whose you take, it is somewhere between \$550 and \$640."

Friedrich: "Have you taken into account the money that we voted in the road program to take money for local units of government on the road fund which is going to come out of general revenue?"

Williams: "Yeah, there will be a growth. I don't think there's ..."

Friedrich: "Well..."

Williams: "...Any questions? There's going to be at least an eight percent, at least a ten point two percent growth, and I'm sure that will take care of that program."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just say briefly that there is a great difference of opinion between Mr. Cosentino, the treasurer, and Mr. Burris about how much



money we have, and I say it is as simple as this. If you have \$1,000 in your checking account at the end of the month, and you owe \$600 in current bills, how much money do you have? I think you've got \$400, and that's what Mr. Cosentino thinks, and I think we ought to be thinking about that. And we just voted not long ago to take \$100,000,000 of this and use it for roads which is money that came out of the gas tax. So I say to you that there is a vast difference of opinion about how much money we really have, and I doubt if the Sponsor has really considered the fact that we have current bills that are not paid."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams to close."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I won't belabor this. I think that this is the time and this is the tax, and I would ask you to give all the help you did on 2564, and let's put this Amendment on. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have to differ with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that have pointed out that this is a phony issue, and that this is an effort to stymie this legislation. As far as I'm concerned, the one percent so called compromise that the Governor has proposed, I'm going to vote against that. I think the people of Illinois can see through that. It is not going to provide any meaningful tax relief. If you think one percent is meaningful, it is nothing, and we're better off with nothing than we are with that proposal."



think Jack Williams ought to be complimented for giving the Governor another opportunity to reconsider this issue and make the right decision in signing the law what it should be at five percent and not one percent."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Williams to explain his vote."

Williams: "Yes, I'd like to explain my vote. I would certainly like to see the 96 that were there with us from suburban Cook and downstate and the Collar Counties, and just remember that come November 1 you've got another cent, and that's not one cent, that's a 20%. So even if this is taken off we're still back to the five that we are right now. I would certainly ask that this Amendment be put on. If you are in any way sincere on giving the people of the State of Illinois and in your districts some kind of meaningful tax relief...I know that some of the other Amendments coming up will address to have some sort of a Committee or Commission to review this. I am in favor of that, but right now we are looking at this Amendment 5. I would like to see a few more votes, you know, up there to give this actually a passage on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Has he taken the record?"

Speaker Bradley: "We did, but..."

Dunn: "Well then, I don't choose to explain my vote if the record is taken. I'd like to see what I could do to get a green light up there, but it's too late. Forget it."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 77 'ayes', and 82 'nay'. Mr. Williams, what purpose do you rise?"

Williams: "I would like a Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wants to poll the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Williams: "I'd like to point out we only need a simple Majority, not 89."



Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees: Bianco, Borchers, Deuster, Epton, Farley, Keane, Leinenweber, Mahar, McBroom..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mahar... 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "McBroom, Oblinger, Polk, Satterthwaite, Slape, Stearney, Younge, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Speaker wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question then there are 79 'ayes', and 82 'nos'. Mr. Williams."

Williams: "I don't wish to take the time, but I would like to verify the negative. It is so close, and you only need a simple Majority here, and I would like to have a verification of the negative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a verification of the negative, and the Clerk will call the...Mr. Lechowicz, what purpose do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "Well, if we're going to go through that, we'll also verify the positive at the appropriate time too. I just wanted to put you on notice."

Speaker Bradley: "Call the negative vote. Mr. Dawson, what purpose do you rise?"

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I think we'd save some time if we'd... just everybody got in their seats and had an oral verification on it."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think this would be quicker. Call the negative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Negative: "Abramson..."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, let's have everybody in their seat though, and raise your hand when your name is called. I think that would help."

Clerk Leone: "Ackerman, Alexander, Anderson, E.M..Barnes, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Bower, Burnidge, Campbell, Capparelli, G..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Capparelli wants to be verified, and J.D. Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright."



Williams: "Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi, Collins, Conti, Cullerton, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell, Ewing, Dwight Friedrich, Garmisa, Giorgi, Goodwin, Griesheimer, Hallock, Henry, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Huff, Dave Jones, Emil Jones..."

Speaker Bradley: "Slow it down just a little. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Kulas, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leon, Madigan, McAuliffe, McBroom...Clerk's error, McBroom voted absent...is absent... McClain, McMaster, Meyer, Molloy, Neff, O'Brien, Patrick, Peters, Pouncey, Preston, Pullen, Reilly, Rigney, Robbins, Ronan, Ropp, Ryan, Schuneman, Simms, Stanley, E.C. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Sumner, Swanstrom, Taylor, Telscer, Terzich, Tuerk, Vinson, Watson, White, Wikoff, Winchester, J.J. Wolf, and Woodyard."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the negative. The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Slape: "Would you please record me as 'yes'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Farley, the Gentleman from Cook, what purpose?"

Farley: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Farley: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. McCourt, what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

McCourt: "I'd like to be on the winning side for a change. Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. McCourt as voting 'no'. Alright."



now, are there any other changes? If not, then are there questions of the...questions of the negative."

Williams: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "79 'ayes', 82 'nos'...84, I'm sorry. 84 'nays'. Mr. Lechowicz, what purpose do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "The count is 79...84 'nos'?"

Speaker Bradley: "79 'ayes', 84 'nays'."

Lechowicz: "I don't know how I got 77. There was a change. There were 78 and then it came back. Want to check that? Does he have McCourt changed from 'aye' to 'no'? Well, there's 78. I'm sorry, the Speaker. I didn't get him. That's fine. I didn't have the Speaker recorded. Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "79, 84. Alright, questions, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Alright, Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Capuzi. He's in his seat."

Williams: "Okay, Representative Ebbesen."

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

Williams: "Representative Ewing."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Ewing, I can't see him there. There he is."

Williams: "Representative Griesheimer."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Griesheimer...Representative Griesheimer is not in his seat. I don't see him. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Williams: "Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Hoffman...he's in the aisle."

Williams: "I see him. Representative Kempiners."

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

Williams: "Representative Klosak."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Klosak...Mr. Collins is in the way. I can't see back there. It doesn't appear that that's Mr. Klosak in his chair. How is the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Williams: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative McAuliffe...is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "There's Mr. McAuliffe."

Williams: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Bradley: "Reilly? He's in his seat."

Williams: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Ronan...he's on the wrong side."

Williams: "Is he here?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's over in the...he's in the chambers."

Williams: "Representative White."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't see him in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How is Mr. White, Representative White recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Williams: "Representative..."

Speaker Bradley: "Hold it, wait a minute now. Return Mr. White to the... to the Roll Call."

Williams: "~~Representative~~ Patrick."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Patrick is there."

Williams: "Representative Preston."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Preston is in Schneider's seat."

Williams: "Okay, that's why I didn't see him. Representative Huff."

Speaker Bradley: "Huff is there."

Williams: "Representative Anderson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Anderson."

Williams: "Oh, I see him. He's alright."

Speaker Bradley: "He's there."

Williams: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Bradley: "Giorgi is on the Republican side."



Williams: "That's why I can't see him again. Representative Hallock. I see him now."

Speaker Bradley: "He's standing there."

Williams: "Representative Molloy."

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

Williams: "Okay, Representative Pullen."

Speaker Bradley: "She's in the rear of the chamber leaning against the pillar."

Williams: "Representative Burnidge. Is Representative Burnidge..."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the...he's in his seat."

Williams: "Representative Cullerton. Is he there? I don't see him."

Speaker Bradley: "He's there."

Williams: "Okay, alright."

Speaker Bradley: "As always. Further questions, Mr. Williams?"

Williams: "I guess there are no further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, 79 'ayes', and 82 'nays'. And the Gentleman's Amendment is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6, Bowman-Daniels, amends House Bill 2796 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof of the following."

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

Bowman: "Leave of the House to withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to withdraw Amendment #6?"

Bowman: "Yes, that's right. We're going with another one, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, he withdraws Amendment...further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, Skinner, amends House Bill 2796 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof of the following."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner in the chamber? Mr. Skinner isn't here, so...there he is, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw this Amendment so we can get to number 12."

Speaker Bradley: "He asks leave to withdraw. Hearing no objections we will withdraw it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, Schraeder, amends House Bill 2796..."

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

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I would leave to withdraw Amendment #8."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no objections the Gentleman has leave to withdraw it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, Vinson, amends House Bill 2796 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

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

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #9 offers a chance to consider the entire philosophy of tax relief. What this Amendment does is consistent with the fiscal parameters that affect the state. I would put this relief in the property tax relief rather than in the sales tax relief. I think it is clear that the property tax is the most repressive, most oppressive, and the worst tax we have. I believe everybody saw the media stories last spring which indicated that only 16% of the property tax Bills are accurately assessed in this state. I believe everybody has seen the media stories from last year..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Vinson...Mr. Vinson, just a minute. We'll see what Mr. Getty wants. The Gentleman from Cook."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would raise a point of order on two points. I question the germaneness, and I would also question whether this is in the call of the Special Session."

Speaker Bradley: "If the Parliamentarian is within the sound of my voice, we'd like to have him immediately at the podium. I think on both points the Gentleman is correct. It is neither germane nor within the call of the Chair."



The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed about that ruling for a variety of reasons. I think if you consider what the ruling really means, it means very clearly that we're going for the purposes of a simple rule on germaneness. We're going to ignore the question of the separation of powers between the two branches of government, the Legislature and the Executive. If that separation of powers is to mean anything, then it has to mean that the Legislature is a coequal branch and consider...can consider reasonable Amendments to Bills. What the Governor would do through the special call and through the title of the Bill to make this Amendment non-germane would be to preclude any chance for us to consider tax relief in a general situation. Do you perceive...remove any possibility for a deliberative consideration of the tax relief question. For those reasons I think the ruling is wrong. It is misdirected, and I would move to overrule the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "I missed your last remark, Sir."

Vinson: "I say if you won't withdraw that ruling and offer the correct ruling, I'd have to move to overrule the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "There is nothing that would make me happier than to rule in your favor, Mr. Vinson. You are from the 44th District, but to be fair to everybody, I think to be consistent, I'll have to remain with that ruling, so... It would probably invalidate the Bill also, so...the Mr. Madigan wants the next Amendment called. Next Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "...Move to overrule the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has that right. The Gentleman moves to overrule the Chair. The question is 'Shall the Chair be overridden?'. All in favor of the Gentleman's



motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Skinner, the Gentleman from McHenry, what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "The motion, of course."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted..."

Skinner: "Not many people are supporting this motion, and they really ought to, because what we're doing is saying that we don't believe the legislative branch is coequal to the executive branch. Now if you really believe that, why don't you get an Amendment drawn up to cut back the Legislature not by one-third, but by 100% and we can run the state by executive order."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Vinson to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You're saying two things. Representative Skinner is absolutely right. You are saying the Legislature doesn't count. It doesn't matter that legislative decisions even down to the question of procedure can be made on the second floor. You're also saying something else, something further that is just as bad. You're saying that you don't think property tax reform is important. That you don't think it is relevant for us to take this opportunity to do something about the worst tax this state has, a tax that is improperly assessed 84% of the time, a tax that is consistently, illegally applied to grant exemptions to people who don't have the legal or the constitutional rights to have exemptions. You're saying that you don't care to do something about a tax that discourages investment. That you would rather encourage consumption. For all of those reasons, I would urge people to vote to overrule the Chair on this matter so that we can enter into a meaningful dialogue on the question of tax reform in this state and do something about the worst tax, the property tax."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentlemen's motion failed. Further



Amendments? Alright, we'll take the record, and 47 'aye', 960.8 'nays', and the motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10, Mahar, amends House Bill 2796 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, rise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to call to your attention that any more innocuous Amendments...any of these Bills, is going to invalidate this Bill, and those of us who are really sincere in trying to give the people some relief back home by trying to put all these Amendments on...I've been told that the Governor will veto any Bill that is going to be amended, and if we're really sincere about getting the people tax relief back home, I think we should consider some of these Amendments that we're offering here today. I'm not speaking on any one particular Amendment, but all of these Amendments. How many Amendments are filed, some 29, 30 of them?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, no, no, Sir. We say we're right... getting very close to the end, and we're on #10 right now. And I'll call on the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Listening very attentively to the previous speaker and my colleague, I'll withdraw Amendment #10."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #10. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, Greiman, amends House Bill 2796..."

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

Greiman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #11 is a very simple, little, tiny Amendment. Some time ago we said that there's a half...a quarter billion dollars, a quarter billion dollars should be exempted from sales tax on equipment and



on machinery. Now we are facing whether a half billion dollars or less should be exempted from food and drugs. The Governor and those people...many Members of this General Assembly have said that we should look each year, we should see how much money do we have. How much tax relief can we give? And then we should do it on a year by year basis. And that's essentially what House Bill 2796 says. Let's give some relief now. Let's look and see what's cooking next year. Let's see where we are next year. If we can afford relief, we'll give relief. Now that's on a half of a billion dollars. It seems to me that what we should do is look at the whole picture, not just part of the picture, but all of it, and accordingly Amendment 11 merely says that we take...we no longer take the exemption for machinery and equipment, that we do that on a annual basis also. If we're going to look at sales tax on food and drugs, we should look at sales tax on machinery equipment as well..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, what purpose do you rise?"

Vinson: "I question the germaneness of the Amendment and whether it is proper within the call of the Special Session."

Greiman: "It is clearly germane. It is part of the Bill."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I think you have to make that ruling."

Speaker Bradley: "In this opinion of the Chair, it is not germane. The title of the Bill deals with human consumption of food, and you are dealing with the sales tax on machinery, and so the Chair will have to rule it's not germane..."

Greiman: "Well, Mr. Chairman, let me...let me understand this. All this Amendment does is delete language in the Bill. It doesn't add anything. It merely deletes language in the Bill. That's all it does. It doesn't add one single word. In other words you're saying that the deletion of material in a Bill is not germane?"



Speaker Bradley: "Well what you're doing though is repealing parts of existing law that doesn't have anything to do with food and drugs."

Greiman: "But it has to do with the Bill. You filed the Bill...or somebody filed the Bill. It seems to me if you file a Bill then I can delete any part of it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Bill has a restrictive title though, Mr. Greiman..."

Greiman: "That's what the Bill is though. Then the Bill may not be germane, and the whole Bill is not germane if that's the case. If...if the matter that I'm asking to delete is not germane, then the whole Bill is not germane, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you I cannot imagine that judgment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich, what purpose do you rise?"

Matijeovich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to back up Representative Greiman because I think too many of us are hung up on that long preamble that the Governor provided us with. The preamble doesn't mean a thing. All he really directed us to do is to consider House Bill 2796. That's all he told us to do. Now I cannot by any stretch of an imagination understand how you cannot delete language out of a Bill out of language that is in House Bill 2796. We are considering House Bill 2796. The language he is deleting is in that Bill. How can that not be germane? I can't see that at all."

Speaker Bradley: "We're basing the ruling on the title of the Bill. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Now that everybody understands the ramifications, the Chair's intent for ruling on this and on all other Amendments that would have any real meaning, I move to overrule the Chair on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, the Gentleman has that right, and the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer on the Gentleman's



motion."

Brummer: "Yes, wasn't he the one to raise the question of germaneness in the first place? I question whether his proper procedure isn't just to withdraw his question of germaneness, and we'll proceed on the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "That was his germaneness question on his Amendment prior to I think Amendment #9 or something. Mr. Vinson, you're caught in the middle here. Maybe the Chair is caught in the middle."

Vinson: "I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is just a question of legislative integrity. We do have...you clearly, after your last ruling, had to rule this way on this Amendment to be honest, which you always are. Now we're in a situation where I think we ought to go up to the general principle that's involved. If Mr. Brummer would prefer it, I'll withdraw my motion to overrule the Chair and defer to Mr. Greiman and agree to support him on this because I think in all honesty he would turn around and support me in a motion to over...reconsider the last motion to overrule the Chair."

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

Friedrich: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have ruled it is not germane. The question before us now is the motion to overrule the Chair, and that is the only thing that is before us.."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, Mr. Vinson, I think, withdrew that motion."

Friedrich: "Alright, then there's nothing before us. You ruled it is not germane. We'll have to go on to the next Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, the point is well taken, the Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, what purpose do you rise?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to raise the question myself. All this Amendment was proposed to do was to do something that the Sponsor couldn't get done in the regular Session. He stood alone with one or two other people trying to



defeat the Bill, and now he's back trying to defeat a Bill that is already on the statute books."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Reilly, the Gentleman from Morgan, what purpose do you rise?"

Reilly: "Personal inquiry of the Chair. Are you going to move on to the next Amendment?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, we're going to move on to the next Amendment. The next...are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, Schraeder-Bowman, Darrow, amends House Bill 2796 as amended by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Who wants to handle the Amendment? Mr. Schraeder. Mr. Vinson, what purpose do you rise?"

Vinson: "I question the germaneness of the Amendment...and its relevance to the special call."

Speaker Bradley: "This one is germane. Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Would you just explain the rationale for why this one's germane?"

Speaker Bradley: "It was in the title of the Bill, and it deals with food and drugs and sales tax on food and drugs. Now, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with leave of the House I would like to show the Sponsors of the Bill as follows and with myself: Representative Daniels, Representative Bowman, Representative Davis, Representative Darrow, and Representative MacDonald. With leave I'd like to show those as the Sponsors of this Amendment...plus anyone else who would like to join us, which would hopefully be everyone."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you through, Mr. Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "No."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen rise?"

Pullen: "Has this been printed and distributed, Mr. Speaker? If it has, could we get it in the back of the room please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Republican Pages please distribute



the Amendment to the rear of the room? Tuerk had...
Alright, Mr...alright, now back to Mr. Schraeder to
explain the Bill...the Amendment."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'll be brief. We've had a long debate. This is Amendment #12, all the rest of them have...while might have been meaningful and could have done the job of sales tax relief for the general public, they've gone by the way of the wind. They have one more opportunity to grant meaningful tax relief to citizens of Illinois. In effect, this will phase out the sales tax now being collected by the State of Illinois over a four year period with the House Revenue Committee and the Senate Revenue Committee being mandated to hold hearings on a yearly basis on the effect that the withdrawal of the sales tax has had at that particular time, and then they are required to report to the...before the Governor's budget on what effects it should be in the following year. I want to point out very clearly, very clearly, and please pay attention to this, this Amendment now does not affect the local municipal tax in any way, shape, or form, and so therefore the municipalities are not interested in this particular part of the old Bill. This only has to do with the state collected tax as it pertains to state government. It is a substantial tax relief program for the citizens of Illinois, and I would ask every single one of you who have pledged to support tax relief for your constituency to give us an 'aye' vote so we can send this over to the Senate and be done with tax relief in this Session. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions, but please give us an 'aye' vote on this meaningful piece of legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniels, the Gentleman from DuPage, I think is one of the Cosponsors."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #12 is an Amendment that many of us discussed at great lengths over the last couple of weeks. In an effort



to answer some of the questions that you have had, and that we have had, and frankly our constituents have had as to the objections of the override effort that fell short a week and a half ago. This Amendment in its present form, we believe, answers most of the questions and objections that were leveled at the override effort, that is by our local units of government that they would be adversely affected and also that the transportation package itself would be adversely affected. I want to emphasize that there are some important features of this Amendment that have been incorporated in it, none the least being that it requires hearing...annual hearings by the House and Senate Revenue Committees to determine the affects of the phase out that is mandated in this program. Mandated commencing January 1, 1980. I would say to you briefly without dragging out any long debate, that before you now you have an Amendment that is completely, completely acceptable by most organizations and groups in the State of Illinois and absolutely acceptable, in our opinion, by your constituents that are...that you are representing. Any Legislator that votes 'no' on this Amendment after having voted 'no' on the five cent phase out is in my opinion not representing his or her constituency. And it is true that this issue has been at certain times a partisan issue. But we have made an effort by this Amendment and by the Sponsorship of the Amendment to make it a bipartisan effort, an effort that we are addressing the taxpayers of this state and saying we recognize the need for tax relief. And maybe perhaps it is not as great as what we would like, but at this time the Amendment itself is the one that stands before you that should be adopted. A four percent phase out that does not affect the local units of government, a four percent phase out that does not affect the transportation package as many of us did in fact object to, but are now willing to accept for more meaningful tax relief



than what the alleged compromise is going to bring us, a compromise that only brings us one cent when we have a chance to deal with four cents here. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the debate can be long on this, but you know, and particularly those of you on the other side of the aisle know that tax relief in this form affects the senior citizen and the poor of our state, and for yes, the minorities of our state. And many of us that are Republicans are standing up and saying we recognize the need for that relief, and we're willing to join with you in a bipartisan effort. Now it is your turn to represent the blacks, the minorities, the poor, and the seniors of this state to address the issue of tax relief as we did earlier in passing constitutional limitations so that the 81st General Assembly can go down as an 81st General Assembly that addressed the issues of tax relief before it and the issues of representing their constituency. I challenge you to put the right vote up there, the vote that means responsibility to your constituency and helps those people that are least able to help themselves. I recommend an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Before I explain my position on the Bill I would like to announce that I intend to ask for an oral verified Roll Call so if there is anyone within the sound of my voice in their offices, I suggest they might want to come back. The Governor had ample opportunity to inject himself into the legislative process when House Bill 2564 was making its way through the two chambers. The Governor did not take a position on it, did not suggest any Amendments, did not support any Amendments, and virtually ignored it until it got to his desk. And when it got to his desk rather than using an amendatory veto and sending it back to us with the one cent reduction as he is now suggesting in 2796, instead of doing that, he vetoed it outright. He thought



he could get away with it. He thought the people back home wouldn't notice that he had vetoed the only tax relief Bill to reach his desk. He thought they wouldn't notice his hypocrisy after having proposed the so called Thompson Proposition and then vetoing that Bill, but they did, and he came in with a so-called compromise. But what he calls a compromise I call a counter proposal. You know, if you buy a car or a house you look at one number, the seller looks at another number, then maybe you agree on something in between. Well, I think the Governor's one cent proposal is a counter proposal. It's not a compromise. Amendment #12 is, in my opinion, a responsible compromise. It does not...it goes 80% of the way to words what House Bill 2564 would have provided. It goes 80% of the way. There are some slight changes in this Bill that I'd like to call to your attention. The phase out schedule is adjusted slightly so the last penny comes off at the end of Calendar year 1983. That adjustment plus eliminating municipal replacement and keeping the municipal levy on, saves the state treasury over the five year phase out period about a quarter of a billion dollars. Now that's not insignificant. However, this is about a billion more dollars of tax relief than the Governor is asking for. We certainly can afford it, and I would point out as Representative Schraeder has already mentioned, just to remind you that the House Revenue and the Senate Revenue Committees are mandated to meet early each year before the Governor's budget message to consider the question of whether the phase out schedule should be changed, whether it should be slowed down or perhaps even advanced if we have the money. There is no reason that we cannot provide additional tax relief at an earlier date. The Revenue Committees then are required to report to their respective chambers. It seems to me that this is a responsible approach, It is a consensus approach. I have personally talked with a couple dozen Legislators on both sides of the



aisle. I have talked with the various groups that have supported House Bill 2564. I can assure you that this is a consensus Amendment, and I ask that we all be joined by your votes and I ask an Affirmative Roll Call on this Amendment."

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

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's the night before Halloween, but there's been a lot of ghosties and goblins out early tonight. Several people have risen on this floor, including our assistant Minority Leader, to tell you what the Governor's going to do with this Bill. He's going to veto the Bill. He's going to do this with the Bill and that with the Bill. Let me just tell you a little bit about what might happen if this Amendment goes on, and it certainly should go on, and I think that everybody should be a Cosponsor of this Amendment. Let me tell you just what might happen if this Amendment goes on. If the Amendment goes on, is this the scenario that the Dragon Lady from the city-state to the north will call her once scorned but now loyal Majority Leader, and tell Representative Madigan to table this Bill? No, I don't think that will happen. If this Bill is passed with this Amendment on it, it goes to the Senate. Will they then tinker with it? Will they negotiate it downward? Will they put it back upward? Who knows what the Senate will do with it. They may even kill this Amendment so it could come back on concurrence. Let's assume the Senate goes along with it. Will Terry...Terry and the pirates on the second floor downstairs then veto it outright? I doubt that. You must remember that the Governor has two kinds of vetos. Don't forget, we're in a Veto Session where amendatory vetos and total vetos are available. Would he then amendatorily veto it down to his one cent level and work the will of the General Assembly and bring it back on that basis? He might. Would he put it at two cents? He might. Would he totally veto



the Bill? I seriously doubt it. This Amendment is a very good Amendment. It is a compromise. It offers to everybody in this state an opportunity to have one cent, two cents, three cents, four cents. It has a provision for a safety mechanism. It has everything we need for those 96 Members of this House who voted to override to vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "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'. Opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Schraeder to close."

Schraeder: "It's been previously mentioned by the speaker on the other side that this piece of legislation has become in the last few weeks, and few months, a non-partisan tax relief program. Well, I'm extremely proud that it has become non-partisan, that it crosses both aisles, because I happen to believe that those on the other side have spoken on behalf of this Amendment, are truly dedicated to tax relief, and so I am more than happy to have them join us in this Amendment. Let me say this is a fiscally responsible piece of legislation that we can afford in the State of Illinois. With the goals in state government, this is very easily...to be lived with, and I would like to re-echo the statements made of the previous speaker. This Bill has life that is beginning to grow, and when we get it to the Governor's office, I dare say he will have second thoughts. He will take counsel with those who have passed this piece...this Amendment and this piece of legislation. We feel this is good legislation. Mr. Speaker with that, I propose and ask for an oral verification... Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Is the Gentleman joined by ten Members for an oral verification? Alright, we will have an oral verification, but I think in all fairness, there has been a..."



some remarks down here there were not any opponents that spoke against the Amendment. Does anybody wish to speak against the Amendment? If not, you can explain your vote. Let's go with the oral verification. Everybody in their seat. Let's go as rapidly as...it was in the rules. The rules provide for, if they are joined by ten Members, that they can have an oral verification. Everybody be in their seat and push their button. We'll move along rapidly if you're in your seat, and we'll move along as rapidly as possible. The Clerk will call the roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Abramson, 'no'. Ackerman. Ackerman, 'no'. Alexander..."

Speaker Bradley: "'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander, 'aye'. Anderson. Anderson, 'no'. Balanoff. Balanoff, 'aye'. E.M. Barnes. E.M. Barnes, 'no'. Jane Barnes. Jane Barnes, 'no'. Beatty..."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute...just a minute. Mr. Lechowicz, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the rules also provide there are no filming when you are having a Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "That is correct. Now, there is some question about Alexander's vote. . . Would you...Did you wish to be recorded as voting 'no' or 'present'? And it is very difficult. We have some Members other than those voting saying 'aye' or 'no', and that is the problem. If everybody is quiet we'll move along. Mr. Matijevich, what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Well, in defense of the camera crews, if nobody is explaining their vote, they can have the films on."

Speaker Bradley: "That is correct. Okay, Mr. Clerk, will you continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander, 'present'. Beatty. Beatty, 'aye'. Bell. Bell, 'aye'. Bianco. Bianco, 'present'.. Birchler. Birchler, 'aye'. Birkinbine. Birkinbine, 'aye'. Bluthardt. Bluthardt, 'aye'. Borchers. Borchers, 'pass'."



Boucek. Boucek, 'aye'. Bower. Bower, 'no'. Bowman.
Bowman, 'aye'. Bradley. Bradley, 'aye'. Braun. Braun,
'aye'. Breslin. Breslin, 'aye'. Brummer. Brummer, 'aye'.
Bullock. Bullock, 'pass'. Burnidge..."

Speaker Bradley: "Push the button 'no', Mr. Burnidge."

Clerk O'Brien: "Burnidge, 'no'. Campbell. Campbell, 'no'.
Capparelli. Capparelli, 'no'. Capuzi. Capuzi, 'no'.
Catania. Catania, 'aye'. Chapman..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Laurino on a point of order. What's
your point?"

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the numerical
count...it doesn't agree with the...the lights that are
present: You...I see, alright."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Johnson already had his light pushed, I
think. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman. Chapman, 'aye'. Christensen.
Christensen, 'aye'. Collins..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
I ask your indulgence only because the debate was closed
without any words of opposition being spoken to this Amend-
ment, and I would like to rise as one who has serious
doubts in opposition to this what I can only label as a
cruel hoax to...on the people of the State of Illinois.
the...much has been made in the affirmative debate on this
Bill that it is only 80% as bad as Amendment #5. Well,
I say 80% is bad, and it is. They referred to public
hearings of standing Committees of both Houses. Well isn't
that ridiculous? These Committees would be holding
hearings on tax relief anyhow."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Collins, just a minute. The rules
provide that there will be no pictures taken during an
oral verification, Sir, so...yes, during the explanation
of votes, so proceed, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I say as I said before,
the Governor has pointed out quite properly to us that we



have spent ourselves into a posture where we really cannot, or maybe we cannot afford this tax relief that every one of us desire, but let's take another look at what he said, and I repeat, I repeat it again and again, he said if you stop the spending, we can all get together and stop taxing. He has taken the very reasonable attitude that a year from now after we've given a years tax relief we can come back, and if there is indeed a surplus, if there is indeed a surplus we can vote additional relief. But if we should go along with a Bill such as 27...the Amendment to 2796, what do we say to these people a year from now? We're either going to say we were fooling you a year ago, and I say to many of you, that is exactly what you're doing. You're fooling people, and we're going to take it back a year from now or we'll raise other taxes. We can raise your income taxes or even worse, we can cut much needed...much needed programs. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a...this is a hoax, and as one speaker pointed out, it is quite proper the day before Halloween. I can tell you what's going to happen if this Bill is amended and passed in this fashion. It is going to be vetoed as sure as any of us are standing on the floor of this House. And then we've killed any hope for any tax relief this year, and I say that's totally irresponsible and...gee, I must have touched a nerve, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry. I say that this is a very...totally irresponsible vote. The onus is on all of you. You think you're pandering to the people. The people aren't as foolish as you think they are, and I talked to them as you will. You'll hear from them. You're fooling them again, and you're going to hear from them loud and clear as to how wrong your action is. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman votes 'no'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Conti. Conti, 'no'. Cullerton. Cullerton, 'no'. Currie. Currie, 'aye'. Daniels. Daniels, 'aye'. Darrow. Darrow, 'aye'. Davis. Davis 'aye'. Dawson. Dawson, 'no'."



Deuster."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well very briefly, on the one hand I'm perplexed by this vote because I know we're getting down toward the end of the disposition of this subject. On the one hand we know that the Governor vetoed this Bill early in the summer and that turned out to be a mistake. Then the Governor presented us with the idea of one penny, and I think the people of the state feel that was a mistake. Now, I know that if we pass this Amendment and the Senate should go along, this Bill will go to the Governor, and he will have another painful decision. To some extent we are facing...causing him to face the music. On the other hand I remember very well when we had one of the most difficult and painful subjects that any Legislature ever considers, and that's our payraise. The Governor didn't hesitate a minute to make us face the music for a second time, and that was a difficult thing. But he felt the people of the State of Illinois wanted us to reconsider that payraise and that subject. We did so. Now it is my opinion that the people of the State of Illinois would like to have the Governor reconsider this subject, too. So I think if we put this Amendment on, and we give the people the relief of all four pennies, the Governor will have another chance to ponder this, and it is my feeling that he will sense what the people really want, and he will sign this Bill. So I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman votes 'aye'. Any more explanation of votes, we'll use the timer. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "DiPrima. DiPrima, 'no'. Domico. Domico, 'no'. Donovan. Donovan, 'aye'. Doyle. Doyle, 'no'. John Dunn. John Dunn, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn. Ralph Dunn, 'no'. Dyer. Dyer, 'aye'. Ebbesen. Ebbesen, 'no'. Epton. Epton, 'pass'. Ewell."

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



Ewell: "Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen. As painful as it is, I think there comes the time when we have to be somewhat responsible. Everybody talks about a surplus of some \$500,000,000. Last year we passed supplemental appropriations in the amount of \$241,388. This does not include the overrides we're going to make this year. We can give and assume that we're going to spend more supplemental appropriations this spring. I say to you, you need at least \$100,000,000 to run the state, because the state spends more than \$100,000,000. We have spent the surplus five times over. We cannot do this, still give all the services that we want, still provide everything for everyone's district, all of the employees, and the like. I suggest to you you cannot have it both ways. You can put this weight on the Governor if you will, but eventually it will come back to us, and we will be here wrangling on whether or not to raise the income tax. I am going to do what has to be done and vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell, 'no'. Ewing. Ewing, 'no'. Farley. Farley, 'no'. Flinn. Flinn, 'pass'. Virginia Frederick. Virginia Frederick, 'aye'. Friedland. Friedland, 'aye'. Dwight Friedrich. Friedrich, 'no'. Gaines."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from...you wish to explain your vote? He wishes to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last evening I was honored as no black Republican was honored for 30 years. I was honored by the citizens of the black community for representing their point of view on this tax relief. They are no different than anyone else. They also want tax relief, and they are quite serious about it. And for a mainly Democratic group to honor a black Republican, it took a lot of courage, and so I am going to show my confidence in them. I am going to show my confidence in the Black Labor Leader's Council. I am going to vote for tax relief for everyone from the



highest of the high, to the lowest of the low. So I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines, 'aye'. Garmisa. Garmisa, 'no'. Getty. Getty, 'aye'. Giorgi. Giorgi, 'no'. Goodwin. Goodwin, 'no'. Greiman. Greiman, 'pass'. Griesheimer. Griesheimer, 'pass'. Grossi. Grossi, 'aye'. Hallock. Hallock, 'no'. Hallstrom. Hallstrom, 'aye'. Hanahan. Hanahan, 'aye'. Hannig. Hannig, 'aye'. Harris. Harris, 'aye'. Henry."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Henry to explain his vote."

Henry: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think I'd have to agree with what Representative Ewell just pointed out. I represent people that are in need. I represent people that need the services, and I would be a fool to stand in this House and tell a lie to the people of the State of Illinois that we can do one thing or another. The Governor has indicated what he is going to do. You're going to throw it back to him. He's going to throw it back to us. So let's...why don't we understand what the positions have to be. We have to be responsible and get on with the business of trying to help the people that is in need. I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Henry, 'no'. Hoffman. Hoffman, 'aye'. Hoxsey. Hoxsey, 'no'. Hudson. Hudson, 'aye'. Huff. Huff, 'no'. Huskey. Huskey, 'pass'. Jaffe. Jaffe, 'aye'. Johnson. Johnson, 'aye'. Dave Jones. Dave Jones, 'no'. Emil Jones. Emil Jones, 'no'. Kane."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot said about what the Governor is going to do when this Bill reaches his desk after this Amendment goes on. I think there is a lot of assumptions made on what the Governor is going to do. I think if the Governor is consistent he will change his mind between now and then and sign it."

Speaker Bradley: "How did you vote, Sir?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Kane, 'aye'. Katz. Katz, 'aye'. Keane. Keane,



'aye'. Kelly. Kelly, 'pass'. Kempiners. Kempiners, 'no'.
 Kent. Kent, 'no'. Klosak. Klosak, 'pass'. Kornowicz.
 Kornowicz, 'aye'. Kosinski. Kosinski, 'no'. Kozubowski.
 Kozubowski, 'no'. Kucharski. Kucharski, 'no'. Kulas.
 Kulas, 'no'. Laurino. Laurino, 'no'. Lechowicz.
 Lechowicz, 'no'. Leinenweber. Leinenweber, 'present'.
 Leon. Leon, 'no'. Leverenz. Leverenz, 'pass'. MacDonald."

Speaker Bradley: "Miss MacDonald to explain her vote."

MacDonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise only because I was very proudly a Cosponsor of this legislation, and I had my light on before the debate was cut off. I only want to remind those Members of this Legislature who are Members from Cook County, that day after tomorrow the RTA tax starts. That means that this Bill would give tax relief whereas the Bill that is a compromise Bill supposedly by the Governor will actually mean nothing to those people. It will cost a cent higher, or 20% more for the RTA tax, and you'll take from one pocket and give to another, put in one pocket and take it out of another. I do say that that is fraudulent, and I recommend that we give an 'aye' vote to give meaningful tax relief to the people of Cook County and throughout this state who need it so badly."

Clerk O'Brien: "MacDonald, 'aye'. Madigan. Madigan, 'no'.
 Mahar. Mahar, 'aye'. Margulas. Margulas, 'aye'. Marovitz.
 Marovitz, 'aye'. Matijevich. Matijevich, 'aye'.
 Matula. Matula, 'aye'. Mautino." "

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mautino to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out that it's kind of an ironic day. We've heard Representatives talk about the branches of government and the separation of powers, those not only being executive, legislative, and judicial, but we forgot one. It's the TB division or the TB division, whichever you want to place it. It's also ironic that we overrode the right to life legislation, Senate Bill 47, today, and all I've got to



say to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle is that the unholy marriage of Governor Thompson and Mayor Byrne have aborted this conceived child as I see it with their inactions on this legislation. I don't think it is fair to the rest of the people of the State of Illinois and those of us who are sitting here and elected to this General Assembly."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mautino votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino, 'aye'. McAuliffe. McAuliffe, 'no'. McBroom. McBroom, 'pass'. McClain. McClain, 'no'. McCourt. McCourt, 'aye'. McGrew. McGrew, 'aye'. McMaster. McMaster, 'no'. McPike. McPike, 'aye'. Meyer. Meyer, 'no'. Molloy. Molloy, 'no'. Mugalian. Mugalian, 'aye'. Mulcahey."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mulcahey to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow the Leadership of my Party, but unfortunately, I can't, because as it turns out right now, we have no leadership. We have no leadership in this Party. We have no leadership on the second floor. We have no so-called leadership of the Democratic Party in Chicago. Mayor Byrne is not a leader of my Party, so therefore I am going to have to assume the leadership of the Democratic Party right now by myself, and more importantly, I'll assume the leadership of the people I represent in the 35th District and vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mulcahey, 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McGrew, did you push your switch green, Sir? We'll get back to it at the end of the Roll Call. I... Would the Doorkeeper get a key for Mr. McGrew?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Murphy. Murphy, 'aye'. Neff. Neff, 'no'. Oblinger. Oblinger, 'pass'. O'Brien."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien to explain his vote."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I rise to explain my vote, and I'll be very brief. I don't think that this measure is going to pass, but even if it does pass, it doesn't matter. We're taking up this issue for the



third time. I voted for tax relief in June. I voted for it again in October, and here we are taking up another vote and putting ourselves back in the same posture we were... we were a week and a half ago. This reminds me of the ERA vote. We split our guts in the blue zoo here, if that's what you want to refer to the House. We split our guts on every issue, and what happens? We turn around and wait for the Senate to decide just exactly what they're position is going to be, and that's what's going to happen in this Conference Committee because you can rest assured this Bill will go over to the Senate. We don't know what they're going to do. They haven't even taken the issue up since the override. Whether or not we pass this or we don't, it doesn't really matter. The issue will be decided in a Conference Committee. I am going to vote 'no' at this time."

Clerk O'Brien: "O'Brien, 'no'. Patrick. Patrick, 'no'.

Pechous. Pechous, 'aye'. Peters. Peters, 'no'. Piel.

Piel, 'aye'. Pierce. Pierce, 'aye'. Polk. Polk, 'pass'.

Pouncey. Pouncey, 'no'. Preston. Preston, 'no'. Pullen."

Speaker Bradley: "Miss Pullen to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I come from the suburbs of RTA County, and many of the Members from the suburbs of RTA County are voting for this Amendment. But I personally have no doubt that the Governor will not give the taxpayers any more tax relief than he absolutely must, and that he would, absolutely without question, veto this Bill in the form proposed here. The taxpayers of my district need tax relief, especially now. I do not think I would represent their interests properly if I voted to jeopardize what little tax relief is realistically available. So I must vote to preserve this Bill and vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pullen, 'no'. Rea. Rea, 'aye'. Reed. Reed, 'aye'. Reilly."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Reilly to explain his vote."



Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, a lot of times here in Springfield within the confines of this chamber, and within the confines of this building and this city, the world becomes a little unreal. Six months ago we debated the real issues of tax relief which were: a) can we afford it?, and b) if we can, what kind of relief? What is the worst tax? What tax ought most be relieved? And many of us at that time believed, and I still believe that property tax is the worst tax and one that ought to be relieved. A great deal was made during the debate on the sales tax over a couple of things, the U of I survey that showed a lot of the people wanted the sales tax on food and drugs abated, but nothing was mentioned about the fact that that same survey showed a higher percentage of people who were concerned about the property tax. A good deal was made about the survey that shows the sales tax on food and drugs contributed to the fact that Illinois has a regressive tax structure without ever mentioning the fact that the same survey showed the property tax contributed even more to that index. My only..."

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

Reilly: "Yes, Sir. My only criticism of Governor Thompson in proposing what has resulted in House Bill 2796, is that when he got up that fatal morning and was shaving and had this idea that he didn't just go back to bed because what I think we ought to do, the responsible thing, is to adjourn this Special Session, come back next spring when the rules will not prevent us from considering something like Representative Vinson's proposal and debate the real issue which is what kind of tax relief ought we give, given the fact that we can afford tax relief. I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Reilly, 'no'. Richmond."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epton, how do you wish to be recorded?"

Mr. Epton wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Richmond. Richmond, 'aye'. Rigney. Rigney, 'no'. Robbins."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "I'm going to vote 'no', and I'm going to do it because I want to be honest with my people, and I have been with them all along, and I have talked to them, and this is their instructions to me. Nothing phony. We're issuing bonds to build roads. We don't have the money, and let's not come back and say as you do every year with the multiplier that goes on...your property tax goes up next year, regardless. Let's stop the property tax. Let's be honest with the people, and let's not have to put an income tax on to see to it that we take care of the people till we pay the proper amount into the pensions for our people that have to retire, and let's be honest with the voters and vote 'no' on this Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Robbins, 'no'. Ronan. Ronan, 'no'. Ropp."

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

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is a couple of things we really have not talked about, and one is that those who are on food stamps are not paying sales tax right now. Those who are receiving medical prescriptions are not paying sales tax now, and that takes care of a lot of people in both of those areas, and I think a good democratic government is one where everyone should share in part of the responsibility that they have. Many of the people who, if this Amendment passes, will not be paying any of the costs of government, and yet will still be wanting a lot of the services that government will be supporting. And I think that all people ought to be a part, and to pay part of the government services that we have in this state, and for that reason, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ropp, 'no'. Ryan. Ryan, 'no'. Sandquist."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Sandquist to explain his vote."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, there comes a time when you lose a ballgame you have to stop. I fought hard for this overall



sales tax relief. I voted for it last time, but that is when we had the package right before us where we were overriding the Governor. If we'd have done it, we'd have had relief for the people of Illinois, but we're in a different ballgame now, and what you're asking us to do, and one of the speakers over there said, 'I don't care if we get any relief'. And that's what's going to happen. If we put this Amendment on, the Governor can veto it, and we will not have the relief on January 1 that the people want it at one cent. I think we should have that one cent now. We can fight the next ballgame next year, and we can get the other relief, but right now, let's make sure we get that one cent for the people on January 1, and therefore I am going to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sandquist, 'no'. Satterthwaite."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk O'Brien: "Satterthwaite, 'pass': Schisler. Schisler, 'aye'. Schlickman. Schlickman, 'aye'. Schneider. Schneider, 'aye'. Schoeberlein."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schoeberlein to explain his vote."

Schoeberlein: "Yes, I represent people on both sides of track, and they are asking for tax relief. I do not...I do not have a dinner to raise money for re-election or renomination. I have no guilty conscience, and I will not do so, or accept money for my renomination. This tax has been on for 40 years, and it is time that we wake up to the fact that the people of Illinois want tax relief and not a penny and a promise. I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein, 'aye'. Schraeder. Schraeder, 'aye'. Shuneman. Shuneman, 'no'. Sharp. Sharp, 'aye'. Simms. Simms, 'no'. Skinner."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that Governor Thompson has managed state government quite well during the last three years. I have ample faith he can do the same in the next five years, and that's why I'm going to vote 'yes'. Can't



passed up this opportunity to point out though, to you, those of you in Cook County who are going to have a 20% sales tax increase on November 1, that's Thursday, that with the Governor's proposal, it is going to be a 20% sales tax increase on everything but food and drugs."

Clerk O'Brien: "Skinner, 'aye'. Slape. Slape, 'aye'. Stanley. Stanley, 'no'. Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney, 'pass'. Steczo. Steczo, 'aye'. E.G. Steele. E.G. Steele, 'no'. C.M. Stiehl. C.M. Stiehl, 'no'. Stuffle. Stuffle, 'aye'. Sumner. Sumner, 'no'. Swanstrom. Swanstrom, 'no'. Taylor. Taylor, 'no'. Telscer. Telscer, 'no'. Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Terzich to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, I just want to explain that I wasn't transferred, and I wasn't promised a new fire truck,...but I...well, maybe I'll get a new one. But again, we fought our battle. It may have been right, and it may have been wrong, but I am supporting House Bill 2822. You do it your way, and I'll do it my way. And we fought our battle, and I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich, 'no'. Totten. Totten, 'aye'. Tuerk. Tuerk, 'no'. VanDuyne. VanDuyne, 'aye'. Vinson. Vinson, 'pass'. Vitek."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Vitek to explain his vote."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last week the Tribune came out and called the 96 Legislators that voted to override on 2564 'two bit politicians'. And the Governor was the one that was quoted in that Tribune article. Now, he's taken offense of his own Party Members that voted with the coalition Democrats over here, and I resented the fact that I was called a two bit politician. He'll be looking for that vote from me one of these days, a two bit politician, but I, too, have been sent down here, and I'm not worried about if this Bill passes that the Governor overrides. I want to be honest with my people, too."



Representative Robbins. They sent me down here to represent them, and what I thought, and I pledged to them that I would support the senior citizens, the poor, on all legislation...legislation affecting them, and if I was to quote all of the supporters of this Bill, it would take me more than my time allotted, so you all got a copy of the STOP thing, and on the back of it shows the organizations that are supporting it. And the senior citizens need this help. The poor people need it, and I'm going to stick with them and vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vitek, 'aye'. VonBoeckman. VonBoeckman, 'aye'. Walsh. Walsh, 'aye'. Watson. Watson, 'aye'. White. White, 'no'. Wikoff. Wikoff, 'no'. Willer. Willer, 'aye'. Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Williams to explain his vote."

Williams: "All I'd like to say is when we had Amendment #5 I said I would also support Amendment #12. I think this is the only ballgame left. It took us about 40 years to get this far. I proudly vote 'aye', and I hope that is the vote that is going to put this over."

Clerk O'Brien: "Williams, 'aye'. Winchester. Winchester, 'no'. J.J. Wolf. J.J. Wolf, 'no'. Sam Wolf. Sam Wolf, 'aye'. Woodyard. Woodyard, 'no'. Younge. Younge, 'aye'. Yourell."

Speaker Bradley: "Miss Younge, for what...she wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Is your key on? Votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yourell, 'present'. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, let's take these...Mr. Greiman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Miss Alexander now wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mr. Flinn, you want to explain your vote, Sir?"

Flinn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, we've been here a long time on this. I would like to say briefly that in spite of the fact that I have no assurances that that Sponsors



won't just drop this once the Amendment gets on there, and in spite of the fact that I have no assurances that we won't adjourn the Third Special Session sine die without any tax relief, in spite of all of that I'm going to put all my cards on one table and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, Mr. Leverenz,...'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leverenz, 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright now, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Because of my perplexity at the rulings on germaneness and because I believe, as does Representative Reilly, that the property tax is the worst of all possible taxes in the state and should be the one abated, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...this Bill 2796 really is the only Bill that actually offers us tax relief. It offers us the same thing as the Bill that we tried very hard to override the Governor, which I supported right down to the very last, but I find myself in a position that it would be irresponsible to help kill the one cent tax relief that we'll...that we have been promised because I am almost certain that if this Amendmenn is tacked onto this Bill, it will kill the one percent tax relief, and that is...a definite promise from the Governor. The Governor has made that statement that he will veto this Bill, and I don't know of any Bill that he has ever made that statement that he will veto that he has failed to veto. So in fear of not getting any tax relief for the people back home, I am going to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Huskey, 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huskey...Mr. Huskey...Okay, now, Mr.

Brummer, what purpose do you rise?"

Brummer: "Yeah, point of order. I thought once votes were verified they could not be changed."

Speaker Bradley: "Change it until we declare it. Any other



changes? Mr. Bullock. Alright, is there anybody else that wants to change their vote? Alright. Then if not, the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 82 'ayes', and 82 'nays', and the motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further business in the Special Session? Representative Ryan, do you want to recess the Special Session, adjourn it until tomorrow, 10:15."

Ryan: "Yes, that's certainly alright with me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "10:15."

Ryan: "I move that we adjourn the Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, is House Bill 2796 in the Special Session on Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Madigan: "It's on Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan moves to recess the Special Session...to adjourn the Special Session until 10:15 tomorrow. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Special Session now stands adjourned until tomorrow. Any other business in the regular Session? Ten o'clock. Okay. Any motions on change of votes, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "On change of votes, Representative Balanoff votes 'aye' on 2789. Breslin 'aye' on 2789. Jake Wolf 'aye' on 2790."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would not ordinarily do this, and hesitate to do it now, but would the Clerk please repeat..."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't we leave these go until tomorrow."

Peters: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "There's too much confusion now. Let's take



these tomorrow. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Inadvertently the only motion to advance to Second Reading that wasn't called today was my motion that was on the regular Calendar. It's Senate Bill 1438 to the noncontroversial emergency appropriation. It passed unanimsously in the Senate and in the Rules Committee, and I'd ask it be advanced."

Speaker Redmond: "What page is it on?"

Johnson: "It's under motions."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on page ten."

Johnson: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "1438. Representative Johnson has moved pursuant to Rule 31B that 1438 be advanced to the order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day without reference to Committee. Those...has that been in Rules Committee?"

Johnson: "Yes, it has. It was moved unanimously 'do exempt'."

Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor vote 'aye', and opposed vote 'no'."

Johnson: "Jesus...it's an appropriation for flood damage loss, Vote people, please."

Speaker Redmond: "I think maybe you ought to do this tomorrow morning. It takes 89...107 they told me. That's even worse. You better take it out of the record and do it tomorrow. 10, yeah. Any further business? Representative Laurino moves to adjourn tomorrow at 10:00? The question is on Representative Laurino's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The House stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
OCTOBER 30, 1979

PAGE

HB-2789	2ND READING	PAGE	3
	3RD READING	PAGE	71
HB-2790	2ND READING	PAGE	16
	3RD READING	PAGE	72
HB-2792	2ND READING	PAGE	3
	3RD READING	PAGE	73
HB-2794	2ND READING	PAGE	4
	3RD READING	PAGE	76
	MOTIONS	PAGE	78
HB-2795	2ND READING	PAGE	68
HB-2796	2ND READING	PAGE	125
	2ND READING	PAGE	131
	MOTIONS	PAGE	123
HB-2797	2ND READING	PAGE	4
	3RD READING	PAGE	78
HB-2798	2ND READING	PAGE	6
	3RD READING	PAGE	71
HB-2799	2ND READING	PAGE	7
	3RD READING	PAGE	79
HB-2800	2ND READING	PAGE	14
	3RD READING	PAGE	81
HB-2804	2ND READING	PAGE	14
	3RD READING	PAGE	84
HB-2805	2ND READING	PAGE	15
	3RD READING	PAGE	86
HB-2811	2ND READING	PAGE	121
	MOTIONS	PAGE	114
HB-2813	2ND READING	PAGE	68
HB-2818	2ND READING	PAGE	121
	MOTIONS	PAGE	114
HB-2826	1ST READING	PAGE	17
SB-0005	VETO	PAGE	61
SB-0032	VETO	PAGE	17
SB-0047	VETO	PAGE	34
SB-0050	VETO	PAGE	17
SB-0058	VETO	PAGE	18
SB-0093	VETO	PAGE	18
SB-0111	VETO	PAGE	53
SB-0157	VETO	PAGE	65
SB-0176	VETO	PAGE	20
SB-0185	MOTIONS	PAGE	129
SB-0228	VETO	PAGE	21
SB-0244	VETO	PAGE	21

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
OCTOBER 30, 1979

PAGE 2

SB-0293	VETO	PAGE	26
SB-0294	VETO	PAGE	26
SB-0511	VETO	PAGE	27
SB-0514	VETO	PAGE	28
SB-0563	MOTIONS	PAGE	126
SB-0642	VETO	PAGE	28
SB-0674	VETO	PAGE	29
SB-0732	VETO	PAGE	30
SB-1061	VETO	PAGE	31
SB-1183	MOTIONS	PAGE	128
SB-1344	VETO	PAGE	32
SB-1436	2ND READING	PAGE	121
	MOTIONS	PAGE	121
SB-1439	2ND READING	PAGE	16
SB-1444	MOTIONS	PAGE	126
SB-1445	MOTIONS	PAGE	127
*HJR-0013	3RD READING	PAGE	89

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
OCTOBER 30, 1979

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. STUFFLE - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
REGULAR SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	1
3RD SPECIAL SESSION CONVENED	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. STUFFLE - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
3RD SPECIAL SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	2
REGULAR SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
TOTTEN'S MOTION/RULE 10 (B)/CONSTITUTIONAL AMDMTS.	PAGE	88
REGULAR SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	122
3RD SPECIAL SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	122
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	122
3RD SPECIAL SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	126
REGULAR SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	126
REGULAR SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	130
3RD SPECIAL SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	130
3RD SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	181
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	182