

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

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

Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amend. Leonard Foley wrote: God asks me to be totally open to His truth and love, and totally possessed by His Spirit, accepting His grace as humanly as possible. To decide freely with the light and love of the Spirit is the greatest human thing I can do. Let us pray. OUR FATHER, Who art in heaven, help us daily to put Thy love first in our lives and all else second. As Members of this House of Representatives help us to develop the quality of real prudence in all that we may think or do. May we always be conscious that any decision or direction we may take begins with an attitude of faith and a sincere desire to please Thee, for is only in pleasing Thee and in doing Thy will that the people of this State of Illinois may enjoy peaceful harmony and true safety. Through Jesus Christ we pray. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bills 825, 1534, 1608, 1737, 1747, 1753, 1760, 1798, 1830. Passed by the Senate May 17, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from



the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill of the following title, to-wit: House Bill 3230. Passed by the Senate, May 17, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution No. 88. Adopted by the Senate May 17, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. 855. Take that one out. Representative Walsh is in the chamber. Representative Geo-Karis is talking to him on the phone."

Clerk O'Brien: House Resolution 853, Leinenweber. 854, Hoxsey. 856, Katz, 857, Steczo, 858, Robinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 853 by Leinenweber, talks about Major Georgantas. House Resolution 854 notes that the City of Ottawa is going to be 125 years old. Katz's Resolution 56 celebrates the 65th anniversary of the Junior League of Chicago. Steczo's House Resolution 857 bestows honor on Lloyd Betourney. Robinson's 858 honors Clarence Boyle. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 855, E.G. Steele et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. Committee Reports."



Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich, Chairman, from the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 17, 1978, reported the same back with the following recommendations: do pass House Bill 2944."

Speaker Redmond: "Further General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 844, Kane. 846, Kelly. 851, DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1747, Telcser. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1753, Abramson. A Bill for an Act concerning persons engaged in a business of preparing excise tax returns. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1634, Pierce. A Bill for an Act relating to assessment and extension of capital stock taxes on corporations and associations created under or subject to The General Not for Profit Corporation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1627, Schisler. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I feel a little bit...like the clergyman who raises Cain with those who are in church and tells all about hell fire and damnation that that's the wrong group, but it might not be an unwise idea if we would tell our colleagues that if we would get here on time in the morning that we would save one full day. That's the difference between going home Friday...Thursday than going home Friday. We waste at least an hour every morning trying to find something to do. Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, I've been sitting here for a couple of weeks watching what's going on in this House. I've been down here fourteen years under five different Speakers and it's getting worse every year. You come in at 9:00 in the



morning and you've got seventeen here. This morning we set a new record with twenty-seven at 10:00. Now there's something wrong in this House that we're not working with the Speaker. This man is trying and he gets to a point when he turns the gavel over to another man so he can go out and catch his breath and not lose his temper. I am not going to lose my temper but I must say what I think. I visit with people in the gallery. I get on the fourth floor and ride down with them and I hear what they say. They say they must hire a court jester or comedian down here every once in a while and we have two of them that act that way. And they mentioned names. Are they being paid to do this comedian stuff here and cluttering up the House or what's going on. We've got some very, very good Representatives here. You never see Representative Schisler take the floor and be a comedian. Madison doesn't take the floor and we listen to Madison when he gets up because he does talk sense. But we have others in the leadership that clutter up the House with butting in and saying they don't have an amendment in their files and all that. The rest of us have the amendments and it all takes up the work of the House. Now Justice Berger and President Carter both ripped into certain people, many of them are on the floor of this House. You think they are not the ones cluttering up, go to the courts and see who's cluttering up the courts with the big back log there is. And that is what's going on here, Mr. Speaker. I don't like to see it because I have people in my district come down here and speak to me about what they have seen, and why don't we get work done, and where are they and all of that. They don't have to be in the men's room all the time or in a restaurant. I hope that today may be the day that we'll start doing a little more work. And then perhaps we should get Mr. Royko and Kilian down here and





start writing stories like they have on other matters in the State of Illinois and they may wake us up to the fact that we're down here for one purpose: To get some Bills passed. I don't ask for the floor very often but this time I am asking the floor without interruption. So I would like to finish what I have to say and ask and beg you...I may not be back next time around...but I hope I can sit up in the gallery and see a better behaved group and see them here in the morning doing their job. They do the same thing in Committee. I'm on three Committees and I sit there and I wait and I wait and I wait. I could be answering my mail during this period, but I try to be there, Von Boeckman can tell you that I am the first one in his Committee. I'm sitting there waiting and waiting and an hour later we get started. Kosinski is always there with me so we are evenly divided on...in the Committee when we are there. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will hold that gavel all day today and that you will have good behavior in the House. Cut out the funny work. Maybe we won't have to come in next Monday. We're only going to have one day this weekend, on Saturday to go to the bank or wherever you gotta go. But I hope you like to go home to your family just like I do and many others. There is no attraction down here for me except coming down here and doing my job, voting yes and no on Bills and getting the calendar clean. So I will close saying, please, help the Speaker. He's not in my party but I want to see him be a success as he was first term or he wouldn't have been elected so easily on his second. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for granting me this privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills. Third Reading. Former House Member, former Representative Merlo, going back to his old seat. I don't know who is occupying it now but I would be uncomfortable if it was me. Bring the gavel over to



Representative Luft."

Speaker Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House last Saturday in Decatur approximately 122 young ladies from throughout the state competed for the title of Miss Illinois National Teenager. Now based on scholarship, leadership, personality, and of course you can tell beauty, Pekin's entry Miss Susie Jones, was chosen above all the other contestants. So today, on behalf of the other Legislators in the forty-fifth district, Representative Anderson and Representative VonBoeckman, I would like to present to you the best of them all, the new Miss Illinois National Teenager from Pekin, Miss Susie Jones."

Susie Jones: "Thank you. I'm very happy to be here with all of you today and I'm extremely proud to represent the great State of Illinois in the National in Georgia, August 12th. Thank you."

Campbell: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on behalf of the fifty-third district represented by Representative Stuffle, Representative Edgar and myself, we also have one of those lovely young ladies who is Miss Congeniality for the teenage pageant. Miss Hospitality, she informs me. Debbie Hall."

Debbie Hall: "Thank you. I would just like to thank you all for being so receptive today. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills. Third Reading. House Bill 104"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 104. A Bill for an Act to restrict manufacture, sale and use of pbc's..."

Speaker Redmond: "Of what? Will you continue, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "polychlorinated..what is it...byphenyl...and certain items contained in it. Third Reading of the Bill"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer...no...Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Representative Griesheimer close. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 104 is a Bill which has been studied over the



past year by the Sub-committee of the Illinois House and was voted out by the Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Committee after very substantial hearings, which were conducted in various parts of the state. And after various problems which industry had, had been worked out. And I want to emphasize that to the best of my knowledge at this time there is no opposition to this Bill. What the Bill does is control the use of pcb's, polychlorinated biphenyls. Pcb's have been over the past fifty years have become a very serious problem in our atmosphere. They are released and unless they are controlled and eventually eliminated, we are going to continue to experience serious problems. As a result of the misuse of the pcb's there have been severe problems in both mammals and human beings. There has been other dangers created in our atmosphere and the control of these products is absolutely essential. Through amendment #4, which was adopted by this House last week, I believe the last remaining objection has been withdrawn and that is the permitting the continued use, but controlled, under rules laid down by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in certain types of transformers and closed capacitors. And Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge your ratification of this very important and adoption and passage of this very important Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any questions or discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. Representative Lechowicz, do you seek recognition?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "Amendment #2, does that put a limit on municipalities?"

Getty: "Amendment #2 provides that the municipality may receive the permit to continue burning. Even though it would not



meet the normal standards as long as they are showing they are going to get into compliance. I don't believe there is a problem now in the City of Chicago at all. There are some smaller municipalities which have had a problem. This is conforming, by the way, to the U.S. E.P.A. and the present standards as would be provided by the Illinois E.P.A.

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Will the Sponsor yield? Mike, is this going to duplicate any of the work of the Federal Toxic Substance Act?"

Getty: "The best way I can answer that is the U.S. E.P.A. strongly urged before our Committee that Illinois adopt legislation which would be conforming to the federal standards. All of our sister states around the Great Lakes have adopted it and most states are in the process of adopting some sort of standard. There's no duplication. Amendment #4 provides that the U.S. E.P.A. standards will be met."

Conti: "O.K. Mike, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye, opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 147 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Skinner, do you want to go with 400. 2626. Representative Ebbesen, are you ready on that one? 2626."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2626. A Bill for an Act to regulate the advertising of ophthalmic material. Ophthalmic material."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2626 is a Bill that does address



9.

itself to the regulation of advertising as far as ophthalmic materials are concerned. And giving a little brief background, the reason for the legislation, you know the State of Illinois along with about forty other states, have had legislation within the professional fields that prohibited price advertising if it relates to professional services and or any materialistic or end product that came out of the professional fields. And the Supreme Court, as many of you know, in recent...about a year and a half ago, ruled that all such laws in all the states were really unconstitutional and that is really the basis of this particular piece of legislation. Those laws were very effective in protecting the public...to make certain... Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2626 is designed to protect the public health and well being by providing that advertisers for prescription ophthalmic material such as lenses, frames and eyeglasses, contact lenses will convey enough information in those advertisements so that the public can make an intelligent and rational decision as to where they want to go to have their prescriptions filled. And the...the legislation that we've had in the past that prohibited price advertising was very effective in protecting the public and all that this Bill addresses is that we have some minimal basis for allowing the public to be protected in making such determinations. Now, this Bill has the support in fact is the...a Bill of the Illinois Ophthalmic Association who's membership includes an overwhelming number of optometrists in Illinois. I have discussed this with the medical society and talked with their people and they certainly have no objection to the Bill and it has been supported in Committee by the Department of Public Health. And I would also like to say that Amendment #3 was the amendment in which the A.F.L.C.I.O.



felt as though there might be some difficulty with the Bill in original form, that it might be interfering with the private group prepaid vision care programs. Now Amendment #3 is the original thinking of the A.F.L.C.I.O. in their language and I think we may have to a...if the Bill passes out of here address ourselves to changing a word or two when they're in the Senate, but I would appreciate your consideration, favorable consideration and I'll be glad to respond to questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Katz: "The Bill is designated as a truth in advertising Bill. Does it require truth in advertising or does it prohibit unlicensed people from advertising? Which?"

Getty: "Well...anyone...an optometrist or an ophthalmologist are licensed and under the control of Department of Registration and Education. It does not prohibit advertising or unlicensed people such as opticians and or manufacturers of ophthalmic materials, anyone of these categories can advertise. And what it does, it provides that they have to put in a minimal amount of information such that the public that they are addressing themselves to can make a determination to where they want to go to get their prescriptions filled. The basis of it is that when they get there that the information that they've taken from the media that's been disseminated to them that they are getting exactly what they are paying for without a bait and switch approach. As our laws in the past which prohibited price advertising we're protecting the public in that vein."

Katz: "Excuse me, does this have anything to do with price advertising? Does it prohibit price advertising?"

Getty: "No, it does not. We can't because the Supreme Court



has ruled that null and void, it's the very purpose of the legislation."

Katz: "Thank you. I just wanted to make sure of that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber"

Leinenweber: "I have some questions for the Sponsor, if he will yield. Representative Ebbesen, according to the Republican staff analysis, it indicates under this Bill it would be illegal for optometrists to offer a sale limited to a specific class of individuals. Is that still in the Bill?"

Ebbesen: "No. I think the concern there was that you get into the prepaid health care plans and in this specific case we would be talking about the...not necessarily the prepaid but vision care programs that came about as a result of negotiations and our fringe benefits. Amendment #3 takes care of that and as I said in the Senate, if we pass this out of the House, that there may be a word or two in there that we have to change to make it all inclusive so that we would not be infringing upon that and there would be an exemption to that group categories you're talking about."

Leinenweber: "In other words, under the Bill as we're being asked to vote for...on it today it would not be illegal or against...unlawful under this act if it should pass for an optometrist to offer a special discount to senior citizens or to youngsters or to any other class of individuals."

Ebbesen: "Well, the way the Bill is now, I couldn't answer that and say yes to your question. I will say that it depends on when you're talking about a group...and I'm here to tell you that there isn't a professional office in the world whether they say it or not that don't take into consideration senior citizens and as far as the monetary aspect in determining a fee for them."

Leinenweber: "What I'm trying to get at is we're being asked



to vote on a Bill and you know it may be amended in the Senate and it may not be, and it may be signed and it may not be signed by the Governor. We're being put in the posture whereby a vote of ours at this time would make it illegal for an optometrist to offer special discounts say to juveniles or senior citizens."

Ebbesen: "No. That is not true. That's not true with this legislation.. The amendment that I have in my hand was drafted last night which we didn't want to take it back from third to second for the fourth time, states that nothing in this paragraph C shall be construed to apply to group vision care programs and that's all inclusive of what you're talking about." If you want to talk about the elderly as being a group or children between sixteen and twenty-five a group, then that would answer that and that's what we intend to put out in the Senate."

Leinenweber: "Well except...as I understand it that was put on because of certain group insurance programs and health care programs. I'm just talking about suppose an optometrist wanted to get more business from say grade schoolers, could he say special discounts to grade schoolers? Wouldn't that be illegal under the Act?"

Ebbesen: "Representative Leinenweber, you're not listening to me carefully. What is the definition of a group? I think we're finding in this...what I'm reading to you right now, if you'll look and add to paragraph C on page 2, nothing in this paragraph C shall be construed to apply to group vision care programs. Now group can be public or private. That's what you're talking about. That was the attitude in drafting of the people who..."

Leinenweber: "I think I've gotten the answer to my question. The second question would be, again according to the staff analysis, it seems to indicate that this would prohibit an optometrist from advertising a particular type of glass





or frame as a loss leader. Is that in the Bill?"

Ebbesen: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question."

Leinenweber: "Is there anything in the Bill that would prohibit an optometrist from selling a particular type of eyeglass or frame below his cost?"

Ebbesen: "No. There is nothing in the Bill that would prohibit that."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Could the Sponsor of the Bill enlighten us as to the penalties for violation of this Act?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen:"

Ebbesen: "Well, the penalties are spelled out there very specifically for those in the licensed categories. For those who are in violation of the law as proposed it was one who was a licensed practitioner, optometrist or physician they'd be subject to revocation of his license and a \$5000 fine, if it's in the unlicensed category the optician or manufacturer would be a...the \$5000 fine. By the way, I might say that \$5000 figure is much less than under the consumer fraud division of the Attorney General. And consumer fraud, I think there is a \$50,000 fine for the same offense."

Bowman: "Well, nonetheless, doesn't it strike you as being still an excessive figure considering the nature of some of these restrictions. What is the practice for other kinds of business offenses?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? Representative Ebbesen, a couple of questions. I understand that the one amendment deals only with prepaid group programs in terms of an exemption. Is that a fact? Would that then preclude the ability to give a discount to an



individual senior citizen or whatever or to one who may be paying his own premium as say a carry over as an annuitant in a public system, a public employee system."

Ebbesen: "The answer to that is no, it would not..."

Stuffle: "You're saying that this would not affect the ability to give that individual a discount."

Ebbesen: "That is correct."

Stuffle: "Are you certain of that?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, I am."

Stuffle: "What makes you certain of that...given the last questions of Mr. Leinenweber?"

Ebbesen: "Well, I've been practicing for twenty-seven years and you've just heard me say that if you listen carefully to what I've read that is...there are two words in amendment #3 that would be removed and we get into the definition of the group. A group can be public or private and this would be changed in the Senate. The original amendment that was put on was brought to me by a representative of the A.F.L.C.I.O. We took it back from third to second, put the amendment on and then after that time, yesterday afternoon they decided maybe we should take a couple of more words out so that we clarify...get the words prepaid out of there because there are some that are not prepaid. And then get the word private out of there so that when we are talking about a group, it can be a public group such as senior citizens and what have you. And that is the amendment and they're writing right here on a yellow sheet of paper we intend to put on in the Senate."

Stuffle: "What then is the...has the A.F.L. taken the position in favor of this Bill now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "I beg your pardon."

Stuffle: "Has the A.F.L. now taken a position in favor of your



Bill."

Ebbesen: They certainly are not in opposition to the Bill."

Stuffle: "Who, if anyone, of organized opposition is there at this point?"

Ebbesen: "Of organized opposition. All I can tell you is that amendment #3 was the wording of Richard Walsh and working with Harl Ray. And the amendment that I have written right on the yellow sheet of paper here came from them yesterday afternoon. It's their writing."

Stuffle: "I'll admit that it improves it, but my question was who is now opposed to your Bill?"

Ebbesen: "All right, Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question here? Could I have leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, to take this back from Third Reading to Second Reading, with the cooperation of Representative Madigan, to amend amendment #3 on its face to take out the word private and prepaid and take it back to Third and still have the Bill heard today on Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Objections have been raised."

Ebbesen: "Then the next best thing is to try to pass it out here and amend it over in the Senate like we agreed to do with the A.F.L.C.I.O."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman, I understand that I cut you off."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was cut off because I had asked a question of the Sponsor about what comparable business penalties there were for business offenses and other acts. Let me...I'll wind this up quickly. In paragraph D..."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, let's take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 620. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 620. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, so that I save some time on this, may I have leave of the House to take this back from Third to Second to amend amendment #3 on its face to strike out those



two words to put into a posture."

Speaker Redmond: "Objections have been raised."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 3 has been engrossed in the Bill,  
Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "All right, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I  
would ask your cooperation to get a new Amendment drafted  
and take it back from Third to Second with leave of the  
House. If I have to put it to a vote I will."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 620. Representative Flinn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 620. A Bill for an Act to license,  
tax and regulate the business of operating jai alai."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 634. Representative  
Laurino."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 634. Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino. 634."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend sections of The  
Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
I'd like leave of the House to bring this Bill back to  
Second Reading for purposes of an amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Objections have been  
raised. I'm not too sure of the objections were advanced  
seriously. If I don't hear any objections, it'll be  
returned to the order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Laurino. Amends House Bill 634  
by deleting subsection C & D and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the  
House, we found that there was a possibility of the  
Section that we added to be...have a possibility of being  
unconstitutional and this amendment clarifies that...puts  
it into proper perspective in case it is ever tested in  
Court."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's...Representative



Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "What substantive change does this make in the Bill?"

Laurino: "We had put on the Amendment before that said if someone wanted to cancel their insurance that before they would be able to have a refundable prorated return of their money they would have to first secure some proof from the Secretary of State and then give that to the insurance companies. It has been brought to my attention that the possibility that it would not be considered constitutional because you are putting the burden on the citizenry."

Schlickman: "Well, by this Amendment, what would be the procedure to be followed?"

Laurino: "This Amendment that we are replacing it with says that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino are you finished?"

Laurino: "I'm trying to put it in proper perspective now. Gene, just a moment."

Schlickman: "O.K."

Speaker Redmond: "Some Member left his glasses on the floor along side of Representative Bartulis's desk. So whoever it was that paid the surreptitious visit to Representative Bartulis, your glasses are here. Is it Representative Bluthardt? This is O'Brien here. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can help out the Sponsor on this and I don't think this is a good Amendment if it does what I think it does. One of the reasons I have had problems supporting a Bill like this in the past is that the insurance companies indicated that they could be used by people who would take out insurance policies in order



to get their licenses and plates and then once they have these in their possession they would then cancel the policies creating an administrative burden for the company. Now this Bill has included in it a provision that at such time if they should cancel their insurance they would be obligated to turn in their plates and any other licenses that they had obtained using their certificate from the insurance company. I think this is necessary if we're going to have a good mandatory insurance Bill in the State of Illinois, we ought to have that provision in there and it is my understanding that Amendment #5 would delete that mandate that they return these plates and these certificates should they cancel their insurance. And I would...unless I'm wrong in my understanding of this Amendment, I would be objecting to the adoption of Amendment #5. Now, maybe the Sponsor would want to correct me on that."

Laurino: "What it does...I didn't have the Amendment in front of me so I didn't want to be remiss in what I was going to say. What it does is that the insurance company has to notify you that you are going to be terminated and I believe there is a thirty day termination grace period. In lieu of that, if at that time, the end of thirty days, if the insured does not procure any other insurance he must then return the plates to the Secretary of State, and it's followed with a class A misdemeanor. That's the penalty. But he has to return the plates if his insurance is canceled at the end of the thirty day grace period."

Kempiners: "Is that what the Amendment does?"

Laurino: "Yes."

Kempiners: "It mandates that he return them."

Laurino: "Right."

Kempiners: "If that is what the Amendment does, it mandates that the individual return...what kind of...let me ask



this; under this Amendment incorporated in the Bill...I gather this went through Motor Vehicles instead of the Insurance Committee...under this Bill with this Amendment on it, how would this be enforced? Would the insurance company notify the Secretary of State that it has canceled the insurance or that the individual has canceled the insurance so that the Secretary of State can flag the driver's license or the plates for the individual?

Laurino: "Not necessarily. All they do is notify the person. He will be aware of the penalties when he goes to get his license plates in the first place. And if he is violating the law and is caught, subsequent to an accident or a speeding ticket and the possibility of a fine being imposed is his problem."

Kempiners: "Can I ask the Sponsor, would you be willing to hold this on Second? I think you've got a good idea here. I think that we have to do something with the procedure, however. Would you be willing to hold it on Second so the two of us could get together to see if we could draft an Amendment that would be an effective Amendment and send this Bill on its way because I would very much like to support this concept. I would be willing to work with you on that, Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "...do you think we could get back to it later on today?"  
Mr. Speaker, can we..."

Speaker Redmond: "I cannot interpret that. Representative Laurino, what's your pleasure?"

Laurino: "If we can get back to it later on today to move it to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't guarantee anything. I can't guarantee that we will, we have a lot of Bills on Third Reading. 120 as a matter of fact."

Laurino: "Bill, why don't we...I'd like to adopt this and if there is any clarifying language we can always fix it up in



the Senate or see if we can bring it back to Second Reading and move it to Third."

Laurino: "O.K. but if we can I'd like to get it taken care of before it leaves the House so that we've got some procedure established in here. But if you'd be willing, and we've got the time to move it back from Third to Second, go ahead and move it to Third and possibly we can get this done next week or yet today or tomorrow... I'd be happy to go ahead with it."

Kempiners: "Fine. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion to adopt this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Representative, how recently was this Amendment offered? Is there some reason I do not have it on my desk? Has it been in for a long time?"

Laurino: "It's been there I believe for at least a week and a half or two weeks."

Schuneman: "O.K. I apologize because I don't have a copy of it and I missed it and I would like to read the Amendment. But this particular Bill, as I remember it, seeks to require compulsory insurance in the State of Illinois. Am I correct?"

Laurino: "Yes."

Schuneman: "And the Bill provides for a declaration by each person when they apply for their automobile license plates...as to whether or not they have insurance and their insurance policy number. Now, does your Amendment affect in anyway what would happen when a policy holder fails to pay his premium and thereby loses his insurance?"

Laurino: "Yes, because he is going to be notified by his insurance company that either he reinstates his policy by completing his premium payment or else he is going to be





canceled within the grace period or whatever it is..."

Schuneman: "Excuse me, but from a practical standpoint, most insurance policies provide that when an insured fails to pay his premium he simply has no insurance. He...it doesn't necessarily require a cancellation notice from the insurance company. And I'm wondering from a procedural standpoint, how this is going to work. I don't think your Bill is such a bad idea, but I frankly see this as creating tons of work for both the Secretary of State and for the insurance companies and everybody that involved. And I'm wondering what the effect of your Amendment is going to be. Could you speak to that?"

Laurino: "I'll try. What I think it is going to do...if the insurance companies are going to cancel you out for lack of payment they still have to notify you that you are late. In fact, they notify you of your premium notice date...that it has to be in at a certain time otherwise you are canceled. If that be the case and you don't pay your insurance premium, you're canceled and it's the same as a having a notice of cancellation for any other reason. Thereby, you are driving an automobile without insurance and you're violating the Class A misdemeanor."

Schuneman: "O.K. Now, someone has handed me the Amendment. And I noticed that the Amendment says that any vehicle owner who's insurance is canceled by the insurer...now the insurer is the insurance company...so my question has to do with people who simply don't pay their premium and thereby the insurance is canceled by the policy holder. Do you see the difference I'm trying to inquire about? And in that particular incident, does the Bill provide that is some kind of a felony for a policy holder not to pay his insurance premium?"

Laurino: "You're electing to cancel out your policy thereby breaking the law that says you must have insurance to drive



an automobile. So you have the Class A misdemeanor on the other side, too?"

Schuneman: "So really the answer is that it would be a misdemeanor on the part of someone who fails to pay their insurance premium."

Laurino: "Exactly."

Schuneman: "And thereby not renew their auto insurance."

Laurino: "Right. They are obligated to do this."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not really sure what the effect of this Amendment would be and until such time as it does become a little clearer to those of us who are Members of the House I really think the Sponsor would be well advised to hold this Bill and not offer the Amendment. I think we need to know what we're doing in their area before we go ahead and approve it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Gentleman standing between Mr. Totten and the Chair, please sit down?"

Totten: "Two questions. Representative Laurino, if you do away with the receipts...Bill, if you do away with the receipts, how are banks going to be able to sell license plates? Are they going to make the determination whether or not you have insurance?"

Laurino: "Well, you're not...you don't have to...you're not going to return the plates to the bank. You have to return it to the Secretary of State's vehicle station." All this means is if you break the law you're going to pay for it. But it's trying to eliminate some of the cumbersome aspects possibly that would be encouraged if it were taken to court properly. This doesn't infringe upon anybody's rights. All it does say is if you are neglectful then..."



Totten: "One other question. There was a fiscal note filed with this Bill. What does the fiscal note say?"

Laurino: "I think the Clerk can answer that question."

Clerk O'Brien: "The fiscal note is upstairs, I'll have to get it down."

Laurino: "John, I think there's a fiscal note...said it was in the area of 140 thousand dollars a year...or the first year to implement it."

Totten: "For which agency?"

Laurino: "Secretary of State's office."

Totten: "Secretary of State. Would the Amendment change that?"

Laurino: "This Amendment...with this Amendment adopted that's what it would be."

Totten: "O.K. Without it adopted, what would it be?"

Laurino: "It might be another 40 or 50 thousand dollars more a year."

Totten: "O.K. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Gaines: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino. Questions."

Gaines: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor what happens if you're in the neighborhood when they arbitrarily raise your insurance rates? What right do you have to protest if you are put in jail by withholding your premium when you want to protest irrational rates?"

Laurino: "I didn't...I didn't understand your question."

Gaines: "The question is; what in this Amendment makes the state a partner in making people pay insurance premiums that are unreasonable...when they are raised arbitrarily by neighborhoods?"

Laurino: "Well, this has nothing to do with redlining."

Gaines: "What do you mean it doesn't have anything to do with



redlining. You say if we redline and don't pay it, we go to jail."

Laurino: "That's right."

Gaines: "Well, then don't say it has nothing to do with redlining."

Laurino: "The whole concept of the Bill is to make sure that you have insurance. Because it's responsible..."

Gaines: "It's to make poor people pay more money. Make the state enforce that if insurance companies like a...collect when they shouldn't collect."

Laurino: "Well, do you... personally, I don't think you are speaking to the Amendment. Secondly, are you advocating that people drive an automobile without insurance?"

Gaines: "No, I'm not. All I'm saying is that the state should not be a partner to redlining."

Laurino: "Well that doesn't..."

Gaines: "It is basically..."

Laurino: "That has nothing to do with this Bill. I don't think you're speaking to the Amendments."

Gaines: "I am, Sir. Because if you make it illegal for me to refuse to pay unreasonable fees...you're saying I have to pay the insurance company. Under the law now, if I have some other security I don't have to pay the insurance company unreasonable rates. The thing is it is going to put a hardship on poor people."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I renew my old motion to adopt this Amendment and if there is any questions after it gets to Third Reading, we'll bring it back and clarify it if the language isn't satisfactory to everyone."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption...Representative Barnes."

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

Laurino: "Certainly."

Barnes: "Representative, in trying to follow this closely... and it's a bit noisy in here...are you saying in your



Amendment as I understood when Representative Schuneman raised the question that in the event that a person miss paying their premium note..."

Laurino: "Gene, hold on a second, will ya. Mr. Speaker, can we have some order? I can't hear any questions."

Barnes: "In the event that a person miss paying for whatever reason, a premium note, and they are thereby canceled... receiving a note as I believe now the way things are set up now as I understand, they receive a five day notice, I think it is, after the failing of payment. For whatever reason if this person or the person that is involved does not pay in five days then automatically their policy is canceled. Although, as I understand, the procedures of the insurance companies, a certain grace period is allowed and if the person returns to pay that premium all of that is wiped out. Now, does this Amendment in any way provide for that and if it does not, as I understand, and correct me if I'm wrong, that it will create a situation where a person could conceivably be or receive a misdemeanor simply by not being able to pay their premium and thereby driving after their premium notice had been received and officially lapsed by the company."

Laurino: "What's your question?"

Barnes: "I'm asking you if that is what is embodied in the Amendment. That was the question. Is that in fact what the Amendment does? I guess that's what I'm saying."

Laurino: "I wish I could hear you a little clearer, but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please, give the Gentleman order."

Barnes: "I'm sorry. I guess what I'm saying is...is it...does the Amendment in fact create a situation where it could conceivably...a circumstance could prevail that if a person through the procedures that are now in place miss paying a premium, and I believe they are giving a five day notice after that and for whatever reason, does not get it the premium is automatically canceled. Would then..."



thereby could possibly receive a misdemeanor violation by driving during that period of time when normally they would have a...with the company be able to reverse that whole trend by paying the premium, although it comes after the five day notice and what do you have. This is not an unusual circumstance."

Laurino: "Gene, I think you answered your question a little while ago when you indicated that you understand there is a thirty day grace period. Now, if he doesn't secure insurance or he doesn't come up with the payment, then of course, he is in violation of the law. But he does have thirty days after receiving that notice that he is going to be canceled. That's the whole crux of the Bill anyway. We don't want people that are responsible (sic) driving an automobile without insurance."

Barnes: "Now, as I understand it...I don't want to be argumentative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order and will you please bring your question to a close. We've been in Session an hour and five minutes and we've only passed one Bill."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, I've stood here patiently and waited. It's hard to hear..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Proceed Representative Barnes. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Doorkeepers, will you enforce the rules of the House?"

Barnes: "Thank you. I guess when...the problem where I'm at, Bill, is that the company gives the person, as I understand, a five day notice which comes automatically if he does not pay his premium on time saying that if it is not paid within five days you are canceled. O.K., I guess what I'm saying is if that is the situation and motorists continue to drive in between...after that five day notice period... in between there and the thirty days we're talking about



here, would that individual driver be penalized...could it conceivably be penalized with a misdemeanor? I guess that is what I'm trying to get at."

Laurino: "O.K. No."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, I move the previous question."

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

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I just renew my motion to have this Amendment adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', those against vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 70...81 'aye' and 26 'no' and the motion prevails and the motion is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Laurino, amends House Bill 635 (sic), as amended, by deleting Section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: Section 2. This Act takes effect July 1, 1979."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "We were just remiss in implementing the law. It was originally put into effect on January 1 and we're moving it to July 1, 1979 so that the Secretary of State can utilize its forms in the proper manner."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's motion? Questions on the motion for the adoption of Amendment #6. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 788. Representative Edgar."  
Out of the Record. 1068. Representative Brady."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1068. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of The Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, we debated the Bill I believe fully on Second Reading yesterday. This is the Bill that will allow voters to apply ten more days in advance for absentee ballots. What we're trying to do is make sure that anyone who applies for an absentee ballot will get it back in in time to get out to the precincts to be counted so that we don't disenfranchise any voters again in Illinois like it has happened in the past. And I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Questions. Representative Bowman. Will Representative Laurino, Kempiners; please break up the conference. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, does this provide for centralized counting in any fashion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bowman: "A question of the Sponsor. Does this provide for centralized counting in any fashion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady, can you hear the question?"

Brady: "I hear the question. Mr. Speaker and Representative Bowman, it does not. All the Bill does is provide for ten days more in applying for an application for a ballot so that the Clerk can get them out in time, and the way the mails are today, the people can get them back in time and they will then be sent out to the precinct places to be counted as they have been in the past."

Bowman: "So all that other language has been struck. Is that correct?"

Brady: "That is correct."

Bowman: "Thank you."





Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed voted 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 156 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1088. Representative Younge. Out of the record. 1238. E.M. Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1238..."

Speaker Redmond: "1238, Representative Barnes. Out of the record. 1270. Representative Porter. Out of the...do you want that one? Representative Bowman, do you want to proceed with that one? Out of the record. 1357. Representative Robinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1357. A Bill for an Act relating to farming by business organizations, family farm corporations and authorized farm corporations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson. Please give the Gentleman order. Members be in their seats. Unauthorized persons off the floor."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Rigney and I have worked for over a year on this Bill and he will open and I will close."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think most of you by now have at least heard in one way or another of House Bill 1357. This is the legislation that Representative Robinson and I are proposing as a means to take some kind of a first step towards the preservation of the family farm here in the State of Illinois. I think if there's anything that every politician does, whether he is running for County Coroner or President of the United States, he always claims his allegiance to the family farm. Well, Representative Robinson and I believe that perhaps the time has come here in the State of Illinois



when we should put down in black and white our commitment to saving Illinois farmland for Illinois farming families. We are saying under the terms of this legislation that only authorized farm businesses may own Illinois farmland for farming purposes. And under the terms of the Bill an authorized business would be a full proprietorship or it could be a corporation with up to 35 stockholders. It could be a partnership with up to 35 partners or it could be a trust arrangement with up to 35 beneficiaries. So I think you see by the terms of the definition, the definitions that are in this Bill, that we are giving some rather broad exemptions to the ownership of Illinois land. By no means have we excluded all corporate or trust type of arrangements for owning land. We have only restricted the very largest from this field. Then in addition to this, we also recognize that obviously there is going to have to be some other exceptions for non-agricultural use. And in no way are we trying to restrict the sale of farm land for non-agricultural use. We recognize that these have to be a part of our system. So first of all we have exempted anything under 100 acres. It doesn't even apply. Anybody can own any type of farm land as long as it does not exceed 100 acres and use it as they see fit. And in the course of the Bill we numbered about 12 or 13 specific exemptions just so that we could put everyone's mind at ease as to what are the exemptions to ownership. First of all we say that any agriculture land encumbered to a business organization as security, that would be exempt. We say that land acquired or enforcement of a legal claim, that would be exempt. That acquired by gift would be exempt providing that they dispose of it within a five year period of time. We say land use for research, agricultural research, would be exempt. We say land for testing and developing and so forth for the development of seeds or animals or plants for sale or resale, that takes



care of your seed companies, it takes care of your cattle feeding operations...these would be exempt. We talk about not for profit ownership of Illinois farm land, that would be exempt. For purposes other than farming, providing that other purpose is commenced within a ten year period of time, from the time the land was acquired, that would be exempt. We're saying that land containing stripable coal would be exempt because the coal companies were getting quite concerned about the necessity to acquire land ownership rights for stripping coal. We say land for the production of horticultural products, the canning companies, they would be exempt. Land acquired by cooperatives, they also would be exempt. So I guess what I'm saying is, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we have probably taken care of those legitimate uses of Illinois farmland and recognized that others are going to have some of our good land for some of these other purposes and I think we have really packaged all of them into this Bill that we conceivably could package in. And with that, Mr. Speaker, from this point on we're ready to entertain any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Sponsors of this Bill are going to live to rue the day that they ever came to the legislature and asked for the state to tell them who they could sell their land to and who they can't sell their land to. This to me is the earmark of a totalitarian government and the farmers themselves, the farm organizations are for the Bill. Can you imagine they want the State of Illinois to tell them who they can sell their land to and who they can't sell their land to? The first step toward restriction on alienation of their property. Right now, farm values are high. There may be a day when the widows of farmers or others want to sell their farms and prices are low. And some man from overseas or some corporation offers them a decent price and no one else has



the money at that time and they can't sell their land. Banana republics restrict who can own land. And for years we criticized Mexico because Americans couldn't own land in Mexico and we said, 'how backward, how anti-American that they didn't allow Americans to own land'. Now, here in Illinois, we're doing the same thing. What are we afraid of? Let the highest bidder buy the land and use it for legal purposes within the zoning restriction. Once you start restricting who can own land, you're taking the first step down the ladder away from free ownership and free enterprise of the property you have. How would you like it if your stocks and bonds—that the government told you—you can't sell your stocks and bonds to foreigners? Some German or some Italian wants to buy your stocks and bonds...no...you've got to sell it to an American. I wouldn't like that at all and I don't think you would. And I'm surprised that farmers who believe in the rights of property and the right to own property whose assets are in property are coming to the Legislature asking us to tell them who they can sell their land to and who they can't sell their land to. I could understand if a communist party came here and said, "land is evil, it should belong to the peasants or someone and you could sell your land to a peasant but not sell your land to a corporation or to a foreigner". But, for the farmers themselves, to come before the Legislature and ask us to restrict their rights to sell their land for farming purposes to people overseas in a corporation amazes me. I know this Bill will probably pass because of the panic, the know-nothingism against foreigners right now that you have. But I know it will probably pass, but believe me you're going to regret this day and all farmers in Illinois are going to regret the day they asked the State to tell them who they can sell their land to and who they can't sell their land



to and I intend to vote 'no' for...on this silly Bill that restricts free enterprise."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I realize that the spokesman for agriculture is the Sponsor of this measure in the House and I have tried to work with these people to modify this Bill to where I think it would be acceptable. I think many of our farmers do want to know what's happening with land and who's buying it. They refuse to accept an Amendment that would give us this answer. Instead, they are trying to solve the problem without knowing what the problem is. And if we're going to do it that way, I would have a better suggestion in that we let the foreigners buy our land and every ten years we just nationalize their interest and pay off our debt. I would encourage people to vote 'present' on this Bill until the Sponsors are willing to put it into a shape that will answer the problem. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers. Byers."

Byers: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. Currently there is eight states that have laws banning corporate...Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, can we have some order, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Representative Byers, proceed."

Byers: "Currently there is eight states that have laws banning corporations and alien governments from buying farms; among them are Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Oklahoma. This Bill has had the hearing in the Agricultural Committee, in which I served. It has support of the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union and the National Farmers Organization, the American Agriculture Movement, the Illinois Bankers Association and independent community banks in Illinois."



Now, as far as the foreign governments and alien governments buying the land, the reason that many of these foreign governments want to come to the United States to buy land is because-if I might read from the report from the Saturday Review last October, that Robert 'Oppenheimer' said, of 'Oppenheimer' Industries, that his clients that come to America from the foreign countries are old, rich families and said that they survived when Napoleon came and the Russians, and all that they have is the fear that the communism is going to take over and they will lose the money that they have invested in their own countries and they want to put the money in a stable economy in the United States. They also fear that they will lose their investments so they want to come to America where they have a more stable economy. What's happening in America at the present time is a decline in the number of farms; In 1960 there were 4 million farms and it has now declined to 2.8 million. And also the number of people on the farm has decreased from 15.6 million down to 8.9 million in 1975. Ten years ago the size of America's farm was 210 acres and now it's 310 acres. All across our country there is a silent movement by many of these large alien governments and corporations buying farmland that who knows what they might want to use it for. I would ask that we support this Bill. It's had a hearing in the House Agriculture Committee, it's been debated on Second Reading, many of the present differences have been worked out in Committee and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On this particular Bill, I suppose it does stand a good chance of passing, and a sentimental point of view, I would think that perhaps all of us should hope that it will. But I believe it is necessary that we all do a little bit of economic analysis of this Bill because there is some



internal problems that we often forget about. Some have been alluded to already, but I think we should remind ourselves of what are the economic consequences and the real world factors dealing with this Bill, Number one, concerning capital investment. And after all buying farmland is capital investment. We have throughout history invested large amounts of American capital overseas. Most countries have been happy to have our capital, of course whether they want it or not, we bought anyway, but most countries were happy to have our capital. It produced jobs, produced industry in their own country and was clearly a benefit for their economy. Here we have a chance to have someone else invest in America. One of the problems America has today is a capital poor country. We have a great deal of standing resources, a great deal of industry, we have a great deal of government regulation but one thing we are short on is capital investment. We need more capital in America. This is a way to get more money invested back into capital development in America. People from outside America can take the money they have already gotten from us, if they gouged from us maybe in the Opec deals or elsewhere, and put that money back in America. This is a chance for reinvestment in the American system. If we do not let these people bring our money back, they are going to put our money elsewhere. They will invest our money in Japan or Taiwan or somewhere in Africa or Europe, but they won't invest American money in America. I think it is important that we remember most of the outside money being invested was American money to begin with. Besides, I don't think that we have to fear too much if someone does invest in American farmland. After all, it would be very difficult to pack it up and take it back to Saudi Arabia. They can do that with an automobile plant. They can do that with machinery work. There are a lot of things they can do that with. Stocks or bonds, but they can't.



take farmland away. So, we are in no sense, in danger of losing this American resource. Something else I think we have to remember is that we have a responsibility to maximize productivity. After all, America feeds most of the world. If we cut back on our farm production, a substantial portion of the world would starve to death in short order. It has been the development of larger farms that has helped lead to this productivity. We have had tremendous increases in the assistance, whether it's fertilizer or whether it's machinery, but it is capital investment that has allowed us to feed more people and this Bill would, in the long run, stop us from putting more capital into our farming projects. Also the point was raised, this is government zoning, something that I am opposed to. And I want to last raise one point, as a final closing remark. We're dealing with a symptom, we aren't dealing with a problem. We are losing small farms, there's no question about that. But, losing small farms is a symptom, it is not the problem. The problem is, that it is too expensive to farm a small farm. The capital involved, the fertilizer, be it outside resources, be it machinery. It is too much for the small farm. And so, we are dealing with a symptom of the problem. The problem is the expenses went up. The problem is not that the small farms are going out of existence, that's a symptom. I thank you for your attention and I hope you will oppose this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms. Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, as the Sponsors have indicated, did first come to the attention of the General Assembly approximately a year ago and was placed in a Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. I was Chairman of that Subcommittee and I sat in on all the meetings





involving this Bill. As it was first introduced I think everyone agreed that it was well-meaning, but that it had problems. Because of the fundamental questions it raised as to the ownership and transfer of real property and also details about how you're going to protect the objective of the Bill. And that is to prevent alien ownership without at the same time creating so many loopholes that the purpose can be circumvented. We've had debate and discussion on the Bill for a year and it's a much, much better Bill than it was a year ago. However, I am still concerned that there are loopholes. I'm concerned that we're going to be well-meaning here, and there's no one that wants any more than I do, to protect the family farm in the State of Illinois. But I think we shouldn't be shortsighted. We shouldn't go about trying to protect the family farm and doing harm and damage in doing so. We're proposing a Bill here that has loopholes in it. If I'm a developer and I own land for ten years, I can go to the Director of Agriculture and ask him for an extension and get five more years. And I could keep on going that way, or maybe I can sell my ground to a farmer. At the end of nine and a half years, buy it back from him. I can keep farming that ground for a long, long time with no obligation to report or account. If I am an alien, I can do this under the Bill that now stands. Let me tell you also, one other thing. If we have...if we pass a Bill here that has loopholes in it that will allow it to be circumvented, we're defeating the purpose of the Bill. And at the same time, we're putting a burden on the family farm. Those who do have family farms who have incorporated or have placed their farms in trust for a state planning purpose, have a requirement to file an annual report with the Secretary of State. Ladies and Gentlemen, if that report happens to be up to a year late, as can certainly happen with farmers who are busy and who are now aware of the details of this



law, the farmer could be subject to a fine up to fifty thousand dollars. I would like you to just ask yourselves whether it's worth it to your folks back home to put a burden on them, to expose them to a fine up to fifty thousand dollars to protect from alien ownership of farmland when you're not sure the protection will be there. I think we should take a long look at this problem. We should find out what the alien ownership is. We should find out who it is, where it is, get the details of the problem and then attack it. I think we're premature here. Unfortunately, this is not a good Bill in its present form and I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman. Gene Hoffman, 40th District."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I checked with a farmer that lives in the 40th Representative District to see what his attitude was on this. Unfortunately, he wasn't home when I called and so it's necessary for me to make my own judgement, my own decision on this Bill. I can't help but think that the fact that the Legislature would even think of getting involved in the market place to this degree and to tell people who they could sell land to and who they couldn't sell land to is gonna put us in the same position as Mexico and Nicaragua and those other places where they say you've got to have a national member, a local, buy the property with you. I'm shocked and chagrined to think that the Farm Bureau, which represents farmers, would take this kind of a position. The market place is where the decisions ought to be made when it comes to economics, not the General Assembly. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House



Bill 1357. Everyone in this House knows that our exports and imports are out of line. We used to export many, many more millions of dollars than we import. Now we're importing more than we export and our dollar has devaluated throughout Europe. The reason is, of course, that we are buying energy and paying for it dearly. Those same people want to buy our farm land. They want to control our farm land. The great State of Illinois...for you and I are proud to say that the corn and soybeans is number one throughout the nation. Ask yourself this question, do you want to see your farm land owned and the prices of farm land guided by foreign interest? The answer is no. Vote for this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..the Greeks had a word for this kind of Bill. They called it xenophobic. It means the fear or hatred of the unknown. It's an ignorant reaction to people when they don't understand the situation of the problem. It ill-becomes the self-confident, reliant people of Illinois and the incomparable House of Representatives to support this type of Bill. I would nominate it here and now for the worst Bill of the year. Let me point out to you why you shouldn't be voting for the Bill. The first thing that it'll do is deflate the prices of farmland And that's what the farmers of this state need least of all. If the prices went down 10%, you'd have a lot of farmers in bankruptcy. The second thing that it'll do is to limit alien ability of land. Every freshman law student knows that alien ability of land is one of the great Illinois traditions. If you pass this Bill, and I should point out to those of us who are lawyers, if you don't vote for the Bill you're voting against your financial interest, but you're probably listening to your conscience. Because if you pass this Bill you'll quadruple the legal practice.



No one would dare to buy a farmer...a farm without having his lawyer there at his side. It would be a more complicated process to buy a farm than to have a heart transplant. So, if you don't want to increase the law business, why vote for the...the Bill. The third thing it does is invite retaliation. Is there one among you that doesn't dream of owning a farm some day in Venezuela, Brazil or Argentina? Why cut off that dream that could come true. Dare to dream big about it. Let's speak just for a minute...wish Bowman would put his hand down...speak just for a moment about this question of going back to the nostalgic nonsense of having a forty acre farm where a man had to have a mule and a bunch of kids to farm the farm. You can't turn back the clock of time. If these people want to attack that new mule, if they want to attack that problem, say so. And what they need to do is ban the tractor. If you ban the tractor then you'd have forty...thank you for banging the gravel...if you'd ban the tractor you'd have forty acre farms everywhere. It's nonsense. If a dime worth of thinking went into this Bill by the farm organizations that supported it, it doesn't show. I invite you to avoid the demagogy, appeal the Bill. I invite you to blow your farm bureau rating. I invite you to listen to your conscience and listen to the financial best interest of your constituents by voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady. Bradley, rather."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to set a couple things straight and point out a few things in the Bill I think are bad. Part of the Bill I rise to support but I can't support all of it, and especially the part where we're talking about the corporations. First of all, I'd like to say that in response to Representative Rigney saying and Representative Byers getting the list of all the people that supported and all the organizations...well, after they accepted all



Amendments that were suggested and all the exemptions suggested by the farm bureau, then the farm bureau said, 'Well we don't have anything else to do, we'll support it.' But I talked with the people at the Illinois Agricultural Association. They're not in favor of this Bill in the way it is right now. I was told yesterday by the Sponsor of this Bill that Funk Brothers Seed Company International was in support of this Bill. I checked with the president of the Funk Brothers Seed Company International this morning, they in no way are in favor of this Bill. So you don't have to worry about your farm bureau rating by voting 'no' for this particular Bill. It's gonna be said that Time Magazine came out with an article saying that there's a tremendous problem in Illinois. There's a tremendous problem in the country. But that article deals with only aliens, not with corporations. Only with the aliens if there is a problem. Other states have adopted legislation, 'But other states have adopted legislation dealing with only the aliens. Missouri did not adopt the legislation dealing with corporations owning land in their state. They dealt with the alien problem. Now, let me point out a couple of things, if I might, in the Bill because that's what we're talking about. On the exemptions; farming does not include, Ladies and Gentlemen, under the Bill, the feeding of live stock or poultry for a period of one year. Now the Amendment was thirty days and they amended it to one year. So if you have cattle on your farm for one year, you're exempt from this Bill. You know darn well it doesn't take a year to get the fat in the cattle."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has run out on this speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes. He has about thirty seconds."



Bradley: "I've got as much time as...how much time do I have...?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Proceed. Proceed. You're wasting your time."

Bradley: "Well, I object to that. On Section 5, Ladies and Gentlemen, no business organization...no business organization or nonresident alien may acquire agricultural land. If you look at the definition of a business organization under the Bill...the business organization...the business organization..."

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

Houlihan: "I'd like to yield my time to Representative Bradley, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman yields. Proceed, Representative Bradley. Proceed."

Bradley: "I was saying no business organization..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Bradley: The definition under the Bill, Mr. Speaker...

Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative...Mr. Speaker, I..."

Speaker Redmond: "I recognize Representative James Houlihan... for Point of Order. What is your point?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the House has followed that practice of yielding time. I think..."

Speaker Redmond: "His time hadn't expired, anyway. So, proceed, Representative Bradley."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I thought..."

Bradley: "Pointing out, Mr. Speaker, the definition of a business organization under the Bill. It means any trust corporation partnership, limited partnership, business or organization. And that means it's about everybody that's in the farming business or has a partnership with his brother or anything else. Under Section 5 it says they may not acquire agricultural land. So...also in Section 5, under number 5, it says agricultural land acquired by gift, if such land is disposed of within 5 years



of acquisition to an authorized farm business. You're limiting the land that is given...being given to somebody say...a parent gives to their son or daughter, gives farm land today that might be surrounding a city or near a city could no longer...could not be sold to somebody, a developer who wants to develop the land. It could only be sold to somebody who is in an authorized farm business. I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, about the loopholes in the Bill and the various organizations that do not support the Bill.. And I certainly think we better take a look at it and I suggest a 'no' vote on this Bill at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

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

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

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, some of the arguments raised today anger me, but because we have worked a year on this Bill, I think, perhaps, that Harlan and I understand some of the provisions better than some of the others. Let me answer that point by point. First of all, the argument about foreign ownership. Those who say that would interfere with our foreign trade and foreign policy, that's just not true. First of all, already, in many circumstances, both our federal and state government limit foreign ownership of business in this country. We do it on business related to inland waterways. We do it on public utilities and in many other areas. I have personally gone to the State Department to discuss this with officials at the State Department. They are aware of this legislation that has passed in other states. They have no objections to this legislation and as a matter of fact, in all of their trade treaties that they are now negotiating, they are specifically leaving agricultural land out of all of their trade and



investment treaties because they believe that the states have the right to grant this limitation. And so those of you who say that this is a limitation on foreign policy, don't know the facts. This Bill is a small businessman's Bill. As a matter of fact, in a poll by the Small Business Man's Association, only on the issue of corporate farming, that was done a few months ago, 70% of small businessmen questioned favored this legislation. 70%. This Bill protects small businesses and let me tell you how. If you allow foreign ownership, if you allow the big corporations to own farm land, the economic decisions will be taken away from the small town communities. If the decisions are going to be made in the Continental Bank Board room, if they're gonna be made in New York, if they're gonna be made in Italy or Saudi Arabia they're not gonna use the small town banks. That's why the independent community banks, the Illinois bankers support this Bill. They're not gonna use the small town grain dealers. They're not gonna use the small town implement dealers and you'll see the small town economy dry up. That's the purpose of this Bill. Some people say there are loopholes. Well, investment counselors have said, that if this Bill passes it will create a totally unfavorable atmosphere for this kind of foreign investment in this state and that that will keep it out. And the University of Illinois, Ag. Department... School of Agriculture has said that if we don't pass this Bill, as Missouri, Iowa and many other midwestern states have, if we do not pass this Bill, Illinois will be a major hunting ground for foreign capital looking for these kinds of investments. This Bill is a necessity. As I said, there are other states that have done this, it worked, and it's been found constitutional in both state courts and in the U.S. Supreme Court. This Bill will work. This Bill is necessary for the farmer. And one other thing, over the last three or four days, some of the lobbyists for the big interests that





want to stop this Bill have been putting a lot of pressure on. Don't listen to them. If there are specific problems, Harlan and I have shown over the past year that we are willing to work with any business organization to work out problems and we will continue to do that. We will continue to do that. Don't kill the Bill now. Allow this Bill to go. As even some of those who oppose the Bill, they said that it serves a good purpose and perhaps there are a couple of things that have to be done to it. Allow this Bill to move. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "There will be a Verified Oral Roll Call. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. When your name is called by the Clerk, stand, indicate the way you wish to vote and depress your switch. Anyone who desires to explain his vote, will do it at that time. Members please be in their seats. Verified Oral Roll Call. Proceed with the Call, Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Catania: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Can we at least know who requested this?"

Speaker Redmond: "The rule says that the Speaker may call it. The Speaker has called it. According to the rules, that is correct."

Catania: "Just curious about who did it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with the Chair, but you can't ask for a verification before you know that someone has the required votes to pass a Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't believe that is correct. For the information of Representative James Houlihan, 55a provides that you may yield argument and seat but not on explanation



of votes. Proceed with the call of the Roll, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson 'no', Adamson (sic) 'aye', Anderson 'aye', Antonovych pass, E.M. Barnes 'no', Jane Barnes 'no', Bartulis 'aye', Beatty pass, Bennett 'aye', Bianco pass, Birchler 'present', Bluthardt pass, Boucek 'aye', Bowman pass, Bradley 'no', Brady pass, Brandt 'aye', Breslin 'present', Rich Brummer 'present', Don Brummet 'present', Byers 'aye', Caldwell 'present', Campbell 'aye', Capparelli pass, Catania 'aye', Chapman 'no', Christensen pass, Collins 'no', Conti 'no', Cunningham 'no', Daniels 'no', Darrow 'aye', Corneal Davis pass, Jack Davis 'aye', Dawson pass, Deavers 'no', Deuster..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, only because the Lake County Farm Bureau is in favor of the Bill, I want to briefly explain my vote. I think essentially, this Bill is going to hurt the little farm widow. Most likely, the situation is the farmer dies, he has a widow who is trying to sell the property. And here we have a Bill that restricts the market. I think Representative Pierce expressed this eloquently, we're telling that farm widow that she can't sell to a corporation. And the net effect of this will be reduce the market, reduce the price and will hurt widows. That's an aspect of this legislation I think we should all have in mind if you're responsible and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster 'no', DiPrima pass, Domico 'aye', Doyle pass, John Dunn 'no', Ralph Dunn 'no', Dyer...to explain her vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I talked to the little farm widow who lives in the 41st district, and she's for it. And she says if you furthermore...if Representative Deuster and others really wants to help the little



farm widow in Illinois, they will vote 'yes' for the Equal Rights Amendment which will change her...Federal Inheritance Tax laws. So I do vote 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dyer 'aye', Ebbesen 'no', Edgar 'no', Epton 'aye', Ewell pass, Ewing.. Ewing 'present'. Farley pass. Flinn pass. Friedland.... Friedland 'aye'. Friedrich..."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that this could be labeled the Robinson Reelection Bill but that's not my reason for opposing it. The Bill actually as its amended doesn't do anything for anybody. It's one of those Bills which purports to do some things ..... it doesn't help anybody, it doesn't hurt anybody and gets the maximum amount of press. Actually the thing has more holes in it than a hoop net. But in the second place, my grandparents were German immigrants and they came over here and were able to buy land and settle here and were good farmers and in my opinion good citizens. I think America is the land of the free. We've got the Statue of Liberty telling people to come here and invest and live and take part in the opportunities. I'm not gonna be a party to this and in the first place it isn't any good."

Clerk O'Brien: "Friedrich 'no'..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the Roll Call. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have studied this Bill and I feel that I'm gonna vote 'yes' because the aliens who are coming over here are interfering with the American rights of ownership. And therefore I'm voting 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines 'aye', Garmisa pass, Geo-Karis pass, Getty...Getty 'present', Giglio...Giglio 'aye', Giorgi 'no',



Greiman 'aye', Griesheimer..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this Bill but I think the proponents are a little premature. The way we could get some of our money back from those damn Arabs would be to allow them to buy all of Illinois. And after they've bought Illinois, nationalize the property. We'd get it all back and the money to boot. I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Griesheimer 'no', Hanahan...Hanahan 'aye', Harris 'aye', Hart...Hart 'no', Hoffman 'no', Holewinski 'aye', Dan Houlihan...Dan Houlihan 'no', J.M. Houlihan..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan. The timer is on."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I think you indicated 55a was the rule."

Speaker Redmond: "The purpose you were recognized was to explain your vote."

Houlihan: "Oh, I would just point out that I think Representative Bradley was wrong. Eight midwestern states have already passed laws restricting corporate investments and I think he indicated that there were no other examples of this... I vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "J.M. Houlihan 'aye', Hoxsey..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to explain my vote. In the process of doing so, I would like to say to you that, obviously, from the people who have spoken against this legislation, there are a lot of people in this House that don't have the vaguest conception of what the young farmer is up against today. There is no way that he can compete with foreign investors. Or I might add, you lawyers that add your money up buck by buck and come out into the country and buy farm land, these young farmers today can't compete with you. One reason they can't compete is because the net profits they've been making over the past thirty years does not



even begin to compare with what inflation has done for people in other professions. Now this is the first step, yes, there may be some problems with it. But, believe me, if something isn't done to help the young farmer invest in farm land today..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Your time has expired, Representative Hoxsey. There is only one minute for explanation of vote.

Hoxsey: "Can I close? If something isn't done to help the young farmer and protect his right to invest at a proper figure, you're going to go hungry someday, Ladies and Gentlemen, because there aren't too many of them left. I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hoxsey 'aye', Hudson..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson, one minute to explain your vote. The timer is on."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hudson 'no', Huff...Huff 'present', Huskey... Huskey 'no', Jacobs 'no', Jaffe 'aye', Johnson...Johnson 'present', Dave Jones 'aye', Emil Jones pass, Kane...Kane 'present', Katz 'no', Keats..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I have a conflict of interest on this Bill, but I'm still going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Keats 'no', Kelly...Kelly 'aye', Kempiners... Kempiners 'aye', Kent..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know of no law at this time that tells a farmer he has to sell to alien interest. I know of no law that tells him he has to sell to corporate interest. So therefore, I think that this Bill should be defeated because this is the last bastion of the republic in the farm land and let's give them the freedom to do as they wish. I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kent 'no', Klosak 'aye', Kornowicz pass, Kosinski..."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski, to explain his vote.  
The timer is on."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, two arguments have been offered. One is loopholes and I think those can be solved in the Senate and the other is constantly American economics. It seems like history tells me we fought a war to keep America, and now we're willing to sell it off at any price...for paper...matter of fact, the Sun Times on May 16th indicated that almost two million ounces of gold will be offered for sale. This can be purchased by foreign central banks. Motorola has gone to the Japanese. The philosophy of this appeals to me—America for America—and I'm proud to vote yes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kosinski 'aye', Kozubowski...Kozubowski 'no', Kucharski pass, Laurino 'present', Lechowicz...Lechowicz 'aye', Leinenweber..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber. One minute to explain, the timer's on."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I've only been down here, this is my sixth year, and mulling over in my mind this is quite ...this jingoistic bit of nonsense has to be the worst Bill that's been put in and brought up in the Third Reading for the six years I've been down here. Some of you people have been down here longer, Representative Collins can't think of anything worse than this in his ten years. So, there is only one possible vote and that is 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leinenweber 'no', Leverenz pass, Levin 'aye', Lucco pass, Luft...Luft 'no', Macdonald 'no', Madigan pass ...Madigan 'aye', Madison pass, Mahar...Mahar 'aye', Mann ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, not withstanding my genuine respect for Representative Leinenweber's judgement, especially in...on a vote like this, I still find it to be a good Bill and



I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mann 'aye',...

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the Clerk call my name."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you call Representative Madison?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes. Madison I passed."

Madison: "Oh, I vote 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madison 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Now that the record is corrected, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Margalus...Margalus 'no', Marovitz 'aye', Lynn  
Martin 'no', Peggy Smith Martin 'aye', Matejek...Matejek  
'aye', Matijevich 'aye', Matula...Matula 'aye', Mautino  
'no', McAuliffe...McAuliffe 'aye', McBroom...McBroom  
'present', McClain...McClain 'aye', McCourt 'no', McGrew..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew to explain his vote.

One minute. The timer's on."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've listened to the discussion of this Bill quite intently and I heard one of the Gentlemen refer to trying to go back to the forty acres and a mule. I submit to you that he hasn't been around a farming community because if he had he will find that they have consolidated the forty acres and sent their jackass to the General Assembly. This Bill certainly is not perfect, but it is...I think they're looking for a rationalization for a 'no' vote. Look at the facts. We know that 'Norris' farms, the largest farm in the State of Illinois, is now owned by either a corporation or an individual from a foreign country. We know that we have had several corporations attempting to buy up large tracts of land. I've got seven brothers that are now farming and two that want to. Today they're facing a very, very real problem. We're talking about the protection of our family farm, and that is indeed what it is because there is no way that you can start farming today unless some of that land comes from your family. You're



facing a five hundred acre purchase at about three thousand dollars an acre, approximately two hundred fifty thousand worth of seed and fertilizer..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the Roll Call. The timer shut you off, I didn't. It's one minute and the timer was on. Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "McGrew pass, McLendon...McGrew 'aye', McLendon ...McLendon 'present', McMaster..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster. The timer is on."

McMaster: "I'll get it over with quickly, Mr. Speaker. In spite of what the people have been saying that this is going to protect the family farm in Illinois, it isn't. This Bill is as full of holes as swiss cheese. Nevertheless, I'm going to vote for it but it's not gonna do one darn thing."

Clerk O'Brien: "McMaster 'aye', McPike 'no', Meyer...Meyer 'aye', Miller...Miller pass, Miller 'aye', Molloy...Oh, excuse me, Miller 'no', Molloy present Mudd..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly, I'd like to qualify my vote. I'm very much in favor of the free enterprise system and I'm very opposed to price control and wage control. And I believe that this Bill falls within that category and I have to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mudd 'no', Mugalian...Mugalian 'no', Mulcahey 'aye', Murphy...Murphy 'aye', Nardulli...Nardulli 'no', Neff..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff. Timer is on."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor of this legislation, with all due respect to him, has amended this Bill so to satisfy every group that's come to him to try to give...everyone happy. When you do this, you have to end up with a Bill. This Bill doesn't do anything. We're kidding the people when we tell them that this is gonna protect them from





corporations and foreign people from coming in and buying. I think it's terrible that we passed out a legislation of this type and therefore, I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Neff 'no', O'Brien..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien. The timer is on."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I too would like to admit that I have a conflict, like Representative Keats, in voting on this measure. I grow tomatoes at home and in addition to that, Roscoe Cunningham indicated, that many of us have a dream. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a dream and when I get to be your age, I hope to be somewhere in the southern coast of Ireland on a small patch of green land. I personally don't think...I personally don't think that the developers of this Bill have indicated any need in Illinois for the Bill. If the farmers don't want to sell the land, then they don't have to sign the contract. And if the small farmers have anything to work..."

Speaker Redmond: "The timer shut you off. You argue with the clock, not with me."

Clerk O'Brien: "O'Brien..."

Speaker Redmond: "Where are we now?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I'm waiting for O'Brien to vote."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote, Representative O'Brien? If you say one more word, McGrew is gonna kill me. Proceed. Don't give him another second or I'll get killed."

Clerk O'Brien: "O'Brien pass..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pechous...Pechous 'no', Peters..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, maybe this Bill doesn't have the answer to all the things that we'd like to but we've got a bank in the City of Chicago, the Bank of India, that was owned by the Indian government. When the employees there tried to organize, the court ruled that it was owned by a foreign government



and our laws did not apply to it and those employees were not allowed to organize. Collective bargaining...I don't know what rules are going to apply to the corporate interest that are buying the farms in Illinois. It's not the German or the Polish immigrant or the Italian immigrant that's buying a farm, it's the corporate interest. It's the fifty billion dollars of money that the Arabs have got. And if they ever dump that here, we're going to have a problem. We better start thinking about that and I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Peters 'aye', Pierce..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pierce 'no', Polk 'no', Porter...Porter 'no', Pouncey 'aye', Pullen...Pullen 'no', Reed 'aye', Reilly ...Reilly 'aye', Richmond present, Rigney 'aye',..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney: The timer is on."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, being quite a realist and watching the votes come up here on the scoreboard, it looks like we may be a little bit short when the final tally is there. But, if there's one good thing about this Bill, I think it's made a lot of people in this House think about the seriousness of the problem Representative Robinson and I are talking about, and for that, we thank you for the time you have devoted to this subject."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Rigney 'aye', Robinson..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson: The timer is on."

Robinson: "Some people have said, Is there a problem? The Post Dispatch has been uncovering over the past two weeks millions and millions of dollars in foreign investment. They've uncovered about fifty million dollars so far, including the largest farm in Illinois, 'Norris' Farm, in Fulton County, which does not use local businessmen. The coal companies own 73% of one state, 16% of another



state. They are using their reclaimed strip mine land for farming. That's going to lead to costly farming. This is a problem. Continental Bank announced that they want to use millions and millions of dollars of pension funds to buy up farm land and manage it. That's a problem. This is an attempt to stop that kind of threat to the family farm."

Clerk O'Brien: "Robinson 'aye', Ryan...Ryan pass, Sandquist... Sandquist present, Satterthwaite..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have referred to the Iowa law in discussion here today. Obviously, this Bill has some problems and I would urge my colleagues to put enough votes on the Bill today to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration and suggest that the Sponsors go back and amend it to do what the Iowa law does, if I understand it, which would document the expanse of the problem that we really have. And perhaps after that documentation, we would be able to pass a Bill more similar to this. I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Satterthwaite 'aye', Schisler...Schisler 'aye', Schlickman 'no', Schneider 'aye', Schoeberlein 'aye', Schuneman...Schuneman 'no', Sharp 'aye', Shumpert present, Simms...Simms 'no', Skinner...Skinner pass, Stanley... Stanley 'aye', Stearney pass, Steczo...Steczko 'aye', E.G. Steele pass, C.M. Stiehl pass, Stuffle...Stuffle 'aye', Sumner...Sumner 'no', Taylor pass, Telcser...Telcser 'aye', Terzich pass, Tipword...Tipword 'aye', Totten 'no', Tuerk...Tuerk 'no', Van Duyne 'aye', Vinson..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vitek...Representative Vinson, pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vinson 'aye', Vitek..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vitek."

Vitek: (Vitek explains his vote in foreign language.)



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevidch. How do you vote, Representative Vitek? 'Yah or Dah?'"

Matijevidch: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, could I have a copy of the transcript of that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vitek present..."

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

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I was off the floor for a moment and I wondered if Representative Vitek would repeat his speech?"

Speaker Redmond: "His minute is up."

Clerk O'Brien: "VonBoeckman 'aye', Waddell pass, R.V. Walsh... R.V. Walsh 'aye', W.D. Walsh 'no', Wikoff pass, Willer 'no', Williams...Williams 'no', Winchester..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Sponsors of this Bill have good intentions here and I think it addresses a very serious problem that we have in the agriculture community. However, I agree with former or previous speakers when they say that this Bill has been watered down to the point where it's really not what the Sponsors intended for it to do. I would have probably voted 'present', but I would like to go along with what Mrs. Satterthwaite has suggested, that the speaker...the Sponsors have an opportunity to put this Bill on Postponed Consideration and perhaps take it back to Second Reading and put some additional Amendments on that will really take care of the problem that we have in this state today. So, I'm voting green, only in order to give the Sponsors an opportunity to get the seventy votes that they need to put it on Postponed Consideration."

Clerk O'Brien: "Winchester 'aye', Wolf...Wolf 'no', Younge... Younge 'aye', Yourell...Yourell 'aye'. Mr. Speaker pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Does any...wait a minute...wait a minute... anybody who has not voted, desire to be recognized?"



Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that Bill is not a good Bill. But I do believe that the Sponsors of this piece of legislation ought to have the privilege of putting it in the kind of shape that perhaps can acquire other support. And so for that reason I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: Will you depress your switch there? Representative Christensen. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, perhaps some of us don't realize this, but under the present Illinois law, aliens cannot hold property for more than six years unless they become citizens of this country. But it's incumbent upon the state's attorney of the respective counties that take action in order to remove their property. However, that's the real reason I was supporting this Bill and I do feel that there are other ramifications, I'm not happy with it, but in order to give it a chance to go back on Second Reading I'd like to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, it has been an international law that he who pays the piper calls the tune. If we start saying who can't buy land, you'll end up saying who must buy the land. I suggest to you that to shuck the dollar out of the market place is to deny the existence of capitalism. I think this is an error at this time. For that reason I will be forced to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Vote me 'yes', please."

Speaker Redmond: "You vote yourself 'yes'. Can you depress your switch? Representative Capparelli. Kornowicz press



your switch. Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "I voted 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone else? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, it's apparent the Sponsor of the Bill wants 70 votes to put on Postponed Consideration. Therefore, it is not a record Roll Call. Let's save some time and put it on Postponed and go on."

Speaker Redmond: "The Sponsor has the control of his Bill. Representative Dawson. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Vote me 'present', please. I'll vote myself 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Since an 'aye' vote is so obviously a vote against secret land trust, I vote 'aye'."

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

Kucharski: "I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Does any Member desire to change his vote? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Terzich: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. He pushed his switch. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Would you put it on Postponed Consideration and we'll see if we can work it out. However, Representative Rigney and I do have some problems with trying to change the Bill so...we'll put it on Postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. Representative Mudd. Turn the Chair over to Representative Mudd. Representative Willer, will you pay attention, please?"

Speaker Mudd: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a very great opportunity in Illinois today. I want to



introduce you to a lady from my district, from the City of Chillicothe. She's a personal friend of mine and what I believe to be probably the greatest asset that our profession has in the United States. First, I want to introduce to you Ilion Crabel. Ilion, would you come over here, please. This is Ilion Crabel. She's a City Clerk in the City of Chillicothe and later you'll know why she's so important to you and I in our profession. Also, Ilion has with her today, Sharon and Sid Cravel, her son and daughter-in-law. And over here, 'Kathryn Carol', who is her secretary in Chillicothe and also, good friends of mind and hers, Mr. and Mrs. William 'Prayser'. I would like to move at this time that we have unanimous consent to move to hear Resolution 855, if we could, please." Mr. Clerk, would you read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 855, whereas, May 1, 1978, marks the phenomenal milestone in the public service career of Ilion B. (Wait) Crabel, and as of that date she has completed fifty-five years as City Clerk of Chillicothe, Illinois; and whereas, in her early years of school in Forrest, Illinois, she was taught how to vote, even though she was taught that women could not vote; and whereas, this enlightenment did not deter her from seeking a career in public service, and in April of 1923, she was elected to her first two-year term as City Clerk of Chillicothe, for which she received the enormous sum of one hundred dollars per year for performing her duties by working out of a corner in her brother's plumbing store; and whereas, the citizens of Chillicothe have expressed their appreciation for Ms. Crabel's efficient, faithful and unwavering dedication to public service by reelecting her to six succeeding two-year terms and ten subsequent four-year terms; and whereas, for the past fifty-four years, she has faithfully fulfilled additional duties as Chillicothe Township Clerk; and whereas, Ilion's conscientious



devotion to duty is evidenced by the fact that, during her fifty-five years as City Clerk, she has missed only fourteen city council meetings, all due to illness; and whereas, she has earned the esteem and admiration of her associates, who insist she is not getting older, she's getting better; and whereas, Ms. Crabel can recount many interesting experiences during her tenure, the most exciting of which, she says is the time during "boot-legging" days when she was subpoenaed to present city records to a federal grand jury when the Mayor, Police Magistrate and a police officer were to go on trial; and whereas, of the countless thousands of hunting and fishing licenses issued, she recalls once issuing a hunting license to underworld chieftain Al Capone; and whereas, she also admits to having meticulously made out and issued a hunting license to one F. MacMurray, only later to find out that he was the Fred MacMurray of TV fame; and whereas, Ms. Crabel has served with zeal and dedication during the administrations of fourteen mayors, only nine of which shared her Democrat political persuasion; therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly, that we express our sincere admiration to Ilion B. (Wait) Crabel upon the completion of five and one-half decades of exemplary service to her community as City Clerk and fifty-four years as Township Clerk; and be it further resolved, that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to Ilion Crabel as evidence of the high esteem in which she is held by all Members of this Body."

Ilion Crabel: "I want to thank Representative Mudd and the rest of you for making this day possible for me and I greatly appreciate it. And the politics in our family goes back quite a ways. Chief Justice Wait, a hundred years ago, gave the oath of office to President Hayes. So, I think that...and other relatives also have been in politics,





such as New York City, my uncle was a corporation counselor there. And my brother in Livingston County was several political offices, which maybe some of you remember as Dutch Wait...Ori Wait. I appreciate it and thank you very much."

Speaker Mudd: "Thank you, Ilion. We're all real proud to have you hear in Illinois. I move that this Resolution be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentlemen's motion for adoption of Resolution 855. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. The Resolution is adopted. Is Representative Hanahan on the floor? 1533."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1533. A Bill for an Act to create the Depressed Areas Land Use and Community Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Out of the record... request of the Sponsor. 1710. Representative Younge. Out of the record. Kelly, you don't need these overhead lights, do you? 1764. Out of the record. 1788. Representative McAuliffe."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1788. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of The Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1788 is a very simple Bill. It would allow the trucking industry in Illinois to be more competitive with the states around us. It would increase the length of the maximum length of 5 feet in Illinois to 60 feet. (sic) It would enable truck driv...truck companies to use either cab-over or engine-in-front type of cab with their tractor combination. It doesn't increase the weight length at all...or the weight limitation at all. In fact, it's a better distribution of weight as the cabs would be longer



and spread the weight out over a wider area. The Bill was heard in the Motor Vehicles Committee and it came out 12-2. And I would ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative McClain, pardon me."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield? Mr. McAuliffe, would these trucks only be able to ride on...or drive on interstate roads or would they be able to go on all roads throughout the State of Illinois?"

McAuliffe: "Representative McCourt amended the Bill to limit them to interstate routes and certain access routes."

McClain: "So right now it's only interstates and certain designated access routes?"

McAuliffe: "Yes."

McClain: So, like in our area where we have no interstate, no truck with this length could drive through western Illinois, for instance."

McAuliffe: "No. It would be limited to interstates and the access routes."

McClain: "And did you ask your trucking companies or associations what kind of economic impact that would have like on ...on a community that does not have interstates? Would we then have to pay a higher truck fee and the like, to get goods because they'll have to change trucks?"

McAuliffe: "I don't believe so. This is mostly to be used for Interstate Commerce. Most of these trucks are Interstate Commerce trucks coming into Illinois. All surrounding states, with one exception, have this length now and in fact, out of the fifty states, approximately 35 have the 60 foot length right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. If you take a look at the Bill, basically what it does is increase the foot length of trucks now from 55 to 60 feet. I think if there's



anything we really don't need in the State of Illinois it's trucks that are 5 feet longer. I think that this is a bad Bill and I think the Members should take a look at it and then defeat it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This issue has been debated before the General Assembly in the past. At the time it was debated in the past, it was pointed out the excessive wear of the roads by the exemption of providing for an additional length of the trucks. Presently, the law in Illinois is that the truck and trailer cannot exceed 55 feet and this Bill calls 60 feet or more. Now the Sponsor indicated that there were some 35 states that have passed this legislation. According to our analysis there are fourteen states in that category. I, for one, believe that the law in Illinois is quite adequate of having 55 feet. I don't believe that in the Bill it provides for additional revenue to the state for the repair or the additional maintenance on the roads. And I will stand in opposition of House Bill 1788."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tipsword: "Does...if we pass this Bill does it allow for the same kind of combination that you find on interstate east of Illinois...those two trailer combinations?"

McAuliffe: "It doesn't affect the combination law at all. What it really does...a lot of truck companies in Illinois are faced with a dilemma. If they have cabs in their pool, they have to be very careful to be sure they use the cab-over type of tractor to pull the trailer. It would simply allow them to use either a cab-over or the type with the cab in front...or the engine in front. The union supports the Bill. We have had no problem with the



Teamsters Union, they're in support of the Bill. It does not increase the weight of the truck at all, in fact, it gives a better overall distribution of weight because the wheels on the truck would be set further apart. There is no more wear and tear on the highways whatsoever because of this. All it is, it allows them to use either type of cab, the cab-over or the cab with the engine in front. That's all it does. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really feel I should at least rise and clarify what was just said. The Teamsters, representing the truck drivers, testified against this Bill in Committee and stated that they considered that an extra five feet of length would decrease the safety factor for truck drivers. And unless there's been some clarification on this that I don't...am not aware of, the Teamsters testified against it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As been brought out here, this isn't going to increase the weight on trucks. The fact is, it will be easier on the roads because it will be more distributed. And as far as 60 foot, we still have that 60 foot trucks on the road...all the car haulers that haul new cars are 60 foot. So, this isn't unusual having 60 foot. And therefore, I think this legislation should be supported."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mautino: "Rog., do you have any figures on how many truckers in the state have 45 foot trailers at this point in time as opposed to 42 or 35?"

McAuliffe: "No, I really don't."

Mautino: "Is it just getting the majority..."



McAuliffe: "The majority of them, I think, are 45."

Mautino: "Pardon."

McAuliffe: "The majority, I think, are 45."

Mautino: "45. That means that the cab-over against the conventional is what you're basically talking about..."

McAuliffe: "Right."

Mautino: "...because the 45 foot trailer would therefore still be the one in most common use, whether it be in Quincy, Illinois, on those roads or the interstate roads."

McAuliffe: "That's right."

Mautino: "O.K."

McAuliffe: "And we just got word from the Teamsters Union.

Teamsters opposed the Bill in the Committee, but we worked out an agreement with them with the Amendment and they're not in opposition to the Bill now."

Mautino: "O.K. What I...my final question might be then, would you be agreeable to put a limitation on the size of the trailer at some future time at 45 foot which..."

McAuliffe: "What...it can't exceed 60 feet right now."

Mautino: "O.K. Fine."

McAuliffe: "The overall length can't go over 60 feet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, there's been a little confusion about this Bill and I would...during the Committee hearing was afraid that this was an effort by the trucking industry to have longer trucks and heavier trucks and to take over the highways more than they have right now. And as a result...in the Committee, the Bill is so written that the trailer length is not increased any, it's still a 45 foot trailer. The only thing we're doing, we're allowing the industry to have a little more flexibility in the tractor that pulls the trailer. And then, with Amendment #1 on, we are limiting these vehicles to four lane highways and certain designated secondary roads as designated by the Department of Transportation. I believe it's a good Bill



and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

McAuliffe: "Yah."

Van Duyne: "Roger, can you explain to me, when you have a limitation, now I believe it's 9000 on your front axle and 16,000 on the duals all the way through, whether it's a train or whatever...and I'm not too sure of that...but as I understand it's 16,000 per axle and 9 in the front. Now, you can, with a cab-over, you can get a better distribution of the weight on the front axle. But how can you do that with a single axle, with single tires in the front? Are they limited to 9000 on the axle with a cab-over? What if they got 16,000...weight on the front axle, would that be allowed? And also, what has the length of the overall dimensions of the truck got to do with that? If you have a cab-over, you can distribute the weight on the front axle better without extending the overall length of the truck. And besides that, I have yet to see a cab-over extend past the front bumper."

McAuliffe: "Well, Leroy, I can't answer the questions about axles and weights, I am not an expert in that field. All I can say is that by spreading the weight out over the more wheels and more tires, you're going to spread the weight out more. That's all I can say."

Van Duyne: "Yah, if you add more axles you'll spread the weight. But if you've got 16,000 pounds per axle, whether you got 20 feet between axles or not, you've still got 16,000 pounds on each axle. And, you know, if I could create a simple analogy, if you spread the axles apart, you've still got so much weight going over a certain section of pavement at one time. So, I don't see the distribution of the weight, except in a cab-over but you don't have to extend the overall length of the truck to get that."



McAuliffe: "Well, that's not the only reason that we're trying to pass the Bill, just to distribute the weight more. We're trying to pass the Bill to help keep the trucking industry in Illinois more competitive."

Van Duynes: "But as I understand though, this is interstate transport. You're not going to allow these long trucks to go up through these narrow streets in small towns because they run over your curbs, they run over your fire plugs, they run over your sidewalks, they run over everything when that rear axle comes around, they're 3 to 4 feet inside the turn of the front wheels on the trailer...I mean on the back axle of the semi. And, you know...this is absolutely to the detriment of the smaller towns with the narrower streets."

McAuliffe: "They're limited to interstate highways..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think...I think we've gone beyond the bounds of placing questions and inquiries here. Representative Shuneman."

Shuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Shuneman: "Roger, I'm concerned about your statement that this is limited to interstate highways and certain access roads. I'll give you an example. Route 121 runs from Morton, Illinois, I-74, to Lincoln, Illinois, with is I-55. Now, would these longer units be permitted on a road like that?"

McAuliffe: "I couldn't answer that question because I don't have the map here. The Highway Department has a map that shows what roads they can be used on."

Shuneman: "Yah, well, I...may I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Shuneman: "I believe that it's important to know what roads we're talking about. The particular road that I referred to is one that runs from one interstate highway to another. And for those of us who drive that road often, we all know,



that tractor-trailer units are driving in packs on that road now. And it is virtually impossible to pass anybody on that road because you have packs of semi-trailers running too close to one another in violation of current Illinois law. They're running too close to one another now, both in the direction we may be driving and in the on-coming direction. And I think it's absolutely a mistake to allow any increase in the length of these units if they're gonna be used on highways like that, which are already too narrow and which are being misused by this industry now. And I would suggest a 'no' vote on this Bill until we know precisely what it is we're gonna be doing to those highways."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

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

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

McAuliffe: "Well, in closing, I would just like to say this is a chance to help keep business in Illinois. It's a chance to help keep the trucking business competitive with other states. Most of the other states around Illinois allow this type of length. Currently in Illinois, auto transports are 60 feet long and they don't seem to be doing any harm. And if the trucks are traveling too close on some highways, I suggest that the State Police be out there and give them tickets. This isn't going to make it any worse. These are going to be mostly restricted to four-lane highways where it is easy to pass on the left side. It's just a Bill to help keep business in Illinois and help keep the Illinois Trucking Industry competitive with other states. And I would solicit your 'aye' vote."

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? All voted who wish?  
Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my 'yes' vote. As Chairman of the Motor Vehicles Committee and a Member of the Motor Vehicles Laws Committee, we studied this issue very thoroughly. And the only opposition that we truthfully had was from the Teamsters Union. And with an Amendment that came in Second Reading on this, worked out all the differences between the Teamsters Union and the trucking industry. I feel like one of the greatest assets we have in extending this is the safety factor. We all know that the problem of an accident with an overhead cab will generally result in the death of the driver. Therefore, I feel that the safety factor is one of the best things that we can have for this type of legislation. It doesn't change the weight or any other thing, other than the type of cab. It provides that when a truck comes from out-of-state and he has a longer cab from the state he comes from, he can travel on designated highways in Illinois. And I think that the Department of Transportation is in full accord with this Bill and I urge a 'yes' vote."

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

McAuliffe: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1803."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1803. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of..."

Speaker Redmond: "Incidentally, you may be interested, we will be unable to break for lunch. We'll have to go straight through. Among other reasons, one of the major political parties wants a conference that will probably use at least an hour up, so we'll have to go straight through. Representative Robinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension



Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Robinson: "This is a Bill Co-Sponsored by Representative Stuffle and myself. The Bill raises the retirement...post retirement increment for retired state employees from 2% to 3%. And that post retirement...that increase is based on the original retirement benefit. It does not compound. There are many senior citizens, thousands of senior citizens who are retired state employees. They are living on the verge of poverty. We had them...had many testify before the Pensions Committee, that a number of them were on food stamps, were on supplemental incomes of one kind or another and could not make a go of it. These are people who have spent their entire working life in public service and we need to treat them better. We need to give them the income that they can have to live. I would appreciate a favorable vote for the retired state employees and university employees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this proposal. I certainly don't rise in opposition to the basic thrust of the objective of the proposal because we certainly...everybody knows about the inflationary factor and the difficulty some of the people who retired years ago find themselves but I'm here to remind you that the payout on this...you can see by your digest and read as well as I do that it gets to be about a half a million dollars for this year and then the projections are there for the next five years. Plus, the impact of almost 7 million dollars on the unfunded accrued liability. And I just want to remind you when you cast a vote on this Bill that in the last two years, one report from Department of Insurance Pension Division to the latest one, the unfunded accrued liability increased 22% from 5.6 billion to 7.1 billion dollars. And all we're doing is compounding this problem and you're digest points



this out, it doesn't take into consideration the university people and as a Member of the Pension Laws Committee... Commission, I know that they are going to study this automatic increment going to 2 to 3% and for consideration, perhaps in the Spring-Session of next year. And I, for one, would urge everyone at this point in time...not in opposition for what it tries to do, but at this point in time I think it's very unsound fiscally and ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. Representative Robinson has explained that the legislation is designed to help former state employees who today are close to the poverty level or below. These are people who have a difficult time scraping together enough money simply to pay for the necessities of life. Every day in this General Assembly we consider the expenditure of hundreds of thousands dollars and millions and millions of dollars and here we have an opportunity in this Bill to simply provide a little more money to the ordinary person who quite often lives close proximity to the capital. They were long time state employees, dedicated, loyal, honest and today they have a difficult time finding enough money to live. I urge an 'aye' vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "I think Mr. Totten was up first, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The speaker yields to Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...on a couple points. We probably shouldn't vote on this until we hear the Governor's...see the Governor's report on waste before we do it, but the Sponsor has a Bill, an appropriation Bill, that is presently sitting in the...a Sub-Committee of the House Appropriations I Committee and it has been the practice of



this House to have appropriation and substantive legislation follow together through the House. I think that the Sponsor should honor that procedure and wait until that money Bill gets out of the appropriations Committee before he moves this. And he should take this out of the record. This is putting the cart before the horse."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support House Bill 1803. The Pension Laws Commission has been reviewing this policy for a number of years that I know of and I can think of no greater problem to pay their particular attention to. I would simply like to read a short letter that I received from one of our former state employees. It says, 'The state of Illinois has been too long in giving retirees consideration. The Federal Government has been giving cost of living increases and it's only fair that the State of Illinois does the same for its people. It's a sad commentary when we look back and think how most retirees made their contribution to the state for much less income, longer hours, less favorable working conditions, withstood depression and had far less all around. Now comes the time when they need so badly to have an increase in this fixed income in order just to get along. Please, please give House Bill 1803, granting retirees 2 to 3% increase. This is certainly minimal and should be passed without question. Again, Members of the House, that this is a very, very small increase. Social Security has been increased for a number of years while our state employees Pension Post Retirement Benefit has been staying at its current level for God knows how many years. These people do need the money. I don't think we can allocate money to a more worthy cause than to those who have given their services to our state. And they're our people and I think they deserve our support."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Wolf, you yielded your time. Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there is a misunderstanding here. Those of us who are in opposition to the Bill in its present form do not deny that former employees of these two systems deserve a post retirement increment increase from 2 to 3%. The only thing we're saying and we tried to correct this deficiency in the Bill in Second Reading by putting an Amendment on that would increase the present employees contribution 1/2%. Just to give you an example of what we're doing here, Mr. Speaker, if this Bill passes in its present form we're going to add to the State University's Retirement System an additional 20 million dollars liability. Right now they have an unfunded liability of 658 million dollars. Now that's just for the State Employees System. ...on the...that's just, excuse me, that's on the University Retirement System. On the State Employees System we're gonna add an additional 40 million dollars of accrued liability. So what you're doing is very dangerous today, Mr. Speaker, and if this Bill passes in its present form The Bill should go back to Second Reading, it should have an Amendment put on that would permit the current employees to pay an additional 1/2%."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to remind the Members of this Body that the deficits in the retirement systems are not the fault of the employees. The deficits in those retirement systems are the fault of the state for not having contributed the employer portion of the contributions that would make those systems sound. Two years ago when I was handling a Bill for the University's Retirement System and it looked as though there was no way of getting this increase without a contribution on the part of the employees we decided to



withdraw that portion of the Bill because the Executive Director of the system indicated that the employees were contributing enough so that their invested funds would allow for this increase without any additional payment on the part of the employee. Since that time the system has agreed to go along with the quarter per cent increase. Mainly, because they don't feel that they can qualify... can get the votes in any other way to qualify for this increase. They have made a confession by agreeing to have the quarter per cent increase, even though, the employees are contributing enough to cover this additional advantage to them. I suggest that we strongly need to support this Bill. It is far more than the employees should be asked to contribute. We should instead be mandating that the state make their adequate contribution to the systems to keep the system healthy. I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Robinson... or Stuffle, who is it? Representative Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I listened intently at the remarks from the other side about what this Bill would cost and why it ought not to be passed. And I submit to you that the claims of Representative McCourt that this Bill shall again be taken back to Second Reading for an Amendment. Speak to a concept that would excessively burden the people who need this and the people currently in the system. His Amendment would have required the state employee, without help from the state, to pay for every penny of the cost of this. By the way, the cost he quoted was 2 1/2 times greater than the actual cost. As well, we're already asking state employees to pay over 10% of their income every month for pension benefits. Currently, the State Employee System and the State University System are taking in twice as much each year in contributions for payout of the annual adjustment as they are spending. We've had an increase of 65% in the cost of



living since 1969, when the 2% benefits became available. All this does is ask for fairness and equity for people who have been asked to wait and wait and wait, year after year, while the Pension Laws Commission keeps discussing this. They've discussed it long enough. We're trying to help the poorest of the poor here. I think on Second Reading and now, we've pointed out that this is not actuarially deficient, this is not going to break anyone, the money is there, it's not being used for this purpose now, we're burdening people twice. We're telling them they can't have a benefit because the state hasn't paid its share, not because the people haven't. If we deny it to them we are once again saying to them, you gotta wait and listen to the Pension Laws Commission. For seven years they've been waiting while they debate this thing. I'm on that Commission too, and as one Member of that Commission, I'm for this and it ought to be passed to help these people. I urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Wolf to explain his vote."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to just say that it's ...you're right, it's not the fault of the employees it's the fault of the state for not funding, it's the fault of the General Assembly who keeps giving away...bestowing and increasing benefits. Now right now the downstate police and the downstate fireman have this 3% benefit but they pay for it in an increased contribution. And as I read this Bill, the university employees are willing to increase their contribution to pay for it, but the state employees aren't. And so what you're doing, you're telling some groups that you have to pay for this increase but the state employees get it for nothing. And I appeal to you in equity that you should not give a freebie to one group when other people have been required to pay for that



increase."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. By way of explanation of my vote, I couldn't agree more with the Speaker who just spoke. It's a very popular thing in this General Assembly to introduce Bills like this because everybody likes to give away money. And I would like to give away money, but I know that in order to give away the money, you have to come up with it somewhere. And that's what's left out of this Bill. Nobody has provided for a way of funding this money. Where are you gonna get it? Are you going to take it from the fund that's already unfunded? Well, obviously, that's what the Sponsors of this Bill want to do. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this is an irresponsible act and that we're doing this time after time in General Assembly. We come up with pension Bills and we want to be popular by giving away money, but we don't fund the pension. And that's wrong, Mr. Speaker, and we're gonna all live to rue the day that we do these things. I suggest a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question is 106 'aye' and 40 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Ryan, do you seek recognition? 1884."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1884. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania. Out of the Record. 1970...no...1913."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1913. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to landlords and tenants. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You may recognize this number. We had a little





fun with this Bill awhile back and so this is actually the second time we have considered it. It is basically very, very simple in its concept. We've had a law in the books for many years that provides what is called distress for rent. That is to say if a landlord has rent owing him, he may on his...by his own action seek relief without going through a court process. And most people assume that this law was unconstitutional because it provided for seizure of private property and without due process of law and so for many years it was not used at all. Very recently, there was a case in Illinois, just about a year ago where it was used against a commercial tenant and it was upheld in the courts. Consequently, we saw a flurry of threats and intimidation of landlords against tenants, where they threatened to seize the property. Incidentally, the seizure of the property can occur anywhere in county. The property can be anywhere in the county of resident of the tenant. Which is to say, your automobile for example, could be seized directly by the landlord. Now, what this Bill tries to do...it doesn't eliminate this...distress for seizure in general. Incidentally, landlords are the only people that can have this kind of remedy available to them. What it does, it simply provides a process whereby landlords can recover the claim from the tenant, but all they do...they go to court and get a writ in an ex parte proceeding, which means the tenant doesn't have to be informed so that he won't skip town or something like that and then the sheriff seizes the property. And I think this is a much more reasonable approach...quite apart from due process argument. It does provide a buffer, if you will, between tenant and landlord. Can you just imagine what would happen if a landlord tried to seize the automobile of one of his tenants. The tenant would probably run out in the street and I'll tell you if he had a hand gun in his possession, I'll bet you there would be a pretty



nasty altercation. At least if my Bill passes the least that we'll have is a situation where the sheriff is the one who seizes the property and has the proper warrant to do so. And I think this is a good piece of legislation and deserves your favorable support. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, almost...for hundreds of years we've had remedy for landlords called distress. In a way what it is, it says that you rent an apartment, you own the property and you rent, you have what's kind of in the nature of a lien... that if you come up to your apartment to see the tenant who has not paid his rent out there with a U-haul trailer loading up his furniture and about to skip, the reason that does not occur is because the law has always said that the landlord has a right to hang on to that property. And normally you don't have problems here, tenants know that. But the Sponsor has the idea of eliminating that. I think it would unbalance the law in favor of tenants so that they could skip off. I think if you take a pair of pants or a suit into a cleaner to have it cleaned, you don't have a right to take your suit away until you pay for the cleaning. If you move into somebody's apartment with your luggage and your furniture...and your individual possessions, you should not have the right to just skip right off without paying your rent and meeting the obligations of your lease. The purpose of distress is to prevent that. I think that if you eliminated that remedy you'd have much more violence. You'd have landlords out there trying to protect themselves. And I'm just as fearful of what would happen in the other direction if this sort of legislation were adopted. I think that you should defeat this Bill. I have concerns about it. I have not heard one complaint from anybody in Lake County and I would bet there's not one legislator on this floor that



has heard one letter from one constituent in the whole State of Illinois complaining about the subject of distress or the abuse of distress. It's a good remedy. It's a traditional common law remedy, it ought to be retained and I would urge you all to think carefully about this legislation and defeat it. Thank you."

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

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to introduce three ladies in the gallery. The Minority Leader's mother, Jeanette Ryan, his mother-in-law, Dorothea Lowe and his daughter, Nancy Ryan. Will you girls rise and be acknowledged, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Question...the Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you rise? We'll call on you to explain your vote. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry the debate was cut off quite so short because there was really only one opponent. I think if it had gone on longer we would have heard... would have had a chance to hear the response that Representative Deuster was seeking. I'm kind of surprised at Representative Deuster's remarks because in fact, you know, I think most tenants really don't know that this distress provision exists in the statute already. I think if you went out on the street and took a random sampling you would find most people are really unaware of the law, except for landlords who are trying to intimidate their tenants with it. You know, I think that as a practical matter, it hasn't been used very much in residential cases.



In fact, the one court case that came to the attention... that did come to the attention of the courts was a commercial case. And I think that's primarily where you'll find this kind of remedy being used. The thing that appalls me the most about it is that after listening to the debate on House Bill 1357, the farm Bill, firstly, everybody got up on the floor and spoke about the sanctity of private property. Well, this is a private property Bill if there ever was one. It says that the landlord has the remedy to recover from the tenant. Indeed, he has remedy...or has a right to payment. It just simply provides that he himself shall not do the seizure, the sheriff or deputy shall do the seizure. And it seems to me that...really what I'm trying to prevent here, really some potentially nasty altercations between tenants and landlords when the landlord walks into a tenant's apartment or tries to hot wire his car and take it and seize it himself. I think we need to have officers of the law performing that kind of duty and I ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Greiman, to explain his vote."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I served as the Chairman in the Sub-committee that worked on this Bill. The testimony from all the people concerned, landlords included and the real estate interests as well, was that this Bill...that this remedy of distress for rent is not used. It is an archaic remedy that legitimate landlords do not use, do not care to use this remedy at all. And as a consequence, we believed that Mr. Bowman's Bill was with great merit...that there is no point, no proper purpose in allowing a...one party to essentially take the goods of another without any kind of judgment. Landlords and tenants do have arguments that have nothing to do with the rent. Nothing to do with



whether the tenant has paid the rent. We're assuming always that the tenant is in default. As a matter of fact, landlords often don't provide services in some very dilapidated...situations. And to take the meager possessions of people, poor people, seems to me is the kind of gun to the head that this General Assembly is concerned about. I think we're not interested in giving one party a great, great, great advantage, a great edge. I think that's what we're here for...to balance those edges. The Committee had a...gave it a full hearing in the Judiciary Committee and it was passed. I think it's a good Bill. I think it's a very reasonable compromise. All it does... it keeps the remedy. It keeps the remedy. You remember that. It just makes the landlord petition the court to show that he has probable cause, probable cause to take the goods. And that's all it does. It doesn't abolish the remedy. Mr. Deuster's landlord can still pick up the goodies, if you call them goodies."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, every Speaker address himself to the residency and I don't see anything in the Bill that exempts commercial and industrial. But I know for a...on two or three occasions where the federal marshall stepped in and took over the property and someone owning a 200 thousand dollar building with 150 thousand dollar mortgage couldn't go in there and remove any of the contents of that until the lien was satisfied, either by the U.S. Marshall or by a distressed...not paying their rent. And the man ultimately went bankrupt and lost the building because he couldn't collect his rent and the U.S. Marshall and the sheriff had a padlock on the door and he couldn't re-rent it. So, unless somebody tells me that this exempts commercial and industrial property, I can't see how I can vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bowman: "One thing...explaining my vote as the Sponsor here. One thing which came to my attention and I should have mentioned in debate, the staff analysis that has been done on this Bill, I believe on both sides of the aisle, was done before an Amendment was attached by Representative Johnson. I think some people may be under the misapprehension that the distress remedy is being abolished for the residential class of property. Representative Johnson's Amendment, which I supported, does not...puts residential back into the Bill. In other words, the distress remedy is not being abolished for any class. And so we are being evenhanded. here, I believe, in our treatment of residential and commercial and industrial property. So that...I'm afraid if you're looking at your staff analysis, it may be somewhat in there...I assure you that the Bill as amended does have its provisions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Being both a landlord and a tenant I have a conflict of interest, I'd like to be recorded as present."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 67 'aye' and 63 'no'. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, can I have a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Bradley 'aye'. Representative Telcser. 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey 'aye'. That's 70. Representative Mulcahey 'no'. That's 69. Representative Farley 'aye'. Representative Jones 'aye'. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Unless there's 19 more people out there I'd rather...I'd like to have this Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. Representative Ryan."



Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on the point of personal privilege. I'd like to take a few brief moments this afternoon to clarify some confusion that was raised on the floor yesterday concerning a Task Force Report on cost control. This morning I spoke with Mr. 'Galord' Freeman, Chairman of the Task Force, and I have some information that I would like to pass on to Members on both sides of the aisle. First, let me state that the Task Force is not made up of government employees. It's not a state agency or state entity at all. The Task Force consists of six retired business executives who are donating their personal time and using seventy-five individuals borrowed from private industry to complete their task. Private funds are being used to support the operations of the Task Force and not one cent, not one cent of state money has been spent. Second, let me clarify some misunderstandings over when the Task Force is...report is to be ready. Yesterday many Members were led to believe that the report was ready on April 15. Mr. Freeman informs me that is not the case. In my conversation this morning, Mr. Freeman gave me an update on the Task Force progress and I want to relay to you what he told me. Initially the Task Force Members hoped to have a report ready on April 15, but as their work progressed it became apparent that the magnitude of the job made it impossible to meet that deadline. The Task Force made a decision that rather than rushing to meet an artificial deadline they would continue to offer their services free as long as it was necessary to compile a report that could benefit the people of the State of Illinois. At this point the Task Force is still receiving data from state agencies. After the initial review, it became apparent that if the report was going to be complete much additional information was needed before recommendations could be made. Mr. Freeman believes that this



report is essential if it is to be of long lasting value. The Task Force report to the Governor will be ready when they feel that they have a document that will be useful to the people of the State of Illinois and to the General Assembly. I don't believe that these retired private citizens, donating their time and their money, should be pressed to do a hasty job because of the schedule of this General Assembly. This Assembly has had no part in helping the private Task Force and I personally believe that it is presumptuous on our part to attempt to set a schedule for those men. Finally, based on what I have learned, I must conclude that the partisan attacks by Members of this House were merely political rhetoric and second rate theatrics. And let me tell you this, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, second rate theatrics will not do the State of Illinois any good. Sound, efficient government and the cooperation of both parties will get a sound, efficient government. I think we should proceed with our deliberation. I think we should turn our eyes away from the television cameras and the press rooms and back to the work we have at hand. And I think that we should begin to consider the budget Bills again today and forget yesterdays mistakes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am the individual that was referred to by Representative Ryan. And as I stated yesterday in my remarks, the Task Force was appointed by the Governor on August 22, 1977. At the time of its creation, and I am now reading from the Governor's own press release, it was stated that the report would be delivered to the Governor before April 15, 1978. The Governor's press release deals in a great deal of fanfare regarding the prestigious nature of the appointments and the prestigious background of the appointees. And he uses a great deal of rhetoric regarding the need





to bring some real penny-pinchers into the act and the act currently refers to the budgetary process of the State of Illinois. Neither I or any Democratic Member of the Legislature was responsible for the creation of this Task Force. Neither I or any Democratic Member of the Legislature was responsible for the reporting date of April 15, 1978. The Task Force was created, the reporting date was set by the Governor himself. And now, at a point in time where he has agreed to debate the budget with his Democratic opponent for Governor, Michael Bakalis, and at a point in time, where several members of this Task Force have told people that the work product of the Task Force is well along the road. And, I might add, that I spoke with Mr. Freeman yesterday and during my conversation with Mr. Freeman he told me that he expected this work product of the Task Force to be sent to the printer before the end of May. And my suggestion yesterday was that if the work product of the Task Force could be sent to the printer at the end of May, then it can be given to us in rough form and we can use it in our Appropriations Committees as we consider the amount of money that will be appropriated to the various departments and agencies of the State of Illinois. I might add that I asked my secretary to place phone calls to all the members of this Task Force yesterday. Fortunately, I was able to talk to Mr. Freeman personally, who is the chairman. However, we made the original calls at approximately 1:30 or 1:45 and not one of these men were in their office. Three of them are on vacation, one out of the country. Governor Thompson decided that he would appoint retired prestigious businessmen to examine the operations of state government. That was his decision. If he asked these people to participate and they agreed to his invitation to participate in this process then I think that the Governor owes it to us and to the people of the State of Illinois to personally



call these men, explain the need for this information immediately and since they apparently are public spirited individuals willing to help the State of Illinois, that I suggest they ought to stop doing whatever they're doing, they ought to return from their vacations, they ought to curtail their two hour lunch period and make this information available so that we can intelligently digest the work that they have done and intelligently vote on the Appropriation Bills that are now pending before our Committees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Chicago never fails to amaze me with his political rhetoric. He gets a little better each time he stands up. I am absolutely appalled, Mr. Madigan, that you would try and dictate the private citizens who have raised private funds to do this study, to dictate a schedule for those individuals. And to make them hurry through with a report of the magnitude that they have to make to meet your time tables because you've attempted to find some 45 million dollars in the budget to take care of your candidate for the Governor's race, Michael Bakalis, and have been unable to find that 45 million dollars. And so now you're looking for outside help for a place to hang your hat. Mr. Madigan, you were elected to survey this budget along with every Member of this House. That's your obligation, it isn't the obligation of a privately funded, private organization appointed by the Governor. And they have no obligation to give you that report, Mr. Madigan, any more than the AFLCIO would have if they did one or the Chamber of Commerce or the Illinois Manufacturers Association. And certainly, you should understand that. And so to make light and to make remarks questioning the integrity of these Gentlemen, certainly was out of order. And I'm amazed at you, Mr. Madigan, to think that you'd make those kinds of statements."



And as I said, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think it's time that we got off of these television cameras and out of the press rooms and continued with the order of business that we were sent here to do. You weren't sent down here to wait for a report from a Task Force to survey the budget, that's your sworn constitutional duty and you should carry those duties out and quit trying to put things in Sub-committees and to pass the buck. Do your jobs, that's what you were sent here for."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, just to correct the record, I don't believe that at any time I questioned the integrity of the appointees to the Task Force. I simply suggest that the Governor created this Task Force with great fanfare. In my judgment it was a political stunt similar to the descriptions offered by Representative Ryan. It's regrettable for the Governor that this has been uncovered, but I think that all of us in the General Assembly ought to band together and uncover the work product of the Task Force and make it available, that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because I participated in this yesterday I would like to add my remark to the Minority Leader's remark today. I have talked with Gene Barnes, who's the Chairman of Appropriations II Committee, and we intend on this day to write a letter to each member of that Cost Control Task Force pleading and urging that they make this report available to us. We hope that...out of the members of that Task Force that some of them will...looking at that letter and realizing the importance of it, make that information available to us. If that doesn't work, I feel strongly that the Committee ought to use the subpoena processes available to it because I think that...well, I happen to believe that if the reports are true that some



have told me that up to 300 million dollars could be saved that we ought to have that information available to us. Now if it doesn't come to us before we can use it for the appropriations process, then I think that all of us ought to be suspicious of the nature of that report in the Task Force, because what is its purpose? Its purpose is either to look at cost control and savings in government and do it now when we can save money for the taxpayers or its only other purpose could be that it is strictly a political gimmick. After we go home and then before the election the Governor with his prestigious Task Force can say, look what we can save. That's all it will be if it comes late and I think that you won't fool any of the voters by it. So I think if they really mean it, they're gonna come down now...the showdown is now...we're in Session. The Governor wanted to debate Bakalis on the appropriations process and what can be saved, well, here we are...we're here, bring your Task Force. I've heard the other side of the aisle say time and time again, you don't get a free lunch, you don't get something for nothing. Representative Ryan has told us that these are all free, the people are donating their services, well maybe it all is political. It all is free. We won't get something for nothing, but at least we're here. Produce the document, bring it to us and we'll look at it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, not to prolong this, but some six years ago the candidate for governor then did indicate that the amount of waste in the budget was 500 million dollars and he did go around the state and tell the people of the state that. Unfortunately, they did buy that and the next four years under that administration we never found that 500 million dollar surplus in the budget. In fact, what we ended up doing is blowing a 500 dollars...500 million dollars we had in the bank. I just say that to remind the



previous Speaker that the initial figure was 500 million dollars in 1972 and at least now we're talking about 45 million dollars in waste. So, it's 10% of what it was six years ago...so maybe we can console ourselves that at least there's a little bit less of waste in government that we've got to attack as we go through the very deliberate appropriations process and finding where this extra 45 million dollars is in these various budgets. And as we go through them, we also know that we can't come up with 45 hundred (sic) million dollars by cutting 18 hundred dollars out of the State Historical Library or cutting 15 hundred dollars out of another budget or 39 thousand dollars out of another budget because you need a lot of 18 hundreds to make up 45 million. So, if you're going to end up doing any kind of cutting, there is just a couple places that if you know the budget you can do that cut. And that cut comes out of the areas of human services. You've gotta cut out of the universities and education if you want to give to the elementary and secondary schools or you've got to cut it out of medical services to the indigent, people on welfare or you've gotta cut it out of welfare itself. Those are the only places that the money exists, including Mental Health. So, if that is in fact the will of the Assembly, that's a problem that we're going to have to struggle with as we go through. And we've kind of talked about this and we remember some time back when the previous administration was in and those of us on this side of the aisle attempted to embarrass the then Governor Walker by piling on all kinds of money on his budget. And we were going to embarrass him by having him...forcing him to veto all kinds of appropriations so that all kinds of people around the state were going to be very angry and perturbed at what he did. And we piled on and we sent him an appropriation with some 5 or 6 hundred million dollars over what he sent us and in one fell swoop he vetoed out some 500 million



dollars to the cheers of the people from one end of the border to the other. So, we're not that concerned whether you want to take the money out because it's gonna get back in because you and I all know you need it for them Human Services. And we're not that concerned that you're going to put it on because you know, being very practical and very political, that you can't add to the budget because the people are just not going to end up going for that, we gone through that a couple of times. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan had been recognized for the purpose of point of personal privilege and I think we've been digressing from that order of business. I don't quite understand what order we're in now when we can all get up and give lectures. So I...Representative Ryan, do you have a..."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would request a Republican conference now if that's the desire of the Chair, if it's all right with the Chair, in room 118 and I would certainly encourage all the Republicans to be there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, could you tell us how many Bills have been passed in three and one half hours."

Speaker Redmond: "3. Representative Ryan has requested a Republican caucus immediately. I would suggest that the Members not going to the caucus avail themselves of this opportunity to get their lunch, we'll be back on the floor...how long is it going to take you, Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "About 35 or 40 minutes, I guess."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll be back on the floor at 2:15."

Madison: "For the benefit of those Members of the House of Representatives that's on the floor now, we're fortunate to have with us today 84 sixth graders from Hefferan School in Chicago with their supervisors, Mr. Packer,



Miss Pruitt, Miss Henton, 'Mr. Featish' and Mr. Parker. And they are in the gallery, to my right. They are represented in the 21st District by Representative Shumpert, Representative Malloy and myself. Welcome, Hefferan School."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members be in their seats. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 17, 1978, reported the same back with following recommendations: do pass House Bill 3270 and 3375."

Speaker Redmond: "The order of Third Reading appears House Bill 2754. Representative Porter is recognized."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to return the Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have House Bill 2754 be returned to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment?" Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I object, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "An objection has been raised, you'll have to wait a minute. Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3392, Kozubowski. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity with awards made by the Court of Claims. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3393, Terzich. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain retirement systems. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bills..."

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

Schlickman: "Representative Walsh questions the quorum."

Speaker Redmond: "Speak for yourself, John Alden."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 825, McGrew. A Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of independent colleges and universities by the Board of



Higher Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1514, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Public Employees Pension Laws Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1608, Younge. A Bill for an Act directing the Department of Administrative Services to sell the Illinois Youth Center Property in Geneva, Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1760, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to a comprehensive County Hospitals Governing Commissions. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a point of information. I see House Calendar Supplemental #1 list House Bill 3375 and it's my understanding that Bill and House Bill 3270 were both reported yesterday by the Appropriations II Committee. I was wondering why 3270 was not also on that Supplemental Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "The only thing I can say is that the people interested in 3375 told us that this was an emergency and that they wouldn't be able to pay the salary of the Governor if we didn't pass it and the Clerk, in his usual accommodating fashion, arranged to have a Supplemental Calendar published. Now..."

Stuffle: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "If there was a similiar Bill that had to do with Legislators salary we would have done the same thing. Representative Porter, do you seek recognition?"

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, we've now...think the objection that was previously registered..."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the Bill?"

Porter: "That's 2754. I wonder if Mr. Barnes..."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 2754 on the Order of Third Reading, Gentleman asks leave to return it to the order of Second Reading. Is there any objections? Hearing none..."





objections it will be returned to the order of Second Reading. Is there an Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Porter, amends House Bill 2754 on page 2, by deleting line 2 through 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "The Amendment would simply take out of the Bill which deals with the power of the Pollution Control Board with respect to noise emission standards. It would take out spectator sporting events and contests, sports car rallies and leave in only that portion dealing with shooting, skeet and trap clubs. So those clubs existing in operation prior to January 1, 1975, would if the Amendment were adopted and the Bill subsequently passed, be freed from noise emission standards of the E.P.A. And I would move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, by your new Amendment, you're exterminating the rights of the car races and so forth and the only thing you can leave in is the skeet shooting, is that right?"

Porter: "That's right. It would only apply to, Representative Geo-Karis, to gun clubs."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2626, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to a...leave of the House to return House Bill 2626 from Third Reading to the order of Second



Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections...have you read it on the order of Third Reading, Mr. Clerk? 26...60. Representative Ebbesen has moved that the reading of the title of the Bill by the Clerk be dispensed with, is that correct?"

Ebbesen: "That is correct."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand it's a constitutional requirement and we can't excuse the reading of the title of the Bill."

Ebbesen: "The word is ophthalmic, Jack, but can't we...can't Mr. Speaker move it back to Second?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ophthalmic. Does he have leave to return it to the order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, it will be returned. Any Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Ebbesen, amends House Bill 2626 on page 2, line 23 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen, what is the status of Amendment #3?"

Ebbesen: "Well, in order to adopt Amendment #4 I would move that we table Amendment #3 and we're gonna delete two words out of Amendment #3 in Amendment #4 so...in order to...first of all, table Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved to table Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried, the Amendment #3 is tabled."

Ebbesen: "Amendment #4, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, merely is exactly the same as Amendment #3 only it deletes two words, private and prepaid as it relates to vision care programs and this is in keeping with the request by the AFLCIO and others that were interested as far as some concern and it brings the Bill then up to date and meets with their sanction, and I'd move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's ...Representative Darrow."



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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "On this you have, apply to group vision care program.

Are you again discussing..considering senior citizen groups and things of this nature as a group or...if so, wouldn't it be better to have a classification of individuals?"

Ebbesen: "Well...no. This Amendment, as it now reads, Amendment #4...the thinking of the legal counsel and the people involved have been that when you talk about a group we had the word private, which private would restrict itself to perhaps unions or an organized private group who have negotiated, perhaps as a fringe benefit, a vision care program. As it now reads that a group vision care program...you can call anything a vision care program, in a group of people since it could be public, could include people...senior citizens or what have you."

Darrow: "Whether they're organized as a group..."

Ebbesen: "Oh, yes, absolutely, surely."

Darrow: "Individuals."

Ebbesen: "That's right."

Darrow: "That would be more of a classification rather than a group, wouldn't it?"

Ebbesen: "I beg your pardon."

Darrow: "That would be a classification rather than a group."

Ebbesen: "Well...if you have a problem with that then we discuss that further but this Amendment...I'd move for it's adoption based on the fact that this is the language that has been agreed to between myself, as the Sponsor of the Bill and the unions. And I move..."

Darrow: "Well, I have people that aren't members of the unions and I would just like to make sure that they're covered."

Ebbesen: "I think you're talking about a different subject, entirely, Representative Darrow."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I've had some discussions with Representative Ebbesen about this on the floor some time ago and I'd like to address my remarks not only to Members in general but also to Representative Darrow who just...raises the question. Representative Ebbesen indicated to me that this would not necessarily be a negotiated care plan. In other words, there's no necessity for a contractual relationship between the members of the group and the provider. Now, if I'm in error, I wish Representative Ebbesen would correct me at this point but that was my understanding based on a private conversation. Am I in error, Representative?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "...Representative you are correct and this discussion has taken place between Illinois Optometric Association people, the legal counsel and myself and all those involved. You are correct."

Bowman: "I would support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye, 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, with us in the gallery at this time are some students from the Jasper Township School of Wayne County. George Leonard is the Superintendent of the School. They're from the 54th Legislative District represented by Representatives Robert Walsh, Rich Brummer and Roscoe Cunningham."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman, are you seeking recognition?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to return House Bill 2661 to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of a



further Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? No objection, leave is granted. It will be returned...2661. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, another announcement. There are 90 students from Franklin Middle School in Aurora and they're with their teacher, Mr. Albright. They're represented by Representatives Murphy, Schoeberlein and Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Which one is Murphy? Representative Chapman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Chapman, amends House Bill 2661 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is an Amendment which was suggested and developed by the Department of Labor and I accept their Amendment. It relates to assignment of claims and removes this language in the Bill. I move for adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Darrow: "Representative Chapman, why are you taking this remedy out of here?"

Chapman: "This is a Bill that we wrote up at the end of Session last week and Representative Leinenweber had some concern about the Bill and I am attempting, with the help of the Department of Labor, to respond to those of...Representative Leinenweber's concerns that I could. This simply relates to the bond which is a minimum of 50 thousand and a maximum of 100 thousand and certain limited cases and does not relate to any other kinds of action taken."

Darrow: "But this is an existing remedy that it...the individual won't have after you remove it. If you're aware of that and if that's what you want, I'll have to object to it."



Chapman: "Well, I was trying to make Mr. Leinenweber happy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if she could explain the Amendment, I can't seem to find my copy."

Chapman: "It was placed on your desk yesterday and if you have your Bill in front of you, Mr. Leinenweber, on page 1, line 26, it deletes the language 'all such claims shall be assignable, and the assignee thereof shall be entitled to the same remedies upon the bonds of such license or otherwise, as the personal aggrieved would have been entitled to if such claim had not been assigned. Any claim or claims so assigned may be enforced in the name of such assignee. The reason I felt that this was an acceptable Amendment is that it appears on checking out the practical situation that this is a remedy that is not being utilized. And that really probably...if I didn't want to to this with this Bill, but these bonds do not serve a useful purpose."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? This question is on the Lady's...Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Could Representative Leinenweber explain his objection to having this language in there?"

Leinenweber: "Yes. The way the Bill read before Amendment #3 and believe me the Amendment 3 in my opinion doesn't go quite far enough, but would have presented the only instance that I'm aware of in Illinois law where a personal injury claim would be assignable, I think that would be an extremely poor practice."

Darrow: "Is this a contract claim or a personal injury claim?"

Leinenweber: "Well, that's some of the problems with the Bill. It would be addressed presumably on Third Reading but if you read the Bill you will find that what in fact is being created by House Bill 2661 is a cause of action for any types of claims. In fact, it's sounding in negligence, which would mean tort claims against the particular employment



agency. Since it speaks in negligence, then we can presume we're talking about tort claims."

Darrow: "Well, we have subrogation and that's an assignment. How is that different from this?"

Leinenweber: "You don't have assignment of personal injury causes of action, you do have forms of assignment of other causes of action I don't dispute that but this Bill, in fact, I believe if you'll talk to Mrs. Chapman, the reason why she introduced the Bill is because of an instance where a domestic employee was referred by an agency to some homeowner and the employee injured the homeowner and apparently the employee...the home owner was somewhere in a quandary as to what rights, if any, the homeowner had against the employment agency and the case and Mrs. Chapman will tell you about it involves substantial expenditures as I understand it for hospital bills and the like."

Darrow: "I have nothing else, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 2661. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On the Supplemental Calendar...First Supplemental Calendar appears House Bill, Second Reading, First Legislative Day, House Bill 3375 to which Representative Winchester is recognized."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave to suspend the appropriate Rule in order that House Bill 3375 can be moved from the order of First Reading, First Legislative Day to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. This is an emergency supplemental appropriation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I join Representative Winchester in this motion. It is an emergency. The people in Title VI of CETA will not get paydays



the next pay period if this Bill doesn't move immediately so I urge adoption of the motion by Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection, he's asked unanimous consent? Is there any object...Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen objects. Do you wanna put the motion? Representative...Representative Winchester moves the rule be suspended to permit House Bill 3375, appearing on Second Reading, First Legislative Day to be moved to the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye' and 7 'no' and the motion carries. House Bill 3375 will appear on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: House Bill 3375. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."





Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. In the gallery we have Jeoff and Joan Parmenter, Brian and Maurino Willey and daughter Leslie, from Grimsby and Cleethorpes, England. And they represent there the Lions Club from that town and their escorts and hosts are Ted and Lil Smith of the Fox Lake Lions Club. They're represented by Representatives Reed, Deuster and Pierce. Would you welcome them please?"

Speaker Redmond: "970."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1970. A Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1973."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1973. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, a lot of people have been asking when the Equal Rights Amendment was going to be voted on and I wish I could oblige them. I have to refer them to Representative Greiman on this matter. But what I can offer to you today is House Bill 1973. House Bill 1973 relates to discrimination in our schools. You will recall that we passed legislation in 1975, good legislation, that implemented our new state Constitution by prohibiting sex discrimination in our schools. So at the present time, the School Code prohibits discrimination in employment, discribts (sic)... prohibits discrimination where students are concerned in access to programs and facilities including athletic programs. Now, three years later though, I've been working with some individuals, a very young, capable attorney helping me with this who is very capable in the area of school law and we have a Bill that is not earthshaking. I cannot promise that this is an earthshaking Bill, but we have attempted to clarify that language to see that one Section conforms to another Section and to make certain additions. For example, the law we passed in '75 prohibited discrimination in employment as related to certificated employees. It was our feeling that surely the General Assembly intended and the Constitution intended that non-certificated employees be covered as well. So we have made this



addition in the Bill and a number of additions of this nature. I would urge you to support this Bill. I believe it improves the law in regard to sex discrimination in the schools."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the last twenty-four hours I've heard quite a few political speeches. Now, I'm going to take the personal privilege of making a political speech of my own at this time. I find that around 2:30 or 3:00 every afternoon it's rather difficult to pass a Bill in this House because there aren't enough Members here and if this continues, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate and sympathize with your problem that you have with the Minority Leader and the Majority Leader in trying to keep the Members here until we can get some of our Bills passed. I'm gonna persist that the Roll Call be taken at 5:00 at night instead of 8:00 in the morning and those that don't answer don't get their per diem for that day."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Would this Bill prohibit a school district from restricting applications for the coaching position of the male football teams to males only?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Schlickman, I believe it's very likely that the present law, the law that is on the books right now, does that. I do not believe that House Bill 1973 in any way would speak to that particular issue."

Schlickman: "Would this Bill present a school district from segregating classes on basis of sex when it comes to sex education?"

Chapman: "This Bill does not speak to that subject either and what the law would be will be dependent on what is in the



present statutes."

Schlickman: "Well, then what does this Bill do that present law doesn't do?"

Chapman: "All right, I will be very happy to go through it and talk about every single minor change if that is your desire. I think there were good analysis done by both Republican and Democratic staff. I give one example, that is of covering noncertificated employees. At the present time even though the Constitution prohibits discrimination by schools where sex is concerned, the law that we passed only relates to certificated employees. We include non-certificated employees now. On page 1 of the Act where we further amend the Section in regard to certificated employees we add to salaries determining terms and conditions of employment. This conforms this particular section of the law with other sections of the school code. On page 2 there is a further clarification. Where the present law says 'no student shall be excluded from or segregated in any such school' we add 'or subjected to discrimination in any program or activity'. It's a clarifying kind of language. On page 3 we make the change I've already indicated which I think is one of the few substantive changes in the Bill and that is it adds the noncertificated employees. This is the kind of change that is made and I'd be very happy to answer any specific kinds of questions you might have relating to the Bill."

Schlickman: "I have another question."

Chapman: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "I'm advised that in Section 22-19..."

Chapman: "O.K., what page is that on...O.K., page 5."

Schlickman: "There's a change in the petition requirement.

Now what petition are we speaking of here?"

Chapman: "O.K. A few years we passed legislation which gave to an individual with at least fifty...a petition filed by fifty residents and filed with the State Superintendent



the right to...investigation by the Superintendent of a claim relating to, and let's see if I can't just the right language here, color, race, nationality, religion or religious affiliation. Now we added sex to that. However, since in the number of years that have been passed there's only one complaint that has ever been filed. It really didn't make much sense to keep this figure at fifty because we know that anybody can go out and get fifty people to sign anything. So we removed the fifty so that one individual could file a complaint rather than requiring fifty residents or 10% of the residents, whichever is lesser, because we thought it gave us better language. Any individual can go out and get fifty names on any complaint that he would desire to file."

Schlickman: "Well, would you feel the same way regarding the election code when it comes to nomination petitions?"

Chapman: "Well, I believe that anybody who wants to get fifty names can get them and you may be right, Gene, it requires a certain amount of minimum effort."

Schlickman: "Don't you think by reducing from fifty to one that there's gonna be a sharp increase in the number of claims, many of which will be unfounded simply because they represent the feelings of one person?"

Chapman: "Gene, if this is a problem to you and it's the only thing that keeps you from supporting this Bill, I'll amend it over in the Senate and put the fifty back in because I really don't think it matters that much. I just do not regard this as an important piece of legislation. This was just one paragraph with what I regarded as clean up so if it troubles you and it's the only thing that keeps you from providing a green light for this Bill, I'll be more than happy to remove it."

Schlickman: "Well from what you've indicated this is the only substantive matter in the Bill."

Chapman: "Oh, no, no, no. There's...it's clarification and I



think there's...this is something that can be very helpful and important inclusion of noncertificated employees... addition of sex. My interest in this matter was the addition of sex. Right now you may file a complaint but only in regard to color, race, nationality, religion or religious affiliation. If you ask me to remove the word sex I would say...I believe this is kinder to the intent of this Bill. But if your concern is simply with these fifty names I'd be very happy to oblige you in order to get your support."

Schlickman: "Well, let me ask you this, do you know from your own experience of any reports that have been given to you that there has been any discrimination on account of sex in respect to noncertified personnel?"

Chapman: "I feel sure there has been considerable discrimination."

Schlickman: "Do you know from your own personal experience or have you received any report of any documented cases of sex discrimination involving noncertified personnel?"

Chapman: "Yes, there's just no question about it. This occurs in this area as it does in every area of employment."

Schlickman: "Can you cite a district where there has been discrimination on account of sex with respect to noncertified personnel?"

Chapman: "O.K. I would have to go to the files of the Fair Employment Practices Commission and I could do that for you...not today, I have to vote on this Bill today. But this is something that is available in the files of the E.O.C. and the F.E.P.C. and I believe that it would be very easy to supply you with information in this regard. School custodians is the matter that comes first to mind, Gene, and I would think your own experience would be helpful."

Schlickman: "Well, it just seems to me from what you've said, and from what I know, that the only substantive matter in this Bill, the only change in law would be reduction in



the number of people required to file a complaint from fifty to one and on that basis I would feel more comfortable if you did bring this back to Second Reading here in the House and amend that change out and if you did that I could vote for the Bill."

Chapman: "Gene, you mean you don't take me...accept my word that I would take it out in the Senate?"

Schlickman: "It's not a matter of your integrity, it's a matter of the practice of this House that I'm trying to protect. It's our integrity not yours."

Chapman: "Thank you."

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

Katz: "Ms. Chapman, I continue to get letters from indignant parents who say that their daughters are discriminated against in regard to athletic programs. Will this Bill do anything about treating equally girls and boys, not competing together, but just having adequate opportunity to participate in high school athletics and school athletics?"

Chapman: "Mr. Katz, at the present time, 27-1 of the school code makes it very clear that such kind of discrimination is illegal under Illinois law. So I would like to tell you that this will rectify those situations. I think in general that the Bill improves the entire picture in terms of sex discrimination but specifically in regard to athletics, I could not promise you that this would solve your constituents problems. Very clearly the law right now, which states that no student shall be denied equal access to physical education and interscholastic or comparable programs supported from school district funds. So a school district that does that is not operating in conformity with the law. That's what the present law provides."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."



Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question? Representative Chapman, I have a similar concern as Representative Katz except it comes in a different direction. I have a ten year old son who is very concerned with my voting record over here on these matters. He is very concerned that he'll have to play tackle football with girls in high school. Now, he's somewhat of a male chauvinist..."

Speaker Redmond: "Which way is his concern, pro or con?"

Edgar: "Pardon me."

Speaker Redmond: "Is his concern pro or con?"

Edgar: "He's not for it yet, he's not that old. But seriously though, do...you kind of got into that with Representative Katz's question...but is there anything in this Bill that would kind of clarify that situation? Now I'm in favor of equal access to women in athletics, but you get into the problems like in regard to high school football, or is that address someplace else in the current statute?"

Chapman: "That is not addressed in my Bill. You will not find that your son will be more likely or less likely to play tackle football with his female classmates with 1973 or without it. The present law makes it clear that it is not possible under the law to discriminate in access to physical education and interscholastic athletic programs. So your son had possibly better ready himself for the possibility that he is going to be involved with girls in some of these sports at least."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Keats."

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

Chapman: "I'm doing so much yielding today, Mr. Sponsor, this doesn't fit in with my personality."

Keats: "I thank you very much for your courtesy though. I want to ask, in the original Bill on page 3, lines 5-10 which is really around line 90, that was original Bill, the interpretation was that while the state could not discriminate,



a labor organization could, in a contract binding with the school board. Under your present Bill, which I know you deleted the entire Bill and then inserted a new Bill after the enacting clause, did you then remove the provision where the state and private individuals could not discriminate but a labor organization could discriminate? Is this different in the new...I can't find it, I've been looking hard."

Chapman: "The reason is, Mr. Keats, that as you point out we deleted the entire Bill and the Bill is Amendment #1 and there is no relationship between Amendment #1 and the original House Bill 1973. So we don't even mention the word labor organization in the Bill."

Keats: "I sorta assumed that was part of the reason I thought I could perhaps not find it, but I just wanted to be sure that somewhere hidden in all this mass of legal language there was not something that I was missing. Thank you very much for clarifying it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson, the Gentleman from Champaign."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

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

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, this isn't an earth-shaking kind of Bill at all, but it's a good Bill. It's a clarifying...a Bill which improves, which strengthens. I ask for your support."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd just briefly like to explain my vote. What Representative Chapman did not mention is a provision that lists temporary physical incapacities as illness, therefore, all the teachers who are





pregnant would now be covered by sick leave. Also, in reading this Bill carefully I can't see where it does not allow reasonable separation of the sexes in, say, such courses as sex education and sports events. I think we're going to end up having all our little boys and girls together in all sorts of sex education. Therefore, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who...Representative Chapman. to explain her vote. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "By way of explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment... This Bill does not treat on athletics, either putting children together or separating children. It has nothing to do with athletics. This is stated on page 177 in our school code and I am not changing, in making this proposal, the law in relation to athletic participation at all. I hope that would not affect anybody's vote on this Bill. The law in regard to equal access to physical education and interscholastic programs remains the same, either with House Bill 1973 or without it. In regard to the point that was made regarding temporary disability, this is a statement that is already in the school code. If you will look at Section 10-22.4, and I'll find that for you if I may, and read it, you will see that the statement on temporary disability in House Bill 1973..."

Speaker Redmond: "You only have two minutes, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Simply provides for conformity with the law that is presently stated in 10-22.4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien. Dan O'Brien. Have all voted who wish? Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "As the Minority Spokesman of the Human Resources Committee, I speak in favor of this Bill. We had it debated fairly in the Committee and it was voted out and as the Sponsor states, most of the things that the opponents



are challenging are not covered in this Bill. They have the wrong Bill. This Bill merely gives women the same rights as men to be employed and under the same conditions as men are employed. I think those of us who really believe in equality for everyone should put a green light up on that board."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'aye' and 48 'no'. A verification has been requested. Poll the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman has requested a poll of the absentees. There's a very ugly rumor going around that we're not going to be in Session tomorrow, but we are."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Antonovych, Beatty, Don Brummet, Dawson, Deavers, Deuster, Domico, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Farley, Friedrich, Friedrich votes 'no', Laurino, Lechowicz, Madigan, McBroom, McMaster, Ryan, Schisler, Stanley, Stearney, C.M. Stiehl, and Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Verify the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, E.M. Barnes, Jane Barnes, Birchler, Bowman, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Byers, Caldwell, Catania, Chapman, Christensen..."

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

Harris: "Verification on the Roll, I have to leave, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified now? There's no objections."

Clerk O'Brien: "Daniels, Corneal Davis, DiPrima, Doyle, Dyer, Edgar, Epton, Ewell, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Hoffman, Holewinski, J.M. Houlihan, Hoxsey, Huff, Jaffe, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kucharski, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Lynn Martin, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain,



McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Robinson, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Skinner, Steczo, Taylor, Telcser, Van Duynes, Vinson, VonBoeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions on the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Representative Birchler...I see him."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the question, Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "I asked for Representative Birchler but he's here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt. Is Representative Brandt in the Chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Schlickman: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Bradley in the Chambers?"

Schlickman: "Never mind, Mr. Speaker, he's voting present."

Speaker Redmond: "There he is, he's back there."

Schlickman: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "There he is."

Schlickman: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell is not in his chair so remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Garmisa. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "You removed Representative Ewell?"

Speaker Redmond: "I did."

Schlickman: "O.K. Representative Giglio."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio, is he in his seat?"



How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Hart."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart. How is he recorded."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove it."

Schlickman: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Emil Jones is way in the back."

Schlickman: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson is behind you."

Schlickman: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Who."

Schlickman: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski, is he here? Take him off the Roll Call."

Schlickman: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz is here."

Schlickman: "Representative Mann."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz, is he here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, is he here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative McGrew."



Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Mulcahey."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove it."

Schlickman: "Representative Murphy."

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

Schlickman: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien. He's this side of Ireland. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Sharp."

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

Schlickman: "Representative Shumpert."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in his seat...at least he's back there."

Schlickman: "Representative VonBoeckman. I see him, sorry. Representative R.V. Walsh."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's that?"

Schlickman: "Representative R.V. Walsh."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robert Walsh, is he here? Ya, he's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Williams."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey is back. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Beatty, for what purpose do you rise? He desires to be recorded as voting 'aye'. What is the tally, Mr. Clerk? 81 'ayes' and 49 'nays'. Representative Chapman."



Chapman: "It looks like I better ask for a postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. You'll be interested to know that we passed three Bills and put four on Postponed Consideration. 2073, Representative Bowman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2073. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes, Sheltered Care Homes and Homes for the Aged Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope everyone has a copy of Amendment #1 to this Bill because Amendment #1 is the Bill. It deletes everything after the enacting clause and provides an alternative to legislation which was introduced last spring and considered by the House Human Resources Committee. House Bill 625 required that the Department of Public Health prepare and maintain and evaluate the files of nursing homes that would constitute a consumer guide to assist in the placing of elderly and disabled inn quality facilities. House Bill 625 passed the House easily but failed in the Senate on Third Reading. This Amendment is based on that, based on the philosophy contained in that Bill. But I believe it's more restrictive and in fact, cleans up some of the objections...the response to some of the objections that were raised in the Senate. It would not, in fact, provide an evaluative file in its entirety, but it would cause exposure of those nursing homes that are chronic violators of the laws and regulations. Particularly, is those regulations involved with the safety and quality of care. We received testimonies from the Department of Public Health that indicated that there are many homes that are repeat offenders and are in need of closure or more severe sanction by the State. The department, however, has been hamstrung in stability to effectively enforce its licensure law. There have been long delays and legal complications which have prevented



expeditious processing of cases where major violations have occurred and a department has been frustrated in its ability to blow the whistle on some of the worst offenders. It may be months or a matter of years, in fact, before a case is finally resolved. During the pendency of a review a facility may remain open, continue to accept new admissions and receive state and federal financing from Medicaid and Medicare. The department's ability to close facilities is limited to the situations where the life or health of a resident is in eminent danger, which is not unusual in some cases. However, the Department of Public Health asserts that minimally it ought to have the authority to make routine findings and conclusions more available to the public and publicly announce the results of its evaluation of those facilities where there is intent to deny or revoke a license, there is sufficient grounds to initiate an official inquiry and investigation. The general public should know the conditions and circumstances of this situation about the suspected problems in a particular facility. Most of the information relating to the department's licensure inspections is accessible by the public but few people are familiar with the procedures required to review these files or obtain needed data about a particular home. The Amendment contends that the department provide more information about the administrative procedures and contemplative sanctions with respect to those facilities that are suspected of being substandard. The general public ought to be made more aware of the facts and the nature of the charges so that a more reform choice about placements can be made. There are two provisions of the Amendment that I want to call your attention to and these are basically the only provisions contained in the Amendment. One, is that it requires that any home that has been notified by the department that action is pending to deny, to refuse to renew or to revoke



a license, must post a copy of this official notice adjacent to it's license. The home may, incidentally, post additional commentary or other remarks of their own adjacent to the notice. Secondly, it requires the Department of Public Health to prepare and publish a report quarterly which would be delivered to the Governor and to the Members of the General Assembly on chronic violators. Now, let's see how many homes we are talking about here? In testimony that we received by the Department of Public Health...we are talking about approximately a dozen or so homes throughout the State of Illinois that are annually in danger of losing their license but...but procedures are underway to revoke the license out of 900 homes. Now in my opinion, this legislation does not pose any jeopardy to the good homes or indeed even to the marginal homes, it is only those homes that have been shown to be chronic violators of state and federal regulations that this Bill addresses itself to. I ask your favorable consideration."

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

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield for a couple questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Simms: "Representative Bowman, what is your determination of chronic violators?"

Bowman: "Well, Representative Simms, it's not my determination ..."

Simms: "What if the Bill..."

Bowman: "...it's the department's interpretation of chronic violators. The department conducts regular reviews of all nursing homes and has state and federal standards which they are obliged to report upon and they are the ones that cite the homes for failure to comply. Now let me just tell you one thing. If the home is found not to be in compliance there are several steps to go through ...that they go through before they actually have a





hearing on the problem. They first of all sit down and have informal discussions, they ask the home to produce a plan for correction and so forth. It's only after, Representative Simms, only after they have requested of the home a plan to correct the violations and the home has either refused to comply or present some inadequate plan that they even take the next step of negotiating...pending a formal hearing. It's only when the formal hearing is contemplated that the notice is sent out that has to be posted."

Simms: "If I might comment on the Bill, I don't have any serious objections to the Bill. I think of all the areas that probably address themselves that there are problems ...I've served on a Legislative Investigating Commission since being elected to the Legislature. We would be having hearings all over the State of Illinois, we had them in Rockford, we've had in Waukegan, up in that area dealing with nursing homes and the problem really isn't so much perhaps some of the chronic nursing homes that are violators...it's the Department of Public Health that really sits on their hands and refuses to do something about it. We had one case in which some nursing home in Rockford was allowed to operate for a period of ten years without a license. So if there's any negligence involved, it's in the action of the Department of Public Health. and all the past administrations and yes, even perhaps the current administration, was the Department of Public Health enforcing the laws that are on the book and getting a great big bureaucracy to move and do something. I have no objection to the Bill, I just think that perhaps what the legislation might do is give the Department of Public Health an excuse not to follow through with the statutes. Perhaps this is an answer to it. But the department has been negligent, I just hope this isn't a vehicle which they can hide behind and not do their job."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he will."

Brummer: "It's been very noisy back here, I could not hear some of your explanation, I apologize. Does this require that any time a complaint is filed that is being...upon which the department is going to hold a hearing that a notice of that hearing be publicly posted in the nursing home itself."

Bowman: "No. Suppose someone did file a complaint against the department, the department may...it would investigate that complaint and so forth and if it found the home not to be in compliance with state or federal regulations, then as I indicated to Representative Simms in an earlier question, they would then ask the home to prepare a plan of showing how they would come to compliance. It's only after all of these steps have taken place that they would then go to a formal hearing. Then and only then would the notice be sent, which would then be required to be posted. It would not...and then only if the license was in jeopardy, only if the license was in jeopardy."

Brummer: "Representative Bowman, as I read...Amendment #1 has been adopted."

Bowman: "Yes, that's the Bill."

Brummer: "O.K. On the first page on line 11 and 12, it says the department may, upon its own motion and shall upon the varied complaint in writing of any person setting forth certain facts, to hold a hearing. Am I wrong?"

Bowman: "Well, right. Well, first of all, let me call your attention to the language on page 1 is the existing statute.

Brummer: "O.K., I understand that. That is the existing language and it requires that the department hold a hearing whenever there is a complaint filed in writing..."

Bowman: "No...that's..."

Brummer: "...and the language is 'shall,' it is not 'may.' It is



'may' to regard with the department's own initiative."

Bowman: "No, now wait a minute, wait a minute, you didn't read the whole thing. It says before denying application or refusing to renew or revoke a license you must hold a hearing. It's only before they take that final step that they have to hold a hearing, not after they give them the initial complaints from somebody. That is not true. I think you are in error, Sir."

Brummer: "The language clearly says that department shall upon verified complaint in writing of any person setting forth certain facts, which if proved, would constitute grounds for the denial of an application or a renewal. Then, in the language that you're proposing to add on Page 2 says that a copy of that notice has to be posted in a prominent place."

Bowman: "No, no. Let's read the whole thing for everybody's benefit. It says they shall investigate, that's what they shall do. They shall investigate. They shall...it does not oblige them at that point to hold the hearing. But they shall follow up on the verified complaint and...to see whether the complaint was accurate. So they have to conduct an investigation under the statute, they can't ignore the complaint. But they need not, at that point, hold the hearing."

Brummer: "O.K., in any case, the language is..."

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

Martin, L: "I'll wait until he finishes but then I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Representative Brummer, proceed."

Brummer: "In any case, the Bill does require that upon the hearing of a denial or reapplication that that notice be posted. Is that correct?"

Bowman: "If the license is in jeopardy. Only when they're considering the failure to renew or the revocation of the license..."



Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the question?"

Bowman: "That's exactly right, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill? Ladies and Gentlemen, I think a basic concept of American justice and our American way of life is that we are all innocent until proven guilty. I think that applies with regard to civil matters, as well as criminal matters ...to a greater degree certainly in the criminal area than in the civil area. Nevertheless, it is plaintiff's burden of proof, to prove his case. We all know that it is very damaging when an allegation is made, regardless of the substance of that allegation, regardless of the validity of that allegation, we in the political arena, particularly, I think understand that. I think it is eminently unfair that it is required that a copy of a notice that a hearing is going to be held concerning the suspension or nonrevocation of license that that notice be posted prior to any findings that the nursing home, itself, is in violation of any rules of the State of Illinois or federal requirements. That would be extremely damaging. It is contrary to our total concept of American justice and I would urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition of this Bill. It's a ridiculous Bill, it's a foolish concept. It will open up the State of Illinois to a multitude of law suits. No other state in the union presently has a Bill of this nature and in addition to that, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the department isn't even in favor of the Bill. Maybe we ought to begin to list which jewelers in the State of Illinois are good, better and worse. Maybe we ought to begin to list which farmers are good, better and worse. Maybe we ought to begin to list every field, whether or not they be an attorneys, etc. as to whether or not they are good or better. This is a ridiculous concept and I ask every Member to vote it down."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Winchester: "I understand that according to the fiscal note it is gonna take about \$30,000 for Department of Public Aid to administer your piece of legislation."

Bowman: "Wait, wait, you're on the wrong Bill because this is not administered by the Department of Public Aid, and it's not \$30,000, you're on the wrong note."

Winchester: "All right, then I move the previous question, Mr Speaker."

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

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that everyone here has been looking at the wrong Bill. I mean, according to Representative Winchester and Representative O'Brien. This is a fine Bill. This is a consumer Bill. It gives consumers information about precisely the nature of the conditions in the homes. It is...please, don't distract me, I'm in the middle of a very important thought. This is a consumers Bill, it is a senior citizen Bill. And, incidentally, there's been a lot of misinformation floating around on the floor. While the Department of Public Health did register as a proponent of this Bill at the hearings, they are in favor of the Bill. I spoke just this morning to the people at the Department of Aging and the Council on Aging, they are in favor of this Bill. What we are talking about here, in response to Representative Brummer's question...item about the American system of justice, look here, all the background investigation on these homes is basically obscure from the public view, just like grand jury proceedings. What this really amounts to is an indictment, a Bill of particulars and you wouldn't expect a trial to proceed without such an indictment. This



is a senior citizen Bill, this is a good consumer Bill, it will not affect the homes that are in compliance with state and federal regulations. We're talking about a dozen homes or so throughout the state. And finally, in response to Representative Simm's point, about the department ducking it's responsibility. Look, the department is going to be under a mandate to report to the General Assembly and the Governor on a regular basis, so if they're ducking their responsibility, we'll catch them. And I ask an Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Dawson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the rear of the gallery, from the 30th Legislative District we have the Henry Clay Grammer School, which is represented by Representative Phil Collins, Frank Giglio and myself."

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

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish the Members of the House would take a close look at this Bill and take the subject matter seriously because it is indeed a very serious subject matter. This Bill was part of a recommendation of a House Committee some two years ago and we're still really fiddling around with the concept. It does nothing except tell people who are either about to put themselves or one of their loved ones in one of these homes...it gives them some minimal information about how that home is run and what to expect. I think that if you were going to put your elderly mother or father in a nursing home you'd like to know if there are any violations pending, if the safety of that institution was in question, if the department had a complaint on file so that you could look a little further. I think what we're doing is...by passing this



legislation is allowing for that information, allowing people to make intelligent decisions for themselves instead of hiding this information from them. It's a very good Bill and I would hope that some of the Members who are voting 'no' would take a serious look at this and reconsider. I think it's too important a concept to glibly pass off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan. Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's truly amazing that a Bill of this nature seems so controversial. We have almost 100,000 people in nursing homes in the State of Illinois. The old, the sick, the infirm that are unable to defend themselves and yet if something goes wrong in nursing homes their parents...their children cannot make any type of complaint against the nursing home. Yet, we spend in the State of Illinois almost a quarter of a million dollars to public aid and to other sources in taking care of these people and yet we're trying to set up a very simple procedure so that people will have some right to redirect their grievances... And I think that...the nursing home industry talks about wanting to increase rates, they want this and that and I am, for one, not going to vote for any increased rates for any nursing homes until we can get some type of legislation that's going to help the people that are in those nursing homes. And I would recommend an 'aye' vote on this. Most of the people speaking against this are either connected with nursing homes or they have some type of things that they are going to benefit from that and I think we should think of the old people in the nursing homes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan O'Brien, for what purpose do you rise?"

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise to indicate that I may have a conflict of interest in that I am probably the only Member of the General Assembly that is a licensed



health care administrator in the State of Illinois and in addition to that a licensed social worker. I probably have spent more time in nursing homes and doing nursing home consultant work than any Member in the General Assembly and I will vote my conscience and I will vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Catania, for what purpose do you rise?"

Cantania: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps if he's a licensed health care administrator in the State of Illinois he shouldn't have been so vociferous in speaking against the legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Bowman:"

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think considering that a substantially broader Bill flew out of the House last spring that this Roll Call is really a testimony to the increased power of the nursing home lobby in this General Assembly. I'd like to know really how many people in this General Assembly feel that literally every home in the state is a good home to the extent that they would be willing to put their own parents or loved ones in there. I think that the majority certainly are but I think that there are those that deserve to be targeted, deserve to be exposed for really what they are."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, let me just say one thing to my colleagues here in the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Conclude."

Bowman: "Yes, before I had exhausted my time in the original debate, people were hollering me down and telling me time, time. And while I was trying to debate this thing in a very sensible way people were really making fun of this and I seriously object to the way I've been treated on this particular Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 68 'aye' and 76 'no'."





Having failed to received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Epton."

Epton: "If I may...point of personal privilege, although I don't think my colleague needs any defense, I can't help but indicate that if an individual on this floor mentions his interests I think he has every right, as a matter of fact a duty, to speak on or about a Bill and I resent it if any Member of this House is suspect because of his or her vote. I'm pleased that one of my colleagues, who has knowledge of this Bill, spoke for or against it and I think that should always be the case and I assure the Speaker and the House that when I get up and speak about a conflict of interest I do so only because I want to point out to the media and to the rest of the people of Illinois how ridiculous this whole idea of a conflict is. Those of us who have knowledge of a situation should be the first ones to speak up for or against the particular Bill. And then vote as our conscience dictates and allow the public to determine whether we acted in our interest or the interest of the public good. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Consideration Postponed, House Bill 3274, Representative Leverenz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3274. This Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave of the House to be able to take 3274 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Bluthardt, Leverenz, amends House Bill 3274 on page 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Amentment #1 and 2 and 3 was withdrawn in favor of Amendment #4."



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table Amendments 1 and 2? No objection, leave is granted. Amendment #1 and 2 tabled, 3 was withdrawn and you've got Amendment #4, Mr. Clerk? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe you should use the Attendance Roll Call in order to table Amendments 1 and 2 because there was a Verified Roll Call on one of those Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call and table Amendments 1 and 2? Hearing no objection, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I'd like to be shown as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Walsh: "I'd like to be shown as voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Walsh as voting 'no'. Other than that, the Attendance Roll Call minus one. No, he doesn't get the per diem then."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Bluthardt, amends House Bill 3274 on page 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #4 would provide that when and if a working cash fund is abolished that it cannot be reestablished unless a request is first put to the public on a referendum, front door referendum. I think that takes care of the problem we have and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "May I address my inquiry to the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Do you desire to answer an inquiry, Representative Bluthardt?"

Bluthardt: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you reconsider the vote by which you



decided no?"

Bluthardt: "I will yield."

Geo-Karis: "I am flattered. Representative Bluthardt, your Amendment cures the objection I finally found in that Bill, the original Bill that would've allowed taxation without referendum. Is that correct?"

Bluthardt: "To an extent, yes. The original Bill would have provided and permitted the reestablishment of a working cash fund two years after it was eliminated. This will not permit this unless the voters say O.K. The question that will be put to the voters is, shall the working cash fund be reinstated, yes or no. Most voters will say no, but it takes care of the objection I had for the original Bill."

Geo-Karis: "Under the original Bill, if I recall correctly, bonds could be sold even if they eliminated the working cash fund, bonds could be sold just on the basis of an 'aye' vote or the majority vote of the board. Is that correct?"

Bluthardt: "That's correct, it requires no referendum to establish a working cash fund. If you opt to eliminate the working cash fund and transfer those funds into some other funds, a general fund or a building fund, once you do that you cannot again establish...if this Amendment is adopted and if this Bill becomes law, you cannot again establish a working cash fund, we're only talking about community colleges, unless you submit that question to the voters and they vote in favor of it."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, they cannot sell these bonds and tax the people unless they have their referendum."

Bluthardt: "That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, I speak in favor of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been told some time ago that it is unwise to improve a bad Bill with an Amendment if the Bill continues to be



bad and that's precisely what happens in this case. Representative Bluthardt answers a serious objection to House Bill 3274, there's absolutely no question about it, but there are other objections. One of them is that they can continue in the Bill to provide that a junior college district does not have to use the working cash fund and can in its stead issue tax anticipation warrants. Now, Mr. Speaker, the very purpose that this Legislature had in permitting a board to issue bonds for a working cash fund was so that they would not have to, they would not have to issue tax anticipation warrants and pay interest thereon. That was the reason that we did that. I don't think we were wise in doing it and I think this Bill bears me out in that. Now, Mr. Speaker, this does provide an alternative, there is another alternative to what Mr. Bluthardt attempts to do with this Amendment. And that alternative is for the working cash fund to be abolished and a levy be reduced accordingly and this money used for operations, if the junior college district finds, indeed, that it does not have to have a working cash fund. I submit that this is for a particular junior college district but its application is state-wide and we will have many abuses if this Bill is passed and this Bill has a very good chance, I'm afraid, of being passed if this Amendment is adopted. So, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Brady."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Amendment. I think the Amendment makes very good sense. It does restrict the program, it faces the major objections that people voiced on the floor the other day, and I would urge your support of this Amendment. It will make it a good Bill and help the colleges in question."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Bluthardt, to close."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment,



this Bill almost passed yesterday, it was only short a handful of votes and I think this Amendment will assure its passage and that's what I'm trying to do. I'm trying to see that this Bill is enacted into law and help out some of the community colleges who have requested it. I urge your vote for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye' ...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 is 126 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Return to Post Consideration Postponed. 2075, Representative Younge. Out of the Record. 2084, Representative Chapman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2084. A Bill for an Act in relation to comprehensive adult education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is an adult education Bill. It doesn't even have the word sex in it anywhere so I think it ought to just zip right through. I hope you're not too disappointed. The Bill originates...the Bill originates with the Adult Education Task Force appointed by the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction back in 1972. This is a group of educators and two Legislators also belong to it, who studied the needs of adult education and how to implement the new state constitution. There is a mandate in our new state constitution, it is that education through the secondary level shall be free. In working over a series of many months and issuing a report, this task force made up of educators from the colleges and universities, the community colleges, the



elementary...I guess no elementary people, come to think of it, but high school adult educators made a report which is implemented to a great extent in House Bill 2084. They discovered that coordination was one of the problems with adult education so we are providing coordination to requiring local planning councils. So through the establishment of this Adult Education Act of 1978 we are providing for regional planning councils in each educational service region to plan and coordinate adult education opportunities and we are writing this program into the school formula only for reimbursement for adults who are seeking an elementary or a high school diploma. I would ask for your support on this Bill, which is supported by the Illinois Adult Education Association and the Illinois Office of Education. I feel sure that many of the adult educators in your community have been in touch with you to let you know of the importance of House Bill 2084."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have followed this Bill through a very checkered career, beginning with Representative McGrew's Sub-committee on mandated programs. The purpose of the Sub-committee was an attempt to do away with mandated programs. The only Bill that we heard was this one which is a mandated program and would impose a mandated program. What...the Bill in the first place, in my opinion, is defective because it removes public aid recipients and others who may be seeking vocational education from consideration as vocation...for receiving vocational education and provides that the Department of Public Aid will no longer pick up part of the cost of such a program, where the recipients are qualified, but provides that the cost will go through the common school funds and will be paid through Section 18-8. Now, I suggest to you that other categorical programs would love to get in and do this also but they



didn't think of it in time. The people interested in transportation and special education, the gifted programs and others would love to be reimbursed at 95, 97, possibly over 100% of their appropriation instead of the 70% that they are getting now. This Bill would require that junior colleges who are teaching people and where those people are seeking an elementary or high school diploma would have to have certified teachers. They do not have certified teachers now, there's no need for them to have certified teachers. And I submit to you that the fiscal note is defective in this regard. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, does for adult education what I think everybody would like to do for themselves. We discussed the farm Bill a little earlier today, if this Bill passes and becomes law adult educators are going to be the only ones who are going to be able to afford to buy a farm. I'm not an adult educator, Adeline. Mr. Speaker, this is truly a revolutionary concept, one that need not be considered in this Session where we are considering emergency education. It is not a good program in my opinion even if we were in a regular Session but it's absolutely inexcusable to be considering this right now and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, if I read this Bill the mandate is not for the program, the mandate is simply for the submission of a plan with regard to the use of a program in adult education. The alternative to this sort of approach I think is to put more people on public aid, to put more people on the unemployment role. Someone is going to pay one way or the other if we don't educate adults who need to get a high school diploma and in some cases even adults who need to get an eighth grade diploma. Someone pays in any case. Education appears to be and has always been in my opinion the only alternative to putting people in these other places. Do we want them to



work? Do we want to educate them to work or do we want to keep them on public aid and the unemployment rolls. I think the Bill is a step in the right direction, and I believe contrary to the last Speaker, that it is not a mandated program except as to the submission of a plan for the particular programs that will be carried out with regard to the Bill. And for those reasons it ought to be given a green light."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill goes much farther than the Sponsor was willing to admit or willing to talk about. What this does is ties all the funding of this type of program to the public schools. It also establishes qualifications for teachers. So which means now in our junior colleges we have people who are not certified teachers but they are of the vocational trade. We're getting this job done now for a cost of less than \$700 a year. It automatically goes up to \$1,300 a year when you start getting it into the public schools. I can assure you that we're getting more for our money in adult education now and in our colleges than we will if this Bill passes. And besides that it turns the whole program over to Illinois Office of Education. Now, if that's what you want then vote for this Bill, but if you want to save money and if you want to keep the program the way it is you better be voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Would the Sponsor yield for one question or two?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Byers: "Representative Chapman, I had a junior college president call me and he felt that this Bill was a power grab by high school districts that were losing enrollment to ,... spruce up their enrollment. Is there any truth to that or not?"

Chapman: "There is no truth to that, Mr. Byers, thank you for





asking. As I indicated, this is a product of the Task Force on Adult Education which reported back in 1974, the report was endorsed by all the Members of the Committee who were members of junior colleges, adult educators from the college and high school level as well as a couple of Legislators and this comes from that report...and community colleges are involved in House Bill 2084."

Byers: "Does this Bill set up regional...with the regional school superintendents, do they use those people in setting up these adult education..."

Chapman: "Yes, yes, that's exactly what it does because we want to encourage the good programs that presently exist and provide opportunities for local planning. As, Mr. Stuffle indicated, Mr. Walsh is entirely wrong, the mandate is only for planning. There is no mandate for a program. The only mandate in this Bill is for planning and it will be on a local level participated in by both the community college and the high school. The presiding officer will be the educational service region superintendent."

Byers: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there's been a lot of misinformation about this legislation. Today we have in the state programs to educate our children in the primary and secondary schools, we have programs to educate our high school graduates and our public colleges and universities and in our public and community colleges. But we are not properly addressing the 3 1/2 million adults in our state who are not high school graduates, they simply seem to fall between the cracks. As Representative Chapman indicated, the 1970 Constitution provides that it is a fundamental goal of the people of the State of Illinois to provide for the educational development of all persons to the limits of their ability. And it is the hope that with this legislation



many non-high school graduates, without jobs or skills, will avail themselves to the opportunity to get a high school diploma and get employment and that the welfare rolls will be trimmed. I think it is important to notice that there is no fiscal impact to this Bill in fiscal 1979 or 1980 and the cost in 1981 is minimal. I think the legislation is needed. I think it's important to the future of the people of this state and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris."

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

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

Chapman: "As it has been indicated, this is not a mandated program. All that is mandated is planning. There are no fiscal implications for the coming year, minimum ones for the year after and none for the year after that. This is something which has the potential to benefit people in our state who have not had an opportunity, it has the potential to put people into jobs who are now on welfare, I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mugalian. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 103 'aye' and 50 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2106."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2106. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of The Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House, this major proposal being offered by this Bill is to allow a first time offender of the D.W.I. conviction a chance to participate in a drinking driver remedial program, that is if the presiding judge so desires. A drinking driver remedial program is defined as any program certified by the Illinois Department of Public Health whose primary emphasis is in modification of drinking behavior as it is related to driving. These programs must meet the minimum standards prescribed the Department of Public Health who will be working in cooperation with the Department of Mental Health. It states the legislative intent of this Legislature, by the addition of the drinking driving remedial program, intends to provide when warranted if those individuals who are first offenders are...an opportunity to modify their drinking behavior as related to driving. It is not, however, the intent of the Legislature to recommend that the court extend such driving... drinking driving remedial programs to previously convicted offenders or flagrant first offenders. Remedial action may be applied as part of sentencing or supervision only to the first arrest. This has the approval of the Secretary of State, all law enforcement agencies, the State's Attorney Association, Mental Health, Department of Health, Alcohol groups and many others. What this really does is allow a first offender from going on high risk insurance and saving him approximately \$4,000 to \$7,000 for this high risk insurance. There's one other thing that we ought to consider in facts and figures pre...we have almost 1,000,000 pre-high school students that are alcoholics and we have almost 2,000,000 high school students that are alcoholics and these are potential drivers. I think... I personally want to comment...commend the Sub-committee who worked so hard and diligently to get this Bill in shape. I know of very little opposition and I want to again give thanks to Representative Kosinski, Leverenz and



Schoeberlein. I ask for your support on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "A couple of questions for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Johnson: "First of all, is that all that your Bill does is to provide this drinking driver remedial program or does it also change some of the substantive aspects of our implied consent law?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, it makes a lot of other changes that the law enforcement agencies want and...but they are changes that will improve the drinking...the breathalyzer test and everything in the State of Illinois."

Johnson: "I think it's important to point out, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill does a great deal more than the Sponsor has indicated it does. Is our staff analysis correct when it says that it changed the number of breath tests from 2 to 1, that it reduced the amount of time for consultation with an attorney from 90 minutes to 30 minutes, and a significant other number of substantive changes in the law...or have those been amended out?"

VonBoeckman: "No, those are all in there. If you want me to read the whole thing...I think everybody's got the sheet on what it does. If you want me to tell you exactly what the whole thing does, I can do that. But I think the Bill in itself, Mr. Speaker, is designed to improve and take off the state highways or the State of Illinois' drunken drivers who are killing innocent people. Now those who speak against this Bill..."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. I asked the Gentleman a question, I didn't ask for an explanation or for the policy behind the Bill, he's already given that."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...I will answer the Gentleman and I will read all that this does."

Johnson: "Well I have a couple of more questions for you then."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."



Johnson: "Doesn't our existing law, either that or our counties in central Illinois are in contravention of the statutes, permit judges now to place individuals into programs such as this? This isn't something new is it?"

VonBoeckman: "No, not all the counties use it."

Johnson: "They are permitted to aren't they?"

VonBoeckman: "Right, they're permitted but not all of them do it and we're asking them to do it."

Johnson: "This is mandating them to do it, is that correct?"

VonBoeckman: "Yes. It's asking them to do it. Yes."

Johnson: "Is it asking them to do it or mandating them to do it?"

VonBoeckman: "It's not mandating them to do this."

Johnson: "Well, if they're permitted to do it now, then how does that change the law at all? They do it now in Champaign County, they do it now in Douglas County, they do it in Macon County, how does this change anything?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, they don't do it in all the counties though."

Johnson: "Well, if they don't do it and it is permissible, how does this change the statutes at all?"

VonBoeckman: "Well there's other changes that will help improve the drinking habit and we're talking about one of...is the refusal to take the breathalyzer test. I think this is where we are lagging in proving that we do have a lot of problems with driving while drinking."

Johnson: "Can you tell me the rationale behind the reduction in the number of test from 2 to 1?"

VonBoeckman: "It has been proven that there's no change from 1 breathalyzer test to the other."

Johnson: "Are you telling me there's never a situation where two tests showed different amounts of a percentage of alcohol in the blood?"

VonBoeckman: "I can tell you that they proved in Committee...in the Committee hearing that there is very, very few times



that there is a discrepancy in the first and the second."

Johnson: "I would say in the course of the last two years our law firm has probably handled 200 D.W.I. cases and at least 85% of them, the two readings have had different... they've been a different amount of percentage of alcohol in the blood stream from one test to the other. And the reason for the two tests is to prevent the problems of a one test shot. Now can you tell me what the rationale behind the reduction is in the number of tests from 2 to 1 is?"

VonBoeckman: "Everybody in the Sub-Committee agreed that this is a...we didn't need the other test."

Johnson: "I didn't ask what the Members of Committee said, I asked what the rationale was?"

VonBoeckman: "The rationale behind it is that the longer you keep a police officer off of the highway, the more drunks you're gonna have on the highway."

Johnson: "And that's the reason for reducing the number of tests."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you should bring your questioning to a close."

Johnson: "One other question. What about the reduction in the time for consultation from 90 minutes to 30 minutes? What's the rationale behind that?"

VonBoeckman: "If we drop that to 30 again, we'll be putting a police officer back on the highway."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, without more information than we've had presented before this House and a total change in the substantive law that this state has become a model for, the existing implied consent law has worked very, very well and it's been made a model for states around the country, I would urge the Members of this House to vote against House Bill 2106 because I think it is a very negative change in our law."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."



Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the way this Bill was originally written it had lots of opposition. People from various departments of state government, people from counties, prosecutors, law enforcement officials, etc. were very much against the Bill. Mr. VonBoeckman, in discouragement, was going to table the Bill. However, at my recommendation, we put it in the Sub-committee consisting of Jim McCourt, Ted Leverenz and myself. We then invited all the opposition to that Sub-committee and hammered and hammered until we came out with Amendment #1. The opposition to this Bill now supports the Bill. I repeat, the opposition to this Bill now supports the Bill. The problem generally has been our attempted implied consent to this point in time was that an increase, the substantial increase in the number of refusals to take breathalyzers defeating the purpose of the Bill and a substantial decrease in the number of convictions. Now we attempted to ingest in this Bill, not only harsher implementation to insist on taking that breathalyzer, to discourage the refusal of a breathalyzer test. But we also attempted at the upper end to give remedial assistance to people who were first offenders, except in those cases that we point this out by mandate in the Bill with the flagrancy of that first offense was such as to warrant the court to make determination of conviction. This is double ended, in a sense. In one end it is attempting to assist the first offender, in the other end it is attempting to strengthen the laws that this Legislature put on the books. To have a statute on the books which is ineffective, the Subcommittee felt was to no avail to the people of Illinois. To have a statute which is too severe was of no value to the people of Illinois either. This, we think is a happy medium. There is no opposition. The original opposition now is in support of this Bill and I recommend its passage."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose House Bill 2106. And if I may take a few minutes of your time, I'll explain to you why. Under the current law...under the current law that exists right now, it has been determined by the Supreme Court of our land and by many other Supreme Courts that in fact law enforcement agencies have rights, according to the legislative statement, to take breathalyzer tests. We've been through that test whether or not they can take these from individuals and receive evidence of their intoxication at the time of arrest. Now what we're intending to do is reduce the required test that the Legislature determined was necessary from 2 to that of 1. One of the reasons that we required 2 tests when we passed the original law was because at that time it was determined that the breathalyzer machines themselves are not totally flawless. But there are some problems with these machines. Granted, the machines have been improved over the years but in Committee we heard expert testimony that the breathalyzer machine has flaws in it and consequently one of the witnesses in Committee said that we should continue to require 2 tests. I feel that's a strong reason to defeat this legislation. I think it's a matter of fairness to an accused on a very serious charge of driving while under the influence that we require two tests to be given. Now there are some other items of this Bill that I think should be addressed. The prosecutors throughout this state have the option of prosecuting or going for court supervision currently under today's law. The fact of the matter is there are many prosecutors in the State of Illinois that are not exercising their rights to prosecute under D.W.I. and are placing people under supervision. The fact of the matter is that they're not doing their jobs in some parts of the state in some indications of offensive charge.





So I say that the law is good the way it is. We are able to convict people found guilty of this crime, we are able to utilize supervision. Consequently, don't take away another right of the defendant after 2 tests to make it to one just because we have some statements here that it's easier for law enforcement. Let's keep the law the way it is and tell the prosecutors to do their job and let's defeat this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I guess I'm old enough and have been here long enough to hear everything about implied consent that a man could hear in a short period of time. I served here with you, Mr. Speaker, I think a time when they even passed this Bill illegally. When we asked for verifications and Paul Edward was the temporary Speaker at the time and the Bill didn't have 89 votes but somehow it got 89 and was sent on to the Senate and it died where it should have died and the whole thing should have stayed buried. But sometimes goody-goody people and do-gooders around the state prevail and they pass bad legislation and then they try and improve the badness by getting worse. This is a perfect example of bad going worse. All I can say about the implied consent law is that it isn't the lawyers that go to jail, it isn't the lawyers that get convicted of drunken driving, or the firm's president, or the corporate executive, it's some poor working stiff with patches on his pants that goes to jail. It's some poor guy that's trying to make a living and may stop for an extra drink at night after a hard days work that he goes to jail or he loses his license. But you know, all the fat cats, even some that are in government, even some that serve on my side of the aisle sometimes refuse to take these breathalyzer tests. Let me suggest to all of you, if you want to be honest with your constituents and honest with yourself



that you know and I know any man or woman in his right mind, if stopped for a drunken driving charge, would refuse to take a breathalyzer test. Any do you know why? Because we are all hypocrites when we vote for bad legislation and then try and make it worse by adding some Amendment to the law like this. Now let's face facts, people have a right to be wrong. People have that right, whether we like it or not. You're not going to legislate morality and you're not going to legislate sobriety in this state. They tried that with prohibition and it failed. Let's give the people an honest shake...an honest break and say to them that as bad as the D.W.I. laws are, they're not fairly administered because you know and I know that if you're smart, you won't take the test. And you know and I know all you gotta do is hire a good lawyer and he'll make sure you don't go to jail for it and he'll make sure it's reduced to reckless driving or some other charge. Take a look at the records around this state of what happens. You and I also know that some poor working stiff making 200 bucks a week can't afford it all the time. So if I can just say to you, before you vote for a bad piece of legislation like that, let's be honest with ourselves and bury the whole darn thing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

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

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

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have to disagree with the previous Speaker when he says that this is against the working man. I think this Bill is designed to help the working man and I'll explain why. Because the working man, as he stated, can't hire a lawyer to get him out. What this Bill does will prevent the insurance companies from getting the JR 22 form



which would put him on high risk insurance. It will put the working man into a category where he would have to pay from 4 to \$7000 for three years insurance on high risk. And don't think for one minute that the insurance companies aren't using this to get this high premium. There are very many instances, I could say personally of individuals who have contacted me on this very issue. I think that this Bill will not only help the working man but will help take a lot of drunken drivers off the highway, which I'm sure if any of us had any of our family killed by a drunken driver would surely vote for the Bill. I appreciate all the 'yes' votes I can get on this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Well I'm certainly going to vote for this Bill, Mr. Speaker, in fact I wish it would have been in effect in California recently. I'm sure this is supported by the Republican candidate for Secretary of State, Sharon Sharp, and I'm sure no Republican would dare vote 'no', even if they were a lawyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this isn't a partisan question. I salute VonBoeckman for having the guts to bring this before you and I think shame on any of you who haven't listened while he explained the truth of the matter. Six years ago with great fanfare the implied consent was brought on the scene in Illinois. It hasn't measured up to its potential and it hasn't measured up to its expectations. We must profit from experience. Experience shows these changes are necessary. To have a principal, Speaker get up and say the public has a right to be wrong is just irresponsible. The public hasn't the right to be drunk and wrong...out on the street killing other people. You have a responsibility to your constituents



and your responsibility is to take the experience of the past six years and try to make this law that is designed to save your life and other voters life and to have a better chance to succeed. The only way that you do that is to fall in behind VonBoeckman here and vote it 'aye'. You will be proud tomorrow you did so and your conscience will feel better too."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill kind of worries me when people are, for example, take insulin or other medication because it changes the evidence standards in drunk driving cases to make testing instrument certification papers along with the test operators license valid as prima facie evidence of the best testing instruments accuracy. I'm afraid that this is not quite right because these instruments are not all right and if someone is on medication there is a distinct difference. As much as I am in sympathy with the Sponsor, I must be fair about it and vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Just in case this Bill gets 89 votes, I want to ask for a verification."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just as a matter of pointing out the facts that were explained here in opposition to the Bill were explained and taken care of in Sub-committee that met and answered those objections that were made here on the floor. We have corrected those points. The instruments that are used will reflect alcohol only, other drugs do not register. It's a good Bill at this point. For those that are worried about conviction rate we had more conviction before we had implied consent. I suggest to you an 'aye' vote is proper."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take



the record. On this question there is 85 'aye' and 39 'no'. Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "I'd like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Beatty, Bluthardt, Bowman, Caldwell."

Speaker Redmond: "Caldwell 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ewell, Ewing, Gaines."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hart, Huff, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kornowicz, Lucco, Luft, Madison, McGrew, McLendon, Meyer, Miller, Richmond, Robinson, Schlickman, Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Taylor, Van Dwyne, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Beatty, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Beatty votes 'no'. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Please change my 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady from 'no' to 'aye'. 89 'ayes', 40 'noes'. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Respectfully request a verification of Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan joins with Representative Johnson in the request of a verification... Representative Katz."

Katz: "I'd like to be verified, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified. Hearing no objection, you're verified. Representative Bowman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Bowman: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Bowman as 'aye'. Rep-



representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker, rather than go through a verification, I'd like Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 2214, Representative Young. Out of the record. 2295, Representative Young."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2295. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Young."

Young: "Mr. Speaker, may that be taken back to Second Reading for an Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to return 2295 to the order of Second Reading? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Would you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Young, amends House Bill 2295 as amended by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is a house-keeping Amendment which updates the number... the original Bill was filed two years ago and the numbers were incorrect. This is merely a house-keeping technical Amendment that makes the numbers accurate and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I've got one question. I noticed from the analysis this authorized \$2,000,000 in bonds, when you say house-keeping measure do you mean you raised it from \$2,000,000 to something else?"

Young: "No, the amount is the same. The house-keeping measure is the figures before that...they're old figures and there is new figures now that are accurate."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2295. Those in



favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2418. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 2529, Representative Mulcahey."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2529. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation for Freeport Bypass. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record temporarily. 2560."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2560. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representatives Levin, Collins, Pouncey... that's a...let's do that one again. Levin, Collins and Pouncey. Who's going to speak to this Bill? Representative Levin. Representative Levin is going to handle it ...out of the record. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, I just I just wanted to comment, Mr. Speaker. If you'll look at that hyphenated Co-sponsorship, you'll come to the conclusion that this is either the best or the worst Bill of the Session."

Speaker Redmond: "2529, Representative Mulcahey...is on the floor now."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2529. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation for Freeport Bypass. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is an appropriation for the finishing construction of the Freeport Bypass..."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Gentleman in the blue sweater sit down."

Mulcahey: "...in Stephenson County which of course goes around the City of Freeport. This appropriation was originally



for \$43,700,000 but with the advice of the Department of Transportation this particular project was cut down, it was lessened, instead of going to a four-lane it was decided by the Department of Transportation that a limited access highway would be much better. According...the limited access and also making this bypass a one-lane instead of a four-lane, the Department of Transportation agreed that \$26,700,000 would be a figure which they could work with. This is a 18 miles stretch in one of the most dangerous areas of northwestern Illinois. The City of Freeport is one of the only cities of its size throughout the State of Illinois that does not have some type of a road facility which bypasses around the outside. But I would urge a favorable Roll Call for this particular Bill."

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would that each of you might have been in Appropriations I to hear the presentation of this the first of large pork barrel Bills to reach the House floor during this Session. They've asked the honorable Mayor of the city there and the incomparable Sponsor and each made an impassioned plea while the money was...while this road was necessary for the survival of their city, but then the question was asked by the Committee, which of you would be agreeable to find the money to pay this improvement that you see? And they looked up at the heavens and down to hell and neither of them showed any inclination whatever to support any type of realistically required increase in taxes to build this kind of a road. I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that that is the problem that is going to be presented to this Body on everyone of these Bills that come before you. None knows better than I the frustration that each of us feels through the inadequacy of our highway system, but it's hypocritical, for anyone to seek highway improvement unless





he is willing, he or she to point out to this Body where the money comes from to make that improvement. Next there is a valid test that must be passed in every one of these Bills. We will have many, many millions of dollars worth of improvements for practically every district throughout the state. Let's meet the problem head on with the forthrightness and the candor that proper presentation of our duties require. Representative Mulcahey is to be saluted for his ambition here in behalf of his city. He has the consolation of knowing that he's on the list. The Department of Transportation has said they are going to build the road at the earliest possible moment the funds are available, that's more consolation than most of us have. In many of our districts they've told us they'll never build a road. He'll get his road very shortly, but he has no right to upset the budget in this particular by coming in and pressuring the passage of this Bill absent some display of where the money comes from. It is simply \$27,000,000 that is not available for this particular project at this time. If you give him a green light out of any sense of buddy compassion or generosity with other people's money, you must recognize that it is taking money from the highway program for...that have been planned... has been made through studies that shows it could be better spent elsewhere throughout the state at this time for the benefit of the maximum number of citizens. But with these economic realities, we urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, those of you who do not have the opportunity as I did who served on Appropriations I, you'd heard the pat argument from the Minority Spokesman on that Committee that he gives to most every Bill that comes across our desk. I was in that Committee and I thought that the arguments and the presentation by the local officials in that area, the lack of



information given by the Department of Transportation, their attempt to create some type of diversion in regard to this Bill...the Bill passed out of Appropriations, the Sponsor explained it, he could not answer a question as to where the money would come from...I think that would be very difficult from any Sponsor in this House to do that and I asked an elected official from some small community if he's willing to impose a gas tax to build a bypass in his district...that question should not be asked of anybody because he doesn't have the wherewithal to impose a gas tax anyway. Let's get to the other part, the real gut issue here. We're taking in one Bill that came to our Committee yesterday over \$8,000,000 to transfer right out of the road fund to pay for administrative costs in the Department of Transportation, right out of the Governor's own road program to pay for operations of the Department of Transportation. I think we owe it to some of the Sponsors regardless of whether they're Democrat or Republicans on this floor that are fighting for justified road programs in their district to give them the support and let's let the Governor or the people in the Department of Transportation who can justify moving that amount of money out of the road Bill and into administration, justify why they can't build these things. I think we should all support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of Representative Mulcahey's Bill. I do that for a very simple reason. At some point in time we're going to have to look at the road fund and indeed our whole financial picture for building roads in Illinois. I think it's interesting that the Representative from Lawrenceville will be against this particular position. To recall, he purchased billboards in Illinois, in Springfield when Governor Walker had his



road program. And on top of that, we have such a pitiful way of handling the road fund. This year alone, Governor Thompson's budget...he ripped off from the road fund \$150,000,000 going to departments and commissions. If we were truly interested in having a viable road fund program so that you can have pot holes filled, so that you could build roads, so that you could have a decent transportation system in the State of Illinois, you would support House Bill 701 and other measures which prohibited taking road fund money from the road fund to pay for operating expenses of...for departments and commissions. In just the Department of Law Enforcement alone, he's taken \$2,500,000 this year for pay raises for the state policemen from the road fund, \$2,500,000. On top of that, when it comes to building roads usually on supplemental freeways it comes from series A bonds, he makes a deal with a Chicago democrat for a cross-town expressway, 50,000,000 for the cross-town, 50,000,000 for the Chicago metropolitan area and 50,000,000 for a 101 counties. I support Representative Mulcahey because downstate, that 101 counties ought to get a fair share also."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ryan: "Representative Mulcahey, in view of recent developments in the last twenty-four hours, do you feel any obligation to put this into a Sub-committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "No, Representative Ryan, I don't...this is not a state agency Bill, it's an independent appropriation Bill. I don't see any reason whatsoever for this to go in a Sub-committee."

Ryan: "Do you have the support of Michael Bakalis on this proposal?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Ryan, I have not talked to Michael Bakalis about



this at all."

Ryan: "He doesn't care about the roads in Freeport?"

Mulcahey: "I'm sure he cares about the roads in Freeport but I care about the roads in Freeport just as much."

Ryan: "Do you have any idea where the money for this is going to come from? Have you figured that out?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Ryan, this appropriation is going to come from the road fund."

Ryan: "Are you going to be a Co-sponsor of the increase in the income tax which..."

Mulcahey: "We'll cross that bridge when we come to it, Sir."

Ryan: "...to fund this Bill."

Mulcahey: "That depends on the terrain of the situation."

Ryan: "To address the Bill, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is totally irresponsible, it's almost \$27,000,000 and I can see no need for it. It's a budget buster and it's further proof of the Democrat majority attempt to totally destroy the Governor's budget. So I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, since you were looking for a Co-sponsor, can we assume that you would be the chief Sponsor of that income tax increase?"

Ryan: "Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, that's been your proposal not mine."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get this show on the road. I move the previous question."

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

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I'll just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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



Skinner."

Skinner: "For all those of you out there that have these special road projects, I want you to know you've got my vote in your back pocket if it's under 16.4 million dollars. Unfortunately, this is not under 16.4 million dollars which is the amount that the R.T.A. rips off the top of the road fund every year to dump in the pocket of the C.T.A."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 93 'aye', 64 'no'. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Mulcahey, do you desire a poll of the absentees? Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Bartulis, Duester, Dyer, Friedrich, Gaines, Keats, Kucharski, Leverenz, Levin..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Levin desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Keats, 'aye'...Oh, Representative Keats 'no'. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I can't let Representative Keats get ahead of me on the conservative game, so I have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer 'no'. Representative Gaines 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schlickman, Simms..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms 'present'. You wanna take over."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney and no further."

Speaker Bradley: "Verify the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bradley, in the Chair. Adams, E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Corneal Davis, Dawson,



DiPrima, Domico, Doyle..."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Holewinski, rise?"

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "John Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevec, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Meyer, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipword, Van Duyn, Vitek, VonBoeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Wolf, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the Affirmative? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Beatty is in Giglio's chair."

Ryan: "Representative Birchler."

Speaker Bradley: Birchler is in his seat, as always."

Ryan: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat...or standing next to it."

Ryan: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Bradley: "In the gallery? O.K."

Ryan: "O.K. Representative Davis, Corneal Davis."

Speaker Bradley: "Corneal Davis. He's not in his seat, he's in his chambers. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Ryan: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker? I should have asked before I started this."



Speaker Bradley: "With Corneal Davis off, it's 94 'aye's'."

Ryan: "Thank you. Representative Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: Ewell, Ray Ewell, is he in the chambers?  
How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Ryan: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: Representative Jaffe, is talking to the press."

Ryan: "Representative Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Jones...Emil Jones is not in  
his seat. Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Ryan: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Giglio, he's not in his chair,  
is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Ryan: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "I hear him...in the rear of the chambers."

Ryan: "Representative Hart."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Hart. He's not in his chair.  
Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Ryan: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Katz. He's not in his chair.  
Is Representative Katz in the chambers? How's he record-  
ed?"

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

Ryan: "How about taking him off, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "I was just checking....there's one Roll Call  
he asked to be verified, this is not the one, we'll take  
him off."

Ryan: "Thank you. Representative Levin."



Speaker Bradley: "Representative Levin is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Lucco."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Lucco. He's not in his chair."

Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Ryan: "Representative Luft."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the chair next to his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Mann."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Mann. He's not in his chair."

Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Ryan: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "He is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative McLendon. I see him."

Speaker Bradley: "He is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Nardulli."

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

Ryan: "Representative Schisler."

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

Ryan: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Bradley: "He is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "Taylor?"

Ryan: "Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "Jimmy Taylor is in his chair."

Ryan: "Representative Van Dwyne."

Speaker Bradley: "LeRoy is in the chambers."

Ryan: "Representative Younger."

Speaker Bradley: "She is in her chair. Mr. Ryan, Jimmy

McLendon would like to be...you did verify him...he can  
leave. All right, Jim."

Ryan: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Jim Houlihan wishes to change his vote from





'no to 'aye'."

Ryan: "I understand that I had asked for Representative Taylor and he was in his chair, I'm talking about Representative Taylor now, not Representative Pouncey."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Taylor I think is in his chair, I can see him, there he is."

Ryan: "I don't know how you could miss him if he was there. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Stand up, Jim. The Gentleman from Rock Island, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

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

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, rise?"

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman changed his vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

Winchester: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 89 'ayes', 65 'nays' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2575."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2575. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. House Bill 2575 is a very serious attempt to provide some relief to the senior citizens of this state. It doubles the exemption from \$1500 to \$3000 on the Homestead Exemption. It provides a replacement of that revenue to the units of local government. House Bill 2575 is one of six Homestead Exemption increases introduced in the House in the Eightieth General Assembly. It is the



only one, however, that provides a mechanism for reimbursement to local governments for the reimbursement on the real estate taxes. Each local taxing district must notify the Department of Local Government Affairs of the number of exemptions claimed in its jurisdiction and the resulting reduction of assessed values in a said district. D.L.G.A. will pay to the County Treasurer an amount equal to 50% of the reduced tax levied it is offering for this procedure. I don't have to point out to the Membership of this General Assembly the serious burden, tax increase burden, that has been faced by not only senior citizens but all people on real estate taxes. House Bill 2575..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz...let's have some order, please, so we can hear the Gentleman."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2575 is a serious attempt to provide, yes, a needed tax relief to the citizens of this state by increasing the Homestead Exemption from \$1500 to \$3000. And, yes, in providing the necessary revenues to the units of local government to finance that program. It's part and parcel of a statement that was made by the Governor of this state to the Membership of this General Assembly in Joint Session last year, in stating publicly if you're mandating an increase or a specific measure to the people of Illinois, the state will have the necessary money to do so. There's been some question, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, whether the 20 or \$25,000,000 that this Bill would cost would be provided in the budget... And I believe, according to the Economic and Fiscal Commission and the report that was submitted to the entire Membership of this General Assembly, they were still talking about having approximately \$200,000,000 in excess revenue above and beyond the Bureau of the Budget's projected figures in fiscal 1978 in having this money available for distribution. I believe that the people in this state are looking



for a serious and reasonable approach in providing a tax relief and I believe 2575 addresses itself to this issue. I would also recall to the Membership that in debate on this Bill in Second Reading there was mention of fact that a number of millionaires would be...they would have an advantage with the increase in the Homestead Exemption. But I would just point out to this Membership that the millions of people that are not millionaires that are being taxed out of their homes would have an adequate benefit, with this Bill. I strongly ask that the Membership of this House give House Bill 2575 their serious consideration and an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I wonder if the Sponsor would answer a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Is this part of candidate Bakalis' program to cut the costs of state government?"

Lechowicz: "I did not speak to Michael Bakalis, the Comptroller of this state, on this Bill at any time."

Ewing: "So the answer would be, it is not part of that program?"

Lechowicz: "No, Sir, it is not...to my knowledge."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to this Bill?"

Bradley: "You certainly may. Proceed."

Ewing: "The cost of this to the State of Illinois is estimated by the Bureau of the Budget at \$40,000,000 a year. This would give relief in property tax to those in the low income bracket as well as those in the high income bracket. There is no means test to this type of relief. The circuit breaker program which we have in this state is a far superior way to give a tax break to the low income people and to get the money where it will do the good. Now if we want to help all of us to make 20,000, 30,000, 50,000 or more dollars a year then we should vote for this program. If we want to increase the cost of state government, we should



do that, we should vote for this program. But if we really want to help those people who need help from the state then let's vote down this miserable Bill and vote for a Bill where we can move the money into the area for the people who need it and that would be an increase in the circuit breaker program. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

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

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

McMaster: "I just heard the figure \$40,000,000 kicked around as being what it is going to cost the State of Illinois for this program. Is that an accurate estimate?"

Lechowicz: "Well, I had a fiscal note which is filed on the Bill, Representative McMaster, and according to the analysis provided by the Department of Local Government Affairs actual cost to local government could be held in the range of approximately 20 to \$25,000,000 and that was submitted in the analysis as well. I'll just point out to you that as far as the fiscal notes and the reports that are generated by two respective departments, whether it's D.L.G.A. or the Bureau of the Budget, it seems when it gets down to the Bureau of the Budget they automatically inflate it by 100%."

McMaster: "Well I guess, Ted, that...another question to you, it's my understanding that the Appropriations Committee are looking for ways to cut some money out of various departmental budgets in order to give more money for public schools. Now if we keep giving away 20, 30, \$40,000,000 in programs such as this, of the state's share of it, where are we going to get the money to fund schools? You guys have got me a little bit mixed up on what you're doing over there, you're gonna cut one place and spend someplace else and I don't really know where we are any more. Do you?"



Lechowicz: "Representative McMaster, I would just point out to you that the Economic and Fiscal Commission released a report approximately two months ago, they're going to be having another meeting...I believe it's next week, around the 22nd or 23rd, I believe that the preliminary indications are that the revenue that will be generated in Illinois this coming year will exceed the Bureau of the Budget's estimates. I believe we're a little bit closer last year than the Bureau of the Budget as far as the revenue estimates in this state. I will just tell you publicly as I see it that probably around the month of October the Governor will come out and make a comment that yes, there is additional revenue in this state and it will provide yes, additional revenue to the school funds, yes, we will provide additional revenue for the senior citizens and everybody will be caught in the happy joy of election time and the money will be there. I'm just telling this House and the Membership that...and especially the previous Speaker before Representative McMaster, on this terrible Bill, this was exactly his Bill last year. The only difference is that the state would reimburse units of local government. It's exactly the same Bill, it increases Homestead Exemption from \$1500 to \$3000. The only difference is who is going to absorb the cost. And I'm telling you, Representative McMaster, that according to the revenue projections as I see them, reviewed by some pretty good people, that the money will be there."

McMaster: "Teddy, that wasn't my Bill last year, I didn't have a Bill such as that in."

Lechowicz: "It was Ewing."

McMaster: "All right. I wanted to get that straight. But I don't know, Teddy, I think this is just a political ploy that you're using to try to spend a lot of money and I think then you're going to hand out that we're not going to be able to fund the schools the way we want to. And I



think it's because you people over there are spending just too doggone much money and I'm getting a little bit concerned about it."

Lechowicz: "Well, let me just respond if I may, Speaker, very briefly...and I had a Bill to address that situation as well. Whether it's the appropriation process and it's heard and approved or disapproved in this House...there are two people that control purse strings of the state government. And those two people are the Governor and the Bureau of the Budget. And you can override the vetos, you can make all the political speeches you want, but unless they release the money it is lapsed."

McMaster: "Well, let me say one more thing, Representative, I don't know when I go into the Sub-committee with L.G.A.'s Budget but I assume then that you're going to offer an Amendment to increase its appropriation by some \$50,000,000 to take care of this."

Lechowicz: "I will offer the Amendment when the Bill is signed ...passed and signed into law to provide additional 20 to \$25,000,000 in taxes to reimbursement of local government for the implementation of this Bill."

McMaster: "Do I gather from that then that we may not pass the L.G.A. appropriation until the first of July?"

Lechowicz: "No, Sir, not at all. In fact, I believe if you'll just recall there's a Bill over here for a transfer for the Department of Transportation which is a supplemental Bill. We have...we passed a supplemental Bill for the Department of Revenue for the repayment of the income tax to the individuals of the State of Illinois. That is not a new procedure and I would just follow that procedure with the implementation of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, rise?"



Ewing: "Point of personal privilege. My name was used here and I think it's important that this House be corrected. The Sponsor of this Bill may believe he probably remembers that he helped dispose of my Bill last time and...all it did was make the Homestead Exemption available at 65. A small difference between his Bill, which doubles it. I didn't raise the Homestead Exemption, I only wanted it to be available for those people who were retired. And I think that point should be made very clear, my Bill was nothing like his."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Ted, I'm wondering why in your Bill you provide only a partial reimbursement to the local government where as the circuit breaker we have known provides for reimbursement to the local government?"

Lechowicz: "Well, because what I'm doing is providing for the increase...a dollar amount. Right now the circuit breaker is at 1500 and in order to be fair and equitable, I'm providing for the additional 1500 reimbursement of local government. If it would be at the total amount, then the figures that are quoted by the distinguished Minority Leader would be fairly accurate."

Tipsword: "Your fiscal note seems to cause a question because what your Bill says is partial reimbursement and then the fiscal note goes ahead and indicates that the Bill will cost local governments 20 to \$25,000,000, which would appear to be above and beyond state reimbursement."

Lechowicz: "No, I'm sorry that question is...that is incorrect. It is a reimbursement to local government, it costs the state 20 to \$25,000,000."

Tipsword: "Well, that's not what your fiscal note says and you read your own fiscal note...said local governments a while ago."



Lechowicz: "Well, they drafted it wrong then."

Tipsword: "I think we ought to get that cleared up and make darn sure there's not a cost to local government."

Lechowicz: "If there is I'll table the Bill."

Tipsword: "Well, I'd like to know about this before I have to vote on it. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from..."

Lechowicz: "Really, Representative Tipsword, there is no cost to local government at the implementation of this Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to speak for this Bill because it's refreshing to have a Member from the other side of the aisle really put the argument in perspective. We're sitting here with the Members of the other side of the aisle trying to cut the budget and provide money for education, when the real battle grounds should be to provide money for tax relief for the people and the taxpayers of this state. Representative Lechowicz and House Bill 2575 have presented an idea, although not new, is done in a different fashion. I think this Bill deserves the support of the Members of the General Assembly so that we can help relieve that awesome tax burden that we have put on the people of this state in prior years. This Bill is one of many that will be a first step in providing that relief. I think that when the Governor has to make decisions as to where money should go or whether we should give tax relief that if he is interested in the welfare of the taxpayers of this state that a tax relief measure of this nature would receive his support. So I speak in favor of the Bill and I urge the Members on this side of the aisle to look carefully at what we're doing. Is it tax relief or education? I say it should be tax relief and I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."





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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favor of this Bill. You know since the last circuit breaker went into effect, it was my understanding that the property taxes went up 85% for people who are unable to afford such a sharp increase in their property taxes. We have inflation going at an ever increasing rate, we're talking about our senior citizens in the State of Illinois. The local units of government are presently picking up the \$1500 of the Homestead Exemption and all we're doing is asking the state to participate in helping our senior citizens and their plight to have a decent living in the State of Illinois. And I would urge support of House Bill 2575."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to close the debate."

Lechowicz: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the Bill has been debated and I'm very happy to see that the Membership of the House gave it the attention that it truly deserves. Again, this is a Homestead Exemption increase from \$1500 to \$3000. The only difference is between this Bill and the five other Bills that were introduced in the General Assembly is that the increase is reimbursed to units of local government throughout the state. As it was pointed out the real estate taxes have risen tremendously in all portions of the state and a lot of elderly people are at the point that they're saying that they are being taxed right out of their homes. This will provide some relief provided by the state for reimbursement to local governments in increasing the Homestead Exemption. And I favorably ask for your favorable



consideration."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we feel that there are two issues that are very important. One, the relief for taxpayers and two, by providing more funds for education we are helping the local taxpayers. It was mentioned that we don't have adequate funds for this program. I would remind the Gentleman who mentioned the local governmental affairs appropriation that there was a supplemental appropriation for \$4,000,000 to the local distributive fund and that proves that the Governor underestimated his projections in revenue in state income tax by \$48,000,000. It's simple arthimatic, all you have to do is multiply \$4,000,000 by 12 and you find that there are \$48,000,000 more that we received in the state income tax that had been anticipated. We'll find that out in the Illinois Economic Fiscal Commission meeting I'm sure this Monday and some other facts that will prove that there will be additional revenues in this fiscal year. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Skinner: "I'm interested to know that you put the time restraint on the Republicans but not on the Democrats. Representative Kornowicz's Bill is infinitely better than this Bill. Let me tell you what's wrong with this Bill. Number one, it helps Chicago homeowners more than downstate homeowners. The average Chicago homeowner, Cook County homeowner would get about \$150 worth of relief while the average downstate homeowner would only get \$90 worth of relief. Number two, it helps only homeowners and not renters. Number three, it helps the wealthy along with those who need it. But on



the other hand, there are advantages to this Bill. The primary of which is that if we pass this Bill we increase pressure on the Governor to allocate some part of the newly found revenue that will come up throughout this year to senior citizen tax relief. 9 out of \$10,000,000 of the savings from the State Employees Group Insurance Plan that was found have gone primarily to people who are under 18 years of age. It seems to me it's time to send a message to the Governor that people over 65 deserve a piece of the action too in the form of senior citizen property tax relief. We need \$9,000,000 more to solve the problem to Representative Kornowicz's Bill and for that reason I'm going to vote 'yes'."

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

Mulgalian: "It's probably unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, but there's some misunderstanding about this Bill or some double talk or some confusion about the reimbursement and the extent of reimbursement to the local governments. This Bill has the best of both worlds. It deprives the state of 20 to \$25,000,000 and also deprives our local taxing units and our schools for about 20 or \$25,000,000. The Bill does two...it takes away the assessed valuation for local districts and provides for the state to reimburse half of it, so everybody's a loser. The need for schools and mental health are cut back by 20 to \$25,000,000 and the needs of our local school districts are cut back by 20 or \$25,000,000 and the beneficiaries of this measure are the wealthy as well as the poor. There should be a means test, we have a perfect device in the circuit breaker to take care...and very flexible, it can go up to \$20,000 a year in income or even \$25,000 or \$30,000 as proposed in one Bill. But to give millionaires and people who own \$400,000 mansions a discounted tax break is irresponsible."



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

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I wasn't going to talk on this Bill, especially now that it's got the votes that it has but I can understand the rationale of the people on the other side of the aisle during the closing days of the budget to come up with Bills like this but when Members on my side of the aisle come up and say it's a good Bill and there's \$42,000,000 costs to the taxpayers. This is nothing but a reverse life line Bill. The State of Illinois is going to have to up with this Bill and certainly I get a chance to talk to the consumers and to the senior citizens when I get home on weekends and they gave a loud message; please don't send us anymore help, we can't afford you. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am really alarmed that there are 113 votes up there. Selfishly, I could be for this Bill because one of these days I'll be getting a \$90 credit on my tax bill. This will give me \$180. Selfishly, I can vote 'aye'. But let me tell you something, if we're gonna help the elderly who are deprived of their home because of inflation then the circuit breaker is the approach. And if you can think of any reason why somebody like me should get \$180 tax break while a young man out here is beating his brains out trying to buy a home, raise his family and pay his taxes and is really bearing the burden of taxation you better be thinking about him a little bit instead of some of the people who have good incomes or over 65. Being 65 doesn't automatically make you indigent. There are a lot of other factors. But if you're not indigent, you're certainly... a lot of people, and I think I'm one of them, I have a lot



more income than the guy down here trying to make a living and raise his family. You better start thinking about that guy because you're gonna destroy the incentive to work one of these days."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 39 'nays', 11 voting present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2578."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2578. A Bill for an Act in relation to the commercial relocation or removal of transfer vehicles from private property. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I like leave of the House to bring House Bill 2578 back for an Amendment...corrected Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return it to Second Reading? Hearing no objections, leave is granted, return the Bill to Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, Lechowicz, amends House Bill 2578 as amended."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #11, I received notification from the Illinois Commerce Commission yesterday approximately at 4:00 after we already moved this Bill from Second to Third, requesting that funds be changed and that's what's done in Amendment #11. The Illinois Commerce Commission requested the fact that the motor vehicle fund is presently limited to the use of Motor Carrier Property Law and that this Amendment should have the fund come out from the motor vehicle fund instead of the general revenue fund. I discussed the Amendment with Representative McMaster, I showed Art Harrison a copy of the letter I



received from the Illinois Commerce Commission and I move for the adoption of Amendment #11."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 2580. Mr. Schisler. Out of the record. 2591. Out of the record. 2598."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2598. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, happily, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, here's a Bill that will save some money for the people of Illinois. And I think it directly affects almost every citizen in the State of Illinois. So I wish you'd pay attention to this very unusual and new concept that I bring to you today. In discussing House Bill 2598 last week with the 178th Representative from the other side of the aisle, Representative Lee Schwartz, he said to me that, 'It seems to have something for everyone.' And I said, 'That may be the case, but I'll let you determine that for yourself.' Due to the unusually late harvest last fall and the early onset of our harshest winter, it was clearly demonstrated by anyone who chose to note that particularly on north-south highways and roads where standing row crops had not been harvested that the blowing and drifting snow that we experienced last winter did not seem to accumulate on those road surfaces. During the past four years the Illinois Department of Transportation has been erecting snow fence along our highways at an ever decreasing rate. Due to the resistance of farmers and landowners to allow D.O.T. on the land because of timing, changing farming practices along with the frequent



field damage caused by maintenance crews of D.O.T. Snow fences are practically a thing of the past in Illinois. Along these already identified trouble spots of drifting snow there is no longer protection afforded. This problem is most severe along Illinois' two-lane highways and secondary roads. Route 1, Route 45, Route 50, all within 8 miles of my home in Will County were closed five times last winter for a period of one to three days allowing no access to some of our smaller villages by any vehicular traffic except snowmobiles. House Bill 2598 would provide a viable alternative to snow fence by authorizing permissively the Department of Transportation to purchase standing row crops from farmers along highways where trouble spots have been identified and snow fence erection has been denied. The cost economy, using a couple of logical assumptions, is that this Bill could effect the cost reduction of some 80% of current no fence operations in D.O.T. if D.O.T. could secure the permission to erect a snow fence in the first place. Since they are being refused, we have the pleasant opportunity to increase snow drifting protection that we cannot now have at a cost that is 80% less than it would have been. There are corollary benefits in that the League of Agriculture Industry would benefit financially from this proposal. The conservationist...this proposal would provide additional cover and habitat for upland game birds, rabbits and other fauna of Illinois. This Bill is wholeheartedly supported by the Farm Bureau of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Conservation and was reported out of the House Transportation Committee on a unanimous vote. I would discuss the cost economics if you're interested, otherwise, I think you all should vote for this very fine Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill...the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."



McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Mr. Davis, could you give us a...I know that you can't because of the market price of the road, but could you give us an indication of what the price might be per year?"

Davis: "I'm sorry, Mr. McClain, I did not really hear your question...it's a little noisy over here."

McClain: "Well, I know that you can't really give us a specific cost because it depends on the market price of the crop at the time of the contract but could you give us an approximate fiscal note on the cost of this...roughly?"

Davis: "Mr. McClain, I could give you comparison to, I think, illustrate the cost of the savings that could be affected here. Last year there was some \$600,000 in labor in fencing materials alone, purchased by the Department of Transportation that's not being put up. That figure excludes all maintenance or...excuse me, all labor destruction of snow fence, the use of the tractor-trailer equipment in erecting and taking it down. So consequently, the figures get astronomical, we don't really know how much it does cost. Last year, for instance, in total if all snow fences not existing could have been erected. We can only tell you that per running mile...and you must understand that this...the crop would only be bought along the trouble spots, not all over the State of Illinois but where those trouble spots have been identified...permissively, that per running mile assuming an average yield of 100 bushels of corn per acre and a \$3.00 corn price, let's say, that it would be around \$600 a running mile as opposed to roughly \$4700 a running mile for snow fence."

McClain: "Would this be from the road fund?"

Davis: "Well this comes out of their maintenance as it does now...their maintenance fund in the Department of Transportation...yes, the money comes from the road fund. It is there now for the purpose of erecting snow fence, but we





can't put it up anymore, Representative McClain, and this is an alternative coming from the same maintenance operational fund."

McClain: "But if you don't have the present employees putting up the snow fence, will we relieve some people from jobs because they won't be needed during the winter months because they won't have to erect these fences?"

Davis: "Well, it has been suggested to me by my colleagues here that maybe they could fill potholes and there wouldn't be any need for a pothole Bill. No, I don't think jobs are in question, here. I suppose that there is plenty to do along Illinois highways in the winter with other activities. This is merely an alternative and I would expect the Department of Transportation to use their judicious wisdom in implementing this program this coming winter to see if the program actually works."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McClain, are you through?"

McClain: "I guess. Yes, Sir, thank you."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "How does this help the nature people and the farmers as you said in your explanation?"

Davis: "Well, Representative Leverenz, it's very simple. Financially any farmer that's worth his salt will sell his... if he contracts with D.O.T. to sell six or eight rows of standing corn, which is our recommendation, to the Department of Transportation then he'll go out and hand harvest the ears from the corn and sell it twice and leave the stalks standing and that's the protection device anyway. Consequently, he gets paid twice for his crop. Secondly, the standing row crops over the winter provide cover and habitat that is now fence over fence row farming not be provided for upland game bird."



Leverenz: "Well, would the pay...the precedent of being paid twice for the same thing...how would that react on other things we do?"

Davis: "I didn't say he would be paid twice, I said the possibility does exist that in the spring he could harvest the crop by hand that was left standing and resell it or feed it to his livestock. He can only be paid once from the State of Illinois. What he chooses to do with the byproduct after the winter is over will be his decision as a private landowner."

Leverenz: "What would be the effect on corn futures contract?"

Davis: "Absolutely none, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "How about snow fence futures?"

Davis: "Snow fence futures look a little dim under this Bill."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill...Mr. Davis, do you wish to close, Sir?"

Davis: "Representative Martin, I think, would like to close, the hyphenated Co-Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Winnobago, Mrs. Martin, to close the debate."

Martin: "Yes, please vote for the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes, 13 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2599."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2599..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, just a minute. The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker of the House, Mr. Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know, in all the years that I have served here I've been impressed by the dedication of the Members of the



General Assembly, particularly those in the House. And many of us have shown it in different ways. I would like to call your attention to the fact that one of our Members has such dedication and devotion to this House that she is spending her wedding anniversary with us here today, Representative Breslin, from LaSalle County."

Speaker Bradley: "Does she wish to respond? She's speechless.

House Bill 2599. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Marijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, you think that's something, the fellow we call 'Mudd', who's the Page for my Appropriation Committee, he got married and he just stayed right here and kept working...and that was this week."

Speaker Bradley: "Above and beyond the call. The Gentleman... 2599."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2599. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 2599 was brought to my attention by a police officer from my community who indicated that when we passed the pension change last year saying that widows would receive a minimum of \$200 we failed to include the widows of policemen whose husbands died while disabled. This was discussed with the Pension Laws Commission and they had no problem with it, it went to Committee and passed out 15 to 0. There are 14 widows in the state at the present time who are receiving less than \$200. This will cover those 14 widows and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Steczo 'aye'. O'Brien, would you push your switch...excuse me. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. He wished to be



recorded as 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 161 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2619."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2619. A Bill..."

Speaker Bradley: "Is Mr. Jones on the floor? Out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2643. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2643 freezes assessments beginning in the year 1980 at the 1979 assessment level state wide on certain categories of real property. The specified property receiving a freeze is limited to single family dwellings and apartments containing six units or less. I've received a lot of correspondence from Northshore Senior Citizens group requesting that...first of all, that the state address itself to the serious problem of escalating real estate taxes and yes, address itself to the serious problem of escalating real estate reassessment. And as it was pointed out in the letter signed by Wilford M. Helm, the president of the Northshore Senior Citizens in Winnetka, Illinois...not in my district, but a concern shared not only in my district but throughout the state, it requested...and according to the New Church Township Assessors Office, the escalation in property values have already increased close to 50% since 1976 quadrennial assessment. At the rate of inflation, as is pointed out, of homes a residential property assessed presently at 16% of market value would.....they gave a quotation of a \$100,000 home would be \$16,000 and assessed at at least \$150,000 would be re...increased in the reassessment would be \$150,000 or more. There were a number of articles located both in the community and the Suburban Press asking



that House Bill 2643 be brought to the Membership's attention and ask for your favorable consideration. The 1970...1980 assessments could not rise above the 1970 level ...'79 levels, 1979 being the date for the next quadrennial assessment for most of this state. Property whose character or use changes after 1979 assessment would not qualify for the freeze. Any improvements made to the property would not qualify for this freeze. Finally, the freeze and assessment would change if the ownership of the property changes. I asked that the staff research the constitutionality of this Bill and they informed me in order for it to be effective it would have to be introduced and passed and signed into law this year. And they also mentioned the fact that it's an attempt at a state wide classification which was upheld in the Illinois Supreme Court in Hoffman vs. Clark and that case was decided in 1977. I know that there will be some opposition from the school districts in this state and this is what Representative Mugalian was addressing himself to in the other Bill. But Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know if you caught it in the paper, a small article just two days ago when he mentioned the fact that yes, in our county and in the county of Cook, the reassessment went out based upon last years level and the next bill you're going to be receiving will come in the month of July. That bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, not only in my county but in every county in this state you'll find a reassessment and what it really costs. I'm for providing property and taxes at an equitable level. And I believe that most of the Membership of this House realizes the fact that we have a responsibility, both on the local and state level to provide the necessary revenue. But I think it is atrocious when you pass on the real estate tax increases under the disguise of reassessment. I'm not freezing tax rates or tax levies, I'm just stating publicly and there will be a law with your help, that



beginning in 1980 the tax assessments will be frozen in this state. I ask for your favorable consideration and I'll be more than happy to answer any questions on House Bill 2643."

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

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman answer..."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Simms: "Representative Lechowicz, what provisions do you have in your Bill for property that owned in trust that is assessed under the provisions of your legislation if the ownership of property is changed the assessment can be changed? What provisions do you have if the ownership of a trust is changed...which trusts are not necessarily recorded...the change in ownership or the beneficial interest?"

Lechowicz: "I don't have a...there's no effect on the trusts."

Simms: "So, in other words, property that is held in a trust, which many people do have property held in trust, would be exempt from your Act? Am I correct?"

Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Simms: "Am I correct in that?"

Lechowicz: "That is correct. They would not be included underneath the House Bill 2643."

Simms: "So their assessments would go up?"

Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Simms: "Thank you."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. I'd like the chair to indicate in its opinion whether or not this Bill would be an infringement on the home rule powers and therefore require 107 votes."

Speaker Bradley: "It seems to the Chair that this Bill deals with assessments and it's out of the scope of the home rule powers and therefore it will take 89 votes. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."



Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Ewing: "As I understand the Bill, Ted, the Department of Local Governmental Affairs would still assess a multiplier even though we've frozen assessments?"

Lechowicz: "As I understand the Bill..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. Lechowicz. For what purpose does the Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis, rise?"

Geo-Karis: "The purpose, Mr. Speaker, of making a parliamentary inquiry. Did I hear you correctly...did you say it does affect home rule, it only needs 89 votes?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yeah, assessment factors are outside the scope of the home rule and we are saying 89 votes, the Chair is ruling."

Geo-Karis: "But it affects...assessment practices affect property in home rule units and I..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair has ruled, Ms. Geo-Karis, you have only one..."

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to appeal the ruling of the Chair then. I really think it's 107."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Lady has appealed the ruling of the Chair and...you withdraw your...all right. She is withdrawing her appeal. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Meyer: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Doesn't this affect the assessment procedures in Cook County which is a home rule unit?"

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could we have some order? Mr. Speaker, simply for the edification of the Membership and to offer some explanation to the ruling of the Chair. There has been court decisions in Cook County, the name of the case escapes me at this time, which have held that matters pertaining to the assessment practices are not considered



home rule powers because that process is a process which is performed in Cook County for home rule units and for special districts such as a park district or a sanitary district and school districts. And, therefore, the assessment practices processees (sic) cannot be considered to be a home rule power."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "If I may make an inquiry of Majority Leader, Madigan?"

Speaker Bradley: "If you may what?"

Geo-Karis: "Make an inquiry of him...of what he just said. Are those cases Supreme Court cases, Appellate Court cases or are they just cases in the circuit...court or superior court?"

Madigan: "The name of the case was Bridgman vs. Korzen in the Supreme Court."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

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

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I raise the point..... I'm not going to appeal the ruling of the Chair, but I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to separate assessment from taxation. Now you know, if you can do that, fine... but I ..... just don't see how you can do it."

Speaker Bradley: "Back to the question from Mr. Ewing to Mr. Lechowicz."

Ewing: "I think I remember the question. This will not change the practice of the Department of Local Governmental Affairs in assessing multipliers.... is that correct?"

Lechowicz: "That's correct, Sir."

Ewing: "And do they assess a multiplier to Cook County?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, they do."

Ewing: "And the only property that would be frozen here will be residential property?"

Lechowicz: "Property will be frozen to single family dwellings and apartments containing six units or less."

Ewing: "I want to question then.... whether.... if we hold





these units at a certain level, are the lower assessments then a third..... 33 1/3% of market value, while business property is rising or if I come in and buy a house and it's at a higher level than it would have been, I'm going to have that increased multiplier applied against my business property or my newly purchased house. Is that correct?"

Lechowicz: "That is correct, Sir."

Ewing: "Would that not cause some very definite inequities for people who buy homes or people who own others.... and residential property?"

Lechowicz: "Well, I don't believe so. I think what we're trying to do is promote and state that quite vividly and straightforwardly that as far as..... there will be no more hidden taxes based on the premise of escalation and reassessment.. Now if you want to increase your taxes, you go out and get the referendum and the approval of the people and not hide it under the guise of reassessment on the.... on the home. This will promote stability. This will promote the availability of people in respective areas throughout the state to say yes, we finally have a true tax relief, knowing that our reassessments won't be going up. I didn't have intention of selling my home, I've lived in for twenty years and all of a sudden...yes, it may be worth \$40,000 in the real estate market but for me to move from one house to another is going to cost me \$60,000.and I don't have the \$60,000. I just want to stay in my home and be left alone and pay my taxes at a fair and equitable rate. This is what this Bill will do."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly, proceed."

Ewing: " I always hesitate to disagree with the Honorable Representative Lechowicz and he usually takes good care of me and we very seldom do disagree on Bills, but I think



however you vote on this Bill that you should keep in mind that the multiplier, as applied to your property, will bring you up in assessments. But if you're a young person or if you trade homes or if you own property that is not covered by the freeze, that effect of the multiplier will be accentuated and the unfairness, I think, will outweigh the benefits. I think what we're after here in freezing property assessments is good. It's a type of tax relief we need, but I'm fearful that the problems created here by the unfairnesses outweigh the good in this particular Bill and it could be improved to the point where this could be gotten around."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I have a totally irrelevant question to ask the Majority Leader and that is how the Cook County Board can justify imposing or allowing tax breaks for industry by use of its home rule powers in lieu of the citation that he's just given. But, if that is out of order I won't pursue that. But, instead I will speak to the Bill. This is undoubtedly one of the worst Bills that has come before this General Assembly. The reason that it is a bad Bill is because it will perpetuate past inequities. In fact, it will perpetuate present inequities. Those who are over assessed will remain over assessed. Those who are under assessed will remain under assessed. Assessments will rise in only three instances, according to this Bill. Number one, if you sell your house or buy a new house....property tax is going to go up. Now parenthetically, if you want more people like me in the General Assembly who are always bugging you about assessment inequities, what you want to do is pass this Bill and I guarantee you there will be a whole slew of 'em like me down here in about four years and soon as people find out what's happening. Because when new people move into an area and buy houses in a subdivision they will find that



they are paying higher taxes than people who have lived in the subdivision for five or ten years. I don't think that we can justify that from a logical standpoint. I know we can't justify that from a Constitutional standpoint. I would point to Article 9 of the Illinois State Constitution, Section 4a, Real Property Taxation. It states: 'Except as otherwise provided in this Section taxes upon real properties shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provide by law'. It does not say that taxes shall be ascertained according to the length of time you've lived in your home. It does not say that taxes shall be...that taxes shall be levied ununiformly, it says uniformly. Uniformity is the keystone to the...to any assets that the property tax may have and it's certainly the reason that I make most of my complaints about the property taxes because it is not being levied uniformly. Many of the people who are complaining from the northern part of Cook County have been grossly under assessed in the past. Absolutely grossly under assessed and they have under the brick and mortar approach and finally when that part of Cook County has been brought in conformity with the rest of the state and we're assessing property according to value, as indeed the State Constitution says, uniformity by valuation...the constitution says. Then they're screaming and holding tax protest meetings. Well, people are going to protest property taxes whenever they go up. If you want to stop the rise in property taxes I would suggest that we direct our attention in one of two directions. Number one, play around with the rates, put a cap on them, don't let the tax district get a higher percentage increase in the amount of real estate taxes that come into them than the cost of living goes up for those tax districts. Now that, at least is being approached in rhetoric by Comptroller Bakalis through Representative Brady's Bill although



Representative Brady's Bill has enough loopholes probably to drive Cook County through. The second approach one could take would be the circuit breaker approach for everyone. Now, if we wanted to take the type of circuit breaker approach that I first introduced in this General Assembly before the Representative who was clapping over here... over on the other side of the aisle was elected back in 1973...and you want to cost it out and figure out how much it will really cost, it will cost between \$200,000,000 and \$300,000,000. Now we just don't have that kind of money right now and so I've limited my approaches to.... attempting to solve, if you will, the senior citizens... property tax problems to senior citizens. I figure if we get it...if we can solve it for senior citizens, then we can approach the rest of the state that Representative Friedrich wants to approach and, indeed, should be approached. This will not solve the problem, this is only going to....it's going to exacerbate the problem. It's going to, to coin Representative Catania's word, it is going to make matters worse in the long run. It's going to make matters really worse in the long run when all the homeowners in the state figure out we're doing to them the same thing that the nation did to the blacks during the 1960's. That is, making false promises that cannot be delivered. I would challenge the Sponsor of this Amendment to try to convince this General Assembly that the state constitution as it is written is not flagrantly violated by this Bill and the concept behind it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from the 'Emerald Isle', Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Lechowicz, to close the debate."



Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. The constitutional question was raised and when I had the Bill drafted, I had them specifically look into the constitutional question. And they assured me based upon a ruling of the Illinois Supreme Court in the Hoffman vs. Clark case, decided in 1977, that the Bill as drafted would be constitutional. Now, I've been here close to ten years, in fact it is ten years...and I just want to point out that I've heard a lot of rhetoric on this floor stating that we're going to provide tax relief or a cap on real estate taxes in this state for the past ten years I've been here. I'll just point out to the Membership if they haven't read it, take a look at Newsweek, April the 10th and one quarter of the magazine is based upon what's happening not only in Illinois but throughout the nation and people being burnt up over taxes. Now there's going to be a proposition offered in the State of California next...the first week in June which will really do something about taxes in that state. I'm just stating, in this Bill all we're trying to address is put a little bit of equity to the homeowners in this state stating that we will not back door them in increasing the real estate taxes based upon reassessment. And according to the staff I had drawn up this Bill, based upon that Supreme Court ruling, they think it is constitutional and I would hope that the Membership of this House would go on record and support the people from the townships..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz, have you concluded?"

Lechowicz: "Speaker...thank you. ....support the township of New Trier, the assessor of that township who is in support of this Bill. Support the Assessors Association of DuPage County... and I've got seven signatures on that. But most important, support the people that send you here, the people that pay the taxes. I ask...favorably ask your consideration on 2643."



Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson, to explain his vote for one minute."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, explaining my 'no' vote...I think there's two things wrong with this Bill. First, a provision which exempts improvements added to property will tend to discourage 'rehab's' (sic) which are vital to preserve the quality of our housing stock. And, also, the provision that prevents appeal and lowering of assessments will tend to make certain buildings economically unfeasible as time goes on. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I plan to take Representative Lechowicz's admonitions and support the people who sent me here. Over half the people in my district live in apartments. Now, if you're going to freeze the residential property, it's going to shift the tax burden on to other classes of property including apartment buildings. And boy, I'm not going to go back to my district and look those people in the eye, many of whom incidently are senior citizens living on very meager incomes and tell them that I am increasing their rents and forcing them out of their units because they're having to pay for the taxes are due and owing by some residential property owner. So, I'm going to vote against this Bill."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill because I don't think it does what it's supposed to do in terms of granting tax relief. But I want to tell this General Assembly that this is my final year in this



General Assembly and I want to tell you something, if we are not prepared in the very near future to do something about the tax situation, particularly as it relates to real estate taxes, we are going to be on the brink of something happening that this county can ill-afford and that is a tax revolt. This Bill won't do it, but we better do it some kind of way."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, would you kindly poll the absentees?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Bartulis, Chapman..."

Speaker Bradley: "Chapman 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Corneal Davis, Deuster, Emil Jones, Katz, Kucharski, Luft, Mann, McBroom, Schlickman, Stearney, Mr. Speaker."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, kindly place this Bill on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "Place the Bill on Postponed Consideration. House Bill, Second Reading. House Bill 1333. Pardon me. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald, for what purpose do you rise?"

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to be voted 'yes' on House Bill 2575, it will not affect the outcome of the vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objections, she will be so recorded. House Bill 2316, on Second Reading, Mr. Kane. Take it out of the record. 1333, out of the record. 2548, out of the record. 2554, Mr. Yourell. Second Reading...out of the record. 2555, Mr. Levin. Mr. Holewinski, can you handle that Bill or ...take that out of the record...you're Co-sponsor. 2555."



Out of the record. 2593, Hanahan. Out of the record. 2594, out of the record. 2604, Representative Leinenweber. Second Reading, 2604. Out of the record. 2691, Mr. Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2691. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Any motions relative to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 2738."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2738. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Neither of the chief Sponsors are on the floor. We'll take it out of the record for now. 2757."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2757. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Any motions relative to Amendment #1."

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1, Representative Brady."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, the motion to table Amendment #1 has to do with some significant changes that happened to this Bill in Committee and the information that surrounded those changes. In my opinion, what Amendment #1 does is make this Bill inequitable for several areas of the State of Illinois. And further, it goes on the premise that there is agreement among education people around the State of Illinois. Vis-a-vis the information handle-outs (sic) that this is a School Problems Commission and it somewhat seems a universal School Problems Commission consensus Bill. I happen to be a member of the School





Problems Commission. I was not there when this was offered on that evening but was given advance warning of it and was aware that there would be a majority vote to carry this principle as a School Problems Commission principle. But I would like to state as one Member of the School Problems Commission that I am diametrically opposed to this form of changing the formula for school aid in Illinois. I don't think it enhances enough districts and in fact, it's very parochial in its interests in only helping a few. And for that reason and the reason that there are others on the School Problems Commission who are also opposed to this, I stand and urge you to support the motion to table this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, has moved to table Committee Amendment #1. On that motion...."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich in the Chair."

Speaker Matijevich: "On that motion, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Schneider and I spent some time today discussing this Bill and the Amendments which have been proposed to us. Amendment #1 was filed in Committee and it is in fact the results of hearings around the state by the School Problems Commission which puts two vital aspects into the formula. Again, these have been discussed with you and I'm not going to take any time of the House to deal with that. I would say, however, that the results of the print-outs that have been around, the comparisons made, you know and I know that if you have looked at those that are contrary to what Representative Brady indicates, the fact is that for FY-79 the distribution of money across the state is very equitable and in the judgement of the Commission, reasonable and fair. And it's for that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that I would like to ask



you to defeat the motion which has been made by Representative Brady."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to table Amendment #1. I think there's more to look at than just what was presented by Representative Hoffman. I served on a Subcommittee as did he, other than the School Problems Commission, which went around the state and gathered evidence and positions from people. I think the people in downstate Illinois do not necessarily and in fact, they do not believe...agree in the majority with him that we should be taking the approach that he is taking. The question of distribution that he mentioned is a separate entity from the question of how we spread out money not only in this formula for school funding but also in the various formula and categorical programs to which we fund special education, vocational education and etc. I don't think the people in downstate Illinois favor a proposal such as this. It is not the only proposal admittedly nor are others such as mine. But I think this is in opposition to what most of us downstate would want."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I also was...am, rather, on the School Problems Commission and I did attend not only that meeting the night we made a decision to adopt the proposal before us today, but, also as part of the Commission and part of the Subcommittee on Finance and Education, travel throughout the state and received a lot of response to the notion of changing one of the basic concepts that I think Mike Brady doesn't like very much and that's the Title 1 change. We discovered that to continue a fair policy that educates children that are Title 1 <sup>eligibles,</sup> we can allow the figure of



'twelve, sixty' to remain in its present level and without damaging their education in fact, Illinois has been demonstrated out spends for Title 1 kids 2 to 1 compared to any other state...its nearest competitor being Pennsylvania. So what we're doing is really providing money for education which will raise the guarantee per pupil to a level of 1300 bucks. Also educate kids in the Title 1 area with great amounts of money, not only from the state but from the federal government as well and also to provide a 3 year over-payment process that also emerges from the basic problems in Illinois. This is the year, 1979, I think when the assessment problems will begin to even out. It's the year that I think we can make some progress in changing the concepts that relate to...the school aid formula. I think, possibly next year, some other changes may be considerable...given some consideration...but presently, this is the best of all possible worlds I think in this year and I would urge defeat of the motion to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to announce the Speaker's intent to work to approximately 8:00 tonight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The previous question prevails. Representative Brady, to close."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I'm urging your support of this motion to table. I've talked before but I would just like to say in closing, if this was such a good Bill for the State of Illinois, how come I haven't received one response..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "God bless Mayor Bilandic."

Brady: "How come I haven't received one response in favor of it...from anybody in education in Illinois? If this is such a good Bill and equitable for the State of Illinois, how come there's already nine Amendments on my desk to change this Bill? I don't think it's any good. I don't think the nine Amendments once we see them and if they're put on will make this a good Bill then. It will probably cost about twice as much as the proposal that we, as a Committee, came out with on this floor that I think is much more encompassing. I would urge you to stand in support of this motion to table and we could get on and discuss a comprehensive formula change Bill that I think will be effective for the entire State of Illinois."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, has moved to table Committee Amendment #1. All in favor of that tabling motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Have all...have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this motion there are 63 voting 'aye', 80 voting 'no' and the motion is defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Kane. Amends House Bill 2757 on page 12, line 16 and so forth."

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

Kane: "I'll withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Kane. Amends House Bill 2757 as amended in the second paragraph and so forth."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, on Amendment #3."

Kane: "I'll withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Bradley. Amends House Bill 2757 on page 1, line 20 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, on Amendment #4."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, if Amendment #4 is the Bill that inserts \$300 instead of the 48, then I would respectfully withdraw that Bill...that Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Bradley. Amends House Bill 2757 on page 1, line and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, on Amendment #5."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we're doing with Amendment #5 is inserting the figure \$200 in place of the \$48 which is the Strayer-Haig Flat Grant formula, it is in the Strayer-Haig formula. What I'm saying with this Amendment is that it's about time and way past time to make an adjustment for those schools...10% of the schools in this state receive 1% of the money, those are the Strayer-Haig districts. I think it's time that we address ourselves to the fact that we are not meeting our constitutional mandate that says the primary responsibility lies with the state to fund our elementary and secondary schools. \$200 will not come even close to meeting that mandate. We have some schools...the inequities that we have in the State of Illinois and our funding, we some students receiving \$1150 per student from the State of Illinois and others receive the flat grant of approximately \$60. Gross inequities, Ladies and Gentlemen, built into the resource equalizer formula and into the Strayer-Haig formula. There has been some talk in the state of doing away with the Strayer-Haig formula which would leave again some 10 to 12% of our schools receiving no tax dollars from the



state at all. Some thinking...some people think also that if we supply \$12,060 to each and every boy and girl in Illinois, regardless of where the money comes from, whether it be at the local level or at the state level, that we have met our obligation. In my opinion, we certainly have not. I think those boys and girls throughout Illinois are being shortchanged by the state...but we send a measly \$60 to their school district to fund their education.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, some years ago we passed a Bill that became law that when a student who goes to a private higher educational institution on an Illinois State Scholarship Commission Fund that that university, if the student is a freshman or a sophomore receives a \$100 in an outright grant for administration cost...for that student just being at that university. If that student who again is receiving funds from the Illinois State Scholarship Commission Fund is a junior or senior, he will receive...the university will receive a direct grant of \$200 for that boy or girl to pay for the administrative cost. I just point that out to you to indicate to you our generosity in funding young men and young women who attend our universities at the private level. I ask you, with this Bill, to assure every boy and girl in Illinois that they will receive at least as much money as those students who are juniors and seniors going to the university level in our private institutions. It seems it's the least we can do, we can't do any less than that. It's time that we met our obligations, at least a fractional part of it, and give that every boy and girl in Illinois at least \$200 for their education...and this Amendment addresses that very problem and I solicit your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are a number of ways to address the



question that Representative Bradley has mentioned. And those...this issue is addressed by increasing the percentage from 125% to some other level. By my estimate, we are talking about adding by this increase to \$200 of approximately \$19,000,000 in the cost to this program. The formula that you have before you in its present condition already utilizes \$66,000,000 and when you put that together with the full funding of the mandated programs that have been suggested by the Commission, we're at a \$125,000,000 new money which is already \$15,000,000 over the Governor says he has available now. The leveling up from 40...from \$60 to \$200, of course, is also a disequalizing factor. I might also point out that all money that is raised for education has been construed consistently by the court to be state dollars because they're applied to a state purpose. The school districts to which this Bill is addressed are school districts...at least by the standards that we measure wealth...now, wealthy above and beyond the qualification for the equalization of resources. Some school districts, there are three school districts that are Strayer-Haig that receive more than \$200 now because the scale moves from \$60 to about \$227...\$226... somewhere in that level, so I understand the interest and the concern of the offer of this Amendment. But it does cost...in our figures...round numbers...\$19,000,000 and that is \$19,000,000 that we do not have. These school districts, through the full funding and the mandated program, will be beneficiaries of state dollars and that way ...and for this reason, I ask that...this...that you vote against this Amendment...#5."

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

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, since we now have the Bill in front of us and we are dealing with it, we pointed out the inadequacies before...certainly one of the



greatest inadequacies is it doesn't address Strayer-Haig districts at all and for that reason I stand in support of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Representative Brady is absolutely right. One of the issues that was addressed by the School Problems Commission and the Subcommittee on funding the formula throughout the state was the issue of the Strayer-Haig districts. Those on the old school aid formula option that existed prior to '73 and exists now is an option to the resource equalizer formula. About 160 or so districts are now on that formula. If we don't do anything to change the current resource equalizer, which we hear so much ballyhoo about, we're going to have 300 districts next year and more and more year after year. This Amendment helps many downstate districts. This Amendment ought to be addressed here now, it should have been addressed in any Bill put in on the formula and ought to be passed."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, to close."

Bradley: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of comments. One, the point that Mr. Stuffle just made regarding the Strayer-Haig, I'd like to make it very clear that he's absolutely right and the reason we have more and more going to the Strayer-Haig formula is because if they are not on the Strayer-Haig formula, they receive absolutely nothing under the resource equalizer. Secondly, we point out to the Members something that Representative Hoffman referred to and that is wealth. It all depends on how you construe wealth. Is it the real estate holdings and value in the district or should we be judging wealth, as some might suggest, on income and there's been thought that that should be placed into the formula. Unfortunately,





it is not there. Unfortunately, also, we are losing students...not only downstate, we're losing students all over the State of Illinois. The problem as I...I'm sure you're well aware...it's the problem that the resource equalizer who we all held such high regard when it was introduced and had such high hope that it would fund our schools with the income tax and the new dollars that came into the State of Illinois would fund our schools adequately. We have seen in the last four or five years the continuing decline of the dollars coming back to our schools. We fully funded the resource equalizer, not by intent, we fully funded it by accident because of the loss of boys and girls going to our schools. At least we can do, what I said to you earlier, the least we can do is do the same for a kindergarten student, downstate Illinois or any place in Illinois, the same for that little boy or girl that we do for a junior or senior who is attending one of our private universities who receives \$200 in an outright grant to that university from the State of Illinois to pay...to help pay for the administrative cost...the least we can do is give \$200 for elementary and secondary boys and girls and secondary students in Illinois. I urge your support on the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McClain, Representative Bradley, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 2757. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 81 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'nay' and Amendment #5 is adopted. Representative Hoffman from DuPage."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has asked for a verification of the Roll Call."

Bradley: "Poll the absentees, please."



Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McLean has asked for a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard you say that the Amendment was adopted."

Speaker Matijeich: "Well, I think that the Gentleman had his hand up and his light on and I didn't know what he was recognizing me for...so he...poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Bowman, Caldwell..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Caldwell, 'aye'. Bennett, 'aye'. Alan Bennett, 'aye'. Capparelli, 'aye'. Winchester, 'aye'. Reed, 'no'. Reed, 'no'. Representative Hoffman, do you still desire verification?"

Hoffman: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijeich: "85 'ayes', 62 'nays'."

Hoffman: "No."

Speaker Matijeich: "O.K. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6..."

Speaker Matijeich: "One moment...Representative Hoxsey, do you wish to be..."

Hoxsey: "Yes, I'd like to recorded 'aye' on that."

Speaker Matijeich: "Record Representative Hoxsey as 'aye' on that last Roll Call. Further Amendments? Representative Walsh, 'aye'. Robert Walsh."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Kane, amends House Bill 2757 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, on Amendment #6."

Kane: "I withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Matijeich: "Amendment #6 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, Porter, amends House Bill 2757 on page 6, line 11 and so forth."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Porter, on Amendment #7."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #7 would provide a 90% hold harmless for all those districts...and I think many of us have them throughout the state which as, a result of either increased assessments or declining enrollments, are experiencing a drastic loss of state aid. And I would urge the Members to adopt Amendment #7."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Brady: "Representative Porter, do you have the amount that this Amendment placed on the Bill will cost?"

Porter: "Yes, from memory. I don't have it in front of me but my recollection is that it would cost 18.7 million dollars."

Brady: "Thank you, Representative Porter. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, what I'm trying to illustrate here is that we are now trying to construct a formula change Bill on the floor, many of which ideas have been incorporated in a prior Bill that we haven't voted on yet. And for that reason, if we're going to talk about this being the possible formula change Bill that we would give more equity to another situation that is effecting many school districts in Illinois. We should be consistent and also have the 90% hold harmless in this Bill we're addressing and I urge your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "If assessed valuation remain constant in the school district but the population, the student enrollment, went down 50%...would the districts still get 90% of its state aid on the prior years....prior years state aid?"



Porter: "I think the answer to that is yes."

Skinner: "Yeah, that's what I think the answer is too and that's what makes this such an abysmal Amendment. We were sitting in Rockford...we were sitting in Rockford listening to the Rockford school people tell us how they were going to lose \$2,000,000 in state aid and so knowing that it had to be either because the assessed valuation was going up or the student level was going down or a combination of the two. I asked, 'what's the situation in Rockford? And they said, 'Oh, we're losing 1800 weighted average daily attendance' and I said, 'do you really think that you can justify getting the same state aid if you're losing 1800 students'? Well, I didn't get quite a straight out yes, but that's exactly what this Amendment is gonna give the City of Rockford. And I'm sure the people from the City of Rockford ought to be very thankful for that and also the City of Chicago, which are losing people right...well, how should I put it, it's not just right and left, it's car after car driving to my district because they're all coming up to the Fox River Valley. And obviously, if you're going to limit the amount of money that a school district loses, it means you're going to be subsidizing empty school seats in order to delay the subsidy of full school seats in areas like the Fox River Valley...and I just don't think that's fair. We get under the Gentleman from Skokie's Bill and as a result of that my school districts did not get money to subsidize school classrooms, while his school districts was getting money to subsidize empty classrooms...and...if not indeed, empty schools. And this is just another extension of that...of that philosophy which is take from the people who give...who ...take from the people who need it, that is the people with the students, and give it to the schools that don't need it, that's the schools without students. It's just unfair."



Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again I rise in support of this Amendment as the others." Representative Skinner's comment should be brought to light here in as much as we already have provision in the school aid formula to use an averaging of three years average daily attendance, that's already a limitation in that provision. This 90% hold harmless also has to be considered against the provisions already in the law which would require, this year, that we deduct from last year's over payments, if any, to set a base on the 90% figure in here. As well, school districts face, as he knows, many fixed costs that are not going to change and as well, I would submit that I don't think you're gonna find anyone with a 50% loss in enrollment in one year, including Rockford."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I, too, was going to question the likelihood of any school district losing 50% of its students, short of a whole series of tornados, etc. going through their district. And there are costs involved that do not decrease when you lose a few students. The problem in the current formula is there is a geometric fall off in state aid for loss in enrollment, regardless of how small that loss in enrollment might be. The loss in state aid accelerates much more quickly than enrollment actually declines and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword... changed his mind. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly in support of this Amendment and to answer some of the charges made by the Gentleman from McHenry, is that Amendment addresses itself to one of the real basic



problems to the present school aid formula and that is that it funds schools on the basis of average costs rather than marginal costs. So that a school district that's growing gets all these...the state increase of state and local funds for each student. At the same time, on a declining...when a school district loses one student, that school district loses the average cost of the average revenue attributed to that student from both state and local funds and the school district does not save those costs. The only way that a school district can save costs is by closing classrooms, closing schools, firing teachers and most school districts don't lose enough students in one year in order to do that. So this Amendment addresses one of the real basic problems of the school aid formula in that it treats education as an average cost industry which it is not. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is the same as House Bill 2564 ...which was before the Education Committee during this Session. As the Speaker...the Sponsor of the Amendment indicated, we're talking about something with a cost of somewhere in the neighborhood of 18.7 or maybe \$20,000,000. Again, I would say that this is above and beyond the resources that we have available. In the Bill, as it is now before you, we deal with this issue when we give school districts three years to repay any amount that they've been paid in excess this year. That costs us \$18,000,000...that aspect alone in the formula. That will be addressing the same kind of school districts and the same issue that is being addressed with this. Plus the fact, it's been pointed out by previous Speakers that we now already have in the formula a three year average



so that when schools count their attendance they are not counting their actual attendance for that year, but an average of the preceding three years. This is reasonable and fair and equitable and we deal with the increase in the assessed valuations from '75 to '76 with the three year pay back provision. And for...the reasons that I've indicated that we've already addressed this problem and the excess cost of this Amendment, I would ask that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider.

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

In opposition to the proposal and in trying to collect some of the ideas that Representative Kane alluded to, what I would argue is that...true, it's a...we are talking about averaging marginal costs, we are concerned about labor intensive industry, but until we figure out some other way than trying to pay for education on the basis of per pupil costs, what we might conclude when we talk about averaging and marginal costs that we may start paying for classrooms as a way of calculating that kind of a factor. I'm not for sure yet how to do that and I don't think my friend, Doug, is either. But, the fact remains that when you also address yourself to this proposal before us, you begin to draw money away...not only from distributive aid but from a lot of those mandated programs that so many people want to fund 100%. And I think this year, in combination with the Bill, as it was originally proposed today...with that concept, we will be able to fully fund many of the mandates, at least the significant ones, at a 100%. When we start adding these kinds of Amendments and the one that was just previously adopted, the mandated programs again are going to be pro-rated and I hope some day we can knock that out of the educational lexicon of the school aid formula and the proposals dealing with categoricals, so I would solicit a 'no' vote."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, to close."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Amendment has been debated very thoroughly. I think that you can tell by the relatively modest cost that there aren't a great deal of problems with 50% declining enrollments. There are districts throughout the state that do have problems with that and with increased assessments and with a drastic fall off of state aid and I think they deserve to be protected and I would urge the Members to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to House Bill 2757. All those in favor of that motion, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted...have all voted...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 87 'ayes', 48 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present' and Amendment #7 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Porter, amends House Bill 2757 on page 6 and line 12 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, on Amendment #8."

Porter: "Amendment #8, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is the reverse side of the coin of Amendment #7. Presently, we have in the law a 25% cap on an increase on state aid that can be received by any district. This would raise that cap from 25% to 35%. It is the same provision that is contained in House Bill 2903. The cost would be around...estimated to be \$6,000,000, substantially less than Amendment #7 and I would urge the Members to adopt Amendment #8."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, Representative





Porter is partially correct, a 35% factor is in House Bill 2903, but as Representative Bowman amended it in Committee, it goes to a 50% factor in a year from now... so there is no fiscal impact next year. But anybody who has a high school district certainly would want to move it from the present 25% to 35%. I think that they are only fair...in getting it this much reform and so for that reason, I would support at least this minimum that Representative Porter is putting in but I would consider that he ought to think about trying to amend it even further if he gets a chance to add 50% in the following year. And I want to remind you once again, we've just added another \$6,000,000 and we're not quite yet close to being equitable with the other formula Bill before us in my opinion. But I'd urge your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This provides for an increase for a high school district...of an additional 10%. Now, you have to remember that what we are saying in the present law is that we limit your increase from what you got last year to 25%, so that in effect, they're getting 125% of what they got last year. That is...you know more than fair in terms of what the rest of the school districts are getting. You have to remember that these high school districts started from a low...a low base because we let them fund themselves and the reason we put the 25% limitation in is because we felt that in terms of increased state aid you already had the access to the local money that this was about...you know, a reasonable amount that they could put in, plus the fact the limit on the state resources. And so, for that reason, the access that they have to local money, plus the fact that we're giving them 25% more than they got the year before...seems to me that where we stand



now is more than fair and more than equitable and I would encourage the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Winnebago, Representative Lynn Martin."

Martin: "Will the Sponsor yield? Would this also cover high schools within a dual district? Excellent Amendment... excellent."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman...the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "How will this affect the school districts in Lake County, can you tell me?"

Porter: "Geo, I can't. I expect it will affect them just like it will affect the other ones. It depends upon whether they're entitled under the formula to an increase that exceeds 25%."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, to close."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think, again the issue is a very clear one. If the districts presently, under the terms of the formula, are entitled to more than a 25% increase, they don't get it because we have an artificial cap on it. In addition, the IOE, when we put the cap on, chose to interpret it in the most restrictive form and then many people think that ...in a ridiculous...so that a good deal of the intended relief that was put in the law last Session really never came through to the districts. I think this tends to correct that and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8 to House Bill 2757. On that motion, all in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, to explain his vote."



Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, most of the high school districts in my district have surplus money in the bank right now and what we're saying is we're going to give them 100% of what they received this year, plus, 35% extra and they've got the money now...and I think this is going the wrong way."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion, there are 80 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and Amendment #8 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Kane, amends House Bill 2757 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, on Amendment #9."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #9 does is address itself to the basic inequities of the formula as it has developed over the last five years. And if you'll see what's happened to various school districts over the state and look to see what has happened to the school districts around the state, you'll know why your particular school districts...are really hurting. In the last five years \$540,000,000 new dollars has gone into the state school aid formula...and where have those dollars gone? The City of Chicago, with 22% of the weighted average daily attendance students, over the last 500... over the last five years has gotten 41% of the dollars, twice the average of students they've got. The suburban areas, those of you from the suburbs...Mr. Speaker, could we have some order, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we give the Gentleman order? Give the Gentleman order. Proceed."

Kane: "The suburban areas of this state that have 37% of the students, in the last five years have gotten only 30% of the dollars. For you downstaters, for us downstaters, we've got 40% of the students and over the last five years



we've gotten 28% of the new dollars. Now, what House Bill 2757 does, in its present form, is continue and compound those inequities. It gives Chicago 44% of the new dollars generated by the formula. Next year, House Bill 2757, will give Chicago 44% of the new dollars that that formula generates...twice what that school district is entitled to if we accept the premise that dollars should follow students. Now downstate, particularly you Republicans from downstate, if you look at the way money is distributed under House Bill 2757, it distributes \$66,000,000 new dollars next year and out of those \$66,000,000 new dollars downstate will get only \$2,000,000...\$2,000,000 out of the \$66,000,000. So what this Amendment #9 does is start with the premise that the new dollars next year, whatever new dollars we distribute, should be distributed on a fair and equitable basis and that the City of Chicago should get no more than 30% of the new dollars that will be distributed. Now the City of Chicago has 22% of the students and I think that giving them 30% of the new dollars is more than equitable, more than fair. So what this Amendment does is reduce the share that Chicago will receive in new dollars from 45% to 30%. And it takes that 15% reduction and gives the suburban areas an additional 5% of the new dollars and gives downstate an additional 10% of the new dollars. Now the particular provisions of this formula are in some respects similar to the Amendments that we have already adopted, it does leave the guaranteed support at \$1300 per student, it changes the access on tax rates to unit districts by 7 cents and for elementary districts by 4 cents, it raises the ceiling, which we just adopted, from 25% to 35% on increases, it has a 90% hold harmless provision in it and it increases the add on for Strayer-Haig districts from 25% to 50%...and what it does on Title 1 money, it shaves the maximum waiting for Title 1 students from .75% to .675% and increases the minimum waiting for



Title 1 students from .375 to .45. Those are the technical details of the Amendment, but what the effect of is... basically is to distribute the new dollars that we're giving to education this year, regardless of the amount, approximately the same amount of dollars as they have students...generally, to the general areas of the state, the City of Chicago, the suburban areas and downstate. I think that this approach is fair, it's equitable, it does not continue the inequities that we have had for the last five years in the formula and I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #9."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman...no, no, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully disagree with Representative Kane on a few parts here. He did say, when he talks of new money...the few things he doesn't talk about is the 90% hold harmless factor, which is going into the formula now and is not only going to help downstate districts this year but in the years to come. And that new money that was put on with Amendment #5 adds up to 19,000,000, none of which that goes to Chicago, but goes to downstate primarily. Amendment #7 added 18.7 million and none of that money goes to Chicago. So there is \$37,000,000 that was just added by a few Amendments that already goes to downstate districts...I think that that's pretty equitable. I think that when we get to the categorical funding we are going to show that we're going to increase transportation amounts that Chicago does not participate in at all, another 15 or \$18,000,000. I'd like to see a fair and equitable formula Bill for the State of Illinois, but we're starting to see what happens, Ladies and Gentlemen, when we forget about Committees and we forget about debate and we just come out to the floor and offer Amendments on very complex and serious issues



affecting the entire state. This Amendment does do some of the things that have already been done in the Bill, we've already accomplished that, but it goes one step further. It then goes on to say, and now let's take one specific area of the state and penalize it and take money away and give it to the others. I don't think that's fair and equitable. I stand and try and support you in getting money for your districts, but I'd like to see it on a broad base basis and I urge the defeat of this motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "For starters, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to note that I have filed a request for a fiscal note following all Amendments. And, I wonder if the Sponsor of the Amendment would yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "I'm intrigued by the analysis you've done that indicates that Chicago has gotten...you said, 44% of the new money, since when?"

Kane: "In the last four years, out of the \$540,000,000..... additional dollars that have gone to education, Chicago has gotten \$222,000,000 or 41.2% of all the new dollars that went to education over the last five years."

Skinner: "And they have 22% of the students?"

Kane: "22.1% of the students."

Skinner: "Well, you certainly have a way of putting it in equity, so it is crystal clear. I'm not sure that your solution is correct, but I'm certainly willing to vote for the Amendment because it couldn't worse than the present situation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill that you have in it's somewhat crippled condition addresses or attempts to address or begins to address the



problem that is addressed in terms of the Title 1 issue that Representative Kane is addressing, which is really the main thrust of this particular Amendment. Because what we said in the Bill, as it now exists, is that we kept the Title 1 count at 1,260 and then from 1,260 on to whatever number we're going to and I have 1300 in my Bill per pupil. Every pupil or every student in the state will weighted...in weighted average daily attendance will be treated the same and we allow the Title 1 factor to function just as it functions now in...up to 1,260. It seems to me, given the givens that this is a much more reasonable way to approach this. And for that reason, I would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in responding to some of the negative comments about this amendment. The negative comments were that this Amendment penalizes a certain section of the state...penalizes it. Ladies and Gentlemen, that is absolutely not the case. If anybody can get up on this floor of the House and say with a straight face that with 22% of the students and getting 30% of the new dollars is penalizing that particular area of the state, I have to respectfully disagree. If there's any area of the state that's being penalized by this Amendment it's the downstate areas. Because with 40% of the dollars...with 40% of the students, this Amendment only gives 13.4% of the new dollars. Downstate is being penalized by this Amendment, if any area is, not the City of Chicago. But what this Amendment does do is give to downstate a great deal more money than any of the other formula Bills now before us. As I said before, in House Bill 2757, as it came to us, there were \$60,000,000 new dollars going to education this year in the formula. Only \$2,000,000 of that was going to come downstate. This



Amendment raises that \$2,000,000 to approximately \$13,000,000. I urge the adoption of this Amendment. It's fair, it's equitable. It's more than fair to the City of Chicago, regardless of what the people and the Representatives of Chicago would have you believe. I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #9."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #9 to House Bill 2757. On that motion, all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The...the Gentleman from DuPage, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You'll find that in House Bill 2757, as it is presently, with the Amendments that have been adopted the statements made by Representative Kane are obviously no longer...no longer are true. With the adoption of the other two Amendments, we have changed that significantly, rightly or wrongly. This Amendment would substitute everything that we've done up to this point for the program that's included in Amendment #9. Now, if that's what you want to do, if that's what you want to do then you should support this, but I don't think, on the basis of previous votes on the part of this House, that that's what you want to do and therefore I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion, there 85 voting 'aye', 65 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present' and Amendment #9 to House Bill 2757 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Kane, amends House Bill 2757, as amended and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, on Amendment #10."

Kane: "I would withdraw Amendment #10."





Speaker Matijevid: "#10 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevid: "There has been a request by Representative Skinner for a fiscal note of the Bill as amended and I think the Chair would have to rule that that's in order. The Bill will stay on Second Reading. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just inquire of the Sponsor of the last Amendment, do you have that...the fiscal note on this with you that we'd used in the past?"

Kane: "I have this or I have a print out."

Hoffman: "It seems to me that the print out has been accepted, so if you'll file that fiscal note then we'll move this Bill on to Third Reading."

Speaker Matijevid: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I objected to that because if you'll check the debate, I asked several of the Sponsors the amount and they gave me approximate...even Representative Hoffman gave one as \$20,000,000 or 18,000,000. I think we have a right to know exactly what all these are going to cost and I would urge that a proper fiscal note be filed on all these Amendments."

Speaker Matijevid: "The request for a fiscal note, since the Bill has been amended, is in order and the Bill will hold on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Kane...Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I would urge that with the filing of that fiscal note it says that the amount of cost to the state next year will be \$82,015,673 of additional money."

Speaker Matijevid: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel that any fiscal note that individual Amendment Sponsors may have gotten about the impact of their Amendment on



this Bill will not necessary be valid in terms of consideration of the other Amendments that have gone on the Bill. I think at this stage we are justified in asking the Office of Education to look at the Bill in its entirety with all of the Amendments that have gone on and give us an estimate in terms of each Amendment and how much additional impact that one has. I don't think that we can just put all of these in separately...that makes it look as though each of these is an add on and that is not necessarily true."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Chair is gonna rule because there were other Amendments, other than Representative Kane's, that the request for a fiscal note is in order...that's the ruling of the Chair. The Bill will hold on Second Reading. Representative Hoffman, from DuPage County."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, if...I can be corrected by Representative Kane if I am wrong, but I believe...Representative Kane... Representative Kane, I believe, unless I'm wrong, your Amendment...for all...took everything else out and what you have in is the \$82,000,000, is that correct or not?"

Kane: "That's correct."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I still think the ruling of the Chair is gonna be, you're gonna have a fiscal note from the Office of Education on...the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I hereby withdraw my fiscal note. I'm satisfied."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, I think in that case, Representative Brady has asked for one also, so...hold for a minute, we're gonna check the rules on this request for a fiscal note. The...on that issue the Parliamentarian has informed me, Representative Brady, in order to hold the Bill you have to have a motion adopted by the majority of the House...once an Amendment has made a change in the fiscal note that has been filed, therefore, on that do you request a motion...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "I'm wondering whether the Parliamentarian is looking at



rule 32F?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's exactly what he's looking at... and I looked at it with him. Is that what you're looking at? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "And if I may, Mr. Speaker, what did you say? I need a roll call to be able to..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You have to file a motion adopted by a majority."

Brady: "A motion adopted by a majority?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's correct."

Brady: "How do I file a motion before I get a majority to adopt it? I have a motion written in hand that is on the desk, if you're saying that that needs a majority of votes I would certainly urge that we take a vote on it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hold for one minute and we'll look at this more closely. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had people file fiscal notes requesting that these Amendments all have a proper fiscal note...motions for it, I had the understanding that those were going to be on the table, I would have filed mine earlier had I known that..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute, we're looking more closely at this rule. I think it may have been misinterpreted. The ruling of the Parliamentarian now is, Representative Brady, that that request for a fiscal note cannot be timely, it has to be made when the Amendment is presented. In other words, the request would have to be for deferring of the Amendment until that revised fiscal note on that Amendment is filed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think we were in a posture of asking for a fiscal note on any and all Amendments that were adopted. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I thought that you ruled that the fiscal note was not in order and that



we should have an opportunity to have the Illinois Office of Education, with the complexity of this, offer a proper fiscal note to give us the entire impact that this might be on the state. I thought that was the ruling of the Chair when we started to have people withdraw their requests."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the request for the fiscal note now, according to our rules, is not timely, that it definitely says that the Amendments would have to be deferred...and we are past that point, we are to the point where the Amendments have already been adopted. So, the request to hold it on Third Reading is not timely and I suggest we move it to Third Reading and go on with the Bill because it simply, according to the rule, is not timely at all."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, there is one point...Parliamentarian, because you weren't here when the debate was going on... there's one point I think that we ought to consider and I want to discuss with the Parliamentarian...because at one time, Representative Skinner had made the...had mentioned to the Chair that he is requesting that a fiscal note be filed on any Amendment. That...by him saying that, I think, he was in effect deferring action on any Amendment, unless a fiscal note is filed on that Amendment. And the Parliamentarian isn't listening to me. Let's hold for a minute, I want to discuss that with the Parliamentarian. Messages from the Senate, while we're waiting on this."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution No. 89, adopted



by the Senate, May 18, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representative, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution No. 60, adopted by the Senate, May 18, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to the following Resolution: Senate Joint Resolution No. 16, concurred in by the House...concurred in by the Senate, May 18, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the passage of Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2696, passed by the Senate, May 18, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bills No. 1783, 1784 and 1785, passed by the Senate May 17, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills No. 309, 554, 571, 1416, 1442, 1483, 1522, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1532, 1533, 1570, 1593, 1594, 1595, 1641, 1705, 1761, 1856, passed by the Senate May 18, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate, Mr. Wright,



Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution No. 72, adopted by the Senate, May 18, 1978, by 3/5 vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Matijeich: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1483, Flinn. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1522, Kane. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1524, Wikoff. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations and reappropriations to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1526, E.M. Barnes. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1527, Deavers. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1533, Younge. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations and transfer funds from the General Revenue fund to the State Community College of East St. Louis. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1570, McAuliffe. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1593, Mahar. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for certain retirement benefits for teachers. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1594, Wikoff. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Trustees of the State Universities Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1595, Wikoff. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the University Civil



Service Merit Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1783, Madigan. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1784, Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1785, Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1534, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1737, Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation of Sheriffs, Coroners, County Treasurers, County Clerks, Recorders, Auditors. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1798, Tuerk. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Introduction, First Reading. House Bill 3394, Kempiners. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the Department of Business and Economic Development. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Back to the order of House Bill, Second, on 2757, where we were at...the court finds some conflict between Rule 32E and 32F and the court rules under 32E because a fiscal note has been requested, the Bill still being on Second Reading and there being changes that it is in order and the Bill will be held on Second until that fiscal note has been supplied or determined to be inapplicable...and it must be filed by the Sponsor of the Amendment. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, to clarify...I would like the Chair, if this is true that the Amendments we're talking about would be Amendment #5 that we adopted, it was my Amendment, Mr. Porter's Amendment and Mr. Kane's Amendment, which he has already filed, I believe, the printout which is the fiscal note, so there's only two fiscal notes that have to be filed. Is that correct or is there another Amendment.... adopted?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I believe you are correct, Representative



Bradley."

Bradley: "Just those three?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's right."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "That should take about ten minutes. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the fiscal note that I filed includes the Amendment that Mr. Porter...that we adopted that was Mr. Porter's because it incorporates that Amendment and so the only fiscal note that is still required is Representative Bradley's Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right.....and he's back in his office working on it. The....House Bill 2794."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2794."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take it out of the record. Take the next one out of the record. House Bill 2857, Representative Dan Houlihan, do you want to go with Appellate Defender?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2857. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the State Appellate Defender. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments No. 1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. House Bill 2898, Yourell, do you want to go with that one? House Bill 2898."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2898. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7....are they all in Committee?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."





Speaker Lechowicz: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Beatty, amends House Bill 2898 in the title and in Section 1 and so forth."

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

Yourell: "I understand that Amendment #8 was adopted. All that is required of this Bill now is the request for a fiscal ....a pension impact note and that's been filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I think Amendment #8 is a Floor Amendment, isn't it, Mr. Clerk?"

Yourell: "They were all Floor Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, they were....oh, I see. House Bill ....has that been adopted? The record shows that 8 has been adopted. Has a fiscal note....further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Beatty, amends House Bill 2898 as amended by House Amendment #7 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook...is that Representative Beatty...is that whose Amendment it is? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "This is a technical Amendment, Amendment #9, and I move the adoption of Amendment #9."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook moves the adoption of Amendment #9 to House Bill 2898. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and Amendment #9 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Has the fiscal note been filed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pension impact note is filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we go to the order of Third Reading, there's a House Bill 2877 where the...there's been a request to take it back to the order of Second Reading. House Bill 2877."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2877. A Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to return House Bill 2877 to the Order of Second Reading and...are there any Amendments to House Bill 2877, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Pullen, amends House Bill 2877 as amended in the title and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, on Amendment #5."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate the cooperation of the Sponsor in bringing his Bill back for this Amendment. This Amendment would exempt from the definition of day care centers, which would be licensed by DCFS, parent respite programs which are commonly called mothers day out programs. These programs are conducted largely by churches and religious organizations and social service agencies for the purpose of mothers of very young children to be able to spend a few hours in a certain day every week doing shopping or whatever other chores she may want to do while having her children cared for in a center like this. It is not a full day care center program, it's a type of program where the mothers sign up for say a four hour day and it's the same day every week and she would bring her child to the center and then be able to go about her business and pick up the child at the end of that time. The exemptions from the definition of day care center does provide that this program would have to certify to the department in writing that the program meets the department's published regulations for space requirements in staff-to-child ratios for day care centers. There have been some problems with some of these programs that have proved very costly with the possibility of licensure and enforcement of licensure. The department is in support of this language and I urge your adoption of this Amendment."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 2877. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Yes, I have no objection to the Amendment. I think it clears up a legalistic problem that the department has gotten itself into which created a great deal of fuss and furor."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The motion to do adopt Amendment #5, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Back to the Order of Second Reading on House Bill 2757...Mr. Clerk, I understand a fiscal note has now been filed. Is that correct?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Back to the Order of Third Reading, there are two Bills that Sponsors request leave to return to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments.... and....I think the Speaker's going to take over."

Speaker Redmond: "I just had a nice rest. 2738. Representative Adeline Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, far be it for me to deny you a well earned rest. However, since you didn't ask me to join you, I feel it's very unfair, very discriminatory for you to sit there and tell us how well you enjoyed your rest while we've been dying in the vine over here with Amendments after Amendments, we don't even know if we're coming or we're going and I hope that you will adjourn at 8:00 P.M. because if you don't, you're going to get mobbed."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, now it will have to be five after because you took five minutes. 2738. Who's the Sponsor of 2738? Representative Cissy Stiehl, hurry up. Take it out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2738. A Bill for an Act to amend



the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, Ryan, amends House Bill 2738 on page 1, line 10 and so forth."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2738 is a job incentive program. It's designed to put the state in a more competitive position in attracting new industry and encouraging industry to expand in Illinois. In Amendment #1 simply permits the job training grants to private schools may be awarded if this is the best source of the job training. It also clarifies language in order to prohibit the Department of Business and Economic Development from granting duplicating training funds...if a company has already received other state or federal training monies. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2738. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2787...on the Order of.... it's on Third Reading, page 8, line....6. 2787, Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to bring this back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment:"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, D.L. Houlihan, amends House Bill 2787 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 to the Bill would amend this article, division 2, of the Cities and Villages Act by making it consistent with Chapter 47 of our statutes, the



Eminent Domain Act, by providing...notwithstanding any other provision under article 2, property belonging to a railroad or public utility, which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Illinois Commerce Commission, may not be taken or damaged without the prior approval of the Illinois Commerce Commission. What it will do is make this provision of the Cities and Villages Act consistent with the Eminent Domain Act. And I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Are you saying, according to this Bill to begin with, a municipality can, in X territory that it owns land which contains a water reservoir or a water treatment plant even though the land it is on is not contiguous of the municipality. Now, how does your Amendment vary this?"

Houlihan: "It does not, Adeline. What the Bill itself was referring to was a specific article under the Cities and Villages Act. There happens to be a gap in a further Section under that article which is inconsistent with the Eminent Domain Act, as far as public utilities and railroads are concerned and this was an appropriate vehicle to eliminate that inconsistency and to make this consistent with the Eminent Domain Act."

Geo-Karis: "Well, under the present law, are the public utilities and railroads subject to Eminent Domain?"

Houlihan: "Yes, but prior to a taking, there must be a hearing first and it requires the approval of the Illinois Commerce Commission, which is a regulatory agency of public utilities."

Geo-Karis: "Under your proposed Amendment then, the Eminent Domain procedure would not be...able to be used against railroads or public utilities. Am I correct?"

Houlihan: "No, no, no, no, no, you misunderstand it. We're putting the same language in this article of the Cities



and Villages Act that presently exists in the Eminent Domain Act...and it provides, that no property belonging to a railroad or other public utilities, subject to the jurisdiction of the Illinois Commerce Commission, may be taken or damaged pursuant to the provision as it says in Chapter 47 of this Act without the prior approval of the Illinois Commerce Commission. What we're doing here is putting that same language in division 2 of this article under the Cities and Villages Act. This division refers to a taking by way of special assessment."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I can see your point. The reason I questioned it was because I remember the RTA Bill didn't even come under the Illinois Commerce Commission...and this one... what your asking is that this one should come under it. Just wondered about it, Dan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar. Mahar."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mahar: "This has nothing to do with the principle that Representative Brummet is trying to do to allow for water reservoirs that are not contiguous to be annexed, is this correct?"

Houlihan: "You're correct, Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Is Chicago wanting to take Crystal Lake and turn it into a reservoir for Chicago; or what?"

Houlihan: "Not that I'm aware of."

Skinner: "Oh good."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Houlihan ...Representative Levin."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Levin: "Representative Houlihan, you've indicated what the provisions are with respect to the Commerce Commission, now



this deals with special assessments? This is the...the basic Bill?"

Houlihan: "No, the Sections that I am attempting to amend under the Cities and Villages Act refers to a taking by way of special assessment...excuse me, taking, improvement of which will be financed by special assessment. There's a whole condemnation procedure set up from that article on the Cities and Villages Act. That article, however, as far as it relates to public utilities, fails to have the same provision which is exempted in Chapter 47, which is the general Eminent Domain procedure set up by the Illinois Statute."

Levin: "So, what is the current procedure that is followed now?"

Houlihan: "I would assume the current procedure would probably be to do exactly what we're doing right here. It's just that there is...its failure to mention it raises a question as to whether or not it does require approval of the Illinois Commerce Commission. All we are doing here is making this article consistent with the Eminent Domain Act."

Levin, So, it would be your view that this in no way weakens in any way any protection of...or requirements or standards ..."

Houlihan: "I think what it does is it requires that before there be a taking of this type of property, the regulatory agency of a public utility, must itself review and give prior approval to before a municipality could condemn the property of a public utility by way of special assessment financing."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Are you ready for the question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2787. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any



further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2775 on Third Reading. Representative Mudd, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to announce at this time that the Executive Committee will not meet tonight, the meeting has been canceled."

Speaker Redmond: "2775, Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring House Bill 2775 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. 2775 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Jane Barnes, amends House Bill 2775 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I'd like to table this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is this Amendment...was it adopted in Committee or is it a floor Amendment?"

Barnes: "Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Just withdraw it then."

Barnes: "I'd like to withdraw it."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Leinenweber, amends House Bill 2775 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Leinenweber...is it?"

Leinenweber: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2775 attempts to deal with the problem of child stealing, that is, removal of a child from the custody of another after the other person has been awarded custody in a court proceedings, presumably divorce. The Amendment becomes the Bill as previous Amendment #2 had become the Bill, problems developed with Amendment #2 because at that time it put the requirement...or the feature that...conditioning taking of a child without good cause. It was determined





that this would be...this was probably too vague. So what we have done in Amendment #4 is we've made it a class IV felony to take a child from the custody of another without the consent of the person, only if the child is removed the state or concealed. These are the two principal areas where there is a problem now in law because the...if the child is located within the state, then the offending parent or the person who is removing the child from custody is subject to the civil court proceedings. If the area where the child is either concealed or beyond the reach of....contempt proceedings... that needs to be dealt with and by making this a class four felony, it would be an extraditable offense and I, therefore, move the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we sat through the judiciary and some objections were raised to Representative Barnes' Bill and I think this Amendment cures all the defects raised and I would strongly urge a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on ....Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Getty: "Representative Leinenweber, if you were to come home to your...to come to the home of your former wife and find that the house was in a disorderly condition..."

Leinenweber: "Is this a hypothetical situation?"

Getty: "Hypothetical, of course, we know you are happily married. But, hypothetically, if you were to go to the home of a former wife and you were to find that the house was in a disreputable condition and the wife was gone and you tracked her down and found that she had a....say a drinking problem and maybe some others, and you took that child to a place of safety. Under this Bill, as you



propose the Amendment, you would be guilty of a Class IV felony, is that correct?"

Leinenweber: "That's incorrect."

Getty: "Would you tell me then, under the language as I understand in this proposed Amendment, you are saying that you have to get a prior court order..."

Leinenweber: "No, that's not correct."

Getty: "...in order to raise an affirmative defense."

Leinenweber: "That's not correct and that's one of the reasons why...originally that was dealt with by putting in for.... without good cause and that was determined to be too vague and some of the law enforcement people objected to that so, what Amendment #4 does, it would only be a violation of this Bill under those circumstances which you have alluded to me...if I took the child either beyond the limits of the State of Illinois or concealed the child. If I took the child to my apartment or to Springfield or whatever and made no attempt to conceal the child, then, the other person who has custody....or has been awarded custody would have to go in to civil court and go through the contempt proceedings."

Getty: "Well, then your...the question goes to what is concealment? If you take the child to your apartment, that isn't concealment. Is that right?"

Leinenweber: "Well, I suppose it may or may not be concealment, but that would be an item of proof which the state would have to come up with. I mean, you can obviously make.... anybody that wants to sign a complaint for the arrest of another is probably free to do so and this would presumably activate the law enforcement people. But, under those circumstances, where there is no attempt to conceal.... let's say by taking the child to someone else's home and not telling my wife or the police officials, then, I suppose that might make me potentially liable under this criminal law."



Getty: "Well, that's just the problem with having potential liability under a criminal law. You either are guilty or you aren't guilty. And I would respectfully request.... I....I tried to work with the original Sponsor of this Bill to make it a workable Bill and I would like to continue to do so and I'd like to ask that you take this out of the record so....that....I think, just by your response, it becomes very clear that there is an area of doubt and I think it's the same area of doubt that you had in the question of without good cause."

Leinenweber: "It's not my Bill so I'm not free to accede to your wish...but, I would like to say, I personally don't feel that the point you raised is a valid one because of the fact that we can always charge someone....the problem as I understand it is that this Bill attempts to alleviate the problem of people in effect taking the law into their own hands and irregardless of a court order awarding custody to someone else....and then, secreting the child or taking them beyond the state line where the civil process can't be enforced. What we have done is....we've tried....by Amendment 4, is to limit the potential criminal liability to those two instances. Now, anything can be charged in a complaint but the question of proof...the state always has that and they would be forced to come up with it."

Getty: "I'm concerned about people in my district, I border the Indiana border. It is very conceivable that a resident of the State of Indiana, say Hammond, would come across the state line into my district, say Lansing, and find the child in the situation I described and take that child to his or her home and that would be across the state line and clearly be guilty of a Class IV felony. And, I would again, renew my request to take this out of the record or ask the principal Sponsor to take this out of the record so that we could put this Bill in shape so that we don't create



crimes where we shouldn't have crimes."

Leinenweber: "Again, I don't recognize that the problem....that as a problem with the Bill as Amendment #4 would propose it but again, that's not my choice."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "I was under the impression that the Representatives on the other side of the aisle had a copy of this Amendment before I submitted it. I have changed the Amendment quite a few times today because I am anxious to get it to Third Reading and Representative, didn't you have a copy of this Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "The answer is, yes."

Barnes: "Well, the only thing is, I wonder why you didn't.... since I put one Amendment in and took it out and changed the language....you had no objections then and I'm very surprised that you're objecting now since you had a copy of it before I filed it."

Getty: "The Amendment which I have in front of me right now, I just noticed a few minutes ago, Representative."

Barnes: "Well, I had known what your objections were....what... I had noticed....I knew what your objections were and we reworded it and I think at this point, it's just a matter of where....we're both on different sides of the issue when it comes to interpretive language. I still feel, as Representative Leinenweber does, that this covers one of your objections. And I am anxious to move this to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Leinenweber, to close."

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again, this Bill, House Bill 2775 attempts to confront a problem that has received a lot of publicity recently in the news media. And that is the case of a parent who has not been awarded custody of a child, taking that child from the parent....the custody of the parent who has been awarded in violation of the court order leaving the state or concealing the child so as to



thwart the order of the court. Now, when the child is taken beyond the state line, the offending parent or person who removes custody is not subject to the injunctive...or the the court...civil court processes and so, as pointed out in all the news media, there has previously,...or does at the present time...does not exist any remedy. So, House Bill 2775 has isolated two situations, the concealing of a child or taking beyond the state line and making the child...the person who removes the child subject to the criminal process so that extradition can occur or at least the child can be recovered and brought back into the court where the situation should be settled. This does not affect in any way shape or form the ability of a parent who has not been awarded custody to file any kind of petition they want to change the custody order in existence. All this provides is that unlawful violations of civil court injunctions and custody orders can be dealt with through the police powers of the state rather than strictly through the judicial process. I think this is a satisfactory solution to a difficult problem and I urge your support of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. 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 is 81 'aye', 36 'no' and the motion prevails and Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3057....which is on page 9 ....the bottom of the page. Representative Skinner, do you want 3057? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "May I have permission to move this back to Second Reading, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 3057



to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing no objections it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Skinner, amends House 3057, as amended in Section 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Representative Satterthwaite yesterday had an objection to our fining public members of a commission or a board for not producing a report. What this Amendment does is take the fine off the public members. And I would ask for its acceptance."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. to House Bill 3057. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion is carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments, but there's a request for a fiscal note filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Remain on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Skinner, it's on Second now, leave it there. The Order of Second Reading. 2941."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2941. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to clerks of courts. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to table Amendment #2 in the interest of putting on Amendment #3 which improves the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Was a motion filed with respect to Amendment #1, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there a motion filed in respect to #2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "He just made a verbal mo...."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Flinn's



motion to table Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Flinn, amends House Bill 2941 on page 1, line 13 and so forth."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #3 does is make this Bill for the circuit clerks the same as the other county officers, changing the minimum and the maximum salaries allowed to be....to the various counties according to population. This makes House Bill 2941 the same as 2256. And I would move for adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Madigan."

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

Flinn: "Yep."

Madigan: "What office is affected by this Amendment?"

Flinn: "I took out the supervisor of assessment by tabling Amendment #2 and now it only affects the circuit clerk."

Madigan: "The clerk of the circuit court?"

Flinn: "Yes. But it does not include Cook County because we have a.....Amendment #1 took Cook County out."

Madigan: "So that the clerk of the court in Cook County will be maintained at its current level."

Flinn: "Right."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Representative Leverenz, do you seek recognition? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2951, Representative Kornowicz."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2951. A Bill for an Act relating to conducting...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 2963."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2963. 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: "Floor Amendment #1, Edgar, amends House...."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Brady on the floor? Brady on the floor? Here comes Representative Brady."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Edgar, amends House Bill 2693 on page 2, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "2963. Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "This Amendment had a technical error and so I would withdraw it. Amendment #2 does the same thing without the technical error."

Speaker Redmond: "We are on Amendment #1, aren't we?"

Edgar: "O.K. I want to move to table...."

Speaker Redmond: "#1 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Edgar-Stuffle, amends House Bill 2963 on page 2, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "This Amendment...the Bill raises the maximum amount that the Scholarship Commission can grant and to award from \$1550.00 I believe to \$1650.00. What this Amendment does is bring that figure down to \$933.00. The figure of \$933.000 is the maximum amount that a student could receive who goes to a public university in the State of Illinois. That's the highest tuition and fee combination to an Illinois school. The philosophy behind this Amendment is that we should be fair to those students going to private and public universities in the State of Illinois and make the maximum the same as opposed to the current system, the maximum is much higher than a student going to a public





universities could receive approximately 2 times as much money as going to students in the state for scholarship aid to students going to private universities than to public universities. To me that seems wrong. I think we ought to make the provision equal for the students going to both public and private schools. With this we could free up, I think, dollars....that we could make more scholarship grants available to more students from middle class families who do have a very definite need for assistance for a higher education. I might also mention, Representative Stuffle is Cosponsor and he might want to add something later on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members and anybody who is aware of the Scholarship Grant Program knows that it serves both private and public universities across the state and is vital, not only to the students that attend them, but for the operation of the universities. To simplistically say, we ought to reduce the maximum award almost better than 1/3 and almost down 1/2 as much as we've been giving students in Illinois. It suggests that every student who has a scholarship grant is now going to have it cut in half if he's not going to a public university where he can use the 933 and that's only in a public university where a student's attending medical school. This would place all students beyond that in great jeopardy of continuing their education next year in Illinois. The maximum award level has been approved by both the Board of Higher Education and the Governor's allocation budget. It passed through the Senate Appropriation Committee under the sponsorship of a Republican Senator. I see this as a move to gut the Illinois State Scholarship Commission...what it's trying to do for the students in Illinois and attack pluralism in education in Illinois. And I would urge the defeat of this motion."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Stuffle, do you seek recognition?"

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I understand the arguments of the private school representatives here, but it should be pointed out that 70% of the money in the scholarship program's going to 1/3 of those award winners may happen to be in private versus private schools. I concur with Representative Edgar in hope for a green light on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support with Representative Brady in urging a red light on this Amendment. This would be totally unfair, it would set higher education in this state back. You have to keep in mind the millions of dollars that the state, the taxpayers, have poured into our public colleges and universities. Students at public universities are already subsidized by the state. So the amount recommended by the Scholarship Commission is eminently fair and just attempts to narrow the tuition gap that the private colleges and universities must charge because they had to do their own capital development and buy their own land. And therefore, I urge a red light on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I, too, would like to oppose this Amendment. I have talked to Representative Edgar about it, the Committee of Higher Education has looked at the Bill and I am sure that we, as a group, think that higher education doesn't need as much substantive as our private schools for...kids that go to private schools. The cost of education is a lot less if we even raise the rates for the private schools even more because all we have to pay there is the cost of the scholarship, the rest of the education cost is borne by the school. I too, would urge the defeat of this



Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "This is an incredible attack against the middle class taxpayer in the State of Illinois and if one wants to take a look at the Sun Times for today and read the last panel in Motley's Crew, I think it's characterized as well as I've seen it anywhere. It suggests there that it ought to be called the middle income shaft. And for that reason we ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Houlihan, will you please sit down?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly and Kane, please sit down."

Satterthwaite: "I think it is unfair for some of the previous Speakers to say that the amount that comes to the private colleges through the scholarship grants is the only state aid that we provide for those colleges. That's totally false, we also provide grant money from the basis of the number of students going to those private colleges, as Representative Bradley mentioned to us earlier in debate on the Bill for elementary and secondary education. We are subsidizing the private schools in many other ways. We are soon going to be at the point where we will have empty desks and empty classrooms in our public institutions of higher education. This Amendment, at this time, would allow us to keep those classrooms filled. Our obligation as a state is to fund the public higher education system and to keep it viable. I am not against support, in some degree, for the private institutions. But, it is certainly unfair to say that they do not get any other support from us, they do indeed, get other support in many forms. And I urge a 'yes' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."



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

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

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate some of the positions on this and their feeling. I don't feel this guts the Scholarship Commission. I don't think we're being unfair to students going to private schools. We are just being equal to those who go to either private or public. We have a serious problem I think in Illinois providing enough dollars in for public education and for our public universities. It's going to get more acute as the years go along when we run into enrollment problems. I think we should address the problem now, I think this Amendment is only fair. I would appreciate a green vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2963. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis. Representative Geo-Karis. Representative Geo-Karis. Everybody wants to hear Representative Geo-Karis. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 6 'aye'...5 'aye', 120 'no' and the motion failed. Representative Stiehl, for what purpose do you rise? Cissy Stiehl. Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, my light was on unintentionally."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I thought that it was you who wanted to move something to Second Reading...Third Reading on 33... Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to advance House Bill 3386 to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day without reference Committee. I've cleared this with the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader. This is a State Government Committee Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing no objection ...use the Attendance Roll Call and advance it to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Dan Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise? Representative.....read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. While we are waiting for the digest, are there any announcements? There was an announcement with respect to the Executive Committee, is that correct? That was cancelled. Representative Williams. 9:30."

Williams: "Yes, and thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make everyone aware that on the calendar it says that the Subcommittee of Environment, Energy and Natural Resources and.....in combination with the Water Resources Commission were going to meet at Southern Illinois University tomorrow and of course, since we are in Session, I'd like to let everyone know that that is cancelled."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative.....any other announcements? Representative Lechowicz....9:30."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourned until Friday, May 19, 9:30 A.M."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'.....what time is it now, Mr. Lechowicz, can you see the clock?"

Lechowicz: "Honestly, 8:00 P.M., Sir, and I want to congratulate you."

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



1.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.	10:00	Speaker Redmond Reverend Krueger Speaker Redmond	House to order Prayer Roll Call
2.		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Giorgi Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted Further Resolutions
3.		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Schoeberlein	Committee Reports S.B. First Reading
4.-5.		Speaker Redmond	
6.		Speaker Luft Speaker Redmond Speaker Campbell Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	In the Chair, Introduction In the Chair, Introduction H.B. 104, Third Reading
7.	10:22	Getty Speaker Redmond (Lechowicz (	Yield
8.		(Getty Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		(Conti ( (Getty	Yield
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
9.-10.		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Katz ( (Getty	Yield
11.		Speaker Redmond	
12.		(Leinenweber (	Yield
13.		(Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Bowman ( (Leinenweber	Yield
		Speaker Redmond	
14.		(Stuffle (	Yield
15.		(Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	Leave to return H.B. 2626 to Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	Objections
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:41	Bowman	
		Ebbesen	Out of the record



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	3.
		Speaker Redmond		
16.		Ebbesen	Leave to return to 2nd Rd.	
		Speaker Redmond	Objections	
		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 634, 3rd Reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Laurino	Leave to return to 2nd Rd.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #5	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Laurino		
17.		Speaker Redmond		
		(Schlickman	Questions	
		(		
		(Laurino		
		Speaker Redmond		
18.-20		(Kempiners	Questions	
		(		
		(Laurino		
		Speaker Redmond		
21.-22.		(Schuneman	Questions	
		(		
		(Laurino		
		Speaker Redmond		
23.		(Totten	Questions	
		(		
		(Laurino		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		(Totten ( (Laurino Speaker Redmond	Continues discussion
24.		(Gaines ( (Laurino Speaker Redmond	Yield
25.-27.		(Barnes, E.M. ( (Laurino Speaker Redmond Johnson Speaker Redmond Laurino	Yield  Moves previous question
	11:07	Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Laurino Speaker Redmond	To close Amt. #5, H.B. 634 adopted Amt. #6
28.		Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Brady Speaker Redmond (Bowman ( (Brady	Amt. #6 adopted, 3rd Rd. H.B. 1068, 3rd Rd.
29.		Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	Yield Passed H.B. 1357, 3rd Rd.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Robinson	Yield to Rigney
		Speaker Redmond	
30.-31.		Rigney	
		Speaker Redmond	
32.-33		Pierce	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	
34.		Byers	Support
	11:25	Speaker Redmond	
35.-36		Keats	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
37.-38		Dunn	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
39.		Harris	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
40.		Cunningham	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
41.		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	Yield to Bradley
		Speaker Redmond	
42.		Bradley	Proceeds



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	Point of order
43.		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Davis, J.	Moves previous question
	11:41	Speaker Redmond	
44.-45.		Robinson	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Verify oral Roll Call
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Catania	Parl. inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	disagree
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Calls Roll
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	Explains no vote
		Speaker Redmond	
46.		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds with Roll Call
		Speaker Redmond	
47.		Dyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	No vote
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Gaines	
		Speaker Redmond	
48.		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:52	Griesheimer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	Explains yes vote
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
49.		Hoxsey	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoxsey	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Keats	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	Oppose
		Clerk O'Brien	
50.		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
51.		Mann	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
52.		McGrew	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMasters	yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
53.	12:07	Neff	No
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
54.		Peters	Explains yes vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Rigney	Explains vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	
55.	12:10	Robinson	Explains vote
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Satterthwaite	Yes
		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds
		Speaker Redmond	
		Vitek	
56.		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Winchester	
		Clerk O'Brien	
57.		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	Yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Christensen	Yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Yes
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ewell	No
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kornowicz	
58.		Speaker Redmond	
	12:19	Capparelli	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	Present
		Speaker Redmond	
		O'Brien	No
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kucharski	Yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	P.P.C.
		Speaker Redmond	
59.		Speaker Mudd	In the Chair, Introduction
		Clerk O'Brien	H.R. 855
60.		Speaker Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			11.
61.		Ilion Crabel	Guest
	12:29	Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1788, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
62.		McAuliffe	
		Speaker Redmond	
		(McClain	Yield
		(	
		(McAuliffe	
		Speaker Redmond	
63.		Jaffe	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Tipsword	Question
		(	
64.		(McAuliffe	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McPike	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Neff	
		Speaker Redmond	
65.		(Mautino	
		(	
		(McAuliffe	
		Speaker Redmond	
66.		McCourt	
		Speaker Redmond	
67.		(Van Duyne	Yield
		(	
		(McAuliffe	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
68.		Speaker Redmond (Schuneman (McAuliffe	Questions
		Speaker Redmond Leverenz	Moves previous question
69.		Speaker Redmond McAuliffe	
		Speaker Redmond Von Boeckman	
70.		Speaker Redmond McAuliffe	P.P.C.
		Clerk O'Brien Robinson	H.B. 1803, 3rd Reading
71.		Speaker Redmond Ebbesen	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond Madigan	Support
		Speaker Redmond Wolf	
72.		Speaker Redmond Totten	Take out of record
	12:50	Speaker Redmond Terzich	Support
73.		Speaker Redmond McCourt	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
74.		Satterthwaite	
		Speaker Redmond	
75.		Stuffle	
		Speaker Redmond	
76.		Wolf	Explains no vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schuneman	Explains no vote
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1803 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1913, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
77.-78.		Bowman	Explains H.B. 1913
	1:04	Speaker Redmond	
79.		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McBroom	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
80.		Bowman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
81.		Greiman	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
	1:13	Conti	Explains no vote
82.		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	Poll the absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	Yes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Redmond	
83.		Ryan	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Redmond	
84.-86.		Madigan	
	1:25	Speaker Redmond	
87.		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
88.		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
89.-90.		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Requests Republican Conference
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schoeberlein	Inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	Recess until 2:15
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
91.	2:00	Madison	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Porter	Leave to return H.B. 2754 to 2nd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Object
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
92.		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Porter	Objection previously requested
		Speaker Redmond	
		Porter	
93.		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2754, Amendment #2
		Porter	Explains Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Porter	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
94.		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2626, 3rd Reading
		Ebbesen	H.B. 2626 from 3rd to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
95.		Darrow	
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Darrow	Vision Care Program
		(	
		(Ebbesen	
96.		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	
		Bowman	Supports Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
97.		Chapman	Leave to return H.B. 2661 to 2nd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Introduction



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	Yield
		Speaker Redmond	
98.		(Darrow	
		(Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	
99.		(Leinenweber	
		(Darrow	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
	2:42	Winchester	H.B. 3375 - leave to suspend rules
100.		Birchler	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 3375, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
101.		Waddell	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1973, 3rd Reading	
102.		Speaker Redmond Chapman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Conti	Point of personal privilege	
		Speaker Redmond		
103.-106.		(Schlickman ( (Chapman Speaker Redmond	Yield	
		(Katz ( (Chapman Speaker Redmond	Questions	
107.		(Edgar ( (Chapman Speaker Redmond	Yield	
		(Keats ( (Chapman Speaker Redmond	Yield	
		Johnson Speaker Redmond	Moves previous question	
		Chapman Speaker Redmond	To close	
109.		Darrow Speaker Redmond		
		Chapman Speaker Redmond	Explains vote	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	19.
110.		Gaines		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Redmond	Verify Roll Call	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Harris	Leave to be verified	
		Speaker Redmond		
111.		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman	Questions Roll Call	
112.-113.		Speaker Redmond	81 'ayes' - 49 'nays'	
114.		Chapman	Postponed Consideration	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2073, 3rd Reading	
	3:20	Speaker Redmond		
115-116		Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		(Simms	Yield	
		(		
117		(Bowman		
118		Speaker Redmond		
		(Brummer	Questions	
		(		
		(Bowman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Martin, L.	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Redmond		





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20.
120.		(Brummer ( (Bowman  Speaker Redmond	Continues	
121.		O'Brien  Speaker Redmond  (Winchester ( (Bowman  Winchester Speaker Redmond	Oppose  Yield  Moves previous question	
122.	3:35	Bowman  Speaker Redmond  Dawson  Speaker Redmond	Introduction	
123.		Holewinski  Speaker Redmond  Byers  Speaker Redmond		
124.		O'Brien  Speaker Redmond  Catania  Speaker Redmond  Bowman	No	
125.		Speaker Redmond  Epton  Clerk O'Brien  Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2073 - Lost  Point of personal privilege  H.B. 3274	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Leverenz	Leave to return H.B. 3274 to 2nd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	Leave to table Amendments #1 and #2
126.		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
	3:45	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Redmond	
127.		(Geo-Karis	Yield
		(	
		(Bluthardt	
		Speaker Redmond	
128.		Walsh	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
129.		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 3274, Amendment #4 adopted, returned to PPC
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2084, 3rd Reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
130.		Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	
131.		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
132.		Stuffle	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Freidrich	
	3:59	Speaker Redmond	
133.		(Byers	Yield
		(Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	
134.		Porter	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Harris	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2084 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2106, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
135-136		Von Boeckman	
		Speaker Redmond	
137-138		(Johnson	Yield
		(Von Boeckman	
		Speaker Redmond	
139.		Kosinski	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	23.
140		Speaker Redmond		
141.		Daniels		
		Speaker Redmond		
142.		Hanahan		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bradley		
	4:20	Speaker Redmond		
143.		Von Boeckman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner	Explains vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
144.		Cunningham		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Johnson		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Leverenz		
145.		Speaker Redmond		
		Von Boeckman	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Dyer	Change to 'aye'	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Hanahan	Verification	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	Leave to be verified
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
146.		Speaker Redmond	
		Von Boeckman	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2295, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Young	Leave to return to 2nd Rd.
	4:30	Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Young	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Young	
147.		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2529, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
148.		Mulcahey	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
149.		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
150.		Mudd	Support
	4:35	Speaker Redmond	
151.		McClain	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Ryan	Yield
		(	
152.		(Mulcahey	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	
153.		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Requests verification
		Speaker Redmond	Poll absentees
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dyer	No
		Speaker Redmond	
154.		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	In the Chair
		Holewinski	'aye'
	4:46	Clerk O'Brien	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
155.		(Speaker Bradley	
156.		(Ryan	Questions Roll Call
157.		(Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Darrow	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2529 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2575, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
158-159		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
160.		(Ewing	Questions
		(Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McMasters	Yield
161-162		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
163.		Ewing	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Bradley	
164.		(Tipsword	Yield
		(Lechowicz	
	5:09	Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Totten	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
165.		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	Support
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	
166.		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
167.		Skinner	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mugalian	Explains vote
168.		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley	
169.		Friedrich	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2578, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	Leave to return to 2nd Rd.
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #11
	5:20	Speaker Bradley	
170.		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2598, 3rd Reading





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
171.		Davis, J.	
		Speaker Bradley	
172.		(McClain	Yield
173.		(Davis, J.	
		Speaker Bradley	
174.		(Leverenz	Yield
		(Davis, J.	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Davis, J.	To close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Martin, L.	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
175.		Speaker Redmond	Announcement
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2599
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2599, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
	5:33	Polk	
176.		Speaker Bradley	
177-178		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		(Simms	Yield
		(Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Madison	
		Speaker Bradley	
179.		Ewing	Yield
		Speaker Bradley	
		(Ewing	
		(	
		(Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Meyers	Inquiry of the Chair
		Speaker Bradley	
180.		Madigan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Madigan	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	
		Speaker Bradley	
181.		(Ewing	
		(	
		(Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
182.		Ewing	Speak to the Bill
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
183-184		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
		O'Brien	Moves previous question
		Speaker Bradley	
185.		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	
186.		Speaker Bradley	
		Abramson	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Bradley	
187.		Madison	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Bradley	
		Macdonald	
188.		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2691
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2738
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2757



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
189.		Brady .	
	6:05	Matijevich	In the Chair
190.		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
191.		Schneider	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	In the Chair
		Getty	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brady	
192.		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brady	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Kane	Withdraws Amendment #2
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Kane	Withdraws Amendment #3
		Speaker Matijevich	
193.		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Bradley	Withdraws Amendment #4
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Bradley	
	6:15	Speaker Matijevich	
195.		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
196.		Brady	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
197.		Bradley	To close
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #5 adopted
		Hoffman	Verification
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Bradley	
198.		Speaker Matijevich	Poll absentees
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	Withdraws verification
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #5 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Kane	Withdraws Amendment #6



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #7
199.		Speaker Matijevich	
		Porter	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	6:25	(Brady	Questions
		(Porter	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Skinner	Yield
		(Porter	
200.			
201.		Speaker Matijevich	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Matijevich	
202.		Kane	
		Speaker Matijevich	
203.		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Schneider	
204.		Speaker Matijevich	
		Porter	To close
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #7 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #8
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Porter	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	6:37	Speaker Matijevich	
205.		Brady	Support
		Speaker Lechowicz	
206.		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Martin, L.	Yield
		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Geo-Karis	Questions
		(	
		(Porter	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Porter	To close
		Speaker Matijevich	
207.		Byers	Explains vote
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #8 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #9
		Speaker Matijevich	
208-209		Kane	
		Speaker Matijevich	
210.		Brady	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Skinner	Yield
		(	
		(Kane	
	6:50	Speaker Matijevich	
211.		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
212.		Kane	To close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	Explains vote
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #9 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Kane	Amendment #10 withdrawn
213.		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Hoffman	Inquiry
		(Kane	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Brady	Object
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Kane	
		Speaker Matijevich	
214.		Satterthwaite	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Matijevich	
215-216		Brady	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Bradley	
	7:05	Speaker Matijevich	
217-218		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
		Speaker Matijevich	
219.		Clerk O'Brien	S.B., 1st Reading





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	H.B. 2757 held on 2nd Rd.
		Bradley	
220.		Speaker Matijevich	
		Kane	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2857, 2nd Reading Amendments #1 & 2 adopted
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2898, 2nd Reading Amendments 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 adopted in Committee
221.		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #8
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Yourell	Amendment #8 already adopted
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #9
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #9 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2877
	7:18	Pullen	
223.		Speaker Matijevich	
		Levin	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Matijevich	H.B. 2757



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	In the Chair
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
224.		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2738, 2nd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stiehl, C.M.	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
		Brummet	H.B. 2787 - Leave to return to 2nd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
225.		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Geo-Karis	Yield
		(	
226.		(Houlihan	
	7:25	Speaker Redmond	
		(Mahar	Yield
		(	
		(Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Skinner	Questions
		(	
		(Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
227.		(Levin	Yield
		(	
		(Houlihan	
228.		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Mudd	Announcement
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes, J.	H.B. 2775 - Leave to return to 2nd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes, J.	Leave to table
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #4
		Speaker Redmond	
229.		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	
	7:33	Speaker Redmond	
230-232		(Getty	Yield
		(	
		(Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Barnes	Discussion
		(	
		(Getty	
		Speaker Redmond	
233.		Leinenweber	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #4 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	H.B. 3057 - Leave to return to 2nd Reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	39.
234.		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2941	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Flinn	Leave to table Amendment #2	
235.		Speaker Redmond	Tabled	
		Flinn	Amendment #3	
		Speaker Redmond		
		(Madigan	Yield	
		(		
		(Flinn		
	7:47	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 adopted	
236.		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2963	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Edgar	Withdraws	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2	
		Speaker Redmond		
237.		Edgar		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brady	Oppose	
238.		Speaker Redmond		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dyer	Support Brady
		Speaker Redmond	
239.		Dunn, R.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Satterthwaite	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
240.		Wolf	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:56	Edgar	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
		Stiehl	H.B. 3386 (motion)
241.		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
		Williams	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Moves to adjourn
	8:00	Speaker Redmond	House adjourns

