

Doorkeeper: "The House will convene in 5 minutes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you show Representative Geo-Karis as here, as usual and Roman Kosinski as usual and Joe Lucco as usual. Representative Geo-Karis has asked leave to introduce her Bills putting Legislators on an hourly basis, with the maximum pay starting in the morning, diminishing toward the middle of the day and then maximum at the later part of the day. Does she have leave to introduce the Bill? Hearing no opposition, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "To explain the purpose of my Bill, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we want to get finished timely and since some of us don't come in timely, I think it would be nice if we took the funds that we got from the per day, per hour deduction per Member for being late and put it in one big healthy basket of money and probably give it to some charitable organization who can do some good for our souls. Because certainly we need it."

Speaker Redmond: "I can recommend the Democratic Regular Central Committee in DuPage County to be the recipient of that fund."

Geo-Karis: "I can make another recommendation. I hear a certain person in this House is leaving for Ireland at the end of this month and I think it would be nice, since I'm always prompt here and I've been given, shall we say recognition for my promptness, be taken along to just do secretarial work, even though I can't type or take shorthand worth a darn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion to possibly cut down the number of Bills. I gave this considerable thought last night and perhaps with every Bill that anyone...any House Member or Senate Member would introduce, they would have to put up a thousand dollar cash bond. And then if the Bill failed in Committee, of course you lose the thousand dollars. And of course the further the Bill progressed out of Committee to Second Reading and over to the Senate, you'd keep



getting more and more money back and if it went to the Governor's desk and was signed, you'd get all your money back plus maybe 500 dollars and that would be your salary. Perhaps maybe we could cut down the number of pieces of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder if you gave any thought to deducting for each time you weren't on the floor."

Ebbesen: "Well perhaps we could work that in a part of ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want that in an Amendment to Representative Geo-Karis's Bill?"

Ebbesen: "That would be fine."

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. John Wesley's rule reads, 'Do all the good you can, by all the means you can, in all the ways you can, in all the places you can, at all the times you can, to all the people you can, as long as ever you can. Let us pray. Almighty God, maker of all men and giver of all good things, we come to Thee this day for Thy special guidance as we labor in the vineyard as Members of this House of Representatives. Clear our minds of all preoccupation and prejudice. Rid us of fear and timidity and the worry of ridicule as we embrace Thy holy word and endeavor to do Thy holy will. And may our lives ever be judged by the good we do unto other, for Christ's sake. Amen."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 258. Schlickman. House Resolution 259. O'Daniel...Redmond - O'Daniel. House Resolution 260. Chapman. House Resolution 261. Dawson. House Resolution 262. Dawson. House Resolution 263. Dawson. House Joint Resolution 38. Wikoff. House Joint Resolution 39. Kelly - Waddell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 258 by Schlickman, honors Mary Louise McCreary, who has spent 20 years as librarian to the Leigslative Reference Bureau, known to everyone. House Resolution 259 by Redmond, honors Lee Milner on his award... his degree of Master in Arts and Public Administration by Sangamon State University all during night classes. House Resolution 260 by Chapman, talks about Frederick Schmoyer, who has led the Arlington High School Band after 30 years and is retiring. House Resolution 261 by Dawson, honors Scout Ray Mazur on being...on receiving the Eagle Scout Progress Award. House Resolution 262 by Dawson also talks about Kevin Bay receiving the same honors. House Resolution 263 by Dawson talks about a further boy receiving the Eagle Scout Honor. House Joint Resolution 38 by Wikoff honors the Chanute Technical Training Center for its 60 years of outstanding contribution to the United States of America and House Joint Resolution 39 by Representative Kelly asks for a Respect for Life Resolution. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. House Bills, Third Reading, Supplemental Consent Calendar, Second Day, Group 11."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bills Third Reading. Supplementary Consent Calendar, Second Day, Group 11. House Bill 2308. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act authorizing certain counties to undertake local improvements. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "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 the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills 30, 414, 419,



420, 421, 423, 426, 427 and 451. Passed by the Senate May 18, 1977. 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, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills 458, 465, 473, 474, 477, 478, 480, 482, 499, 505 and 506. Passed by the Senate May 18, 1977. 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, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills 519, 525, 526, 528, 537, 538, 550, 557, 560 and 562. Passed by the Senate May 18, 1977. 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, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Bills 584, 589, 590, 594, 596, 597, 606, 607, 614 and 1200. Passed by the Senate May 18, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton, do you seek recognition? Do you want to unlight Representative Epton? House Bills, Second Reading. House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 32. House Bills, Second Reading...Oh, pardon me. I've got the wrong page. 48."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 48. Mautino. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to Agriculture Economic Fair Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 107."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 107. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation





to the Councils for Family Practice Residency Program..."

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

Totten: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Chairman of Appropriations I is listening, on most of these Commission Bills we asked the Commissions to line item their appropriation and I think that they are not in that fashion right now. And I wonder if we could just hold them. Most of them have indicated that they would line item them and they're not and I wonder..."

Speaker Redmond: "Let's move it to Third Reading and then you discuss it with them and bring it back to Second. I'd like to have everything in the posture of Third Reading."

Totten: "Well, if they will bring them back and there's no... Appropriation Bills don't have to be there."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I don't know anything under the rules that says I have much alternative except to move them to Third Reading. Now if you want to discuss it with the Appropriation, I'm reasonably sure that they're reasonable people. They've always been very cooperative and I don't think there will be any problem. I don't think it's fair though to hold these things on Second Reading indefinitely. So unless there's some... Representative Matijevich, do you concur..."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I agree with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading on 107. 217."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 217. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Local Government Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1, 2 and 3 have been adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to those Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 275."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 375. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from...any motion with respect to that Amendment or Amendments from the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed. Floor Amendment #2..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney here? Whose Amendment is this? Stearney's Amendment and you'll handle it, Representative McAuliffe? Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, would you kindly have the record indicate that Representatives Kornowicz and Mann are excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections."

Lechowicz: "And Representative Katz being excused."

Speaker Redmond: "The record will so show. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Dunn is absent because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "The record will so indicate. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to inquire what our order of business was. Are we going to go onto Second Reading and follow the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Right at the moment we're trying to move the Bills from Second to Third Reading. And then we probably will go to House Bills Third Reading, Priority of Call and take up where we left off yesterday."

Griesheimer: "All right, Mr. Speaker, you skipped House Bill 268 and it was skipped, I wasn't here early in the day three days ago and I was not allowed to go back to it and I didn't want it to be skipped today in the same manner."

Speaker Redmond: "The objection has been noted. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I just had word that Representative Dunn is well and will be in Session today. So you can strike that from the record."



Speaker Redmond: "The record will indicate that the excused absence of Representative Dunn was premature. Representative McAuliffe on Amendment #2 on 375."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Stearney. Amends House Bill 375 as amended by deleting the proposed subsection (b) and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe moves the adoption of Amendment #2. Any discussion? The question is on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion is adopted... The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 409."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 409. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 767."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 767. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Land Resources Management Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 788."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 788. A Bill for an Act in relation to school district income tax. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to that Amendment or any floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed. There are floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, read the... Representative Edgar here? Anyone handle this Amendment... Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment? Representative Johnson here? Take this one out of



the record. 798."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 798. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Registration and Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "And no Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 885."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 885. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission on Economic Development. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 951. Take that out of the record. 954."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 954. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Insurance Laws Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 962."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 962. A Bill for an Act providing for the ordinary..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, do you want to hold that one or pass it? I can't interpret your head shake."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I've been waiting to hear from Representative Mulcahey on this. I don't know whether he's ready to go with it or not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey on 962."

Mulcahey: "Is that the Governor's budget?"

Ryan: "You have the Amendment for it?"

Mulcahey: "Yes, I have the Amendments for it. Mr. Ryan, could you still hold off on that? Thank you."

Ryan: "Certainly."



Speaker Redmond: "964."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 964. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Law Enforcement. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Whose Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. McClain. Amends House Bill 964 on page 1, line 6 by deleting road and inserting in lieu thereof 'General Revenue'. Amendment #1 is McClain's."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative McClain on the floor? Representative Ryan, what's your pleasure? Representative Schlickman, I can't see Representative Ryan. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a simple Amendment. It just basically says instead of the money coming from part General Revenue and part Road Fund it ought to come entirely from General Revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am opposed to the Amendment, needless to say. And for years the money has come from the Road Fund. This is a statutory longevity increment that we're trying to pass here that the accounting section of the State Police failed to put in when they upped their pay raises in '74. But if this Amendment goes on, I'm not sure that I could live with the Bill, Mr. Speaker. So I would oppose the Amendment and hope that we could defeat it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the passing of Amendment #1. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain this Amendment, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. The clock is on."

McClain: "Thank you. What happens is the money goes into the Department



of Law Enforcement right now and it's about 55 million dollars. We're draining the Road Fund substantially. I believe if we put money into the Department of Law Enforcement at all, the Secretary of State's Office of other agencies and commissions, it ought to be only at a cost level and not at this tremendous sum of money. What we're asking here is for the Amendment to say the money ought to come just from General Revenue. Its operational funds and I think that it ought to come from General Revenue and not from the Road Fund, which is badly depleted."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 50 'aye' and 63 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Mulcahey. Amends House Bill 964 on page 1, line 6 by deleting 'road' and inserting in lieu thereof 'General Revenue' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #2 to House Bill 964 does basically the same as Representative McClain's."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mulcahey: "The total appropriation is cut in half. Number one, it transfers the source of funding in this Bill from the Road Fund to the General Revenue Fund and number two, it reduces the amount that the Bill appropriates from 334 thousand to 167 thousand and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to oppose this Amendment also because as I said earlier, the State Police accounting section neglected to include the longevity increments to the State Police. This is money that's due the State Police and it has been paid out of the Road Fund. And so I would oppose the Amendment and would hope that we could defeat it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed



vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?  
 Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record.  
 On this question there's 38 'aye' and 59 'no'. The Gentleman's  
 motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Mulcahey. Amends House Bill 964 on page  
 1, line 12 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is really  
 a good Amendment. This reduces, totally reduces the amount  
 appropriated from this particular Bill and indeed from the  
 Road Fund from \$334,000 to \$167,000 and I move for the  
 adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must oppose this Amendment. Again, this  
 is money that's due the State Police. We owe it to them.  
 Statutorily, it's due them and I think it's a bad Amendment and  
 should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those  
 in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative Leverenz, do  
 you rise?"

Leverenz: "Yes, just...the Sponsor would tell us what the amount of  
 money the reduction actually represents."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "The amount of money that is the reduction is \$303,000 from  
 Personal Services and \$30,000 Retirement."

Leverenz: "What does that represent? Employees?"

Mulcahey: "Yes, it does."

Leverenz: "Does it eliminate them or just not give them a raise or  
 what?"

Mulcahey: "That's for somebody else to figure out besides myself."

Leverenz: "Evidently we can't get an answer to that so I'll have to  
 vote 'present'."

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

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Kosinski: "I don't understand this quite... Why do you wish to reduce this amount?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Representative Kosinski, for years and years and years, year after year, this particular fund has been reduced more all the time. It's to the point now where everytime we go to the Department of Transportation with a concept or an idea that we are, in our particular districts, are being cut short as far as the Road Fund is concerned, as far as widening and resurfacing primary roads, the constant answer is, indeed 'We don't have the money.' And the reason we don't have the money is because so much every year is being increased in these other agencies. So it's my fault and my idea that we've got to start somewhere to reducing these other agencies, as far as the Road Fund is concerned. And this, indeed, is a start."

Kosinski: "In other words, it's to protect the Road Fund not to deny a justifiable claim for back wages."

Mulcahey: "No question about it. Indeed to protect the Road Fund."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Mulcahey, to explain his vote. The clock is on."

Mulcahey: "Well, it looks rather hopeless, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, but I would just suggest to you downstate people that when you go back to your districts and people want to know why this little road running from a five mile stretch from one little town to another little town hasn't been resurfaced or widened for the last twenty-five years. And why it appears that it won't be resurfaced or widened for another ten or fifteen years at least, you can say 'Because all of this money is going to other state agencies'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 28 'aye' and 63 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."





Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 966."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 966. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to those Amendments or any other Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed. Floor Amendment #5. Johnson. Amends House Bill 966 by deleting Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Robinson would like to hold this, so I'll take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 991."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 991. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Local Government Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 994."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 994. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of General Services for the operation of a Forms Management Center. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1003 is it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "1008."

Speaker Redmond: "1008."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1008. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Legislative Audit Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1011. Representative Getty, do you want



to take that out of the record? Out of the record. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an introduction of a visitor, Mr. A.S. Jiah, Bureau Chief of the Sarawak Office of the Malaysian National News Agency. He's in the gallery and is visiting Springfield today."

Speaker Redmond: "1034. Representative Matijevich. Pardon me."

Matijevich: "Please don't overlook me, Mr. Speaker. John Blazis, the Doorman from Woodside County is up there. Thank you, John. Good to see you."

Speaker Redmond: "1034. Representative Williams."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1034. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Water Resources Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Any..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out that the Water Resources Commission did submit a line item."

Speaker Redmond: "1099."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1099. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Township Government Laws Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? "

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1115."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1115. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was tabled in Committee. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee and Amendment #3 failed, Amendments #4 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Leverenz and I and the staff are working on some additional Amendments and I'd appreciate it if you'd take that out of the record until they're prepared."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1180."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1180. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to Medley's Moving and Storage. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to that or any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions or floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading 1220."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1220. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Secretary of State. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1391."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1391. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Secretary of State. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion or Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1429."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1429. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Arts Council. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1593."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1593. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted in Committee. Amendment #2 was withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to those Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."



Speaker Redmond: "Any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6. Mautino. Amends House Bill 1593 as amended in Section 2..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, do you have an agreement with the Sponsor with respect to your Amendment #6? Okay, out of the record then. 1594."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1594. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Business and Economic Development. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Whose Amendments are... What floor Amendments? Representative Simms isn't here, I see. Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Amendments #1 and 2, which were adopted in Committee, have those been printed?"

Speaker Redmond: "They're Committee Amendments."

Houlihan: "Have they been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Amendments? Whds the Sponsor of the floor Amendments? Well, Representative Simms isn't here, so we'll take this out of the record. 1724."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1724."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1799. Out of the record. 1922. Out of the record. 1934. Out of the record. 2315. Representative Terzich, 2315. Representative Terzich. Will you read 2315, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2315."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2341."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2341. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2358."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2358. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Court of Claims Fund. Second Reading of the



Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions or floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "And there's no motions with respect to the Committee Amendments. Third Reading. 2360."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2360. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Legislative Advisory Committee to the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2362."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2362. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois Motor Vehicle Laws Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2363."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2363. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2365."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2365. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Commission to the Uniformity of Legislation in the United States. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2366."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2366. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Legislative Reference Bureau. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"



Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1115. I understand that there's an agreement between the Sponsor and the Sponsor of the Amendment to move that to Third Reading. Is that correct?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we have agreed to move it to Third and bring it back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment when we get the Amendments drafted. Which will probably be tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, is it your desire, with an Amendment coming in, to move it to Third now or to leave it here? Which is better clerically? Okay, we'll move it to Third Reading then. Third Reading on 1115. 2367."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1115. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Attorney General. Amendments #2, 4 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed on..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there a Committee Amendment on that? The Calendar is in error if there is."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Put the right number up on the board. Oh, you're talking about 1115. Pardon me. Okay, there's no motions."

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "2367.... Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2367. A Bill for an Act making...to amend Sections..."

Speaker Redmond: "2367 is the Bill, isn't it? Representative Tipword, will you come to the podium? 2367.. I've been advised... Are you going to...are you going... Representative Friedrich. I've been advised that the intention is to take off one of the Committee Amendments and if that's true, it's better procedurally not to move it to Third Reading because we'd have to have Enrolling and Engrossing do it all over again. So, it's better procedurally to leave it on Second Reading. So we'll return it to the Order of Second Reading. Second Reading on 1115. 23... 2367. 2367."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2367. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the Secretary of State. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2373."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2373. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Legislative Advisory Committee, to the Regional Transportation Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2375."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2375. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for a work-study program for high school students living in areas of high unemployment. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On the Order of Third Reading appears House Bill 613. Representative Leverenz desires to have this returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I wish you'd speak a little louder. I can't hear you."

Speaker Redmond: "On House Bill 613, it's requested that it be returned to the Order of Second Reading to table an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 613 on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sponsored Amendment #2 to 613, which was an increase of 3 million dollars to the Bill. I wish, at this time, to have leave to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted... Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Are you talking about the Amendment that was put on in Committee,



Representative?"

Leverenz: "That is correct."

Ryan: "What does that Amendment do?"

Leverenz: "It added certain employees in the Department of Transportation, which increased that Bill by 3 million dollars. I'm asking leave to table that Amendment and reduce it by 3 million dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "That's all right. I just wanted to find out what..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion carries and the Amendment is tabled."





Speaker Redmond: "2339. Representative Tipsword. Tipsword. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, could we...613 goes back to Third Reading..."

Speaker Redmond: "Correct. Representative Tipsword on 2339."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask right now, which place is this Bill? Is it on Third or Second right now?"

Speaker Redmond: "It says on Third in the Calendar."

Tipsword: "I think we moved it back but if not, I'll make the motion again to move it to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. It's on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Tipsword. I believe we read the Amendment yesterday..."

Tipsword: "I believe we read the Amendment last night but...no... Let me make it very clear and I'd like to...there are several people on the other side of the aisle that had a lot of questions last night about this Amendment to 2339. Let me make one thing very, very clear. I'm going to present this Amendment in behalf of the Department and the Hospital Association and the others who have worked this Amendment out. Now there were some questions last night that this was related solely and only to hospital rate making and many people feared that this would in some way impair the rights of the other medical providers. Medical service providers of various kinds, the doctors, the nursing homes, all the other kinds of medical institutions and providers of all kinds and we'd give full rate payment to the hospitals and perhaps at the expense of all the other providers. Well let me tell you that the Bill, as it is on this floor, provides for rate setting for all of those providers. And if you want to provide for all of those providers, please defeat the Amendment. If you want to do it only as it has come out of this group, to set it up for the hospitals, then vote for the Amendment. I frankly like the Bill the way it came out of Fiscal and Economic Commission the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

very best. We had some difficulty and were not able to get it out of Committee in that shape, then the Departments came to me and said they'd like it out as the vehicle, that they felt that they could go part way on this Bill. And it came out for that purpose and that purpose only. But if you like it the way it is, I'd be delighted to try to proceed with the Bill the way it is. But I will present the Amendment. And the Amendment does limit this rate review to hospitals alone. It sets up an authority of five public members, two of whom shall be hospital trustees. That is members of hospital boards but they cannot be anyone who has a financial interest in the operation of a hospital or of the profits of a hospital or the administration of a hospital. It provides a salary for these people not to exceed \$150.00 per day and at a maximum of 20,000. I believe that the first year is the only year they can even earn up to that amount because thereafter there will be very little rate setting to be done. It provides that they would set rates for hospital services. It provides that there shall be a uniform system of reporting from hospitals to these...to this authority. but it does not require uniform accounting. Uniform accounting procedures are required under the original Bill. It does say that the authority will do everything it can to try to bring the federal third party providers in line with the rate settings by this authority. But it recognizes, as both Bills do, that the viability of the legislation and its effect will be singularly impaired if the federal providers and medicare does not come in at the same rate. That basically is what this authority does provide. The original Bill provided a technical group that was to advise the authority that had no voting rights. There is still, under this, a smaller advisory group upon which there are a few people who are administrators of hospitals and others who have some particular skills in the area that are available for advice only to this authority. The original one had a much more expanded technical council that provided advice.



I would present this Amendment, which is solely and only for hospital rate making and ask that you consider whether you wish to adopt this Amendment, on my recommendation, to House Bill 2339. If you do not, the Bill will then be in the shape that it is in at the present time which would provide rate control for all of the medical providers."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Could you close the board?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well if you had been on time, I'd have known you were here but you weren't here on time. All right, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm sorry, I thought you said 10:00... I thought perhaps we might have 12 hours off from the time we adjourned and the time we are forced to return to this ... place."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us if he will provide a revised Fiscal Note before we vote for this on Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Of course there will be a revised Fiscal Note available. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines... Pardon me... Proceed, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Boy, I thought I was antsy today but you're really antsy. What happens if we don't pass this Bill?"

Tipsword: "We'll be in the same situation we are now."

Skinner: "Are we going to lose federal aid?"

Tipsword: "We have had no threats of that kind. No, Sir."

Skinner: "Well I think I remember reading some memo that said that we had to pass a Bill by October or else there was some federal implication that some federal law would supercede state regulations."

Tipsword: "Maybe I should revise my answer. If there is such a threat I'm not aware of it. I think we may face that sometime in the future but I'm not going to threaten the House with that because I



don't know that that's true."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm really not too much of an advocate of socialized medicine and that's obviously the direction in which this is going. But it seems to me if we're going to have it for hospitals we certainly ought to have it for nursing homes. And with the Act...with the Bill, as it is drafted now, it will do so also for nursing homes. And the complaints I've been getting from people about the costs of nursing homes of...compared with the services provided, lead me to wonder whether this is the best way to go. And for that reason I'm not going to vote in favor of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

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

Tipsword: "Certainly."

Epton: "Roland, I have no objection to following any Bill that you pursue but I am troubled by the fact that we had at least seven Bills involving various health care features. And because of the complicity of the problem, because of the various model legislation introduced, I was under the impression that we were going to try and work this out on the Interim Study Calendar. Now I certainly respect your right to go ahead with this Bill, but isn't that somewhat contrary to what I thought you were in accord with?"

Tipsword: "No, we had nothing that was on the Interim Study Calendar. This Bill... Maybe I should give you a little history of this and what's happening in the Senate. This Bill, 2339, was drafted as a result of the Medicaid Study performed the the Illinois Fiscal and Economic Commission of this Legislature. This...in that study, one of the recommendations was that we should have a good means of rate setting because we can't come up with providing adequate care until we adequately provide for that care. And we also cannot adequately provide for that care until we know really what the true costs should be. Not what someone bills us necessarily. And so this was the...the Bill that was recommended, 2339, out of the Fiscal and Economic Commission. And



I carry that Bill, not as my personal Bill, but as the Bill from that Commission as a result of the Medicaid Study. I happen to have been Chairman of the Subcommittee that made that study. In the Senate, the Hospital Association has filed a rate setting Bill. And it's a rate setting Bill for hospitals only. Now this Bill, that I presented, was not first...did not first come out of Human Resources Committee because there was some objection, basically on the socialized medicine aspect. At least that's what I...I felt was the objection to it. Then the Department came to me and said, 'We'd like to move that Bill out because we think that we should or are going to have to.' At least they felt under some pressure to set up a real rate making authority and an authority that could investigate and find out what the real rates ought to be. Now in the course of their doing so, they've been meeting with the Hospital Association and other groups. They took the nursing homes out because they tell me that they do not have the capability to find out the information necessary from nursing homes that they now have with hospitals. That the hospitals capability is presently available throughout the state. Now that's why they said they went to it. I'm sure also that the hospitals don't want to be a part of the rate making authority that goes into all of the rest of them. They don't want to bother with them, they want to bother with only their own and I think that they feel a pressure that they're going to have to have some kind of rate making authority and I don't doubt that they think that maybe this will give them the first step up the ladder to be adequately funded. That may be part of their attitude."

Epton: "I don't want to prolong this but I would simply call to your attention and of course I certainly agree that you didn't even suggest that this go to Interim Study but one of the Bills that went into Interim Study was a model health care Bill, derived from the Conference of Insurance Legislators which will do exactly what you're attempting to do. So we will be, in effect, duplicating our work. However I think you should do whatever you



think..."

Tipsword: "Well if we pass Legislation perhaps we won't be duplicating then. But this...this Amendment was put together by Public Aid, Public Health, the Hospital Association certain other health care providers sat in from time to time. They had someone sitting in from the Department..."

Epton: "That's almost an unholy alliance."

Tipsword: "It's an absolutely unholy alliance."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Thank you. I rise to...I'm the Republican spokesman on the Human Resources Committee. And this Bill got out of Committee with the understanding that Mr. Tipsword would hold it until an agreement was reached between the various parties involved. Now I've been informed this morning by the Governor's Office that they are...they can accept this Amendment. And also, however I feel that Mr. Tipsword should be...should know that many of us on this side of the aisle have not had an opportunity to study this and that even though I will vote for the adding of the Amendment that in no way says that we will vote for the Bill on Third Reading until we have a chance to digest this Amendment. But I just wanted to get up and make that statement."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Peters. 44 'aye' and 4 'no'. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I indicated last evening, as a Member of the Appropriations Committee I am becoming increasingly concerned with the manner in which we are making payments out of public aid to those individuals and institutions that end up providing health care. We have a great emphasis on what we want to do with hospitals but we have not enough concern, I think, for those other individuals, the doctors, chiropractors, podiatrists, nursing homes and so forth and so on that do end up providing care. I understand that the administration is in favor of this



particular Amendment. Let me also say that I am not sure, in my mind, that the administration is correct in their support of this particular Amendment. I am extremely concerned that we will be going into an area of advanced payments, especially to hospitals, which will end up causing a tremendous, tremendous financial burden on the rest of the programs in the state and the rest of the medical providers. Now this may or not be true. However, I think from what I have heard, what I have been told, that that certainly is the direction we are going in and I, for one, do not feel that is a proper direction to single out one part of the medical field for that kind of treatment. Also, I think it has to be made abundantly clear in whatever discussions we have on Public Aid, the tremendous amount of that budget that is going for health care providers and not going directly to individuals in terms of assistance. Now those are things I think that this General Assembly and society as a whole must start to begin to discuss so that we can have some rational kind of approach to providing decent and proper care to those people who need it and at the same time not be overburdened by an ever growing health care medical provider kind of system that today takes over 50 percent of our budget. For that reason, until those questions are better answered to me, I am going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take... Representative Barnes.

52 'aye' and 7 'no'. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Just...Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that as the Chairman of Appropriations II that I should say something here, since this is a Bill that will impact greatly on one of the largest budgets that we have that come before us. My reservations about it is just that...It's not that I am opposing the concept but I think that when this Bill comes on Third Reading that we should have some specific facts in front of us to let us know exactly what kind of impact that this kind of Bill will have on the Public Aid budget and the requests that we have to deal with in the appropriation process. This being the largest...one



of the second largest budgets that we have, usually the largest deficiency that we have every year, we will have one coming up later so I would just say to the Sponsor that we need the answers to these questions before we can look at this Bill in an objective manner on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I would just like to add, in response to the last two Gentlemen, who were absolutely right, that the basic reason for this kind of an approach in the original Bill and in this Amendment, they will find in that study...the Medicaid Study done by the Economic and Fiscal Commission that the reason for the growth and for the continuing and on-growing and inflated growth of Medicaid is because we...we do not have prospective rate setting in the State of Illinois. So there is no control. What we are doing is responding after the fact. And the fact that they feel that they're going to get paid we...They are continually increasing the cost and increasing the equipment and increasing the personnel and so what this attempts to do and the suggestion of the Fiscal and Economic Commission was that we should first decide what is really needed in all of these various medical ... by all of these various medical providers and what the cost of that provision should be in advance of providing the service. And that will also thereby give us a handle on what we can expect in the future for the cost of Public Aid to be for Medicaid. And that...that's the reason they're taking this approach. Thank you. The Federal Government also has recognized that fact. That is one thing that is on our side."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 56 'aye' and 9 'no' and the motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."





Speaker Redmond: "Are there any other Members that have Bills on Third Reading that desire to have them returned to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment. Any such Bills in that posture, please give the number of the Bill to Chalkie. Don't give it to me, give it to Chalkie because we have to take the Bill out and find the Amendment. Once more now. Any Bills on Third Reading that Members desire to have returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment, bring the Bills... the number of the Bill to Chalkie. Consent Calendar. Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar. Third Reading. Supplementary Consent Calendar. Second Day. Group 11. House Bill 2308. A Bill for an Act to authorize certain counties to undertake local improvements. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It's the intention of the Chair, everytime that somebody has to be added to the Consent Calendar or taken off it requires four separate entries in the Clerk's Office. So, it's our intention not to honor any such requests today. Have all voted who wished? You're suppose to vote... if you were in your seat, Representative Cunningham, you wouldn't have that problem. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 1 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Once again, anybody with a Bill on Third Reading that they desire to have returned to the Order of Second Reading for an Amendment, please bring the number of the Bill to Chalkie. It's most unlikely that if it isn't done today, it's very unlikely that we will every pass this way again. There's a song, Representative Totten, do you know the words to that song, 'We'll never pass...again.' Do you want to sing it? Okay. House Bills, Third Reading. Short Debate. It is also the intention of the Chair that matters that are put on Postponed Consideration will in



all likelihood, be called Saturday. Those Bills that are taken out of the record, will in all likelihood, will also be called Saturday. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, while we're on that subject, what is the fairness of the present Priority of Call, inasmuch as the Chair is publicly dedicated to the proposition that every...every Bill is going to be called? Why don't we just go down the Calendar as it is, without jumping back and forth. Mine are all under May the 3rd and I submit that the arrangement is unfair and that the Speaker, in fairness, should return to the numerical call order. Is that possible?"

Speaker Redmond: "Being fair isn't... The only thing I can say is that in the wisdom of the House they set out certain methods whereby the Speaker could call Bills. And in their wisdom, they decided that Priority of Call was one of the systems."

Cunningham: "But all of us..."

Speaker Redmond: "We have always gone in numerical sequence until yesterday. I think it's been working very well and if we would confine our natural tendencies to tell the world how we feel about certain things, I'm sure that everything will be reached..."

Cunningham: "Did you hold with me or against me?"

Speaker Redmond: "I'm with you and against you. House Bill 41. Out of the record. 106. Representative Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 106. A Bill for an Act to provide grants for the Family Practice Residency Programs and Medical Student Scholarships to the Illinois Department of Public Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 106 is the product of about eight years of work on my part and the part of many other Members of this General Assembly. My Cosponsor, Eugene Barnes and I, had similar legislation two years ago and the Higher Education Committee formed a Subcommittee for study on this subject and the result is House Bills 106 and 107. So what this Bill does



is to establish residency programs and grants to medical students who will agree to serve, for at least three years, in medically underserved areas of the State of Illinois, after they become doctors. The S.I.U. Medical School breakfast, this morning, coincided beautifully with a hearing on this Bill today. Several years ago S.I.U. was charged with the responsibility of providing medical service for central and southern Illinois. and the S.I.U. Medical School was established. It's a beautiful school, we're very proud of it. I'm sorry that more of you were not able to attend the breakfast this morning. It was a beautiful slide presentation and open house tour of the medical school. But S.I.U. Medical School has a rural oriented admissions policy. All of the students there, I am told, are residents of Illinois. The problem is that Illinois is one of the greatest exporters of medical graduates in the United States. Approximately two-thirds of the students that we graduate from medical schools in the State of Illinois, practice outside the state. And it's felt and this Bill coin... is a compliment to the program, that if we can provide residency programs in Illinois to the satellite residents such as in Decatur, Quincy and Belleville, that could be established. And if we can get the students to agree to practice in medically underserved areas once they become doctors, then we can solve two problems. One would be that we will have doctors practicing in these areas and the other would be that we would not have them leaving the state. House Bill 106 is the... has the full support, I'm told, of the Board of Higher Education, of S.I.U. Medical School. It's a concept that was addressed by the Governor on a white paper, I believe, prepared for us by our former colleague, Jim Nolan. It has his support, I'm told, and I would urge the Members to adopt this, which I consider to be one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come before this General Assembly during this Session."

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



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "The timer is on."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure what I have to say is not going to have any effect on this because it should fly and I hope it does. But I want to commend Representative Hart and Barnes because they have worked long and hard on this proposal. And the thing that's great about this is the fact that we're going to see a lot of young people who are interested in getting into the medical field who otherwise, if they couldn't have this type of a program or didn't have this type of program offered to them, would be unable to go, never be stimulated. And I think it's just something that the...is out there on the horizon that the State of Illinois is going to...medically going to reap the harvest in the best interest of the health and well being of our people in this state."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Dunn, do you desire to explain your vote?"

Dunn: "I do."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is my understanding that this Bill will permit the implementation of a family practice residency in an area which may not qualify as a medically underserved area. On that understanding I vote for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 156. Representative Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 156. A Bill for an Act to create the Patients Compensation Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 156 is in a form similar to the one that passed this Session...this House last Session by a vote of 115 to 0. The purpose of this Bill is to provide excess coverage for malpractice awards above 200 thousand dollars per claim or 600 thousand per year. This Bill covers hospital associations and other health care providers as assigned in the Bill and has the 100% endorsement of the Illinois Hospital Association. I know of no real opposition to the Bill and I solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone stand in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining his vote maybe Representative Daniels can tell us if there's anything in this Bill to...safeguards in this Bill not to allow this type of insurance to run away like the Workmen's Compensation Premium Funds have run away. Can you tell us, in explaining your vote, that this won't happen in this case?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels to respond."

Daniels: "Yes, Representative, we have a board that determines the assessment and what we're attempting to do here is have a type of self insurance plan in order to cover the excess verdicts and judgement and the availability of coverage for the public's benefit."

Giorgi: "I didn't hear in that any guarantee that the premiums won't run away from us, like Workmen's Compensation payments have run away from us."

Daniels: "The premiums per se, are not born by the public on the surface. It's a nonprofit organization that determines those."

Giorgi: "I'll be glad to be the only one to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby



declared passed. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thought that many of our colleagues in the House would want to give a General Assembly, State of Illinois welcome to a former colleague. One of the outstanding young men, Jim Holloway, who's standing right next to me, the Gentleman farmer from Sparta."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holloway, I understand that you came here with the best freshman class that ever came to the House. I wonder if you would elaborate on that."

Holloway: "That's right, Mr. Speaker and I understand that just you and I are the only two left of that class. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Only two alive. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. The 7th and 8th grade classes of St. Mary's School of Pontiac, Illinois, accompanied by teacher, Sister Celeste...Cecelia and Katy and John Miller. Would you rise please? They're represented by Representative Hoxsey, Breslin and Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "219 out of the record? Is that correct, Representative Pouncey? Is Representative Ryan on the floor? Representative Telcser. Representative Telcser, maybe you and Mr. Madigan might listen to this. We still list Bill 219 as one that's being held and has been held because of a companion Appropriation Bill. And there are quite a number of Bills that are in that category and we have not yet taken official action to exempt the substance of Bills where there's an Appropriation Bill that hasn't caught up to it. Now, I personally don't think that there's any great harm in passing those Bills because if there's no appropriation why it's a nullity anyway. I am a little bit concerned and I wonder if you would consult with Representative Madigan and see if we can't resolve this thing because I don't want anybody to get caught at the switches. There's many of these substantive Bills that we could have passed a long time ago and we've taken them out for this reason. 555. Representative McClain. 555. One thing at a time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 555."



Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record...same situation with that one.  
560. Representative Youngue."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 560. A Bill for an Act to establish the  
Illinois Community Development Finance Corporation. Third  
Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Youngue."

Youngue: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 560  
provides for the establishment of the Community Development  
Finance Corporation which would promote industrial and economic  
development in Illinois. It would provide equity and debt  
capital for businesses and industry in depressed areas of  
Illinois. We have certain areas, mostly the southern and western  
counties and certain portions of St. Clair County and the  
intracity of Chicago and other specific areas of Illinois that  
are in deep financial trouble. The effort here would be finance  
through the sale of one million shares of stock that would be  
purchased by the treasurer, as a result of the sale, at a later  
date of general obligation bonds. The proceeds of those bonds  
would be invested in very secure portfolios, market security  
that would draw a seven percent return. Three million dollars  
of this investment would produce about 210 thousand dollars  
a year that would be used for the staff. And the balance would  
be used to invest in secure securities and the interest would  
be used to make loans to businesses. I think that this is  
a instrument that can bring equity capital and loan money to  
those areas that need it to expand their businesses and  
become economically stable and I ask for your support of  
this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the final there, Representative Youngue?"

Youngue: "I ask for your support of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Ewing...Short debate and the  
timer's on."

Ewing: "Yes, we have a motion pending on this and I think it should  
be disposed of. And I would like to say, before I get the short



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

gavel or the fast gavel, that these motions to recommit to the Revenue Committee are very seriously filed. We had a lot of Bills that should have gone to..."

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

Younge: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, has Mr. Ewing offered his motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's on the Calendar."

Madigan: "If the motion has been offered, I move that that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Gentleman wasn't even given the opportunity of explaining his motion and then interrupted in a motion to table. It completely deprives him of the right to explain to us what the basis for his motion is."

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

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion is written and is in the Journal and it was the Sponsor of the Bill that initiated the motion to lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "The motion to table, Mr. Speaker, is not debatable."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that is correct but I would just like to remind Representative Ewing that the gavel is not as Implied Consent Bills once in a while.... Not as fast as Complied Consent Bills are. Representative Ewing. I think in all fairness to Representative Ewing that we should let him explain that. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I preface that my motion with the comment, 'If he has offered his motion', so I am more than willing to withdraw my motion to allow him to explain his motion. But then at the appropriate time I would request to be recognized to move to lie his motion on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll recognize Representative Ewing with respect to his motion with regard to House Bill 560. Representative Ewing."





Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Since I'd like one point of personal privilege about the fast gavel and the Consent Calendar. The Consent Calendar was a creation of the Leadership and I assume the Speaker's Office and many good Bills have been passed out on it. I would say that it's obvious that this Bill has affect on state revenue. We have refused to send these Bills back to the Revenue Committee where they should have been sent to begin with. I think it's impossible for any Committee with the responsibility of the Revenue Committee to keep any track of what we're doing to state finances and state revenues if we're not going to hear those Bills. And if this Bill is as good as the Sponsor would lead us to believe, we can always come out with a Committee Bill that is exempt from our deadline. I think that this Bill and the others that I filed a motion on should be heard by the Revenue Committee. We should have a full picture of what we're doing to state revenue and I would ask that the motion to table, which will be made, be defeated. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would renew my motion that Mr. Ewing's motion lie on the table. And I wish to point out to the Membership, as I have in the past on similar motions that for this motion to prevail is to deny to this Sponsor the opportunity to present her Bill to the Membership after having received Committee approval of this Bill. Mr. Ewing may disagree with the assignment of this Bill to a particular Committee. But the fact remains that the Bill has been approved by a Committee of this House and is now before the full Body for its consideration and I, for one, don't feel that the Bill should be sent back to a Committee without giving the Sponsor the opportunity to present her fine Bill to the Membership."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing has... The question is on Representative Ewing's motion to House Bill 560 be returned to



the Committee on Revenue. He made that motion. Representative Madigan moved that that motion lie on the table. The question is on Representative Madigan's motion that the motion lie on the table. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 65 'no' and the motion to table prevails. We now refer back to House Bill 560. It's on short debate. Anyone stand in opposition? Representative Young has explained her vote. Representative Simms has joined the Assembly and he now seeks recognition."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in total opposition to the passage of House Bill 560. This is one of the worst Bills of a concept that we could possibly pass by this Session of the General Assembly. What this calls for is a quasi-independent state agency, which would make loans in the private sector. And what it does, frankly, is to lend money to the vehicle of a new corporation. And now these bonds, that they will be issuing, even though they're not general state obligation bonds, if a business should default it will be incumbent upon the State of Illinois to try to retire the debt. Since, very frankly, these business fail, the corporation thus the State of Illinois could be in the posture of losing millions of dollars. This also could provide, for the state, an investment of private enterprises. And very frankly, what you're asking the State of Illinois to do is to invest money in private enterprises that banks and lending institutions would basically feel are poor risks. And the State of Illinois would be in the posture of lending money to business opportunities that are bad investments. And therefore, the taxpayers and the Citizens of the State of Illinois, would be in the posture of possibly losing millions of millions of state dollars because of a bad investment. This is a bad principal for the State of Illinois to embark upon, especially in light of our economic problems in Illinois. And to also...



that we must consider the precedent that we're establishing. Why should we use taxpayer's dollars to pour into a bad investment that the Citizens of the State of Illinois could very well lose because of the business that they will be financing would go under. And for these reasons I would urge that this Bill be defeated by the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority."

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

Skinner: "All I want to do is to note to my fellow Members that Representative Ralph Dunn has returned looking hale and hearty and I hope everyone will stop by and shake his hand."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell, to explain his vote."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, what Representative Younge is asking in this proposal is nothing new. East St. Louis is one of the most deprived areas in its surroundings, of this state. And it is a part of the State of Illinois. I recall in the early 50's when the Federal Government set up the Small Business Administration, that agency has done consistently what is being suggested here at the state level. I see nothing wrong with this. I think that the Representative who spoke against this Bill is assuming that any business that would be set up and established under this law would fail. And I think that he has no right to make that assumption and I'd like to suggest that we pass this Bill, let the State of Illinois do what it should do by all segments of the state and give the people an opportunity to upgrade themselves at the economic level."

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

Madison: "Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As usual, Representative Simms and his usual eloquence is as wrong as two left shoes. This Bill... There is nothing new about this kind of vehicle. This kind of vehicle has been used time and time again across this



country. The newness of it is the concept of the state's involvement, the state's commitment to jobs, as opposed to welfare. I don't see anything wrong with that. This Bill seeks to establish a vehicle whereby there can be the creation of jobs in areas where jobs are needed. Now I suppose what we could do, if the Representative would choose, instead of making loans we could make grants. But I don't think he would agree with that. Maybe that's what we ought to do, not make it a lending program, make it a grant program and then it can operate like the rest of the Departments around here that give subsidies to various interest groups. But what we're asking for is not a handout, we're asking for some assistance to develop jobs and this is a good vehicle to do it. It is sound, this concept has been used time and time again and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill doesn't ask for any money, not now. I said it doesn't ask for any money, to my distinguished friend over there, it doesn't ask for any money now. It asks you to set up the Illinois Community Development Finance Corporation. Now whether we get any money for it or not, that's another question. But do you mean to tell me that you're going to deny this Lady the right and this House, to form that Development Corporation? I think that she's been a most graceful Lady since she's been in this House. She's gone along with you on everything. Why, in the name of God, can't you give her the right to help her people down there? Now we take care of the money angle when we set up the corporation. And I'm asking...soliciting your vote to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Davis: "...This is for poor people."

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



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want you to know why I'm going to be voting 'aye' on this particular Bill. Six years ago I put in a very similar to create a group to encourage businesses in areas that needed it. Let none think that it be restricted to any geographical area or to any particular people because there is in southeastern Illinois a wide segment of mankind as deserving and as needy of the helping hand of government as anywhere else in the State of Illinois. I serve notice on the Sponsor that though I vote green with her, when it comes time to divide the money we're going to be in there to get our fair share for the underprivileged of the 54th District and we hope that we'll have your heart and hand and vote at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 52 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 5...714. It's our intention to break for lunch at noon, come back at 1:00 and probably not break for dinner unless we do more this afternoon than we've done so far this morning. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have...I have a point of parliamentary inquiry. I understood you to say that you are now going to call those substantive Bills which we had previously ruled were not covered by the deadline. Is it your intention to continue to do that?"

Speaker Redmond: "If you had gone to Marquette instead of where you did go you would know that that isn't what I said. I said that something has to be done, by the Body, to take care of that problem...Representative Telcser and Representative Madigan to sit down and see what they come up with. We are not calling them."

Leinenweber: "This past one did have a companion Appropriation Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I'm not clairvoyant and nobody has mentioned it to me and I've declared it passed. Representative Sumner."



Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded on 106?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the... 106, I think that's up in the gallery. Representative Byers objects to anybody either getting on or off of the Roll Call."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "714."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 714..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 797. Representative Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 797. A Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of athletic trainers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 814. Out of the record. 815. Out of the record. 890. Representative Reed. 890. Out of the record. We frightened her. 993. Representative Winchester."

Clerk O'Brien: "House..."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 993 has a companion Appropriation Bill of 994, which is now on Third Reading, First Legislative Day. And I understand that tomorrow it will be on Second Legislative Day and at that time I can ask for leave to have both Bills heard at the same time. Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester. The clock is on."

Winchester: "No, Mr. Speaker, it was a point of inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, state your point."

Winchester: "House Bill 993 has a companion Bill of 994 which is on First Legislative Day on Third Reading. Tomorrow it will be on Second Legislative Day and at that time I can ask for leave to have both Bills heard?"

Speaker Redmond: "The only thing I can say is that under the rules this Bill would expire at midnight Saturday. Now, the Body has not yet taken official action with respect to what they are going to do. Now the...there has been a suggestion that we're liable to make these Bills exempt. I never want to be in the position of reading the minds of 176 Members. I don't know what they're going to do. Out of the record. 1025."



Representative Younge. Representative Matijevec, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, I was called outside, but as I came back I think you were talking... Dan, can you get down for a minute. You were talking about the exempt Bills, companion Bills?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Matijevec: "I'm trying to prepare a motion. What I'm going to do is, in one motion I'm going to talk to the, both George Ryan and Mike Madigan in one motion to suspend the rules on the companion Bills. And I'm going to pass out a sheet to all the Members so that they are aware of the Bills. And if they are excluded and do have a companion Bill, to let me know so that we can include them in that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Very good, Representative Matijevec. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much. I only want to reiterate what the Chairman of Appropriations I has indicated. Appropriation II will be included in that one motion. We intend to do the same thing."

Speaker Redmond: "In law that's known as cumulative evidence. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we just went by House Bill 797 and 798 as a companion Bill, it's on Third Reading but if they're going to be exempt then I'll pass it by and I wish that the... I hope that the other Sponsors of legislation pass by because they are exempt and we can address them next week. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, more cumulative evidence. 1046. Representative Meyers."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1046."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ted Meyers. Out of the record for the same reason. 1098. Representative McMasters. I can't see McMasters because some Gentleman in a white coat is standing between me and McMaster. Out of the record. 1231. Representative Daniels. 1231. Out of the record. 1303. Representative Porter."



Do you want to take a chance on the 52nd? Out of the record.  
 1428. Representative Madigan, 1428. Out of the record. 1430.  
 Representative Getty. Out of the record. 1432. Representative  
 Taylor. Out of the record. 1447. Representative Kucharski.  
 Representative Kucharski on the floor? Out of the record.  
 1601. E.M. Barnes, 1601. Out of the record. 1633. Representative  
 McLendon. McLendon, 1633."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1633."

McLendon: "That's Representative Caldwell's."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell, do you want that out of the  
 record, is that correct? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I was just going to point out that's exempt."

Speaker Redmond: "1694. My own personal observation is that had these  
 gone over it would have uncluttered the Calendar here, it  
 might have helped the Senate but it would have uncluttered us.  
 And if the appropriation doesn't catch it why, the...you know,  
 we waste time on this thing and...1694. Representative Schneider.  
 Out of the record. 1702."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1702. A Bill for an Act in relation to  
 state agencies and their termination continuation to reorganization.  
 Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.  
 House Bill 1702 is another sunset Bill. It was heard in  
 Executive Committee and passed out of there unanimously.  
 It deals with sunset in all the departments of state government.  
 It provides committees to do the oversight and it also requires  
 on the review that we do something about zero base budgeting  
 for supplying the information to the Appropriation Committee  
 that we're unable to get now. I'd be happy to answer any questions  
 and I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question is, shall this  
 Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.  
 Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record.  
 On this question there's 155 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill,





having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. I understand that 1822 has a companion Appropriation Bill. Out of the record. 1861. Representative Satterthwaite. Out of the record. 1949. Representative Capparelli. Capparelli, 1949. Out of the record. 2000. Representative Porter, do you want that out of the record? 2113. Representative Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2113. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vital Records Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of House Bill 2113 is to amend the Vital Records Act and provide that the fees that are received for vital records would go to the County Treasury. And it's a rather simple piece of Legislation and I'd ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is anybody in opposition? The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135...40 'aye', 2 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2115."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2115."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, out of the record. 2154. Representative Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2154. Hart. A Bill for an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with sale on credit and lending money. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Bill does is just to make the state law comply with the federal regulations. This Bill passed out of Judiciary I 19 to nothing with I voting 'present'. It really doesn't have a whole lot of substantive effect but it would help people find out what the law is in Illinois and I urge the adoption of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar, do you stand in opposition? The



question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2212. Representative Younge. Out of the record. Just to make an observation here, of all of the Bills that were on Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, we've taken 27 out of the record, which is by far the largest number of Bills on there. And the reason we did was because of the substantive...these are substantive Bills in which there was a companion Appropriation Bill. We've been on this Order of Business probably 40 minutes. So, you might consider that in your further deliberations about the correct procedure on substantive Bills, when there is a companion appropriation. Senate Bills, Second Reading. On Senate Bills... Representative Jones."

Jones: "I ask leave to be recorded 'aye' on 106. It has to do with the medical school and we were occupied with their open house this morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. Senate Bill... Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, who raised the objection? We had another Member that wanted to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers stands in objection."

Ryan: "Well then maybe we ought to have a vote on it to see where we stand. This is going to effect every Member of this House. We pointed out yesterday that we're called off the floor, there's other things to do and once in a while somebody gets caught short. And I think it's very unfair to not let these people be recorded on these Roll Calls that are important to them. Now if we're going to start playing that game, we're all going to play it, Mr. Speaker. And I think for the best interest for the harmony of this Chamber that you ought to allow these things to happen. It isn't that big of a deal."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "It takes unanimous consent and those are the Rules of the House and I try to abide by them. Now he has been denied unanimous consent. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker we've been going on this and people have got their switches voted, no wonder we never get anything done. And I'm not going to give consent anymore, I don't care if it's my brother."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, on that issue of the companion Bill, as far as I'm concerned now that we're this late in the Session I have no objection to hearing the companion Bills. This list is being provided, just as a precautionary measure to protect those companion Bills. I just didn't want them heard early in the Session when three months later they catch up. So, I have no objection to hearing them myself."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that final conclusion there?"

Matijevich: "I said, I have no objection to hearing companion Bills, substantive Bills. But the list that I'm preparing is just to protect those Bills from the May 21st deadline."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that. The only reason for my comment is that I just see from here that...that, you know, we've been doing things which we have to do but it takes time and time is of the essence. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I would object to hearing these Bills that are exempt. I'm looking at the Calendar...(tape failure)...to do on Bills that are not exempt. We've got all the Bills on Postponed Consideration to go through and I think if we want to avoid being here till Saturday at midnight then we ought to get what has to be gotten out of the way first and let the others go over till next week. I would object to that, I think that we have plenty to do and let's do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, let's get out of the dialogue here and get down to some business. Senate Bills, Second Reading. The first one, Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would



join Representative Leinenweber in that objection. We've had House Bills over in the Senate, some of them for four or five weeks..."

Speaker Redmond: "We're not doing it now and there's no need for any further dialogue on this. We're not going to call them. We're now on the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading. The first one was taken out of the record. 318. Senate Bill 318 on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 318. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Veteran's Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 340."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 340. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 486."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 486. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Aid. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Peters, for what purpose do you rise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, initially a parliamentary inquiry, is this the Public Aid supplemental? If it is, Mr. Speaker, I did file a motion to table the Committee Amendment. I got lost in my



Calendar here."

Speaker Redmond: "Do we have a motion, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, I do have a motion to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove that from the Order of Third Reading and return it to the Order of Second Reading. Will you read the motion, Mr. Clerk."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pursuant to Rule 64(d), I move to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 486."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Barnes is the Chairman of the Committee and I'm sure that he will have an interest in this. Can we just take this out momentarily until he returns to the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, out of the record...Call the Members attention to page 13, Senate Bills, First Reading. We only have one House Sponsor on those Bills. So, if any House Sponsor that wants to identify himself, please step forward. You'll notice we also have a Supplemental Calendar #1, we don't have any House Sponsors on any of those Senate Bills. If you have any interest in a Senate Bill it's suggested that you identify yourself to the Clerk. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Representative Barnes has returned to the floor. I ask that you flip 486 back on the record for Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The order is Senate Bills, Second Reading on which appears Senate Bill 486. A motion has been filed to table Amendment #...Committee Amendment #1. Representative Barnes is recognized."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose this motion. I think that I would appreciate it if all of the Members would take a little time to take a look at what we are doing here and take a look at the Committee Bill that was a product of the Democratic Members of the Appropriations II Committee. What we are doing, very briefly, very briefly, in that field does not



change the bottom line in any way of the some 39.8 million dollars that has been requested by the administration for a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Public Aid. But in working with that Bill and with our staff and working in concert with the Members of the Appropriations II Committee, it was the feeling of that Committee in our deliberation that everyone here in the House and all of the Citizens of the State of Illinois should have a clear picture of the deficiency that was involved therein. The only thing, the only thing and I underline, in the Committee Amendment is to reflect the true deficiency, when it occurred, when it was reduced, where the money is coming from. It shows a true picture, in the words of one of our Committee Members, to simply tell it like it is. It shows the true fiscal picture of that Department and what is being offered to us in Senate Bill 486. Mr. Speaker, I would move that the motion to table the Committee Amendment would be defeated and I would hope that all of the Members, all of the Members that are truly, truly committed to fiscal integrity would support me in their effort to simply reflect...simply reflect the true picture of the deficiency involved. I again reiterate, in talking with various Members of the Bureau of the Budget, talking with Members of the Comptroller's Office, talking to the people in the Department of Public Aid, this Amendment...this Amendment in no way, in no way would deter the ability nor would it in any way, in any way detract from or add to the request of the administration in this deficiency. I would urge your support to support my motion on this to include House Committee #1 Amendment to Senate Bill 486 and to defeat this motion to table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters, respond to the motion."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I might just initially indicate that there is no real difference between myself and Representative Barnes, in what we would like



to see in regards to Public Aid, the attitude of that Department and what that Department ought to be doing. Part of what's involved here is the disagreement as to exactly how we end up presenting the figures and the cost and what that might end up doing in terms of the public and the public interpretation of figures which can become very very complicated, as all of you well know. Presently, this supplemental appropriation calls for an addition of 39 million dollars of new money. The actual deficit in the Department comes to somewhere near 126 million. But that deficit is covered by savings that were made in the reduction of various other line items in the Department's budget. So what the Department really needs in terms of new money, is 39 million dollars. Because again of the change and the transfer they have made between various line items. Our concern is this, that with the passage of this Amendment, what we will be doing is passing a supplemental appropriation for 126 million dollars as opposed to 39 million dollars. Representative Barnes and I and all the Members of the Committee understand that the Department will not spend that additional money. That in the last analysis, all that will really be spent is 39 million dollars. Okay? A part of the reason for this Amendment, as it was adopted in Committee, is to bring to the public's attention, the fact that we are spending a little over 50% of our budget not on direct welfare costs or not on direct assistance to individuals in need but rather on a system that takes the form of medical payments. It is our contention, on this side of the aisle and the Republican Members of the Appropriation Committee, that this picture, because of the accounting methods and the figures involved, becomes extremely confusing. And what's going to end up happening is that the public is going to come out with the impression that we have increased the Public Aid Appropriation by 126 million dollars. That is going to be interpreted as an increase, one, in the Governor's budget and worse, in our feeling, it is going to be interpreted by the public



as an additional 126 million dollars of spending for people on welfare. I think we have worked, all of us, long and hard to attempt to bring to the public a true realization of what the welfare picture is. We should be going on it, what we should be doing on it and it is our fear, our fear, that this will just add to a polarization and a confrontation. Let me just, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, read from the Illinois Hospital Association Newsletter. And what we feared did in fact happen. Their newsletter states that House Appropriation Bill 486 was amended to increase the funds from 39 million to 126 million. It goes on to say that the Department said an additional appropriation was needed to pay vendors. It also went on to say, in the last sentences, that this money probably would be unspent and it would last. But I fear, as many again on our side of the aisle fear, that what is going to end up happening is that the headline is going to be, 'Public Aid Appropriation Increased by 126 Million Dollars'. I repeat, the state is not going to fall apart if my motion to table fails, but what it is going to do, it's going to add an awful lot of confusion to an already confused kind of picture. I would appreciate your support on the motion to table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison. Representative Jones, I can't see Representative Madison. Representative Greisheimer."

Greisheimer: "Mr. Speaker, if I may, in all deference to the Chair I have a parliamentary inquiry. I guess it goes without saying that the rank and file Members here have very little impact upon the Leadership but we respect what you've been doing here. We also respect the importance of this matter in the eyes of the two parties arguing this motion. But when this House is facing an arbitrary deadline of this Saturday and we have a huge Calendar of Third Reading, a huge Calendar of Consideration Postponed, what in the world are we doing on Second Reading, Senate Bills and motions at this time that are not subject to any deadlines. I was just wondering if the Chair would explain some degree of why we're...we're not dealing with the Third Readings



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



which were under the ax...and all the Consideration Postponed when this matter could be handled all next week without any deadline problem whatsoever."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines in response."

Gaines: "I wish to ask Representative Greisheimer, are these funds monies that Governor Walker did not pay from last summer through December. And there's several hospitals, particularly in the City of Chicago, which will close this week if it isn't passed, that's the deadline. There's several hospitals in intracity and possibly in the rural areas who have to have this money right now or else there won't be any health care. That's the deadline. The deadline is that these hospitals who have not been paid because Governor Walker preferred to have a balance in the State Treasury when he went out of office rather than pay his just debts and this is why this is emergency at this time. And therefore, I ask the Speaker to call this Bill at this time."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is my 4th term on the Appropriations Committee and I have some concern that we all know precisely what is occurring, where money is being spent. It's on that basis that I oppose the motion to table. May I read you from a letter from the Director of the Department...Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Mandoville, to our Committee. 'In our discussion this morning I responded to your specific question of what impact, if any, your proposed Amendment would have on the ability of the Department to operate for the rest of this fiscal year.' My answer was absolutely none. The third point I want to make is that whether Senate Bill 486 is introduced or the Amendment which your Committee adopted is alternatively adopted is alternatively enacted. The net impact on the State's General Fund will be identical, that is we will need 39.7 million more than was originally appropriated. In my 4th term I have discovered that the media, I



repeat, the media, is well informed. They will echo the Appropriations Committee's feelings to tell it like it is. I have respect for the media, they know what's going on, they will tell it like it is. I think there will be no confusion. I oppose the motion to table."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Committee Amendment #1. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Peters, to explain his motion."

Peters: "In closing, Mr. Speaker, what has been said by the Members on the other side of the aisle is exactly correct. What Representative Kosinski read is exactly correct. That's the position of the Bureau of the Budget and it's the correct position. Let me reiterate, this is an involved accounting kind of thing. Sure, the press will end up reporting it but I'm sure that there will be some here that will end up taking this vote for an increase of, paper increase of 126 million dollars and meet you one place or another and say 'You voted for 126 million dollar increase in Public Aid.' And I suggest to you, there is no way you're going to end up being able to explain that. I vote 'no'."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, just to insure that it is clear, what is being accomplished here, this is in no way, in no way increasing this budget. I read to you from the testimony given to us by the Chairman of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. He stated that Medicare fraud abuse is estimated by that Advisory Committee as 10% of all medical payments this year. He stated, if this 100 million dollars plus in fraud payments had not occurred in this year, this supplemental would have been minimal. The only thing that Amendment #1 is reflecting is to show where the...the dollars are coming from, where the dollars are being spent. I suggest to you, in explaining my 'no' vote, that this 119 million deficit is simply another way to gloss over the scandal ridden Medicaid payment program



by painting it green with taxpayers dollars. I don't think that we want to be a part of that. I would solicit your 'no' vote to insure, to insure that we do not give the public the reflection that we are simply concurring with the over 100 million dollar plus fraud in that Medicare program. All this money, all of it, all of it, not one red cent goes to an individual Public Aid recipient. All of it goes to hospital and medical providers. We need, the-public needs to know that. We need to be responsible in our fiscal approach. I solicit your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to explain my 'yes' vote. You know, some of the things that have been said on the other side of the aisle are a little hard to understand over here. One thing that's said is that people have to understand what's happening over here. Well people aren't going to understand that we're underbudgeted on the medical line item. All they're going to understand is that we're appropriating 126 million dollars more to the Public Aid Department for Fiscal Year 1977 when we don't need that much money. Another thing that they're going to understand is that we're appropriating 80 million dollars more than we really need. Because that is the bottom line figure of what happened with this Amendment. We're appropriating 80 million dollars more than we need. Now if you want to go back home and tell the people who are very suspicious about Public Aid to begin with that you appropriated more money than was even needed, you can vote 'no' on this particular motion. But if you want to be honest with the people back home and let them know that we're transferring some money within the Department and we're appropriating approximately 40 million more because we need that money in the medical line item, then you'll be voting 'yes' on this motion to strike this Amendment. A 'yes' vote is the right vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. What we're really doing here, we're losing



sight of the fact that this is a deficiency appropriation. And it's needed in the hospitals immediately. If this motion doesn't pass this will have to go back to a Conference Committee. It's going to take time. Your hospitals need it. Let me quote from the Hospital Association News to get behind some of the things that Representative Peters and Representative Kempiners have said. 'This Amendment was offered by the Committee Chairman, Representative Eugene Barnes. And had funds for the payment to the aid families and dependent children.', well this is false. Now the very people that should be most interested got their stories backwards. Now if they have the story backwards, I think much is going to happen exactly as Representative Kempiners has pointed out. We're going to go home and they're going to say, 'Why did you appropriate more money than was needed in a deficiency appropriation? You only needed 39.7 million and you appropriated 126 million.' The only right vote on this question is a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski, you spoke once, I believe."

Kosinski: "To explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Not after you've spoken on the Bill. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I note that the both press boxes are full and I assume they're taking notes and I assume that Representative Barnes' point has been well made, because there is as much corruption."

Speaker Redmond: "The clock is on."

Davis: "As much corruption in the medical services field, probably, in the Department of Public Aid as anywhere. However, if Roman Kosinski, my fine friend from Cook, is also correct and this Amendment does nothing to the budget and will have no force and effect on the budget, then what is the need for the Amendment, Representative Kosinski? And I urge an 'aye' vote, simply to get this off of the ground and get going so that we can pay this bill, call it what it is. Gentlemen, your point has been made. The media is taking



notes of it. Your point has been made and it is a correct one and we are going to tell it like it is in the Appropriations Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 80 'aye' and 88 'no'. The motion to table carries. Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. In the balcony..."

Speaker Redmond: "Just a minute. The motion to table, fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, again I rise for the purpose of an introduction. In the balcony in the back of the Speaker is the Government class of the Middle School of Aledo, they're here to watch the process of government at work."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Waddell: "Their teacher is Wilma Lung, their represented by Representatives Neff, McMaster and McGrew. Would you stand please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I know all the Precinct Committeemen around here, Aldo Mazenni from Woodside Township."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading, Priority of Call. 2321."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2321. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan, 2321."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Kucharski spoke to me about an Amendment concerning this Bill. Is there an Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Redmond: "A little earlier I requested any Member that had a Bill on Third Reading that he wanted returned to the Order of Second Reading please come to the podium and leave the memo with Chalkie."



Houlihan: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'll take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2325."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2325. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois Community College Board.  
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bradley in the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, arise?"

Leinenweber: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. This appears to be an appropriation matter and one that is exempt."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Well it's...it's true, but it's also an emergency appropriation to repair a roof at the John H. Logan Jr. College. This Bill, I believe, has the support of the Governor's Office. And if it rains down there we're going to be in trouble if this Bill doesn't get passed. So I would ask that it be called at this time. Because it's in the nature of an emergency."

Speaker Bradley: "The Bill has been read a Third time. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, amended, appropriates 187 thousand 500 dollars for repairs that are needed at the John A. Logan Jr. College, near Carterville, Illinois. I'm advised that there's no opposition to this Bill from the Governor's Office. It's very much needed, it is an emergency and I would urge the support of the House, so we can get this to the Senate and get it on the Governor's desk and start repairing this roof."

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

Conti: "Yes, just one question. Or are we on Short Debate? Will you yield to a question, Dick? Dick, will you yield to a question? Shouldn't there be a companion Bill on this to meet the obligation bonds?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."



Hart: "There's no additional bonding appropriation involved. It can be paid out of appropriated....the appropriated bonds."

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

Schlickman: "Before I proceed, Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry. Mr. Speaker, are we at regular order or..."

Speaker Bradley: "Priority of Call."

Schlickman: "Okay, fine. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "By what principle or philosophy should the burden financing repairs fall upon the state?"

Hart: "I suppose the answer to that would be that there's no place else to get the money."

Schlickman: "May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker? May I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may. Proceed."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't think it's the proper basis to pass a Bill appropriating money to a unit of local government by simply saying, 'They have nowhere else to go.' Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the passage of this Bill would establish, I think, a terrible precedence because it would tell every other unit of local government, school districts, community college districts, that when you've got a problem, you have need for money, go to the state if you got nowhere else to go. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's about time we give the message to local government, to the citizens of the state. We don't got it. We just don't have it. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, with all deference to the Sponsor of this Bill and the plight of this Community College District, that it's inappropriate, inappropriate to come to the state for these funds which there is no basis in principal, no sound philosophical basis and we vote 'no'."

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

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



Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Yes, Representative Hart, isn't it true that the state, I believe, put the first roof on this building?"

Hart: "Yes, that is right and it was paid for, 75% by the state and 25% by the local government and the Amendment that was placed on the Bill would carry out that sharing of responsibility. so that 75% of the estimated cost of the repairs would come from the state, 25% from John A. Logan Community College."

Leverenz: "And isn't it true that there is not recourse to the contractor that put the roof on because of the way the state was set up at that time, which has now been corrected so it could not happen again?"

Hart: "Well, the way I'm advised, Representative Leverenz, is that in fact there will be recourse attempted against this particular contractor and architect. And that if there is a recovery that the state will have a hand and recover its share of the money."

Leverenz: "Yes, thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, we heard this thoroughly in Committee. We put it out of Committee 15 to 1 and I think it is a good appropriation. I ask everybody to vote green. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Representative Leverenz said, it went through Appropriations I, came flying with great colors. The monsoon season is not over in Southern Illinois. Two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars worth of tar at this time will save millions. Your words of concern, for those of you who are fiscally troubled in this matter, need to bow to the reality of protecting this structure that's already there. We need a roof on the college. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr... I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt, did you wish to be recognized?"

McCourt: "May I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

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





McCourt: "Assuming in this law suit, Dick, that you recover from the contractor for evidently negligent work and you recover say the 187 thousand dollars, will that money then be refunded to the state...reimbursed to the state for this appropriation?"

Hart: "Yes, it will, in the same proportion which the state and the community college shared the expense, as I indicated. The Amendment that was placed on the Bill reduces the appropriation from 250 to 187 thousand 500 dollars, which is 75% of the estimated cost of repairs. If the recovery would be in fact 250 thousand dollars then the state would get 187 thousand 500 back and the community college would get the rest. If they make some sort of settlement or get less then it would be shared proportionately."

McCourt: "Okay, thank you."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I...I wasn't really paying full attention, Representative Hart, but I... Did you say the Governor's Office does not oppose this? My understanding is that they do."

Hart: "It's my understanding, Representative Telcser, that the President of John A. Logan, Robert Carbon, had several meetings with the Capital Development Board and has had input from the Governor's Office and that there is no opposition to the Bill."

Telcser: "Well, that was my only question. My understanding is still the opposite but if you know...that's fine, you know."

Hart: "I don't believe that the Governor's Office opposes it."

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

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

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

Ewell: "Representative Hart, what is the 29th District getting out of this?"

Hart: "Well, it would get my vote if it had a similar problem."

Ewell: "Okay, just wondered."

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



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, it does appear to me that the state has an obligation in this matter. They were built with state funds, it was designed by CDB and apparently poorly designed, as some other things they've done are. I wish this had a companion Bill to abolish CDB, I'd vote for both of them."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, or Harden, Mr. Winchester."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The previous question has been moved. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to close."

Hart: "I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems to me that the state has an obligation to try to help our schools remain viable. In this case, a roof is leaking and destroying a building. It certainly needs to be funded for repairs at this time. The staff analysis indicates that there is a possibility of a legal suit and a recouping of this money from the contractor who was responsible for the faulty roof in the first place. However, we really can not afford to have our school buildings stand and deteriorate with the weather while we're waiting for the courts to decide this case. It is certainly a good investment of state money to preserve a building that is already there and in need of repair and I urge your support of this Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Well, the only reason I'm explaining it is..."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take... Mr. Ewell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "No, I spoke, I'm sorry, I forgot. I just wanted to vote 'aye'."



Speaker Bradley: "Record the... All right, have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are '96 'aye', 36 'no', 12 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The... On the Order of Call appears House... The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. The 8th grade members of the DeKalb-Clinton-Rosette School, 60 in number, led by instructor Carl Taylor, represented by Representatives Epton, Schuneman and Mautino, in the balcony in the rear. Would you stand please?"

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a motion to eliminate all introductions for the next two days."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we eliminate all introductions for the next two days. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion... All those... All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Before we do that, I want to introduce Joe Mudd and his daughter, Buffy."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...on this question we have 103...104... take the record. 106 'aye', 10 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and we have eliminated the introduction of guests for the next two days, which I assume is Friday and Saturday. Did that include the rest of today, Mr. Kane, in the motion? Mr. Kane, did that motion include the rest of today and Friday and Saturday? Was that the...that's what I understood. All right, on the Calendar appears House Bill 2321."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2321. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests we go back to Second... No, he doesn't, no. The Gentleman from...Mr. Houlihan, J."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was a proposed discussion of an Amendment. I'm in agreement with that Amendment but it's not ready yet and because of the time problem I will try to put that Amendment on in the Senate. It adds some additional matters that Representative Kucharski and I have talked about. It doesn't address the substance of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Ladies and Gentlemen... Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill provides that in a case where the Fair Employment Practices Commission has determined that a respondent has involved himself in a discriminatory practice that he can make the appropriate award for reinstatement, back pay, cost or reasonable fees. It gives the Commission that power. Currently, the Commission only can order that the particular person who has violated the law stop, cease and desist that violation. This gives the particular person who has agreed some remedy and enables the Commission to institute that remedy. I would move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2321."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 101 'aye', 32 'no', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The hour of 11:55 having arrived the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, what is the intent of Speaker Redmond as far as our recess?"

Speaker Bradley: "To recess from 5 till 12:00 until the hour of 1:00."

Madigan: "Okay, well I move that we recess until 1:00."

Speaker Bradley: "And I can assure the Members we have the...first Bill to be called will be an important Bill. We would like to have



the...everybody in attendance at 1:00 so we can get started promptly at that time. I think they're on the Order of Call. There will be a few motions, probably, before we get to it. Bill Marovitz, generical. The House will stand in recess until the hour of 1:00."

Doorkeeper: "Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in 15 minutes. Thank you."

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery. Attention Members of the House of the Representatives, we will convene in 5 minutes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "McClain, do you seek recognition? We are honored by the presence of the Comptroller of the State of Illinois, the Honorable Michael Bakalis in the middle aisle. His many friends are greeting him. The House will come to order, the Members please be in their seats. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 170. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 228. A Bill for an Act to eliminate the period of persons placed under supervision after the acquittal or discharge from the slate before he files a petition to have his arrest expunged. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 30. A Bill for an Act to create a Law Enforcement Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 414. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 417. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 420. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 421. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 423. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 426. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 427. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Hazardous Facilities Planning Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 465.



A Bill for an Act to create the Attorney General's Environmental Protection Trust Fund. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 487. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 473. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 477. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 480. A Bill for an Act to provide for the use of gas transmission facilities for private energy. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 482. A Bill for an Act to provide for a Metropolitan Exhibition Auditorium Authority in Waukegan. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 499. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 506. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 525. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 526. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 528. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 557. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Board Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 562. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 589. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 606. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 607. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 355. A Bill for an Act in relation to Legislative Information System. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Order of Motions appears House Bill 2275.

Representative DiPrima. Representative Ewell, is Larry DiPrima behind you?"

DiPrima: "Yeah."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. DiPrima, on the motion to take from the table."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to take House Bill 2275 from the table and to suspend Rule 25(b) and recommit the Bill to the Interim Study Calendar, the Veteran's Affairs Registration and Regulation Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to take from the table House Bill 2275 and recommit it. Is that the motion, Mr. DiPrima?"

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and it's recommitted. First... I think we'd better do one thing first. Let's take a Roll Call for an attendance. On second thought, let's take a vote on the Gentleman's motion. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that's Representative Catania's Bill. She's not on the floor. I don't know what her feeling is on the Bill, but..."

Speaker Bradley: "I think she's the cosigner of the motion. Let's check that though."

Clerk O'Brien: "The motion is signed by DiPrima and Catania."

Ryan: "And what is the motion?"

Speaker Bradley: "To take from the table and recommit to the Committee, the Interim Study."

Ryan: "Which Committee, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Veteran's Regulation...R and R...Veteran's Regulation."

Ryan: "All right."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was inadvertently tabled. It should have been in Interim Study Committee. And what Representative DiPrima and Representative Catania are trying to do is return it to Interim Study Committee of the Veteran's Affairs Committee and I was there when it was suppose to have gone into Interim Study Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Beatty, will you please record me



as voting 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 130 'ayes', no 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. While we're on the Order of Motions, are there any other motions to take from the table or to recommit or whatever? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Klosak."

Klosak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a motion in regards to House Bill 2395. The Bill has been filed a couple of days after the deadline and I am requesting, by this motion, that the Bill be advanced to the Order of Second Reading without reference to Committee. What the Bill does is put some teeth into our Fiscal Note Act. Several times in the past few days the Speaker has ruled that he has no authority to rule on the sufficiency of a Fiscal Note. Some of these Fiscal Notes are nothing more than mickey mouse items. Now in House Bill 2395 I am specifically authorizing the Speaker to rule when the question asked of the efficiency of a Fiscal Note filed is brought up. That's what the Bill does. I request it go on the Order of Second Reading. Further, I have cleared it with the Leadership on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Klosak, did you say you had cleared it with both Leaderships, on both sides? The Gentleman moves that House Bill 2395 be discharged from rules and moved to the Order of Second Reading. On that motion it will take 107 votes. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. On the Order of Motions, Representative Terzich has filed motions to recommit. Would the Clerk indicate the number of those Bills?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motions filed, I move to suspend Rule 25(b) to commit House Bills and return to Interim Study on House Bills 842, 851, 860, 864, 866 and 867. I believe they're all on Third Reading."





Speaker Bradley: "Representative Terzich, on the motion."

Terzich: "I'd just like leave of the House to recommit these Bills?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that those Bills shall be...  
House Bills 842, 851, 861...860, 861...864, 866 and 67. The  
Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I think technically he has to ask leave to place these  
on Interim Study Calendar of those Committees also. Doesn't he?  
And I think he should indicate the Committees."

Speaker Bradley: "The Judiciary Committee, as I understand it, and it  
is to return them to the Interim Study. Is that correct,  
Mr. Terzich?"

Terzich: "No, that is not correct."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, then what is the correct motion? I understand  
that there are different Committees but they all go back  
to the Interim Study of the various Committees. Is that  
correct? Mr. Houlihan:"

Houlihan: "Most of these Bills came out of the Executive Committee.  
I believe Representative Terzich's motion is on House Bill  
842 to place it on Interim Study and recommit it to Revenue.  
On 842, to recommit it to Environment and House Bill 851, the  
same motion but the Committee to which it would be committed  
would be Revenue. On 858, 864, 866 and 867, he's asking  
for it to be recommitted to Judiciary I. Isn't that correct,  
Mr. Terzich?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Clerk O'Brien: "I don't have an 858."

Speaker Bradley: "We don't have an 858. Did you say 858, Mr. Houlihan?"

Houlihan: "That's correct."

Speaker Bradley: "There is an 858 motion? Do we have it, Mr. Clerk?  
No? Well, we'll get you one then. He doesn't have that.  
Well, let's go with the rest of them. On the Gentleman's  
motion to recommit. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I notice that we have various Sponsors  
of these Bills, some of whom are not on the floor. I... Can  
Representative Terzich tell me what's going on there or what?"



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

Terzich: "Yes, George, I discussed that with the Sponsors and they have signed the motion. The motion is signed by the individual Sponsors. These were... I am the Chairman of the Law Revision Commission and this is also with their approval."

Ryan: "Could we have the correct list read again, the Bills numbers, Mr. Speaker, so we know what we're talking about here?"

Speaker Bradley: "I'll have the Clerk read the motions and who signed them. Let's do that."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 842 to be committed to Environmental Committee, Interim Study. Signed by Representative Terzich. House Bill 851 to be assigned to Revenue Committee, Interim Study. Signed by Representative Terzich. House Bill 860 to be returned to Judicial I Committee, Interim Study. Signed by Representative Ewing. On House Bill 864, to be sent to Judiciary I, Interim Study. Signed by John Dunn. On House Bill 866, to go to Judiciary I, Interim Study. Signed by John Dunn. On House Bill 867, to go to Judiciary I, Interim Study. Signed by John Dunn."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to be that I heard...the Clerk didn't read, which Representative Houlihan mentioned, 858. That's not in the list, is that correct?"

Speaker Bradley: "It's not in the list. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I was mistaken, 858 is not on the list."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Any further discussion? If not, all in favor of the Gentleman's motion will vote 'aye' and the opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On these questions there are 129 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Any other motions?"



Speaker Bradley: "On the Order of Third Reading, on the Order of Call, appears House Bill 1650. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1650, .....a Bill for an Act to amend the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and Pharmacy Practice Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much.....Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Marovitz, before you begin.....the Speaker has given permission before.....this debate to be filmed."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the generic substitution Bill. And....I'd like, in the opening statement, to explain the present status of the Bill. What the Bill would do presently, it would allow a pharmacist to substitute a generic drug for a brand name that is prescribed. Now....what generics can be substituted? The Bill, which we amended last week, by putting on an Amendment that was prepared and drafted by the Illinois State Medical Society, would provide for a Technical Advisory Council composed of doctors, pharmacists and pharmacologists to prepare a list of those generic drugs that are, in fact, bio-equivalent. Only those drugs that are on that list can be substituted. Only those that have been approved by the doctors and the pharmacists and the pharmacologists can be substituted. That is one safeguard. The second safeguard, which was not in the Bill before, on the prescription pad, there will be boxes 'May Substitute' ... 'May Not Substitute'. Any doctor that does not want there to be a substitution....all he has to do is check off 'May Not Substitute', and then there cannot and there will not be any substitution. We feel that the doctor should retain control. He knows the patient best. If he doesn't want there to be a substitution, all he has got to do is check off that box and then the Bill doesn't even apply



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

and there cannot be a substitution. Now Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, eighty-five percent of our hospitals today use generic drugs. These hospitals all have formularies, the types of which I am talking to you about. A formulary that will be provided by this technical advisory council from which only the quality generics can come. All of the medical schools in this country teach their students to provide to prescribe generically. All of our public aid recipients receive generic drugs. Over sixty percent of the large pharmaceutical houses that make the brand names also make the generics. The Food and Drug Administration recalls drugs every year because of some bio-equivalency problem. The percent of recall of generics is the same as the percent of recalls for brand names. Ladies and Gentlemen, the trend today is toward generic substitution. Twenty-six states now have generic substitution laws....and I feel it's time that Illinois got in line with the rest of these states. A recent study done in the Chicago-land area found that the average, and I stress the word average, the average price difference between brand names and generic drugs is ninety-three percent. That's the average. That means in many cases you are paying three, four and five times more for the brand name as you could for an equal quality generic drug. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, these are drugs that are all approved by the Food and Drug Administration. I've already detailed what the safeguards are. I think it is a good Bill. We have worked on this Bill for four months. We've compromised with every organization that's come in with objections. We've tried to remove every objection there is to the Bill...every problem. We've dealt with liability, because those are some arguments that people bring up. We have solved the liability problems. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a model Bill for generic substitution. I would like to see Illinois fall in line with the other states. More



than half of this country now have generic substitution laws.....I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Williams: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, .....a tough one for me to stand-up on because this is like being against God and motherhood and dogs and all those good things in life. But...I'd like to point out a few things about this Bill and I'd like everyone to listen very carefully. First of all,..... the Sponsor....and I'd like to say that the Sponsor is actually very sincere in his coming forth with this Bill but there are a lot of things that the Sponsor and those who do not know the industry, just do not understand. First of all he says ....and I wasn't even going to talk about bio-equivalency, and for those of you who were not here last year....I think you recall the fact that I had a piece of coal around my neck and a piece of coal to you people from downstate is pure carbon and so is a diamond.....pure carbon... So...chemically, they are both the same. I wasn't going to talk about bio-equivalency but I don't think we can get into this issue without talking about bio-equivalency as I will point out a little bit later on. The assumption, as the Sponsor has said, that these drugs and by Amendment #2 he says there is a positive formulary that now says that the Department of Public Health says that these are 'Okay'. Now I'd like to point out that it's the assumption that creates a potential for legal concern. It will probably trigger a lot of litigation on the part of the state. If they admit that all generic drugs, and it's been very difficult to determine actually, that all generic drugs are actually bio-equivalent or they are therapeutically equivalent. I think I'll probably start out, and I notice that the fiscal note on this Bill says that, that this is only going to cost the state sixty-seven thousand and twenty-three dollars. Now ...in the other states that the



Sponsor has talked about that have gone into this, as to the minimum costs and I have the figures right here, would be three hundred and thirty-three thousand dollars. So I don't know where the fiscal note came from, from our Department of Public Health, because in all of the other states that have gone into a positive formulary which we will be talking about a positive formulary now, since that is Amendment #2, as to the start up cost, the ongoing cost will be at least three hundred and thirty-three thousand dollars ....and not even talking about the ongoing cost which it says the Department of Public Health will update this thing every three months and will have to come up with the things that are quote, unquote, 'all right'. Now, the....I think that the central issue involved in the substitution of drugs, as I said before, is the bio-equivalence of the substituted drug as to the prescribed drug. The Bill...as it now stands...as amended...adopts the provision for a positive formulary which consists of a list of drugs which have been determined by a state agency, in this case the Department of Public Health, who says that these are okay. Now, under the existing law, a pharmacist...I'm going to talk to you about the role of a pharmacist. If the physician has actually prohibited any kind of substitution, or has not prohibited substitution and the pharmacist would dispense the exact drug that is called for on the prescription, if any harm would result from the drug that was dispensed, at this point the pharmacist would be held 'not liable'....and any suit that would name him would actually be dismissed because he has filled that prescription the way the doctor has written it....and if he has so done that he will not be held liable. If the physician has not prohibited substitution but has prescribed by trade name ....not the generic name but the trade name and the pharmacist dispenses a drug which he



considers to be the equivalent of the trade name drug, if any harm results or is alleged to result....you know, from the drug that he did dispense....yeah...that he did dispense, any attorney that would be representing the injured party will, as we well know, he will certainly include the pharmacist in the suit.....that is going to ensue. Since this Bill actually states that the pharmacist may or is authorized to dispense a generic equivalent if less expensive, or is mandated now to dispense from the state...positive formulary....you have eliminated any choice ...any professional choice...that the pharmacist might have to make...while you've added additional liability. In the present area...a pharmacist's liability..actually the courts have held that a pharmacist must act with due ordinary care and diligence in the selling and the dispensing of drugs. Such care as is ordinarily possessed and exercised by members of his profession. If a pharmacist wishes to substitute....a more than passing knowledge of the bio-equivalency of the drug has to be possessed to avoid charges of lack of due ordinary care and diligence. In other words, if a pharmacist chooses to substitute his own judgment for that of the prescribing physician, in the drug to be dispensed to a patient, he needs to have adequate knowledge of that drug, of the substituted drug and of the patient, in order to avoid a charge of negligence in dispensing. All right, now, if the pharmacist dispenses the drug from the state's positive formulary, he could conceivably then...he could set up a defense to a charge of negligence in dispensing a generic drug....."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close....we have ..a time limit..."

Williams: "...I think we have time on this...Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Bradley: "...We have the timer on and we do have a limit on the debate..."



Williams: "I think it's important. All right. Thank you. Right. Okay. He could actually set up his defense if he dispensed that....that it was listed in the state formulary. I say to you then and as was pointed out and they say there will be no liability on the part of the pharmacist, if he is not liable then I say the State of Illinois has to be liable for this. And...the state's sovereignty in this case will not apply in exemption from litigation and you people had better be prepared to appropriate about ten million dollars to the Attorney General for the litigation that's going to ensue because the pharmacist has dispensed .....something from a positive formulary that our Illinois Department of Public Health says is 'okay'. Now the state is going to be liable if the pharmacist is not liable. I'd like to get into an area here then from the Bill. ... and I'll go right to the Bill here and to the Amendment here and it says a substitution of any drug by a pharmacist shall not constitute evident negligence. At this point there has been no decision by the highest court of any state that has passed upon the question of utilizing a formulary as a defense to an action for harm arising from a substituted drugs use..."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman please bring his remarks to a close....We've gone past...the timer...for some time...Mr. Williams.."

Williams: "...Well, unless someone. If you'll recognize Mr. Totten... or someone?"

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

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 1650 and in so speaking commend Representative Marovitz and the others who have been involved in the preparation of this Bill. I vote for it for one reason and perhaps more. There's probably no single area that there's more concern about in the





society today than the spiralling cost of medical care. Medical care in my estimation and in my definition also includes the cost of drugs and medicine. I think that when we have an opportunity to substantially diminish the cost of medical care without society having to make the payments for it, I think we ought to grab the opportunity to do that. There is probably no single area of the cost of living that so affects people that are least able to afford it than there is when it comes to the question of medical care. I think the evidence has been fairly clear in this case, that there is going to be a dramatic positive effect on people's ability to afford drugs and to afford to care for themselves without us having to split the bill in the state or at the federal level. So I enthusiastically support House Bill 1650 and urge Members of the House who are undecided to cast a green vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll assure you I won't be long.....but I do want a few of you people on this floor to listen to the few words I say. I speak very seldom but this time I want to say just a few words...personal. My wife has been on medication for some forty years. I do work with four druggists and seven different doctors. I've asked about this Bill.....to see what their feelings were. I have been told that the precipient that carries the drug many times causes the reaction that gives problems. The old aunt, ninety-four, my dad would have been ninety last month, and my wife has been confined and used to this for forty years. They have to put her....I have to put her in the hospital sometimes ten days at a time so that they can find the type of medicine that won't react with the two or three different types of medication she has to take. I'm very leery about this Bill for that particular reason. The druggists tell me they can only prescribe what the doctor says, if he specifies. That's



true. I'm not going to speak to the legal part, to the liability part. An aspirin can have a salt base or it can have a lime base. Some bodies can't accept the salt, others can't accept the lime....but still they're aspirin. I feel this way, you get what you pay for. I don't think it is going to make our drugs cheaper. My bill, if you want to check the record, runs from one hundred to one hundred and fifty dollars a month for drugs and I'm glad to pay what the doctor says I'm supposed to pay. That's why I spoke today, because I know some of the boys here wonder why I'm going to vote against this Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Under Rule 55 (h), I'd like to yield my time to Representative Williams."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. I think if we turned out the television lights we'd get this over with a lot quicker."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I don't mind yielding time to anybody on the floor of the House because it's within the rules, but I object on this Bill, yielding time to a person who has a conflict of interest on this Bill. He's a registered pharmacist and I can tell you about that conflict when I get my turn to talk."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman objects. The Gentleman yields to Mr. Williams...."

Williams: "I'd like to take exception to that remark from my good colleague there. I am a pharmacist and I think therefore the House should hear what a member from the profession....I'm not talking....this would be the greatest Bill in the world for me to make a million dollars, if it passed. I'm against it from the standpoint of liability here. Liability to the State of Illinois. I think I should be heard, Mr. Speaker. It's a very



important point."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out something in response to the last comment by the previous Gentleman. I think it's ridiculous to accuse a part-time Legislator of a conflict of interest..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniels, we didn't recognize you for that purpose, Sir."

Daniels: "I still say it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Williams."

Williams: "...I thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank Representative Totten for ceding his time. I think we do have to point out another area that I...you know that I didn't have any opportunity to get into. Actually....On page two of the Bill, now as amended, it says that the patient has to be informed and agrees to the substitution. All right, it's actually not only the patient, it's been amended so that the parent or the spouse can also make that..... Now I'd like to get into and I think the trial lawyers here will know what I'm talking about and I get into expressed and implied warranties. It is probable ...actually that if the patient comes into the store he is going to ask the pharmacist if the product that is dispensed is as good as or the same as the product that was prescribed. When the pharmacist answers 'yes', as he most certainly has to, an expressed warranty at that point, an expressed warranty has been created that the dispensed product is interchangeable and therefore it has a bio-equivalency and will have identical effects upon the person. The pharmacist then becomes a co-guarantor of the generic drug that's on that positive formulary. As for implied warranties, the implied warrantee as to a fitness for a particular purpose presents the greatest potential liability for the pharmacist."



Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, arise?"

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I question the fact the time limits have expired properly. We have many other Bills on the call. I know of no right of any Member to talk more than the amount of time that he is allotted. Other people cannot yield time properly. The Gentleman has exceeded his time. We have many matters. I would propose that people be held to their time limit with regard to all matters on the Calendar."

Speaker Bradley: "Under the rules ...he can...Mr. Totten yielded his time and we recognized Mr. Williams and ...if the Gentleman will bring his remarks to a close...we would appreciate it. We will get on with the debate."

Williams: "All right. I will bring my remarks to a close. All right then. In closing, let me just say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we are a nation of Legislators, and a nation of litigators. We press for and we pass legislation in the name of economy, morality and progress. We then, a year or so later, we come back and challenge the very laws that we passed down here. ... The proponents of antisubstitution legislation have urged that this will result in a tremendous decrease in the overall cost of prescriptions. Although the extent of the savings actually remains a very highly speculative and very highly controversial. ....The marketplace, as we know it, has taken care of what we used to say was the high price. You go into the marketplace, you have the professional integrity and trust of the pharmacist and the position and that's where it should be. Actually this Bill can only lead to increased liability insurance premiums and the same potentially distasteful adverse legal consequences to the State of Illinois. On that basis I oppose this Bill."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I went through the hearings on this generic drug last year. One of the most



impressive things that we happened to hear is the companies coming before us telling us about how much money they needed for research because they wanted to produce only the finest pills. When the records were brought out, it was brought out that their money spent on advertising detail men, promotions, was far in excess of any moneys they spent on research. It's been reported here recently and I'm quoting a column from Jack Anderson, which basically supports what we heard, that the drug companies in the United States are spending five thousand dollars for each of the two hundred thousand physicians for the purpose of persuading them to prescribe brand name products. That's one billion dollars and it doesn't ....a penny of it go to research or development. We heard other interesting things before this Committee. When we asked about the writing of prescriptions, one of the primary questions came up, 'How much time doctor, does the doctor get to learn how to write prescriptions?... How much time does he spend on pharmacology?' The answer, one three hour course over the semester. 'How much time does he get on generic drugs?' Answer, one lecture. That was the prevailing answer no matter where we heard it from. I contend that what you're watching is the rip-off by the drug companies....for thousands and thousands of dollars at the expense of the public. People who must have drugs. Who must use drugs in order to survive. To point out....Warner/Chilchott produced the product for the heart 'Peritrate'. They charge sixty-two dollars per one hundred thousand. The brand name is only two dollars and ninety-one cents per thousand. We could go on ad infinitum in comparing the cost of brand names and comparing the cost to generic drugs. But I say to you that the poor needs this kind of relief from high prescriptions bills. The doctors have the ultimate right, if they don't want any substitutions all they do is write in 'no substitutions' and that is it.



However, in most cases, I'm sure that even the pharmacists will agree ....the pharmacist can also make some determinations as to generic drugs. We got down into a basic technical question of what they call bio-equivalency. Let me tell you there is a difference in water...between well water and lake water, they aren't bio-equivalent. They argue about fillers and mixers. I say there is a difference in all of these things. We talked about it, we argued, we determined that you may get reactions ....that's true. You can get different reactions from drugs simply because you use say nicotine, because you use caffeine, because you decide to take your own cough medicine, because you use a number of drugs on your own. Of course this thing is fraught with countless problems but basically the hearings determined one thing, the drug companies are indeed ripping off millions in profit at the expense of the people who can least afford to pay. It is a good Bill. It has been modified....and every reasonable request has been met. There's nothing wrong with this Bill. It's just an attempt by the drug companies to cover-up and to take care of their own profits and I would urge a favorable vote for this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair has a question of Mr. Ewell.... Is there a difference between 'creek' water and 'creek' water?"

Ewell: "Yes, I'd like to give you that difference. I once asked that question and C. L. McCormick reported. 'If it's creek water, that's when you ask for fifty thousand dollars, it's stream water when you ask for five hundred thousand and if it's a river you'll ask for five million.'"

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say...if you think the drug companies are making so much money I'll be glad to send down and get you a Wall Street Journal and you can be a part of it and get rich too."

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



Matijeovich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I first want to say that I didn't object to the Member who I said had a conflict. It was only the matter of yielding the time to hear more from that person. I want to say that this Bill was similar to one that I introduced four years ago. At that time the pharmacists gave me...in addition to another Bill...the Legislator of the Year Award. I told them at that time there may be a time in the future when I'm going to be in opposition to you. The only reason at that time they were ...for the Bill was because the cost savings didn't go to the consumer. I knew it was a first step. I didn't hear one pharmacist, at that time, under that Bill, say that they were worried about liability. All they said at that time....that they had the capability to substitute. They knew that they had the capability....As to the opposition from the Medical Society ....their opposition was based upon the fact that they lose the authority and give it to the pharmacist. But they really had the ultimate control of ....under it and everybody knows that. I commend Representative Marovitz because his Bill is much better than mine was at that time because the ultimate savings do go to the consumer. So don't be worried about those remarks you heard about the pharmacist, this is a better Bill. It's a better Bill than we had in most of the other states. That's why it's not working in some of the states ...because the savings doesn't go to the consumer. We know what the high cost of drugs is. We know that many people cannot afford to stay alive because of the high cost of drugs. This is a first step toward good care....good health care that people can afford and I commend an 'aye' vote to you."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz to close the debate."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, when one of the speakers said that we don't ....people here don't understand the industry, I must disagree with them....because just in yesterday's Tribune there was an article from the President of the Illinois Pharmaceutical Association, which represents all of the druggists in the State of Illinois, supporting generic drugs. That was in yesterday's Tribune. He is the President of that Association, Don Grotawald. In concerning....with what my colleague, Representative Birchler said, if a patient wants to take exactly what the doctor prescribed and doesn't want a substitute, that's all he is going to take because there won't be a substitution unless the patient wants a substitution. All we're doing is giving people the freedom of choice. After all, that's what we did yesterday, with laetrile, and laetrile passed this House yesterday with one hundred and thirty votes, to give people the freedom of choice, and that's a drug that's banned by the FDA. These are drugs that are all approved by the FDA. Furthermore, they're narrowed by approval by doctors and pharmacists and pharmacologists. So we're only talking about the quality generic drugs. Yesterday we talked about legalizing laetrile in this state. I don't see how one can vote for laetrile and not vote for generic drugs that are approved by doctors and the FDA. This Bill is a model Bill. It takes care of all the objections that were referred to by some of the previous speakers. No patient has to take a generic unless he wants to. Any doctor....any doctor that wants to prevent a generic from being taken ....all he has to do is put a check mark in the box 'May Not Substitute', and there will not and there cannot be a substitution. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a substantial difference in price between brands and





generics.....ninety-three percent. If there are differences between some generic drugs and some brand drugs, that will be taken care of by this Technical Advisory Council that all the hospitals have. All the hospitals that use generic drugs, that's eighty-five percent of your hospitals across the country, have this positive formulary that allows for only the quality generics to be taken. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Bill. We've worked for four months on it. We put an Amendment on it, which you approved, that was prepared and drafted by the Illinois State Medical Society. Please, Ladies and Gentlemen, give us an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor of the Gentleman's ....all those....for what purpose does the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, arise?"

Waddell: "An explanation. I was not recognized before and I want to be recognized when it comes to voting."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, Mr. Waddell, I was going to recognize you...first....to explain your vote. If we could get it to that point? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no', and the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, to explain his vote. One minute."

Waddell: "In rising in opposition. The reason that I have voted this way. Number one, in clarification of a few points in the limited time. The Gentleman referred to in the Tribune was again the President of that organization and he is with Walgreens, probably the biggest schlock warehouse outfit that there is in drugs. Number two, when it comes to lawyers deciding who should have confidence, they don't take into consideration the fact that these people have gone to schools of pharmacy and they in turn, those persons in turn have.....

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



Waddell: "...have graduated..."

Speaker Bradley: "Continue, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "...they have graduated from that school of pharmacy, they have worked hard and likewise, those lawyers... maybe we ought to have a Bill on here that says the State of Illinois controls lawyers. They are subject to the same schools, the same law books, the same everything else, but it doesn't tell you, as an individual, whether you are going to get a highclass lawyer or one that doesn't know what it's all about. I think that the people in the pharmacy world ought to have their rights and your confidence in them restored in a vote of 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to explain his vote .....in one minute. Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill has 128 votes. It has in fact, passed the House, but I think what ought to happen, and I'm going to end up voting for it, ....but I think what ought to end up happening is that we ought to ...put something in prospective...in exactly what this is going to do for the consumer....and what it's going to do for the public that is requiring more competent and increased health care. I read from a short article in the Chicago Tribune of Wednesday, May 18. That says as follows: 'While pharmacists were first to advocate drug product selection, a phrase that bypasses the ominous implications of substitution, a survey of Michigan pharmacists showed that only one point nine percent were now exercising their new option. Before Michigan changed the law, forty-two percent of the pharmacists said they would avail themselves of substitution.' Blame now is laid on the fact that the law is not properly written. That the real reasons seems to be a growing awareness by pharmacists that substitution could make them liable if something went wrong. I suggest to the pharmacists, to the medical profession, that we're going to have a multiplicity



of malpractice suits, an increase in pharmacy malpractice insurance and in the long run...in long term, a decrease in proper health care delivery and a decrease in the proper kind of drugs people should be receiving and an increase in cost. In spite of all that..."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman.....bring his remarks to a close..."

Peters: "...I am going to vote 'aye' because that appears to be the will here and the will of the pharmacists."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', 18 'nos', 13 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Eight two zero.....Mr. Kucharski..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 820. A Bill for an Act to provide for home loans to any Illinois resident."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor."



Speaker Bradley: "921."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 921. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 921 amends the Illinois Insurance Code to include clinical social workers as provided to service for treatment of mental, emotional and nervous disorders in insurance policies. The insurance companies do provide that such coverage...nationally. There are four other states that have said legislation, California, Louisiana being two of the four. And clinical social workers, as you are well aware of, are licensed in Illinois. This is the same thing we did for clinical psychologists last year in House Bill 1080 who are also now amended in the Illinois Insurance Code last Session. I'd be glad to answer any questions if you do have any. There was one negative vote in the Insurance Committee. I think it had a very fair and thorough hearing and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose House Bill 921. This Bill would require, would require that group health insurance policies covering mental or nervous disorders also offer to cover the services of clinical social workers. I'd like to point out to the House that this Bill, which would work to the advantage of clinical social workers whatever they are, and would work to the advantage of no other group. Not a single employer group or not a single employee group supports this Bill. The Bill is opposed by the Department of Insurance. It's opposed by the major associations of Physicians and Psychiatrists. It is supported only by that group who will be helped by this Bill and that's the group of clinical social workers. They're the people that you heard from, in my opinion, this is a flagrant case of special interest legislation. It's written only for the benefit of the clinical social worker. Unfortunately, nobody knows for sure just what a clinical worker is or what he does. He's not a physician. He's not a surgeon. He's not a psychiatrist. The duties of clinical



social workers are not defined in this Bill or in the Licensure Act. From the best of my knowledge from listening to testimony in the Insurance Committee, they're somewhere between a psychologist and minister who might counsel on marriage counseling. I submit to you that this is a case of the Illinois Legislature meddling in the affairs of business again and you should absolutely oppose this terrible Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis. Jack."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with all due deference to the previous speaker and my good friend on the Insurance Committee, Representative Schuneman, I must take exception with his remarks. We had a very thorough and a very full hearing in the Insurance Committee on this Bill and the subject and definition of clinical social worker is clearly defined in the legislation. And having practiced in the field of counseling psychology myself, I can tell you that as a therapeutic counselor, that the definition as outlined in this Bill is certainly equal to or above my credentials and qualifications when I was practicing with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Consequently, I think this is a good Bill and I think these people should be included as therapists for exactly what it states, mental, nervous, emotional disorders because it will allow areas that are not serviceable by easy access to the psychiatric or the clinical or counseling psychologist. It opens the area a little bit wider. As the Sponsor of the legislation knows, I did handle an Amendment for the American Medical Association that I wanted to see on the Bill. It's not on the Bill. I don't consider it detrimental for it not being on the Bill at this point simply because I think the clinical social worker in his protocol practice will direct himself to the purposes of that Amendment. This is a good Bill. It will provide services in the state where no services now exist and I would urge a favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I, too, would urge support for this Bill. We do not specify in regard to the others who



interest themselves in...in applying help for people who have mental or emotional or nervous disorders. Any kind of a definition as to what each of the various aspects of...of services are provided, whether by a psychiatrist or the clinical psychologist or by the social worker. We don't purport to set forth what their duties are in the limits of what their duties may...may consist of. This is known in the field. In the field they have absolutely no problem in discerning what they do and what they should do and should not do and what help that they can provide for the patient. This is not a Bill that solely and only is for the purpose of providing help to the..the clinical...to the social workers who are covered under this. This is a Bill for the purpose of helping the patient and providing that there is coverage for the kind of care and help and services that they receive under this Bill and from these clinical social workers. So I would urge very much that we do this in behalf of those persons who are receiving treatment for mental and social and emotional and nervous disorders of various kinds and provide that the help that they get, and the cost of that help by clinical social workers, is covered under the Insurance Code. Thank you."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of the Bill yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Hoffman: "Number one, Representative, can this coverage be included now under insurance policies? I mean, can insurance policies now be written that would cover this...these individuals, or the cost for these individuals?"

McClain: "Well...well, clinical social workers can be covered...are now covered under a variety of insurance carriers nationwide. However, that's one of the reasons why we're amending the Illinois Insurance Code for group policies, Representative Hoffman, so that they can be covered in group policies."

Hoffman: "Are you saying that they cannot now be covered under group policies?"

McClain: "...That's why we're trying to spell it out, Representative."



Hoffman: "You didn't answer my question. The question was, are you saying that group policies can now...cannot now be written to cover clinical social workers?"

McClain: "That's exactly right. In Illinois, that's exactly right as I understand it, in talking to the people around the clinical social worker."

Hoffman: "Does Illinois law prohibit group policies to be written to cover clinical social workers?"

McClain: "No, they...they write policies on the basis of what is authorized by Illinois statute."

Hoffman: "All right, so that the...group, then what you're saying is, that group policies can now be written that would cover the cost for clinical social workers?"

McClain: "I'm sorry, could you repeat that question? Someone whispered in my ear while you were asking it."

Hoffman: "I know. Well, sometimes you get a break and sometimes you don't. Would you strike that... I'm sorry. Let me, let me rephrase the question. You are then, you are saying then that we now...that group policies can now be written which do cover the cost of clinical social workers and what you're in effect doing here is to say that all policies must be written this way. In other words, you're going to mandate that this be included and it is something which is now not prohibited."

McClain: "Well, in the...in the contract if they would approach issues of covering mental and emotional disorders, in the contract now in the group policies, they would be required also, the clinical social workers would be required also to receive that insurance coverage."

Hoffman: "Okay. They may include it now in those offerings now, is that correct?"

McClain: "They would...if they would cover it now in the contract under the group policies they would only be able to receive the insurance benefits by going through a clinical psychologist, not through a clinical social worker and receive insurance coverage."

Hoffman: "Unless the policy is written and which is now...could be written to cover clinical social workers?"

McClain: "That's correct."



Hoffman: "Okay, so the fact of the matter is is that what is happening is that you are moving from the present system of optional inclusion on the basis of the agreement as arrived at by employer, employee groups or whatever the case may be on the insurance company, from an optional situation to a mandatory situation which says that the insurance company shall offer to cover clinical social workers. Let me ask you one other question..."

McClain: "Could I...only...only if the approach to the issue of mental and emotional and nervous disorders."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair would like to think that we have a dialogue here. If you'd like to address yourself to the..."

Hoffman: "...Thank you..."

Speaker Bradley: "Issue, Mr. Hoffman, proceed."

Hoffman: "Thank you. All right. One other question. What is the position of the Department of Insurance on this Bill?"

McClain: "Cal was correct."

Hoffman: "Cal was correct. The Department of Insurance..."

McClain: "On that issue."

Hoffman: "On this issue that the Department of Insurance is opposed to this Bill."

McClain: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "Okay. Now..."

McClain: "Let me explain if I might..."

Hoffman: "That's fine. That's all I want to know. The last question I want to ask is, you can deal with that a little later if you want to Representative, what is the definition of clinical social worker in this Bill?"

McClain: "Clinical social worker means a person who has completed two years of graduate education with the clinical course curriculum in an accredited graduate school of social work. Has obtained a master's degree in social work. Has had at least two years, or three thousand hours of supervised clinical experience relating to the treatment of mental, emotional or nervous disorders or conditions following the award of the degree. And has registered as a certified social worker under the Social Worker's Administration Act in





Illinois."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to close."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a clinical social worker is by education and experience professionally qualified at the autonomous practice level to provide direct preventive and treatment level service to individuals, families or groups. Representative Davis who was in fact a practicing psychologist in his own right has stood up before you today and said that this is an excellent Bill. Representative Schuneman, although I believe offered not really a clear explanation of his opposition to the Bill, did imply the Department of Insurance is against the Bill. The Department of Insurance said it was not against the concept of the Bill but only because they do not know the experience rating of House Bill 1080 that we passed last Session. This is the same kind of legislation that we passed last Session, House Bill 1080, for clinical psychologists. I believe there's widespread support for it. You've heard from Representative Davis, Representative Tipword. I urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know group insurance benefits are purchased by an employer and it's an employer purchase. I don't think that the General Assembly should mandate what anybody should or should not buy. If you go to clinical psychologists you can extend it to social workers, your next-door neighbor and you're telling a person what he has to buy not whether he should or should not buy it. There's not one benefit in this world under a group insurance contract that can not be purchased if you want to pay the price for it. So it's available if you want to buy it."



And I don't think we have to mandate and tell anybody that they have to buy a product whether or not they want it. So therefore I would urge a 'no' vote. It's a bad principle for us to be underwriting benefits for other people."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, ordinarily I'd be the last individual on the floor to get up and disagree with my colleague, Bob Terzich, but I must state that none of us need carry any brief for the insurance industry. The fact remains, of course they can write this. The equal of the fact is that they won't write it unless it's mandated. And if they don't write it, you're going to have hundreds of thousands of people presently who are in need of this type of help, perhaps including even the speaker, that won't be able to get it. The fact is that we should give the insurance industry a jolt in the arm, a good healthy one. Unfortunately those of us who are closely associated with the industry know its good points as well as its bad points. In this case, the insurance industry is somewhat of a Neanderthal I described years ago. And I suggest that you vote for this Bill."

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

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill has the...has the votes that it needs."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 123 'ayes', 28 'noes', 8...9 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Amendment... Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 1039. Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1039."

Speaker Bradley: "It's an Appropriation Bill, take it out of the record. For what purpose does Mr. Conti arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Conti: "I'm going to take some serious exception to what I've witnessed here on the floor of the House three times in the last two weeks. Members of this House have been publicly ostracized, the galleries were full, about conflict of interest, about special interest or about having some kind of conflict in what they were talking about. I have fought Jack Williams many time back home, in the district, where he should be fought. Not on the floor of this House. I think that it's despicable for anybody to get up and ostracize any Member of this House on anything that he knows that has personal knowledge. I voted against Jack Williams Bill on the generic drug, but I was very much interested in what he had to say because he's an expert in the field. And I appreciate attorneys when they get up and help me on some of these Bills that I don't understand. But to have any Member get up and ostracize another Member, I don't care whether he's a Republican or a Democrat, if they want that man defeated, go in his district and defeat him but don't do it on the floor of this House or don't use this Body as a form to do it."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I never apologized, nor will I apologize for anything I think is right. I can be one here and think I'm right and there can be 177 that think I'm wrong. I'm going to say it here, my district or anywhere, in front of you, Elmer, I don't give a damn if I feel it's right. My feeling at that time was...I heard ten minutes from Jack Williams. I pointed out the fact he's a pharmacist, this Bill related to the pharmacists, you can add it up. I don't give



a damn. But don't tell me I've got to close my mouth in my public forum, when I was elected by the people of my district. I'll never tell you to close your mouth."

Speaker Bradley: "I think the decorum of the House would probably be in much better shape if the Members did not mention one another's names or refer to other Members during the debate. And I would think from now on we'd all be better if we follow that policy. For any purpose. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Davis: "When the debate began on 9 - 21, I put on my light and I sat here patiently, patiently, patiently, patiently. I even stood up. I want to know why I wasn't recognized?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Davis, the Chair has tried to go back and forth from one side. And you can be assured, if your light is flashing then maybe we'd better try that out."

Davis: "It's still flashing."

Davis: "No, it's on in one solid white light. I'm saying the flashing light may not be working, Mr. Davis. Because I certainly would have recognized..."

Davis: "Well, if it isn't working, why that's different. But I certainly had it on and it's right here."

Speaker Bradley: "It's working at..."

Davis: "I just wanted to know why I wasn't recognized, that's all."

Speaker Bradley: "Turn on Mr. Davis' light. Push your light, Mr. Davis, would you please? Your light's flashing, Sir. We'll see that we recognize you whenever you're... Mr. Jones, the Gentleman from Cook, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to speak on the Generic Drug Bill once and my light was on, because I wanted to speak while the television lights and the cameras was rolling. But... and I didn't get the recognition but maybe what you should do, Mr. Speaker, just a matter of suggestion, is that I noticed when Gene Hoffman was speaking you immediately went to Representative



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ebbesen without even coming to this side of the aisle. I think in all fairness, you should go from one side to the other instead of just picking one side of the aisle to recognize and their chance to speak on any given matter."

Speaker Bradley: "We're going to...we're going to try to do that...

If I do try to go from one side to the other, we're going to try to go from Republican to Democrats and then to women to whatever might be that...short people to tall people and... we'll bring everything into play and golfers and tennis players and we'll get everybody in...built into the system. Where are we? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller, for what purpose do you rise?"

Miller: "On a point of personal privilege to make the same point that Representative Corneal Davis did with regard to our lights being on for better than five or ten minutes, trying to get the floor to either engage in debate or to explain our vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, everybody...I recognize everybody to explain their vote and I was...Mr. Jones, I was looking at Mr. Jones because he had his light on but he didn't look my way to explain his vote on the Bill. We will get... Everybody that has a light on to explain their vote, we're recognizing them. House Bill 1071. Mrs. Macdonald. Out of the record. 1328."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1328. A Bill for an Act to establish Appellate Courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1328 creates additional judicial positions for the 1st District Appellate Court."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, Mr. Houlihan. Mrs. Geo-Karis, do you have your light on for some reason or other? Would you please turn your light off so that the Chair will know when you want to talk and when you don't want to talk. Just illustrating a point that sometimes these lights are flashing up



here and you're not suppose to have them on and that's part of the problem we have up here at the Speaker's Rostrum. Mr. Houlihan. Sorry, Sir."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To repeat, House Bill 1328 creates additional judicial positions for the 1st District Appellate Court. The Bill would create six additional such Judges, three to be elected at the general election in 1978 and three at the general election of 1980. It is my intent and based upon the statistical case load information recently received from the Administrative Office of the Illinois Court, to amend this Bill by reducing it from the total of six positions to four positions. That Amendment will be placed on the Bill in the Senate in view of our deadline here in the House. Presently, in the 1st District Appellate Court there are 18 elected Judges and two serving there by assignment. The need for this Bill is increasing case loads in the 1st Judicial District and what is going to be an inevitable further increase as a result of legislation passed last year, which created 30 additional Circuit Court Judgeships and ten additional Associate Circuit Judges in the Circuit Court of Cook County. The effect of the Bill, by electing two in 1978, will be simply to hold at the same number of 20 but to replace the two that are assigned by two to be elected. And then to increase, by 1980, with an additional two so that that court is in the position to meet the inevitable increasing case loads coming from the 1st District and to provide for the expeditious disposition of both civil and criminal cases and I ask for an affirmative vote."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1328 is simply one in a series of Judicial Bills flowing through the Assembly this Session to create more plumes and more spots for favorite people in Cook County. Let me simply show you the Judicial note, or read to you the Judicial note which has been filed, the Gentleman's Amendment notwithstanding. The



Judicial note says that we don't need any Appellate Judges up in that district. We don't need any of them, let alone four or eight or six. There are three or four Bills going through the House at this time for these Judges, for this power play and for this power grab. This is only one of them and don't take my word for it, simply look at the Judicial note that's been filed from the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. They know. They know what we need. We don't need any Appellate Judges right now, my friends. And I sincerely hope that you'll vote against this House Bill 1328. It simply isn't necessary."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman on the other side of the aisle, Dan Houlihan's brother, James, from Cook."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would not want to rise and raise some of the political questions which Representative Telcser has addressed, although he has addressed them in his usual fashion, clearly and straightforwardly, but I would like to point out that we have been moving toward a merit selection of Judges system. The two recent nominees in election... The two recent Supreme Court Justices have established a system and have proceeded on that system. There have been Amendments and Constitutional Resolutions to establish merit selection of Judges in the State of Illinois. I think that issue is paramount when we're talking about judicial spots. When this Bill was up we discussed Amendments. And Amendments clearly describe the partisan system and I think until we make major strides forward in establishing a merit system of Judges, I'm going to have to vote 'present' and I would urge everyone else not to vote for this legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin."

Martin: "Originally, an Amendment was filed to this Bill by Representative Tipsword and myself, feeling that if the 1st District needed this perhaps the rest of downstate might need the same kind of Judges. Unfortunately, both of us researched it and we found that



no one, absolutely no one in this state needs Appellate Judges. Therefore, Representative Tipsword and I tabled that Amendment because even with the joy of appointing new Judges, we could not do that to the state. I regret that the original Bill wasn't tabled. There is no need in no district in this state for Appellate Judges. And so on this Bill, downstate and Chicago, I must vote 'no'."

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

Greiman: "Well it struck me, as I listened to the Assistant Minority Leader, that we are now going to have a daily speech, a politically motivated speech from the Representative. He might put that on a cassette and sell it for \$3.95 or perhaps to long play. It sounds the same every time I hear it. It's always on the edge of hysteria and always the world is going to go down. The truth of the matter is that people that have to wait for Appellate decisions when their liberty or substantial property is involved are as upset as people who have to wait a long time for a trial at the trial level. We have new Judges. They will be rendering decisions, a lot of decisions. Some will be wrong and should be appealed. And justice delayed, whether it's the Appellate level or the low...or the trial court level is justice denied."

Speaker Bradley: "We have two lights flashing. I assume Mr. Taylor wants to move the previous question. That's not necessary if that's what you're rising for, Sir, because Mr. Houlihan can close debate. Just wanted to check and make sure that you didn't want to speak on the issue. So, Mr... Now we have Mr. Walsh. Is your light flashing, Sir? It wasn't flashing before. Mr... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Bradley: "Did you wish to address the Body, Sir, on the Order... on this Bill?"

Walsh: "Isn't that what we're doing, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I have to go back to Mr. Taylor then, the Gentleman from Cook who... The Gentleman..."





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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close the debate."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that Representative Greiman has aptly characterized Representative Telcser's harangue, as far as the Bill was concerned. I would point out though, to Representative Telcser, yes there has been a Judicial note filed. But apparently he hasn't read it. If you will read page two in the concluding part of the Judicial note, you'll note that the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts states, that if this goal be achieved, referring to an increase in a number of opinions per Appellate Judge throughout the state. And if the number of appeals filed does not increase any more than it has in the last several calendar years. Well the fact is, it's inevitable that the number of appeals is going to increase. It can't help but increase with the 45 new trial level Judges that are now serving in the 1st Judicial District. Now, that ought to be rather obvious, that if you increase substantially your trial level Judges, that you are going to get an increasing number of appeals flooding into the Appellate Court. Now the effect of this Bill will not increase the number in 1978, it will simply be at the same number that the Supreme Court has placed it at by assigning two Judges. These are suppose to be elected positions and what this Bill will do is place those two into an elected posture. The increase will only come in 1980 after we have had some three and a half years of service by the new trial level Judges. Now, in addition, there are more trial level Judges for Cook County, which are going to be created in this Session of the Legislature. Now what this refers to is speedy disposition of cases. It takes a year and a half minimum and more realistically, two to two and a half years



to get a decision from the Appellate in the largest county...  
in the largest circuit, Judicial Circuit in this state.

Don't allow this to become tied up in a political harangue because Mr. Telcser thinks that it's time to do that this afternoon, as he's done every afternoon for the past three weeks. This is a very reasonable Bill. It deserves our support and I would request that support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly in voting 'yes' on this legislation is like voting for a cure for which there's no disease and I'd encourage you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent, to explain her vote."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the Judicial note that I requested for this Bill it said that the Supreme Court feels that each Appellate Judge should be able to produce 60 opinions per calendar year. Now may I tell you that downstate the Judges have produced an average of 57 opinions each in 1976. But in District 1, they have just produced 41 opinions per year. That is 19 less than they should be. And so I would urge you to not vote for this Bill. It is not necessary. The Judges must begin to put on a little more work on their part to uphold what the Supreme Court requires."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I remember one time when Justice McGlooin, now Justice McGlooin in the Senate, had a similar type Bill and when he couldn't do it by arguing for it, he made this remark. This may be the best opportunity he has to get rid of some Members of the Democratic Leadership. If humor would help just a little bit, I would ask for some more green lights. I think it is a reasonable Bill. I don't think it should



be tied into a political harangue."

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

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I usually vote for things that benefit Chicago, because that's where I live. And one of the Appellate Judges there now is a close personal friend of mine. Well I find it hard to vote for...Sponsor may go to some Members on the other side of the aisle that refused to vote for the poor folks yesterday. It only got 68 votes and there are 94 Democrats on the other side of the aisle. So that's why I'm voting 'present'. Because I don't feel that this point in time that I should vote to create jobs and spend money for folks that don't think that poor folks need any extra money. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Everybody explained their votes? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 'ayes' and 54 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Postponed Consideration, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Postponed Consideration. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to object to your failure, your advocacy of your responsibility. During the last debate our esteemed Minority...Assistant Minority Leader was described from the other aisle as near hysterical and repeated haranguer. Now, neither of those remarks drew the slightest rebuke from the Chair. The decorum of the floor can be immeasurably improved if the Chair will do his responsibility. I think an apology is owed Telcser."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we appreciate you calling it to my attention that I was remiss in my duties. Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1500. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege, if I may, and first say that if I have been haranguing the Members of the House, I want to offer



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

my sincere apology. The last thing I want to do is to be an irresponsible person who simply, as someone suggested, acts hysterically. Those things do disturb me and I think that if Members of the House don't speak up loudly, as sometimes, we're going to find ourselves getting hurt when the Session is over and we see what we've done collectively. So let me first of all offer my apologies if I have bored anyone or taken up their time unnecessarily or have acted hysterically or harangued. But I must say, however, that that accusation coming from whom it did, in my mind, is a compliment."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 1500."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1500. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Criminal Justice System in Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1500 is the work product of approximately two years of study by a Committee and Subcommittee of this House. The Subcommittee on Adult Corrections. It is the Determinate Sentencing Bill. It is a Bill that was unanimously voted out of Subcommittee by a very broad margin, in terms of philosophical of the Membership. We are proud to have people who work throughout the state holding 13 hearings on a Determinate Sentencing System. I would suggest to you, possibly more work has gone into this Bill as a Committee product than any other Bill that's come before this House. Philosophically it goes to two points. On the one hand it says we are going to come down harder on violent crime and at the same time it says we are going to be fairer and more certain in our criminal system. It creates, in Illinois, a Determinate Sentencing System for all felony convictions. It does raise the term or the average time in penalty that a Class 1 and a Class 2 felon and a murderer would serve. It does reduce the typically non-violent offences that are Class 3 and Class 4 felonies. It removes the arbitrary and capricious nature of our parole...present parole system, replacing it with a



day for day good time sentence system, where a man will know when he does his time that if he does behave and follow the rules and regulations of the institution he will get out at a specific time. If he doesn't, there are sanctions and time may be taken away from him. But it will be taken away from him fairly because we create, separate and apart from the Department of Corrections, a Prison Review Board, so that a man is treated fairly in the institutions. We provide for the doubling of the maximum ranges in certain habitual offender situations and we provide for consecutive sentences where the offense involves extreme violence and severe bodily harm. We require and I hope you note this, a mandatory pre-sentence investigation that goes hand in hand with the Bill that we passed out just last week of creating a statewide probations system. A system that would, I hope, bring an end to the unfortunate system where we have people placed on probation, placed on probation and placed on probation again. Sometimes only the defendant knows he's already on probation. This would bring that sort of thing to an end so a Judge would know when he makes his sentence that a man is already on probation. And it would requiring a sentencing Judge to give his reason for the sentence imposed. And it would not straightjacket that Judge, it gives him a wide range of sentence to choose from so that the penalty can fit the crime. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that this is one of the truly outstanding pieces of legislation that has come out of this House and I would like to thank all of those who served on the Adult Corrections Subcommittee and on the full Judiciary Committee, for their service, their help and their aid over the past two years. And I ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, to explain his vote.  
Mr. Davis, Jack Davis."

Davis: "I don't think it's necessary, but if the chamber would be silent for



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

a moment, the Bill is sailing. I think that if they will listen they will hear the people of Illinois applauding Representative Michael Getty."

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

Kosinski: "There is no need of explaining my vote, for a vote, it's up there on the board, I merely want to say that this is going along with the intent of the General Assembly in long order. I'm proud of all of us."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to add my congratulations to Mike Getty for a job well done...needed."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a couple of Members have congratulated my seatmate and I'd like to rise. There's probably no issue that could be more politicized than law and order. No issue which could raise more political comments and I think no one deserves more respect because he's worked on this issue through the last two Sessions and worked on it day in and day out. He's been in the Committee hearings, he's been at the Subcommittee meetings and he is probably one of the most conscientious Legislators and I applaud him for that effort."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote with 151 'aye' votes."

Katz: "Only to join Mr. Houlihan in his remark in the work of the Subcommittee that produced this and also to tell you that this Bill is a historic Bill in terms of trying to do something to modernize the Judicial system and the law enforcement system in Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman certainly is entitled to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 153 'aye', 6 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1543."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1543."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to define Executive Agency Reorganization.

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 1543 defines Executive Agency Reorganization and regulates the expenditure of funds of such agencies. It provides that any gubernatorial reorganization or agency not created by an Executive Order or a law is a nullity. It prohibits the expenditure of funds furnished to the state by the Federal Government, unless the expenditure is pursuant to a specific appropriation by the General Assembly. This Bill was heard in the Executive Committee. It was recommended on a... What was that vote? I'm sorry, it was heard by the Committee on Government Reorganization and in turn it passed favorably out of that Committee. Let me just point out, as far as the Governor...may create a new agency only by statute or Executive Order. This Executive Order must be filed with the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate, Comptroller, Secretary of State, the President and Minority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House. The Comptroller may refuse to honor vouchers from new agencies until the filing requirements are fulfilled. The General Assembly, by majority vote, may disapprove of any Executive Order creating a new agency. If the Legislature does disapprove such an Executive Order, the new agency must discontinue spending no later than one month following the month in which the Legislature acted. No funds may be expended by a new agency created by the Executive Order if the General Assembly denied appropriation or legislation for the agency for that fiscal year. This Bill also



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

requires that no state agency may expend federal funds whether received directly or indirectly unless appropriated by the General Assembly. This Bill excludes colleges and universities who are under the definition of state agencies do not include disbursements to local governments or school districts. The federal reimbursement of state expenditure must be deposited in an appropriate state fund or a trust fund under the custody of the State Treasurer. These reimbursements can not be spent until appropriated by the General Assembly. I believe this is a good piece of legislation and merits your support."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. I do believe it is a first step in implementing legislation that is necessary if the Executive Orders are to be dealt with efficiently and with clarity. And I also believe it covers some loopholes where special agencies can be created, funds diverted from the purpose of the General Assembly. And there's more and more of Representative Lechowicz's continuing effort to increase the control and the involvement of the Legislature in the appropriations process and I think that's a laudible and worthwhile effort."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Mugalian: "I...I assume that the Committee took care of this responsibility but I would like to know what safeguards were taken to cover an emergency situation where the Executive Department might have to act quickly to protect life and property."

Lechowicz: "That item was discussed and in turn, this Bill does not effect any emergency situation. In fact, it's just in reverse, Representative Mugalian. Everything is ongoing and until we do action either the positive or negative aspect."





Mugalian: "Does..."

Lechowicz: "That's a separate chapter within the statutes as far as the emergency powers of the state. It does not include that chapter."

Mugalian: "You mean they could spend the money if they had to?"

Lechowicz: "Correct."

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

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill really concerns me. I think that what it would effectively do is tie the hands of any Governor if he wished to alter the...any program or if he wanted to change any goals in an independent program. This Bill does not address the purposes of Executive Orders, of proclamations or of Administrative Orders. I think that it's a very dangerous concept, in this regard, if we attempt to tie the hands of the Governor and I would ask for a 'no' vote on this."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. May I point out to the Lady who just spoke, on page 1 of the Bill, Section 2, lines 15 thru 29 and I'll read them to you if you didn't have an opportunity to read the Bill because this Bill does in no way, nor is it the intent of this Bill to tie anyone up. It's just a clarification as far as the Executive Order and the item of going through statutes. It says, 'Where it is within the authority of the Governor to create a new state agency, the creation of a new agency may be accomplished only by Executive Order and such Executive Order shall be delivered to the General Assembly by filing with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate and file with the Comptroller, Secretary of State, President and Minority Leader of the Senate, Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representative. The Comptroller shall refuse to honor the vouchers of such agencies unless and until such delivery and filing. Such Executive Order shall cease to



be effective if either House disapproves the Executive Order by the record vote of the Majority of the Members elected. An Executive Order, not so disapproved shall remain remain in effect by its terms. I believe this is good legislation. I believe it's much needed legislation and if you want the power, as far as the General Assembly, to approve or disapprove that situation, the power should be here. And in turn I believe it merits your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr..... The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "I apologize to the Members of the House if I have spoken on too many occasions today but I think this is a very important Bill that we have here. This is not a Bill directed to the present Governor. This is a Bill directed to the operation of government in the State of Illinois and comes not from current experience but experience gathered over a great number of years in the operation of the Government of the State of Illinois. It is incumbent that we have this kind of legislation to correct ills that we have seen, all of us, too frequently and on too many occasions in the past years. And to gather again to the Legislature that power which is legislative. So that we can assure the people of the districts which we represent and the people of the entire State of Illinois that the Legislature is providing the funding and that the creation of agencies outside of the limits of this rule and authorization that would be set forth in this statute shall not be funded unless the Legislature has provided those funds. I think this is essential. This is not a slap at anyone currently in state government. But it's certainly a realization and an action taken upon what we have all seen, all experienced in our service in government over many, many, many years. And it corrects ills that should never occur in the organization of



Illinois Government."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to explain her vote."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think this is an excellent piece of legislation also and it ought to receive the additional green votes needed to pass. There is no way for the General Assembly to effectively coordinate the resources of Illinois and the resources made available on a federal level for the people of the State of Illinois until this type of legislation comes into law. The point being that there is really no way to appropriate state funds and not have that appropriation process be aware of what the Federal funding is. For there to be a coordinated, coherent approach to the problems of the State of Illinois, it's going to be necessary for a policy...for a policy to be set, public policy. And then that public policy is going to have to be coordinated and supplemented and implemented through the use of the resources of the Federal Government and of the State Government. And that's why this legislation needs to be passed and I commend the Sponsor for drafting it and I think that we ought to begin to make economic decisions. Decisions which are based on sound public policy. And the only way we can do that is to know what the resources are and to coordinate them in a logical coherent manner."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's an act of futility to pass this Bill with less numbers than are required to override a safely predictable gubernatorial veto. The Constitution gives the authority to the Governor to make these changes by Executive Order. Practically everything that was done in Executive Order 1 and 2 could have been done without any...taking any notice whatever of the Legislature. The Governor made the mistake of being kind and considerate to the General Assembly by taking them into his confidence in these matters. His reward is to be slapped in the face with this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

dead fish Bill that would seek to restrict his Constitutional authority. Those of you who are voting green are being foolish beyond reason or description. You don't have enough votes to override the veto, why waste the time with the process? Leave the authority where the Constitution gave it, put a red light on and save everybody time, including your own."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, to explain his vote."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "You may have it. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I hate to disagree with my colleague from Lawrenceville but I couldn't let pass his comment with regard to the Governor being able to do all those items included in Executive Order number 1 and number 2. The Subcommittee on Government Reorganization has been consuming a considerable amount of time in the last number of weeks with regard to those orders. I think it will become apparent to this General Assembly that there are serious Constitutional questions presented by those two orders. We will be shortly reporting to the General Assembly with regard to them but I... It appears that there may be serious questions of whether or not the Governor is attempting to usurp the Legislative authority that properly belongs in the General Assembly. I think it's important that that comment not go without passing. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I request a poll of the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "There are 88 'ayes' and 67 'nays' and the Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ewell. Kornowicz. Madison. Mann. McBroom.



Mulcahey and Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question we have 88 'ayes' and 67 'no' and 14 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Madison: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question we have 89 'ayes' and 67 'nays' and the Gentleman from Kankakee has asked for a verification. All Members will be in their seats. The Clerk will call the affirmative roll. Just a minute, Mr. Clerk. All those who are not entitled to the floor will please vacate the chambers. Clear the aisles so Mr. Ryan will be able to see while verifying and the Members will please be in their seats. Raise their hand when their name is called and we'll move along quickly with the verification. Continue with the... Begin with the affirmative roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Breslin. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Darrow. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Hart. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. Jim Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Kane. Katz. Kelly. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Levin. Lucco. Luft. Madigan. Madison. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Mudd. Mugalian. Murphy. O'Brien. O'Daniel. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Richmond. Robinson. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Shumpert. Skinner. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Tipsword. Van Duyne. Vitek. Von Boeckman. Willer. Williams. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the affirmative? Questions of the affirmative, Mr. Ryan?"



Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Giglio."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Giglio? He's..."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, what is the count right now?"

Speaker Bradley: "89."

Ryan: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Doyle is in his seat."

Ryan: "John Dunn."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Ryan: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the chamber."

Ryan: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Flinn is not in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Ryan: "Representative Nardulli."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Nardulli."

Ryan: "No, that's all right. Representative Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Laurino is not in his chair. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll. John Dunn has returned to the chambers. Put him back on the roll."

Ryan: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McClain is in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Skinner."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Skinner....."

Ryan: "Oh, there he is."

Speaker Bradley: "Did you say Representative Skinner, Mr. Ryan?"

Ryan: "Yes, .... I see him now."

Speaker Bradley: "He's recorded as voting....."



Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye'."

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

Ryan: "Representative Tipsword."

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

Ryan: "Representative Friedrich."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Friedrich is in his seat."

Ryan: "I have no further questions."

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

Friedrich: "I'd like to change my vote from 'aye' to 'present', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, will you please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones."

E. Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see you've got your glasses on, but I still don't believe that you can see too well. Change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Change the Gentleman's vote from 'present' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. Mr. Ewell. Turn Mr. Ewell on."

Ewell: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Ewell. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Totally intimidated, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Place Mr. Laurino back on the roll. He just walked in the chambers. On this question we have 90 'ayes' and 68 'no's' and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, before you announce that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."



Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be changed from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Schlickman, the Gentleman from Cook, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "Change me from 'present' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Return Mr. Flinn to the Roll Call. He's in the chamber. On this question there are 92 'ayes' and 67 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in view of the motion that carried earlier today prohibiting introductions, I would... at this time like to make an observation, with leave of the House. Immediately behind me are members of the Board of Directors of the Illinois Municipal League. They are all mayors. They are Mayor Paul Linds of Alton, Mayor Irwin Pledgie of Bethalto, Mayor John Ereamis of Bridgeview, Mayor Robert Slevaniak of Calumet City, Mayor Niel Eckhart of Carbondale, Mayor Anthony... Tony Evacco of Evergreen Park, Mayor William Givin of Flora, Mayor Mark Maclaroy of Freeport, Mayor Roger Deatrow of Mattoon, Mayor James Thomas of Ottawa, Mayor Richard Carver of Peoria, Mayor Joe Trainer of Pontiac, Mayor Marion Smith of Robbins, Mayor William Telford of Springfield, Mayor and the present President of the Illinois Municipal League. Jake Bender of Pinckneyville, Mayor Harold Gowins of South Holland who is the First Vice President, Mayor Nick' Nicholas Blaze of Niles, Mayor Jay Leo Davis of Carlyle, Mayor Tom Ryan of Kankakee... the brother of our Minority Leader. Mayor William Wallmeier of Pekin, Mayor George Burtstead of Monmouth. And on the floor, Mayor Jack Williams, Mayor Elmer Condy of Franklin Park and Elmwood Park. Thank you, very much."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since I think that the rules should apply to everybody equally and since it





was my motion to eliminate introductions from now until Saturday, and that motion carried by 107 to 10; I move to reconsider the vote by which that motion passed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to reconsider the vote by which his motion passed. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to reconsider will say 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'noes' have it and the motion fails. Dump the roll on that last Bill. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to reconsider his motion will vote 'aye' and the opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevec on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider."

Matijevec: "I want to explain my vote by introducing another great labor leader, Bob Gibson, Secretary Treasurer of the AFL-CIO. And if Mary Andreatta comes out of the Clerk's Office, I'll introduce her too."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 44 'ayes' and 62 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. House Bill 1547, Mr. Bowman. We'll read it a third time. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, for the purpose of an introduction."

Porter: "No, Sir. I'd like to ask unanimous leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 1543. It will not change it at all."

Speaker Bradley: "There are objections, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "There are objections?"

Speaker Bradley: "There are objections. In case you weren't here.... we had a Gentleman say this morning that he was going to object to all of those from now on. Mr. Bowman.... or... read it a third time.... 1547."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1547. A Bill for an Act to revise the law regarding freedom of association in the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman. Could we have some order in the chambers?"

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1547 may be the most important Bill the House will consider this Session because it will guarantee to every individual in the State of Illinois the right to freely associate in lawful groups and organizations without encountering secret agents of the police unless they have a true law enforcement mission. We Americans are very secure in the belief that we live in the freest country in the world. And therefore, we are not reluctant to express our views, nor to assemble peaceably, nor to petition our government for redress of grievances. "

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, could we have some order?"

Speaker Bradley: "We just attempted to get some a minute ago. Continue, Sir. Let's give the Gentleman some order."

Bowman: The question I raise to you, Ladies and Gentlemen and Mr. Speaker, would we exercise our right if we knew that agents of the police were watching our every move, recording our every thought and reporting these to City Hall? We would not. Yet, this is exactly what the Chicago Police Department has been doing for many years. It is a fact that there have been files kept on over two hundred thousand citizens of the City of Chicago and over twelve hundred organizations. At least fifteen sitting Members of the General Assembly are among these...Senators Charles Chew, Dawn Clark Netsch, Richard Newhouse, Harold Washington. And in the House, our colleague... our colleagues, Ray Ewell... this is not an introduction, Mr. Speaker...Ellis Levin, Jesse Madison, Robert Mann, Peggy Smith Martin, Susan Catania and Charles Gaines. Who are these people, Ladies and Gentlemen, that they deserve to be spied upon by the Chicago Police Department? Mr.



Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, you know.... you know."

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

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Gentleman deserves a little bit more decorum than this. He doesn't need to be harrassed. He feels strongly about the issue."

Speaker Bradley: "Give the Gentleman some order."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, these are people like you and me. These are people who do have a hope for a better state and who enter politics to try and secure that hope. They were local leaders in their community and then became candidates and then they became public officials. And during all this time they attended public meetings, worked in organizations. And these were organizations that were riddled with police spies and agents who recorded their activities and their thoughts. Examination of their files, which have been made public, show repeated entries of attendance at public meetings of lawful organizations, descriptions of discussions of electoral politics at such public meetings, endorsements of political figures by the subjects, endorsements of the subjects by well known and lawful and political organizations. Let me give you a few specifics in case you haven't seen their files. Representative Ewell's file consists entirely of remarks which he made at a meeting of 'Black Community Leaders'. The Police Department apparently felt that it was noteworthy that he said such things as, 'Black children are free to walk in their own areas and that we, the blacks, must solve our own problems'. These were noted by the police. Representative Gaines' file consists of almost entirely with extensive lists of appearances of public meetings. The only remark which was credited to him concerns his views on 'machine control versus community control' of the city. Representative Madison's file contains a particularly revealing entry. He was observed at a public meeting at which the District Police Commander was the featured speaker. Now, would the police have us believe that this was a subversive group or that the purpose of this entry was to



detail the Representatives' political associations? The file which I've had on display at my desk for the last week was a file of an organization whose luncheon meeting was infiltrated by the Chicago police. Many of you have laughed at the petty detail which was included there. You know, I've seen you come by my desk and laugh at it. It contains references to Governor Stevenson and the current Governor, you know, very, very minor things. And they are petty. But this is funny; and when you ask yourself, what was the purpose of gathering this information? To what purpose was this information to be put and who was going to be making use of it? Those answers, I suggest, are self-evident; and they aren't funny. Many of you wonder whether Chicago's Police Department is continuing to do such things when they say that they are not. In an article which appeared in Chicago over the weekend, and I delivered to many of you, contained proof that the Chicago police spied on a Committee which was trying to put together a slate of candidates to run against the regular Democratic Party of Cook County, directly contradicting statements made by the Superintendent of Police at the same time. Chicago police were discovered to have used the secret agents to infiltrate a meeting between attorneys and their clients. They were plaintiffs in litigation against the department. Now, think about that. If that doesn't violate confidentiality of attorney-client relationship, I don't know what does. These tactics mock the constitutional guarantees of free speech, free assembly and free petition. And yet the Constitution is silent on the right of individuals to privacy within associational relationships. The Fourth Amendment protection does not extend to...to this privilege. Legislation is needed to fill this void. House Bill 1547 now before us would not outlaw all use of secret police agents. It would require that whenever police authorities use secret agents to infiltrate lawful groups that they first produce before a judge some objective fact which would cause a reasonable person to become suspicious that some unlawful act either had or was about to take place and to obtain that judge's approval. This would cut out the political snooping



without inhibiting legitimate law enforcement. No authorization would be required for infiltration of unlawful organizations. There is no First Amendment protection to operate a drug ring, and the police would need no authorization to infiltrate such a group. However, if the police suspected that the drug ring were operating under protection of a lawful organization, such as a church, the police would need authorization to infiltrate the church. There is provision for temporary infiltration of such organizations without judicial authorization in emergencies. There is provision for maintaining the secrecy of investigation and to protect the identity of the informant by making the judge the only party to the authorization until the investigation has been completed. If the agent is kept secret, his principle officer must be named to provide accountability."

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

Bowman: "Yes. Once the investigation is completed, the authorization and summaries of the file are delivered to the subject's organization. To provide the check on indiscriminate use of judicial authorization to cover politically motivated spying. This Bill has received the editorial endorsement of the Chicago Tribune, Daily News and Sun Times. I hope it has your support as well. And Ladies and Gentlemen, I do hope you give the debate more careful attention than you've given to my remarks because this is a very, very important topic. Thank you."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is with some reluctance that I get up to speak against this Bill after its endorsement by the metropolitan newspapers. However, if we look at the drafting of the Bill itself, we find that we are providing civil remedies in the Criminal Code, something that we do in no other case. We also have the term 'reasonable suspicion' used, and yet no definition for that. Might I also point out that I, for one, and many of the other Members of this House have a great deal of respect for our law enforcement agencies, for the state police, for our local police department and local law enforcement



officers. This Bill would cause these law enforcement officers to be criminally liable for acts and omissions that would be... others would be free to do who are not law enforcement officers. It specifies things that they cannot do, but that private citizens may do. For example, we all have attended meetings concerning the Equal Rights Amendment. We have gone to N.O.W. meetings. And who do we find there? Some anti-E.R.A. people. They are there either in disguise or as little quiet ladies sitting in a corner. And why are they there? To find the candidates' view on the Equal Rights Amendment. They can do that. And yet if they were a police officer, they could not go to the N.O.W. meetings. They would be criminally liable. And as to keeping records. Think about that. How terrible it is to have records kept on us. The Board of Elections have records on us, the League of Women Voters, the U.A.W., the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the Chamber of Commerce. You name it. When we are in newspapers, when we are in the public eye, when we are in the political realm, people keep files and records on us. I, for one, have nothing to hide. If the police want to follow me around Chicago, let them follow me around Chicago, let them build a file on me. Whoever is following me will be rather bored. I think this is a local problem. I think this is a problem that concerns the City of Chicago. It should not be brought to this General Assembly. If the Members who were spied upon have a grievance, they should go to the Chicago City Council and have a hearing there. I'm sure that Alderman 'Simpson' and a few other Alderman there would help them with their cause. I'm not that familiar with the City Council of Chicago; but I feel that would be the appropriate form to go to with their grievances. So due to the technical errors in the drafting and the intent of this Bill and my respect for the law enforcement community, I would solicit a 'no' vote. Thank you."

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

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me start off by saying I have the most respect for Representative Bowman. I know he has good intentions in his Bill; but let me



say that this is not the time to tie the hands of the police department. Recently we witnessed in Chicago a bombing of a consulate office. We've had the terrorist activity happen in Washington, D.C. The Police Chief of Washington, D.C., stated that if he was not prohibited from having these groups infiltrated they would have known this was going to happen. They could've taken steps to stop it. There are times like this when the terrorist activities not only in America but all over the world, they're increasing at a rapid rate. There is a need for police to infiltrate these groups. And if there's been cases where people were wrong, I'm sure they're going to put a stop to it, the superintendent of police in Chicago has ordered a stop to that kind of activity. Now, I, for one, think that the police department probably has a file on me; and I really don't care. If I attend meetings that they think might be subversive, they have a right to have a file on me. And I don't see anything wrong with that. There's nothing in there derogatory to me. I don't think anything was said derogatory about any of the Members here that had files taken on them. But at the time like this when the terrorist activity is on the increase, there's no...this is no time to put further roadblocks in the way of the police department. They're trying to protect the people of Chicago; and this is one of the ways they can do it. And I'd certainly solicit a 'no' vote."

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

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hate to oppose Representative Bowman on this Bill; but, as you all know, my name is DiPrima, DiPrima, and the name, DiPrima, is of Sicilian origin. I don't have to go any further. I...I've been affiliated with the Westside Block, probably with the Mafia and what have you. But I feel as a good American like all of you in this House are as elected officials you have nothing to fear. And on those grounds, I oppose this Bill. I feel that we should all be investigated, good, bad or indifferent. I'm sure that none of us are going to be playing around with any Commies or floosies to get ourselves involved in any way, shape or form. So on the basis of that, I would



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ask you to oppose this legislation."

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

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as one of those whose name were in the files, I wish to state that what they do in terms of watching me since I've become a Member of the General Assembly, I've become a public figure. Well, they started back in 1946, when I was active with my block club. Now, I'm not so much concerned about those of us who make ourselves public speakers. I'm worried about their going in...infiltrating civic organizations, putting peoples names down where people later on someone will ask for a police check, some employer will ask for a police check. They will come back, oh yes, he doesn't have any criminal...well we've got him down as attending some of those lousy Commie meetings or some subversive meetings. And this is what's going to hurt. It's not going to hurt me, I can take care of myself; but it's going to hurt the other members of our block club whose names are probably also on the list. It's going to hurt those who honestly come out to hear the public issues. It's going to cause people not to come out and hear you or to hear me because they really feel the strong arm of big brother and the breath of big brother is breathing on their necks. And citizens should be free and have a right to protest without having...the threat of having their name put in a file, they can reach their employer and have them fired; or if they come up with some public job, a public board to be appointed to, and they go back and find this file that they attended this meeting. And they may be an officer in a civic organization who have...someone who may have been suspect on the list had attended their meetings. And then all of a sudden all the good citizens who are trying to improve their community become tainted with a police record. And this is what I'm concerned about, the other people, not us who are in public light. We have to expect this. But I'm talking about the hundreds of other people who belong to these civic organizations like block clubs and churches whose names are going to be forever besmirched because of these infiltrations. And some of this information comes from the informers which are untrue, and people are





really put on record for things that they did not do. So that is why I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Martin...Peg Martin."

Martin, P.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I rise in support of House Bill 1547. I deplore the tactics that were used by the police 'red' squad in the investigation of my colleagues and me. I am outraged to say the least to think that we as taxpayers have to see our monies being spent for informers, surveillance by police officers, newspaper clippers and police investigators. By its very name, police 'red' squad' leads me to believe that their following me implies that I am a Communist. I'm want to dispel this fact right now for my colleagues and for all who are interested that I am not now and never have been a Communist. I am a Catholic by faith, and I do believe in God and Jesus Christ. Especially am I outraged when I see that the information gathered on me was mostly from houses of worship. To be exact, there was 38 visits to houses of worship reported in my file; 3 of these visits informed upon me were the accountability sessions that were held by our former Governor Daniel Walker. There were 4 peace organization meetings, 4 newspaper clippings, 3 marches, 2 labor organization meetings, 1 university meetings, 1 restaurant meeting, 2 hotel meetings, 1 at the Y.W.C.A. and 1 park district field house meeting. My file further show that I was supposed to have been in Russia in 1973. This is not true. I went to Russia and Poland in 1977. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that as a black, and especially as a woman, that no matter what civil rights organization, people organization, or organizations which are humane by nature that we are affiliated with we are suspected as being Communist. In the 26th Legislative District there are 194,000 people. And I would be naive, stupid and foolish to believe that all 194,000 people are Democrat, Republicans or Independents; just as I would be foolish to believe that they are Catholic, Baptist or Jewish. The tactics used by the 'red' squad are the kinds of activities that make some people seek out other kinds of politics. I marched against the war in Vietnam, I support the Stockholm appeal. I am fo



stopping the arms race because I believe that billions of dollars spent in this area around the world could best be used in humane areas, for instance, employment, education and housing. I have spoken and marched many times for peace and not war. I will go anywhere in the world to build peace among all nations. If this means being spied upon, then so be it. I would think that this state, and especially we as the Legislators, would send a clear message to the Chicago Police Department and other police departments throughout the state to give their investigation in the area of crime and its possession and not against innocent people. I urge an 'aye' vote for House Bill 1547."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, under orders I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Jones, for what purpose do you rise on the motion?"

The Gentleman moves the previous ques..."

Jones, E.: "Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I didn't think you see too well. I wish you would remove yourself from the Chair if you're going to be biased in selecting Members to speak. Now, I noticed one of my colleagues behind me had his light on ever since this Bill was debated on; but you..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich, would you withdraw your motion until

Mr. Jones, and everybody give Mr. Jones...proceed, Mr. Jones. I did not know that Mr. Matijevich was going to move the previous question. We've got Mr. Greiman, Mr. Katz, Jimmy Houlihan, Mr. Kane, Geo-Karis, McBroom, Deuster, Telcser, Wolf, Kempiners..."

Jones, E.: "...As I said before, Mr. Speaker, is Representative Madison's light on?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Madison's light is on, Mr. Brummer's light..."

Jones, E.: "Well, I notice you didn't call his name when you went from one side of the aisle to the other. And this is the reason why I asked you the question earlier when we were debating the Generic Drug Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that you intentionally passed over certain Members of this House to get to others. Now if you cannot sit up there and be fair, I suggest that you remove



yourself from the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, has moved the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye'...do you withdraw...he withdrew his motion. Mr. Jones, you're recognized, Sir."

Jones, E.: "I did not...I asked to be recognized to speak in this debate. I was asked to be recognized to raise a point of order. And I reiterate, if you cannot rule fairly, Mr. Speaker, kindly remove yourself in the best interests of the Members of this House."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners. Mr. Kempiners' flashlight's flashing. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "I just wanted to move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a...I have concern, of course, I think I'm as liberal as anybody else. And I think that the police have perhaps hurt my career because they didn't have a file on me. And perhaps I'll do something about that I suppose. I've been listening to some of the speakers, and I was particularly interested in what the Gentleman from Rock Island had. He said, 'Police and people will be treated differently'. Indeed, they should be treated differently. What we...what we expect from our government, the restraint that we expect from organized society, are very different than what we might anticipate from individual people. If society is to be a free society, then there must be restraints, restraints like this Bill, House Bill 1547, on police and in government. One of the most important rights that we have is the right to freely associate. I suppose when George Orwell wrote his book of 1984, I think it was fiction. I hope it will remain fiction; but as we reach that year 1984, I am afraid that unless Bills like this are passed it will become a reality. In closing, and I think in reference to some of the remarks of Representative McAuliffe, I think those who would give up their freedom for security are neither free nor secure.



And I will vote for this Bill."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm reminded of the story of the little boy who said, 'Momma, momma, what is a second-story man?' And his momma said to him, 'Son, your father is the best second-story man I know', she said, 'If I don't believe his first story, he always has a second story ready'. This is what I'm against. I'm against the second-story business. Now, you listen there isn't a lawyer in here, if your client was arrested and his home was raided, then you wouldn't go in and make a motion to dismiss because he didn't have a warrant. Isn't that right? Isn't that right? I just want to be reasonable. You say, 'Well, he didn't have a warrant'. You mean to tell me that's an insult to the policemen if you raise the question that he didn't have a warrant and was raided. Now listen to what this says here, 'To conduct what would otherwise be unlawful police activities'. Do you believe in 'unlawful' police activities? Frankly not. I can hear the voice from the distant and the dead when he revived this country and said, 'You have nothing to fear but fear itself'. We have the right to be freedom...free from fear, even police fear, even police fear. We should be free from being afraid even of the police. And that's all this Bill says. They can get a warrant and search your place as long as they want to. Now, I know some of us get a little teed off with the press. I made a statement here the other day, some people got mad with me. But I tell you, I told you that I loved you, God bless you. Well, I'm going to tell you why I said that. If you put a bit in the mouth of the press, hear me now, you're putting the muzzle over your own mouth. It was the freedom of your fathers, it was the freedom of your ancestors that made this the foremost nation in all the world. Do you hear me? I'm not afraid of the police; but the police have said they have denied this. They have said that they don't do this sort of a thing. Now, what is there in the Bill if they have denied that they're doing this sort of thing? What is in the...in the Bill that makes them afraid or makes you afraid? There's absolutely



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

nothing in the Bill, not a thing...I'm on, I guess, borrowed time here...irresponsible talk, irresponsible talk is one of the most mischievous, one of the most destructive forces in our human society. And you know and I know if the police raids without a warrant, and is starting to load you in one of them wagons out there, and you have no regress, your lawyer got to make a motion to D.W.P. because they failed to have a warrant. What's going to happen in the street. Everybody is going to assume that you're guilty...I'm ...I'm just trying to point out to you how you can lose your own freedom, get excited, and your lawyers know this...how you can lose your own freedom, the right to be free even from police brutality. If my time is up, God bless you, there's nothing wrong with this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to speak in defense of the police, and I'm going to speak in defense of the police and support the Bill. No conscientious policeman wants to do anything illegal. No conscientious policeman wants to be a superspy...interfering unlawfully with the rights of others. No conscientious policeman believes in a police state. This is not a police state. Illinois is not a police state. The United States is not a police state. The C.I.A. made some horrible mistakes to the Watergate on and so forth, before Watergate also. I don't think we should set a poor example. And I think in defense of the good policemen we should support this Bill."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, after Representative Davis' and Representative Geo-Karis' statements, I'll be happy to wait and explain my vote."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Several of the...several of the previous speakers has said, 'What's wrong with the police spying, what's wrong with having a file?' I can only point to my own file as an example of what's wrong. It's got three entries in it; two of which are absolutely and totally false. They have me representing groups when I was still in law school. Now, I don't know what would



the effect of that might have been in terms of 'drawed' prospects and in terms of my governmental career. It could be very injurious. And I never had an opportunity to correct the record. And what about the third entry. The third entry was that Ellis Levin was working against the Illinois Bell Telephone rate increase. This is a subversive thing that was in my police file. Of course, if they had read the newspapers in 1971 beginning in September, this entry was in December, they would've known this. But they had to spend money, and this is the subversive type of thing, I think it's a waste of time, it's a waste of money. The money should be spent on fighting crime, not on getting involved in politics. I urge your support for this legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I just pass on this, I'm sorry, I was trying to turn off my light."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, is it ever again going to be in proper order to move the previous question or is that...I'd like to do that if it's in order."

Speaker Bradley: "It's not in order. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I think they have to talk rough to you in order to get you to recognize them. I feel that you've been discriminating against me because I've put my light on at the very beginning of the debate. Because I've heard the same arguments before, and that this time I want to move the previous question and hope from here on in that you recognize me."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. I'll be brief, I'd just like to make two points. In response to the technical issues raised by Representative Darrow, civil remedies are provided in criminal statutes involving civil rights. This is not all that unusual; in that the reason with suspicion while not defined in terms of the Bill is defined in terms of Supreme Court



decisions, 'Terry versus United States', which describes the conditions or the standards for determining when a police officer should either frisk a suspect or pat them down. And so there is in case law, I think, an adequate definition. I hope that you will vote 'yes' on this Bill; but if you're still uncertain in your own mind, I hope that you will try and imagine yourself going up to one of your colleagues in the House who have had a file kept on them. And imagine yourself telling them that it was okay that they had a file kept on them. Tell them that if they had nothing to hide, why should they care. Or in essence, going back home and telling your friends and neighbors that the extra paperwork that the police would have to do in getting a warrant would be intolerable, that the police should be able to send secret agents at any time to the church bazaars, P.T.A. meetings, coffee klatches, garden parties, union halls. Or imagine telling them that we should abolish search warrants before the police might be able to enter private homes because they are so bogged down on paperwork. And lastly, I'd just like to call to your attention to an article that appeared in the Sun Times today, where Mayor Bilandic was asked if he were content to leave total responsibility to the Police Superintendent without controls, and he said...he argued that no one can operate without controls because of the constitutional law and democracy system of checks and balances. And that's from Mayor Bilandic. I implore you to vote 'yes', Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As one of those subversive individuals who was a victim of police spying, I certainly rise in support of House Bill 1547. The question that I constantly raise is, why was I under surveillance? And the answer that comes to me very clear is because I had the audacity to become involved in such subversive and radical activities, as picketing the Chicago Police Station protesting the treatment of black students at 'Austin' High School, because I had the audacity to be involved in picketing



the Chicago Board of Education for the lack of facilities of schools in my district. For six years, Mr. Speaker, I was under surveillance from 1968 til 1974. And I heard somebody say, 'If they want to follow me around, let them'. Well, if that's your choice, fine. I don't want them following me around. I heard somebody talk about the respect for law enforcement. Well, I ask you was it lack of respect for law enforcement that had caused Attorney General Griffin Bell to finally decide that his own F.B.I. agents ought to be investigated? That was not lack of law enforcement. This is a law and order Bill, Mr. Speaker, so all of you that support law and order this is it. We talked about freedom of choice as it relates to laetrile and generic drugs. Well, why don't we for once talk about freedom of association? The freedom of choice to decide what meetings you want to go to without being spied upon by the police? This is a good Bill...and it ought to be supported. It ought to have your support to once and for all stop this insidious spend...reckless spending of money that is absolutely unnecessary by the police so that those of us who choose to have those freedoms of association can have them without fear from the police department."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady...or the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote...one minute."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I lived in the nation's capital for 10 years at a time when people were bombing the capital. They had riots, they were marching down the street, there was smoke going up in the air going up towards my house. And at that time the police were doing everything they could to keep an eye on all sorts of groups. And it didn't bother me that the police were listening in on telephone conversations or attending meetings any more than it should bother any of us that the police are sitting at the side of the highway watching cars go by. I think all of those who were distressed over the assassination of Robert Kennedy, or John Kennedy or Dr. Martin Luther King or the attempts on the life of Ronald Reagan or Governor Wallace or anybody else, the question always is raised, why don't the police know that there are people circulating around? And the only way





the police can know is to attend meetings and, sure, they go to some meetings that are innocent and they find out nothing. But when they do find out something, we're darn glad for own safety that they do. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I've listened to the opponents of this Bill, and especially the last speaker, and I have this weird feeling that am I really in the United States of America listening to this kind of conversation about why should you care about the police following you around, sitting at the side of the road. I see those squad cars on the side of the road as a rule. I may not...I won't see the policeman who's in disguise attending a League of Women Voter's meeting or any kind of a meeting, a political meeting. I am shocked to hear a lawyer say policemen should be held with the same standards and no more than citizens. That is an awful thing for anyone to think, especially a lawyer. Yes, I do mind if someone follows me around, even though I'm not doing anything I'm ashamed of. And it isn't just the City of Chicago, maybe a Hillside policeman might decide...plainclothes man follow me around. I don't want that happening. This is the United States, for heaven's sake, not Russia. You all act like we're so much better off than Russians; and yet you hold us to the same standards that they have. We are better off because we're different. We have our constitutional guarantees of freedom of this...from this sort of harrassment. And I would hope the Gentleman who led the fight...opposing this Bill two years ago, who now is our Majority Leader, would stand up and exercise that Leadership and oppose this Bill and be a real Leader."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote in one minute."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've been on the other end of the stick on this Bill. I've served three years in naval intelligence, two and half years of that I was a plainclothes agent, an undercover agent for naval intelligence. I had access to the police files, I had access to the F.B.I files. And I'll tell



you what, the same people that want this Bill passed want to destroy the F.B.I., too. And if you just destroy the F.B.I. and you're going to do...if the United States does not have some surveillance agency, God help this country. And if you think Chicago is bad, you take away police intelligence, and you haven't seen anything yet. You ought to be proud of the fact that they have got policemen who knows who's who in Chicago and who's liable to cause problems. So I tell you now you cannot operate a city like the size of Chicago without an intelligence unit. And this thing would do a severe damage to that unit."

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

Jones, E.: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't need a full minute to explain my vote; but it's very ironic as I look at the board and look at some of the red lights up there. And I reflect back how soon we forget. Do you remember what happened on the national level in less...less than five years ago, and yet and still we see people sitting here saying, 'We need this sort of action'. Our President of the United States had to resign for the same doggone reason, the same reason, at which this Bill addresses itself to. And we've got individuals sitting here saying, 'No we don't need this kind of legislation'. How soon we forget."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I regard it as appalling, almost pathological, that a Bill like this could get so many votes. It's obviously going to pass; but aren't we blowing it completely out of context beyond any sense of reason? If the facts were known, every politician in this room whose name was on the spy list in Chicago would've been disappointed if his name or her name hadn't appeared there. And there isn't a single person that claims that there was any overt act taken against their safety, their well-being by the Chicago Police Department. The remarks that were there recorded were of an innocuous nature, some of them were more complimentary than deserved. Same



old story, though, we feel illustrated as in the rest of government, the Chicago Police Department just focused in on the Chicago people and the 54th District was left out. Let's give this Bill what it's entitled to, that's to be defeated. Don't be intimidated by the big city press who seem to have jumped onto a phony issue, and to ...to in any way connect this with foreign ideologies, suppression of rights of citizens, is to miss the whole point of the surveillance."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll take about 30 seconds. Many of you have heard about the study and surveys that have said that if the Bill of Rights were put to a vote to the American public, that the Bill of Rights would fail. Now, that is a very, very depressing thing to know; but, my colleagues, you ought to know better. What you're talking about is so simple...is whether or not you believe in the Constitution of the United States, and whether or not you are American. We have heard the phrase un-American and American. Well, think of all the rhetoric you've used at the Fourth of July speeches and at other occasions. This is a witness test of sincerity. This is not complicated at all. And then I've heard some of my colleagues say that they don't care if they don't have their Fourth Amendment right. They are willing to waive for themselves the right of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution. The First Amendment presumably as well as the Fourth and others. Well, they may do it for themselves, but I think when they took their oath of office, they had no right to waive it for their constituents."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would just like to point out that all of the women Legislators from Chicago and many of the black Legislators from Chicago are in this file. I ask you if it's fair to be treated as a subversive just because you're a woman or because you're black? All this Bill does is to introduce one level of sanity into this process, and that is to say that the police have to ask a judge if it's all right for them to trail an individual. And I ask your support for this Bill."



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

Katz: "Oh, and I would add to what the Lady has said that the Bill goes even further. And it says that in an emergency if there is reasonable or probable cause to believe that the individuals are engaging in the commission of a crime, they may proceed to act without getting judicial sanction. The distinguished Gentleman from Evanston, Mr. Bowman, and his distinguished predecessor, Joe Lundy, who should not be forgotten on this day, have pointed attention to the fact that the police no less than the king are bound by the law. And this Bill makes it possible for them to carry out their legitimate function within the protection of a judicial system, a judicial system that we are told continuously here operates at such an excellent level in the County of Cook. I believe in addition to that that the people of Illinois and the people of Chicago are entitled to have their police stick to law enforcement functions and not to waste their time on the trivia that has been shown to exist in all of the matters that have recently been publicized of notes taken on ridiculous meetings that any citizen of Illinois knows is a tremendous waste of time. Let the police stick to their legitimate law enforcement functions, let them go into court if they need authority where the public security requires that they investigate organizations that pose a legitimate threat to the people of this state. This Bill will permit that to be done; and I am very pleased to vote 'aye'."

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

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'yes' vote...say that requiring police to just move on the basis of reasonable suspicion is enough that now we can have no chilling effect on our First Amendment right. This is the minimum standard, and I think it's adequate for their functions and for the function of the political process and freedom in our society. Thank you."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would not have objected to a uniformed policeman attending a meeting because we needed the



protection. I made that point at the particular meeting. I said that the children were afraid to go to school. I said that we have to solve our own problems. I'll repeat anything I said any time for anybody at any time or any place; but my problem is here. I think it's a waste of time to have a nonuniformed police officer at that kind of function. I do not believe it's the function of the City of Chicago to try to keep tabs on that type of thing. If they have any reason to believe that there's violence, subversion or anything else, let them get a warrant, let them follow the law because we must remember that no man, including the police, are above the law. And I say that we cannot have law enforcement when the law itself becomes beyond the law for it is the law that protects us all. And when we chop down the trees of the law, nothing will protect any of us anymore."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not a woman, nor am I black; but I happen to belong to an ethnic minority and I was referred to as having a 'red' vote up there. I would like to vote for this Bill; but I don't think this Bill goes far enough. I've got a file on me with the Chicago newspapers that are an inch and a half thick with the words 'allegedly, supposedly and according to secret sources'. Now, what difference does it make whether the police got a file on you or whether the Chicago press has a file on you? I tried to get some relief from this type of a 'allegedly and supposedly and according to secret sources' remarks. I went to the best liability lawyers in the City of Chicago; and as long as those words are used, there was no way I could start a suit. And thank goodness there's people back home that knew Elmer Conti and didn't believe what they read in the papers."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I share Representative Conti's concern about newspaper files. And I think we ought to go that far too because I happen to belong to a minority called 'the



downstate Democrats'. But I would also say that as a Member who's voted for every law and order Bill that's gone through here to legitimize police activities and law enforcement activities that the best thing we can do in supporting the police is get rid of the illegitimate activities and support this Bill. There are 48 lights up there either absent or 'present'. And I think people here know that this is an issue where there is a right and a wrong in their own mind. Well, I support it. I hope everybody would get on or get off."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to explain her vote."

Younge: "Very quickly, I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that I'm voting for this Bill because the whole debate here reminds me very much of what began to happen in England when the foundations of justice began to crumble when the 'accuseary' power got all out of whack. When those persons, when the law enforcers began to use up their power, there was a crumbling of justice in England that led people to have to come to America. I think that every American holds very precious and very dear the ideal of equality and the ideals of justice under our system of jurisprudence. And the fear and intimidation which is brought about by police spying cannot be tolerated in Illinois or in America. And I think that we ought to send back a message loud and clear to the Chicago Police Department, and to every police department and to every individual who has been given a right under the law to accuse people or to in any way participate in the law enforcement activities that that standard of conduct is unacceptable to those people who go and who are elected to make decisions in reference to the sovereign powers of Illinois. And that's why I'm voting 'green'."

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

Kosinski: "Fears are being expressed here. There's a justifiable fear that our civil rights may be abridged. It's a justifiable fear. But I have a 'red' light up there because that may be the tip of the problem. I don't know, I repeat, I do not know what damage we



will do by passing this Bill in terms of the legal, legitimate law enforcement agencies that are attempting to protect me in this society. I don't know what they are investigating. I don't know who they are investigating. I am concerned that they may be doing something to protect me; and by voting for this Bill I will be stopping that protection. I protect civil rights, but I'm in an area of fear that I don't understand. And I'm afraid to pass this Bill; and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, in response to what Representative Stuffle said earlier, I was one of those 48 that had not voted or was voting 'present'. And I've always...on pieces of legislation which I haven't made a decision, I've listened to every word that's been said here today attempting to make up my mind whether this is in the best interest or not the best interest of the people of this state. And Representative Stuffle said, 'Do one thing or the other', 'Get on or get off'; and I've decided to get on with a 'green' vote."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge all of you to...to really vote for this Bill because it is a good law and order Bill. It's for the good cops. It's for the cops that want to do the correct job, and not fiddle around with trivialities that they...that they should be spending...not spending their time on. And I want you all to remember that this government is a law...is a government of laws and not of men. And this is kind of a law that the protections are in there...for all of the people. And the good cops are going to want to go along with it, and notwithstanding a former President of the United States, the law is for all of us. And we should all carry out the law and that's why I'm voting 'yes'; and I should like to see a lot more green lights."

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



Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have 90 votes up there; and we must, in my opinion, put this way over the top to show that, yes, we that are in this House represent the people of the State of Illinois. And there are times when law enforcement activities go too far. I have stood on this House floor and defended the policemen, worked for criminal punishment legislation, determinate sentencing and the like. But now I'm saying to you that it's time that we recognized that the police can go too far. I had the good fortune of coming from a middle-class society. Some of you have not had the good fortune that I've had. I'm appalled, frankly appalled to hear about some of the investigations and the surveillances that have gone on. And it's you that I say...I support what you're saying. I say if you want to conduct surveillance, if you want to look into somebody's background, then get a court order to do it. And that's what this Bill is saying. It's reasonable, it's for the people, it's America. And this is the kind of legislation that we should have. Put it over the top right now, let's get down to other business. You know it's right."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 45 'nays', 19 voting 'present'; and this Bill having received the Constitutional requirement...the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1714."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1714. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to prevent fraudulent and corrupt practices in the making and accepting of official appointments. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew, for what purpose do you rise?"

McGrew: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I didn't get on the last Roll Call. Could I be recorded as 'no'. It will not change the outcome."

Speaker Bradley: "Objections have been heard. Is Mr. Lauer in the chambers? The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, on House Bill 1714."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I





don't know whether this is a good time or a bad time for this Bill to come. House Bill 1714... if you'll look at the analysis on the Republican side and I distributed a number of them on the Democrat side; this is one time that our staff has accurately reflected what the Bill does. As you know, we have a problem... and this is particularly in the rural areas and in the small town areas of the state. The problem is is that we are now having difficulty having people run for public office or serve in local units of government, whether it be school districts, park districts, municipal governments or county governments... township governments because of what is known as conflict of interest. Mr. Speaker, the Conflict of Interest Bill was actually passed about 1908 and it hasn't been changed since then. And we had no problem with conflict of interest until the Attorney General ruled in 1974 that the Act should be interpreted so broadly that virtually the only one that could serve on a local unit of government had to be the town bum because anyone who was responsible, anyone who was a businessman, anyone who in any possible way had anything to contribute probably would also find himself in a conflict situation. I could tell horror story after horror story, but I'll just tell a couple. For example, the President of the school board in one of the schools in the 44th District had the misfortune to have his mother die. She left him three shares of stock in the bank in which the school had its money deposited. And he was declared to be in conflict of interest. In Champaign County we had a situation where a member of the school board had voted on the contract which set teachers salaries. This happened in ... oh, I think March or April. Later that summer he fell in love with one of the teachers, married her and was indicted in Champaign County.... because he married her.... he was indicted for a conflict of interest. Specifically, 1714 is to alleviate the problem if the individual having to do with county government meets one of these six criteria. I'll read them. First, if he has less than a 7½% share in the ownership and if he acknowledges such ownership before the vote and abstains from the vote. Second, if the contract is for less



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

than \$250 and not for more than \$500 aggregate within a calendar year; he acknowledges an interest before the vote and abstains from voting. Third, the contract was made from sealed bids by a 3/5's vote of the governing body; and he acknowledges an interest in the vote and abstains from voting. Fourth, the contract is with a financial institution; he acknowledges interest before the vote and abstains from voting. We passed out of here House Bill 2326, which took care of that fourth provision in a separate Bill. And I might say that it whizzed out of here with a bunch. Fifth, if the contract is for an emergency and is declared by a 3/5's vote of the governing body of the unit..... excuse me, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. In an emergency situation... you're talking about fire, flood or acts of God. Sixth, the original contract was made prior to his election or appointment and this is a renewal of that contract; he acknowledges an interest before the vote and abstains from voting. Notice that in each one of these instances, the individual must acknowledge his conflict and he must abstain from voting. In some boards this will reduce the number of votes that are available so it takes a higher preponderance of votes for a measure to be adopted. But I don't think that this is unnecessarily stringent. It is a situation, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly don't want to take the lid off of the conflict of interest laws; rather I want them to be responsible, but I do want to be able to take care of the fund.... or from the fund of the best talent that we have available for local units of government. I solicit your solid support for this Bill."

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

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this year we've had many Bills introduced on the subject of conflict of interest or ethics legislation. I think that Representative Lauer should be congratulated on this particular measure because it not only identifies the very serious problem that exists in our smaller school districts to prevent citizens living within those communities that are leaders and businessmen. And we can all recognize the fact that today managing school districts is big business. It



takes people who understand business, the expenditures of funds, as well as the other Representatives that understand education and people in the community. I think that he has drafted a piece of legislation here which recognizes the problem and also sets out a formula to protect the public from any conflict. And I support this particular measure very strongly and I hope that it receives the support of everyone in the House."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, to close the debate."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I think rather than waste the time of the House I will simply say, this will solve a great many problems for people in small units of government and will let us take advantage of the best talents that our local units of government have available to it and I strongly support... solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you should have recognized someone that was against this Bill and give somebody a chance to ask some questions."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't know how I can tell that, Mr. Byers. I'm not a mental telepathist. The Gentleman in the back had his light on for some time."

Byers: "Well anyway, this Bill could be called the Cronyism Bill because it allows people to approve contracts that...maybe that they might have an interest in but they could...so they don't vote on it and then they approve it for their friends. And I think that this Bill should be defeated. We have thousands



of local government municipalities in the State of Illinois that handle millions and millions of dollars. And I think there's plenty of people in the state that are willing to serve on these boards and be...without having a conflict of interest. We certainly don't have any problem in our area of finding people to serve on these boards and I think this is a very, very bad Bill. It's another Bill to loosen, rather than tighten, conflict of interest. And I'm appalled even that is kind of legislation is introduced and I think a 'no' vote would be proper on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a good Bill. In this Bill the person who has an interest in ownership has to acknowledge it and has to abstain from the vote and has to do so before the vote. And there are other safeguards in it. I think we can go too far outfield. In small areas you can only have one...one hardware store. Otherwise, they have to go to some other county to do their shopping. I think it's a very good Bill and it's very timely and needed Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think those of you that are voting on this Bill should look at it again. And if you're concerned about your voting record, insofar as corruption in government and good government votes, just look at it for a couple of seconds and maybe review your green lights. I think the intentions of the Sponsor are good but I believe that the effect of this Bill is to say a little corruption is okay. Now, let me explain based on some experience. The law that would be amended has been on the books for about 40 or 50 years. It literally reads in a rather prohibitive way. However, the courts have interpreted these so as to not come to any ridiculous conclusion. I have represented many municipalities in the past and we have had on our Village Board, employees of Illinois Bell Telephone Company and



employees of other utilities. The courts do not require the absurd results that a few State's Attorneys are attempting to come to...to come to. Be very careful about your vote in this Bill. I think you should vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, We who are afraid to vote for this Bill should examine ourselves and our own votes. Are we connected with any business or any Bills that may effect our livelihood? I've watched many, many Bills here. We have Mayors and Village Presidents on this floor. I have never seen anything wrong with them voting for Bills and I think this Bill should be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'no' vote, I just want to say that I get a little tired of listening to the conflict of interest thing. To me, they appear to be nothing more than a regression back to the old puritan paranoia that ultimately leads to witch hunts, grave digging and I don't think anybody... I don't the people of...who perpetuate these conflict of interest issues will be satisfied until the whole Legislative Body is dead and buried. I'm voting; 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? The Clerk will take the record."

On this question there are 116 'aye' and 34 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed." 1785. Representative Steczo."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1785. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1785 amends the Illinois Insurance Code and provides that the Illinois Department of Insurance will be able to approve policies for individual and group legal coverage. A large segment of our population has inadequate legal representation and the aim of this legislation is to provide relief in the



form of individual or group plan. Approximately 25 states currently have this type of insurance and this Bill is necessary because the Department feels its specific authority is needed to write this type of insurance coverage and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone against the Bill? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1811. I'm hereby appointing a temporary Parliamentarian. Ann Lousin, temporary Parliamentarian. Representative J. David Jones."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1811. A Bill for an Act in relation to township's share of State Income Tax receipts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1811 is a rerun of legislation we passed out of this House last year to help the townships with some funds to repair the roads. The increased cost of the towns of the oil and all the repairs have put the township roads into a disaster condition in which no funds are available, additional funds to...to accommodate them. I realize that we have 75,000 miles of township roads, which equal to all the other roads put together. Now this concept was to take a part of the State Income Tax that...which is now only allocated to counties and cities. This does not divert funds from those sources distributive funds, but to set up a separate distributive fund for the township aid. In the original Constitutional discussions on this, Maurice Scott testified that the townships were suppose to get funds but they didn't. Now be realistic about this. This legislation, as presented, would divert seven and a half million dollars from the General Fund into this distributive fund for the township. Now I realize that that is not a realistic approach in the present



fiscal situation of the state, but I put this Bill in as a vehicle to see what can be done on behalf of the townships and if there's... If there's action taken elsewhere to accommodate this need, why we would, of course, disregard the...this proposal. And I would only suggest that it be processed out as a vehicle to try to resolve the problems of the townships and their need for funds for repair of the roads. And with... The understanding is the Bill, in present form, it's not to be, in my own judgement as well as others in the...in the administration, but so far I've seen nothing come forth to be...to help the townships. And I'd like to keep this Bill alive for that purpose."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Willer: "I understand this Bill, that tax would be levied on everybody in the township."

Jones: "No...no."

Willer: "Just those who live in the other..."

Jones: "No, no tax. This would take the income tax, one-half of one percent of the State Income Tax and put it in a distributive fund for the townships."

Willer: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Will the Gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Telcser: "Representative, how much do you think this will cost the State's General Revenue Fund?"

Jones: "Seven and a half million dollars."

Telcser: "You say it's coming from the State Income Tax?"

Jones: "Correct."

Telcser: "Are there any other situations such as this that we've directed funds from the State Income Tax to?"

Jones: "Well, we just yesterday almost did with the Park Board."

Telcser: "But we didn't. Did the Bill pass?"

Jones: "No it did not. It was put on Postponed Consideration."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's... Can you untake the record? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'ayes', 49 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. That is the 18th Bill that we have done today. 18 out of 172. 1898."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1898."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Giorgi on the floor? "Out of the record. 1930."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1930. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1930 would, in effect, allow counties to enforce the law in unincorporated areas. As you know, there has been a substantial need for more protection in unincorporated areas, where the crime rate has been raising. Now, this is one of several Bills which have been brought before this Body during the last couple of weeks. dealing with the subject of unincorporated areas. The counties need this statutory authority to effectively control crime and vice and some of the other permissive things that are happening in unincorporated areas. The urban counties has endorsed House Bill 1930 and I certainly ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

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

Kelly: "Yes."

Mahar: "Dick, doesn't the counties already have the authority to provide necessary police functions in the unincorporated areas? And aren't they really doing it now? And isn't it because of the lack of total enforcement, the lack of people, the lack





of policemen?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Representative Mahar. They already do have this authority. However, by giving statutory authority, I think the law is needed to effectively combat crime in unincorporated areas and I think that this proposal is needed."

Mahar: "Well, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mahar: "I'm a little bit confused. I know that in the unincorporated areas in the district in which I serve, we see that the County Police are enforcing the laws there now. And apparently must have some jurisdiction under Chapter 24 or whatever applies. And it would seem to me that those additional duties needed or ordinances needed could be passed by the County Board and I regretfully say that this looks like we don't really need this Bill. And this Bill will just cut up the statute."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't believe that it's necessary for me to ask the Sponsor of this Bill any questions. He said by his own admission that this was an unnecessary Bill, that the County Sheriff already had the right to do this. And I agree with him that it is unnecessary and the Sheriff does have this right. Not only that, the Sheriff's Department has the right to enter into protection within villages or municipalities by contract with them to do their policework within the municipalities or small towns. It's completely unnecessary, Ladies and Gentlemen and let me warn you that if you should vote 'yes' on this Bill, it may come back completely different than it looks like today and something you would have no desire to have your name or vote connected with. It's one of those things, you know Mr. Speaker, that we term a 'Shell Bill'."

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



who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do want to respond to Representative McMasters and that is that I definitely feel this legislation is needed or I wouldn't be Sponsoring this particular Bill. Certainly it's not the greatest Law and Order Bill that's come before this Body. But I think in clear conscience, you're going to have a hard time voting against it if you believe in law and order in unincorporated areas and I think that everyone, especially Representative Yourell, should vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 'aye' and 79 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost." 2163. I didn't know Bill Veeck had something to do with the House. 2163. Representative Willer."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2163. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer. Representative Mugalian, stop being so charming. Representative Willer. 2163. It may never come again. 2163."

Willer: "What Bill is it?... Oh, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think we were calling Appropriation Bills. I'm sorry, I don't have my file here. Take it out of the record, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 2173."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2173. A Bill for an Act in relation to subsidy for probation officers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer. Representative Lauer on the floor? 2173? Out of the record. 2176."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2176. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms. Representative Simms, 2176. Representative Keats, you're standing between the Chair... It's against the rules."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill



2176, as amended by Representative Getty, has eliminated a great concern of those legislators from Cook County. And it does solve the problem for downstate Illinois. Under the amended Bill, as it now stands, that for those counties that have municipalites where they choose not to have a City Attorney and where the State's Attorney of that county chooses to allow the State's Attorney to prosecute those cases, the State's Attorney or the county would receive 40 percent of the fees and the municipality would incur and receive 60 percent of the fees. This is in response to a Supreme Court decision back in Decatur resulting from the allocation of fees and the prosecution. And this Bill now, as amended, that Representative Getty so kindly has placed into the correct shape, I think it's a Bill that the majority of the Legislators can support and I would urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Could I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Rigney: "Could you tell me, is this this bad Bill that all the Mayors in the small towns in my district are asking me to vote against?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please come to order."

Simms: "Well I... I think that was before the Bill was amended. The Bill, as amended, I think does take care of the objections of those individuals that were concerned that the State's Attorney couldn't encroach upon the right of the municipalities to prosecute their own cases. This Bill does not do that. It encourages, if anything, for the municipalities to have their own attorneys to prosecute traffic cases and allow the State's Attorneys the privilege of prosecuting those more serious cases in the felony courts. And I think it's a good measure and I think the Bill, as amended, solves those problems."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."



Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Representative Simms, this is the...similar to the Bill that I think Representative Giglio had that was defeated in this House earlier, except in the manner that you may have amended it. And I would like to know that...has the municipal league and the township officials, because of your Amendment, removed their opposition to this?"

Simms: "I do not know if they have or have not. We've only amended the Bill, I think Representative Getty amended the Bill yesterday. Cook County was amended out of the Bill and it addresses itself mainly to downstate Illinois. I have not conversed with him since then."

Totten: "Well, then let me speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

Totten: "No, I want to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead."

Totten: "Thank you. I still think that there are many deficiencies in this legislation. If you remember, the Bill we had prior, I think it was House Bill 387, we defeated because of the fact that there is litigation pending in the courts, that Representative Conti pointed out. And that there were...there has since then been disclosed to me by the township officials, many townships who are receiving a considerable amount of funds that they're collecting in fines that a good portion of this would no longer be available to them. I don't think that we should be in the posture of getting involved in legislation when we're still attempting to adjudicate some of the problems that have occurred because of the courts trying to solve this matter. This legislation is untimely at this point and I think that we should wait and see how the courts decide. It will certainly diminish the amount of money that the townships and municipalities have to correct road deficiencies in their area and I'd urge a 'no' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McMaster: "Tim...Tim."

Simms: "Yes, Tom."

McMaster: "In the case that this Bill would pass and the State's Attorney prosecuted a case for a city or village, what percentage of the fine would go to the city or village?"

Simms: "Sixty percent."

McMaster: "Under current law, what percentage goes to city or village?"

Simms: "Ninety percent."

McMaster: "Isn't it more like 100 percent?"

Simms: "No, they get 10 percent for...at the present time."

McMaster: "In other words, what you're going to do is take away 30 percent of the cause...the fine from the city?"

Simms: "That's correct."

McMaster: "And this is the reason I oppose this legislation, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It would not only effect townships, it would certainly effect every municipality, especially the smaller ones who cannot afford to have a City Attorney and I think many of them that are perhaps not so small, who cannot hire their own City Attorney to prosecute in the courts of our counties for fines in regard to traffic violations. I think, Tim, I hate to defeat your Bill but I am opposed to it and would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Ready for the question? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Just a brief question of the Sponsor, if he will. Mr. Simms, does this only apply to... I'm looking at an analysis here where the violator was arrested by county authorities, or would it also apply if...a small town for instance, a speed trap like Sherman just north of Springfield; where this is a source of revenue when it's done by the local police officer. Would that effect them as well?"



Simms: "Yes, it would. It would take... If they chose to allow the State's Attorney to prosecute, Sherman would not get as much money. You're right."

Wolf: "So, you think it might be a deterrent to small towns with speed traps."

Simms: "I think it very well could, yes."

Wolf: "Thank you very much."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Lady order."

Geo-Karis: "I rise to speak against this Bill because it takes revenue away from the small cities and the towns. I think the counties have enough revenue if they'd balance their books a little better. And I don't see any reason why we should deprive the smaller areas, they have a hard time enough as it is from their revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, to close."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing and the arguments of this Bill, I think some of the arguments against this has been somewhat distorted. The problem really lies in...especially for the large downstate metropolitan counties, right now that the cities should abolish their legal department, thereby forcing the State's Attorney to start prosecuting all the minor traffic cases. And this way the State's Attorneys would have to hire additional help and the counties don't have the money for it. The State's Attorneys are in support of this legislation. If anything, it insures and would encourage that cities have their own municipal attorneys to prosecute their own cases. And if they choose not to then this only pays for the additional costs of prosecution that the counties are going to have to incur. And I would urge that since Cook County has been amended out and it does satisfy the problem that...clarifying language



that has been a problem for Cook County, dealing with the disposition of fines, I would urge that this legislation be passed by the House."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 15 'aye' and 111 'no'. Representative Simms is the new champ. 2180. Representative Stearney."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2180. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Miller is going to give the Brian B. Duff traveling award, which he had, to Representative Simms."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney. Is he on the floor? Representative Johnson, are you going to handle this? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Stearney is ill this week and asked if I would handle House Bill 2180 for him. House Bill 2180 comes out with the 12 to 3 vote of the Judiciary II Committee and provides basically, in very simple terminology amending the Criminal Code for provisions for contempt for failure to cooperate with the Grand Jury. And basically, I think it's probably better to simply read the four line statute and answer any questions rather than try to explain it. The Section provides that a person who has been given immunity from prosecution and subsequently fails to cooperate with the Grand Jury is guilty of contempt or failure to cooperate with the Grand Jury. The sentence being that no person found guilty under this Section shall serve more than 6 months in prison, other than the penitentiary for such contempt. Simply, it adds teeth



to the ability of the Grand Jury to prosecute and to seek information, so long as the person who is appearing before them has been given the proper immunity. I think it's a relatively noncontroversial vote...Bill and I would solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer, for what purpose do you rise? Byers."

Byers: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Byers: "Representative Stearney is the only Sponsor of this Bill and I don't believe that he can delegate the authority to someone else to handle his Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does... Representative Lechowicz."

Lecnowicz: "Mr. Speaker, you'd have to point to rule... Let me point out to you that it's a matter of courtesy, the person... Did you file anything with the Clerk? You're suppose to file something with the Clerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Lechowicz was on the Speaker's rostrum and we had a Bill, 1843, and we wanted to put an Amendment on and he said you couldn't do it if the Sponsor wasn't here and there was no such thing as giving written permission."

Speaker Redmond: "Better take it out of the record."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, what ever the House desires is fine. I simply indicated late last week to Mr. Stearney, when he gave me this file, that I would speak on his behalf. And if Mr. Byers objects, he can handle it."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. It would seem to me that we should take it out of the record. You should come up and ask leave to be added as an additional Sponsor and then I think you could proceed. Out of the record. 2239. Mrs. Geo-Karis. 2239. Out of the record. 2256. Representative Lucco. Out of the record. 2355. Representative Taylor. Well, he's not here. I can't reach... Do you want to handle it for him?"





Does he have... Does Representative Collins have leave?  
2256."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2256. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation of Sheriffs, Coroners, County Treasurers, County Clerks, Recorders, Auditors and necessary Clerk hire. Third Reading of the Bill. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill that the urban counties and Coroners and other officials of the counties have been working on for some time. This came out of our Committee on Counties and Townships and Tom Duffy of the Coroner's Association, and Art Gautshcalk, of the Urban Council that represents some 27 or 30 counties in the State of Illinois, have come up with this Bill. And this is the Bill that I'd like to present to you. This Bill increases the minimum of the county elected officers in the various counties throughout the state under 1 million population. It does not effect the Circuit Court. It does not effect those people. It raises the maximum but makes it permissive. It does not effect all, or very many, of the counties in the State of Illinois but it does raise a minimum...the minimum of the county officials in the...throughout the state. The maximums are unraised, but I say that is permissive and shouldn't bother anyone. I have the effect that it might have on any and all of the counties in the state. If you're interested and want to ask me in the various categories, I'd be glad to tell you what effect it had on the elected officials in your particular county."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, would the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Lucco: "Yes, Sir."

Stuffle: "Representative Lucco, you say it's permissive but in the sense that it raises the minimums, is that portion permissive?"



Lucco: "You're correct. It is not permissive on the minimum. It does raise the minimum salary and it does effect some counties in the state where the minimums are real low and those counties are still paying their elected officials at that minimum. So, the only way to get them to raise it is to raise the minimum. Now, for example, in Madison County they are already paying their elected officials way above the minimum and way up, almost, to the maximum. But it does raise, or it does make the maximum raise permissive but not the minimum. You're correct, that is not permissive."

Stuffle: "How long has it been since the minimums were raised?"

Lucco: "Thank you, the minimum and the maximum of these elected officials are naturally fixed by the State Legislature and fixed by statute. It's been quite a number of years and I hesitate to say 10 or 12, I'm not positive. But it's been quite a number of years since the minimum has been raised. The maximums have been raised several times and that remains and always has been permissive. But in the eyes of these two organizations, the Urban Counties Council and the various elected county officials, they feel that the minimum should be raised. I'll give you an example, in the category of counties where it's 30,000 to 60,000, small counties, at present the minimum is 14,000 and under this proposed Bill it would raise to 16,380. Now that's a considerable raise but that only effects several counties in the State of Illinois. From 100 to 200 thousand population the present minimum is 16,500 that would increase it 18,975. There are only about 3 counties effected by that. The county which I represent mainly in the 200 to 300 thousand category, the minimum is 18,000 and under this Bill it raises 20,700 and in our county the minimum is already 22,000. So I don't believe it effects enough counties to, we'll say, to be concerned with."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Would the Sponsor tell me who has to pay for this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."



Lucco: "This of course...these salaries are fixed by the County Board and the County Boards pay for the salary."

Ewell: "In other words, we're forcing the residents of this particular area to pay more money for services by legislation here in Springfield."

Lucco: "In one sense, there are a few counties that would be effected where the minimum is, we think, or the State Legislator or these people...organizations feel is low. But on the other hand, it is permissive."

Ewell: "Besides these county officers, who else has asked for this increase?"

Lucco: "No other officers. This excludes the Coroners and the Circuit Clerks. It does include all of the other county officers."

Ewell: "No, the question was, besides the people effected, well... Besides the people effected, who else wants this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "The..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm just calling on you, Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "I want to get order. The organization that represents these elected officials. No question about it."

Ewell: "All right. Thank you very kindly. I just want to point out that this is going to mandate a 20 to 25 percent increase in the minimum salary of these particular counties. We of the Legislature are not provided any money to pay for it and I think it's questionable wisdom as to whether we ought to mandate these particular things to County Boards and not send in the money to pay for it. Cook County is excluded but nevertheless, I think we're treading on very, very thin ice. And this Bill doesn't have too much widespread appeal except to those people who are going to get some benefits. And they are very, very few."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne. Representative Birchler.  
Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise in support of this Bill myself. In reference to Representative Ewell's



question, in my county, which is a county of about 250 thousand people, which lies in the last, next to the last bracket, our Treasurer and our county officials are getting 21,500. So it's right dead center between. Now, the important thing here, I think you'll remember is that it's not us that's actually going to raise these salaries. It just gives the County Board the authority to do so."

Speaker Redmond: "Come to order, please."

Van Dwyne: "We've done this time and time and time again with all the local entities of government, either with a back door referendum or else outright authority to do it. And I don't see anything wrong with this. I sat on the County Board in Will County for ten years and some of the officials that sit there are the most reluctant people in the world to give their county officers a raise. So, I don't feel that we're infringing on the people of the State of Illinois at all by giving this added authority. And I assure you, if my association with the County Board people is any criteria, they are not going to abuse this. So, I would speak in favor of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lynn Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. Certainly the part that would allow counties the maximum is good for counties. If they...if the boards wish to raise the salary of those officials, I think that is meritorius. As an ex-member of the County Board though, I don't know why you would want to forcibly raise the minimum. One of the reasons you raise salaries is to attract good people. But there is no dearth of people running for those county offices. I think Representative Ewell hit the nail on the head. Certain specific groups want this mandated raise in their counties. And I think that we should trust those local County Boards who know their officials and their taxpayers. Allow them to set the salaries and give them permissive upper limits, so if they feel they need raises, fine. But this



Bill has a mandated lower limit and I would ask you to defeat this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lucco, could you answer a question for me?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kent: "Is it not possible now for any County Board to raise the salaries from the minimum?"

Lucco: "Yes."

Kent: "They do not have to pay the minimum, do they?"

Lucco: "They have to pay... The minimum is set for various populated categories and they must..."

Kent: "But they don't have to pay that low. They can pay more."

Lucco: "Oh, yes. They have to meet the minimum and they can go higher. You're right."

Kent: "So then aren't we taking over the responsibility of the County Board by taking what they should already be doing?"

Lucco: "The General Assembly has, for years, fixed the minimum and a maximum and left the inbetween up to the discretion of the County Boards. This is no differently than it has been done for years."

Kent: "But, I think what we're doing here, by raising the minimum, is we're saying, 'You can't pay that anymore. You have to raise their salary.' I would urge people to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco, to explain his vote."

Lucco: "I would just close with this, that there are counties in which the minimum salaries are way low in the opinion of those people. And they feel that the State Legislature should raise the minimum. Now this effects very, very few counties. The maximum, although they are raised, is still permissive to the County Board. And I...I think that this has been something that the State Legislature has done for years. It's not anything different then we do in other categories. You're going to have other Minimum Salary Bills come up here in which the minimum salary is raised. I think that most of us have been



supportive of reasonable raises in all categories and I just 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 wished? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in rising to support this Bill, I think it should be pointed out that this is a Bill that was compromised and now has the approval of all...not only the original proponents but those that came in opposition to the Bill as well. Originally, the Urban Counties Association and the Illinois Agricultural Association were opposed to the proposed minimums as set out in the Bill. But Representative Lucco and the Representatives of those organizations sat down and hammered out an Amendment that met the approval of everyone, so that the minimums that were established now have no opposition from anywhere. It should also be pointed out, I think, that in most counties they are paying over the minimum now. So this is not a great increase, as has been suggested, but is more in line with what is being paid now. Another thing that I think is being overlooked...the smaller counties, I believe those that are under 60,000, the Clerk also performs the duties of Recorder and this should, I believe, have...be reflected in the salary level. The maximum was purposely set at a level high enough where they would not have to come back to us at any foreseeable time because it is not something that they intend to reach for quite sometime. I really can't imagine opposition to this Bill. It was a Bill carefully worked out, fully compromised and has the full approval of everyone involved. I think that the Sponsor explained the Bill thoroughly and it really is beyond me and I'm sure...why there is opposition to this Bill. And I urge those who are voting 'no' or not voting, to take a position and vote in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise in support of this Bill."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

We have the situation in many counties in the state where you..."

Speaker Redmond: "The timer is on."

Lauer: "Where you have a county officer of one political party and the preponderance of the County Board, the other political party. I know of instances in counties that, to my knowledge, there's almost a political vendetta going on because a popular member of one party failed in his bid for election or reelection and revenge is being taken by the County Board. And this being the case, I think that from time to time we down here have to prod the counties and remind them, 'Hey, it is a two party system, but by all means be fair and pay your employees, even your elected employees, their full value.' Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 70 'aye' and 51 'no'. The Bill, having failed... The Gentleman has requested Postponed Consideration. 2355."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2355. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for certain claims against the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, could I have leave of the House to return House Bill 2355 to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 2355 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. You look at the Priority of Call and if you have a Bill on there that you're going to make a similar request, it's suggested that you advise Chalkie so that we can be ready with the Amendment when that time comes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Taylor. Amends House Bill 2355 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Clerk knows what happened to



Amendment #4. Amendment #4 I do want to move to table, have leave to table Amendment #4."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Taylor. Amends House Bill 2355."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #4. Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, Amendment...leave to table Amendment #4 is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Taylor. Amends House Bill 2355 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #5 adds 25 claims for \$296,520.15 awards by the Court of Claims so that House Bill 2355 was originally introduced. This Amendment also appropriated \$107.50 from the Federal Vocation Rehabilitation Fund to the Federal Emergency Employment Act, Section VI Fund, to correct an error in the PA 79-1278. I move for the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 2355."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On the Order of Third Reading appears House Bill 775, for which Representative Schlickman is recognized. Representative Schlickman, I understand, requests leave to return this to the Order of Second Reading for the..."

Schlickman: "From the Order of Consideration Postponed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Representative Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker, isn't 775 on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's being removed from there to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment and will return to Postponed Consideration."

Jacobs: "Wouldn't that have to be done by a motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he asked leave. Are there any objections?"

Jacobs: "Yes, I object."





Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "In all the years that I have been down here, I don't recall anyone every having objected to a Member asking for leave to have his Bill returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, on account of that objection, I would move that the appropriate rule be suspended so that House Bill 775 could be returned from the Order of Postponed Consideration to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of the adoption of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question has moved for the suspension of Rule 72 so that House Bill 775 can be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 99 'aye' and 11 'no' and the motion carries and the rules is suspended. 775 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Schlickman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. D. L. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 775 as amended on page 25 by deleting line 14 through 22 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Representative Dan Houlihan. Daniel Houlihan, 775. Amendment #3. It's been returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of somebody doing something with Amendment 3. Representative Schlickman, do you seek to some way yield?"

Schlickman: "Well, it's his Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Schlickman: "If he has nothing to say, I'd move that it be tabled."

Houlihan: "If I could have just a moment, please? I move to table Amendment #3, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan moves to table Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is...the motion carries and the Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Schlickman. Amends House Bill 775, as amended, by deleting line..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I move to table Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed: 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #4 is tabled. Anything further?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Schlickman. Amends House Bill 775, as amended, by deleting line: 21 through 31 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, to explain the Amendment."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

As I'd indicated previously, when this Bill was at the Order of Third Reading, a vital part of House Bill 775 is contained in Section 22, which provides for a more explicit definition of the attest function. It's a Section to which there has been no objection expressed. There is also Section 25, which has resulted in considerable...24, excuse me, Mr. Speaker, for which there has been considerable confusion. Section 24 is a restatement of the existing law prohibiting anyone who is not a certified...a registered accountant from practicing public accountancy. It's a Section that is not necessary, not vital to the Bill. As a consequence, Amendment #5, deletes that Section. But Amendment #5 goes further, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it responds to the express concern from independent accountants as to their exemption from the Act. And specifies specifically what they may do in response to this concern, which I think is unwarranted. But in sympathy with that, we have, in Amendment #5, substituted the present Section 24, by deleting it and inserting in lieu thereof, the existing Section 11 of the existing law. With this Amendment, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are responding directly to the express concern of the independent accountant and with this Amendment I know of no further substantive objection to House Bill 775.



I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Back to Postponed Consideration. House Bill 44."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 44. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Illinois General Assembly, House Bill 44, as amended, will approach a need that many of the Legislators have recognized and approached in slightly different ways. I would cite specifically Representative Murphy's Bill, Representative McPike's Bill, Representative Lechowicz's Bill, all of which are a result of a continued perceived need that property taxes are higher than they ought to be for our Senior Citizens. House Bill 44 does not solve the problem. There is not enough money available in the present budget to solve the problem, but I would contend it is a partial solution. What it does is find money by saying we are going to tell the Senior Citizens they have to apply during the 12 months that the applicant...during the first 12 months after the beginning of the Calendar year. And that they may not apply for back year grants. Now, with the money that we will save by not allowing past year applications back to 1972, we will expand the program so that every Senior Citizen with an income of less than \$10,000 on a Property Tax Bill of more than \$500.00 or rent of over \$139.00 per month, will receive increased benefits. I have distributed to many of you a little memo I have written which has two formulas...two grant formulas on it. No one will end up getting less money, they will end up getting the higher of the two grants. Basically, what this does is create a new option



in the State Senior Citizen Property Tax Relief Program, which indicates that basically, if your income or if your rent, if your rent...if 30% of your annual rent or your tax bill is over 30...is over 5% of your income, that you will get markedly increased grants. If there are questions, I'd be happy to answer them or I would yield to other Cosponsors or opponents."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate getting some attention because I would like to bring into focus all the legislation that we have been working on on Senior Citizens and how it all began because I think it has a bearing on this particular legislation. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me track you back through the legislative action that has been taken by this House for Senior Citizen's needed legislation for tax relief. In 1969, Representative Wolf, Representative Jacobs and I introduced similar Bills to pioneer the homestead Act in Illinois. We joined together in a combined Bill which was signed into law but fell upon the courts because the old Constitution did not permit it. We saw to it that the new Constitution did have a provision that would expressly permit such legislation and out of that came the current homestead law, with wide support from the General Assembly. Then as the need developed, it was noted that the Homestead Act had deficiencies in the fact that it did not accommodate those who paid rent and that it...and it gave benefits to those who had no particular need, no matter what the value of their house the Homestead Act does give a deduction. So in 1974, working on this problem, there were Bills introduced by myself, by Cal Skinner, by Jack Lauer, Representative Gibbs, Calvo, Giorgi, McClain and Peters, to again approach this problem. The Revenue Committee appointed a Senior Citizen's Tax Relief Subcommittee, composed of myself and Skinner and Joe Lundy. We had exhaustive hearings throughout the state to get at some basic problems and



this is the report in which the present legis...Act is now functioning. The Circuit Breaker gets directly at the need without any of the problems that are in the Homestead Act, as to the...or those who pay rent. And I suggest to you that we have a lot of these Bills that have been passed out and floating around that get at part of the problem but that the real answer to it is in the legislation in House Bill 44, to revise the Circuit Breaker so to accommodate the various needs that have been addressed to by the other Bills that are now in one stage or another in the General Assembly. So I recommend to you that for the benefit of the people that you're trying to provide the benefit for, in a fair form, this should be the vehicle and I solicit your support for House Bill 44."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor answer a question? How much revenue loss is expected from this Bill?"

Skinner: "That is a question which can not be answered with too much precision because the estimates are not hard estimates. We estimate that we will save approximately 10 million dollars and that the new program, the increased benefits will cost approximately 11.6 million. But I would suggest that both of those figures have at least a variance of 10%."

Ewell: "Well I have an analysis here that estimated the revenue loss from 16 million 2 hundred thousand, to 20 million 800 thousand. And I just have a second question."

Skinner: "Could you repeat that?"

Ewell: "16 million 200 thousand and 20 million 800 thousand. This is on the Bill, the date of analysis is 2-2-77. That's now. Now, I understand the Bill has been amended, and whoever the analyst is, I don't know, he left a note which says, 'Thus the lower income person qualifying for Circuit Breaker would not find any changes in his computation. A higher income person would be the beneficiary of the Bill, as amended.' Would



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"How you care to comment on that?"

Skinner: "Yes, I would. I'm sending over to you, via Page, a copy of the benefit schedule and when you say lower income, the whole principal of the Circuit Breaker is you compare the property tax or 30% of rent with one's income. And depending what the relationship is, a person earning a thousand dollars could get markedly more. As I stated in my opening remarks, anyone who pays more than \$139.00 a month rent will benefit from this. And anyone who pays more than \$500.00 a year taxes will benefit from this."

Ewell: "That's precisely the point. I think that the...all of the Members ought to look at the analysis of this particular Bill, which simply sets out a higher income person is going to be the beneficiary of the Bill, as amended. The person in the lower income, qualifying for the Circuit Breaker, would not find any changes in the computation. I mean, I think it's a bad policy that we should go around giving away 16 to 20 million dollars of the state's revenue to persons in the higher income without trying to take in account those who happen to be at the bottom. And therefore, I think that you possibly, possibly, just barely possibly might have a bad Bill which doesn't benefit the people where the benefits ought to be intended. Good Sponsor though."

Skinner: "Since he didn't ask a question I can't answer it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in all deference to my running mate from my district, I'm going to have to disagree with him on this one. It seems to me and I know in my own district, one program that I found that the people that come to my office and the people that I visit and I visit quite a few Senior Citizens in their meetings, in their functions, one thing that we did for them that they agree collectively benefited and helped in ways that we could not ever estimate is this program that we're talking about here now, with Senior Citizen's Property Tax Relief. Most of these



people are on fixed incomes and without a doubt, you would be surprised how much the 40, 60 or 80 dollars that they accrue from this benefit means to them individually. To us it may not mean very much but to a person who's on fixed income, who is trying to meet the ever rising tides and meet their minimum requirements and trying to face the ever rising cost of living, this benefit is one of the small bright spots in their lives. I want to commend the Sponsor on this. I think that anything that we can do in terms of trying to give any relief to our Senior Citizens, who was responsible for the basic foundations of the benefit that we are accruing in our younger years, is something that we should address in a positive manner. Nothing, nothing is perfect, but this is something that will help many of the Senior Citizens in terms of their ever emerging fight toward maintaining a style of living comparable of something that we all approach and think of as simply a way of life. I commend you and I would solicit the support of everybody in the House on House Bill 44."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "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 Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Many of us, I'm sure, have discovered when filling out applications forms for our Senior Citizen constituents that it is not uncommon, even with the Circuit Breaker, for them to end up paying over 10 percent of their income in property taxes. Now in my opinion, that's intolerable. All of us have focused in on the 4 percent triggering device that's in the present Circuit Breaker Bill. And some of us, including myself, thought that the productivity feature that is in the current Bill meant that the Senior Citizens were paying just a little bit more than 4 percent of their income in Real Estate Taxes. That is just not the case. We know what the solution to this problem is, we just do not have the money. And



the money, which Representative Ewell mentioned, the 16 to 18 million dollars, is what it would have cost to fully fund House Bill 44. House Bill 44, as amended, will cost approximately 11.6 million dollars. That's the best estimate we have and I admit that is a soft estimate. This is offset by at least a 10 million dollar savings, which is also...I say atleast, it is also a soft estimate but about as hard as you can get in this field. 10 million dollars will be saved because we will cut off prior year applications. As with the original Bill, there is still a progressivity feature built into this Bill. Now, for example, if you happen to be earning 25 hundred dollars a year and your tax bill is 9 hundred dollars, under the present formula, you're still going to be...your grant will only be \$375. That means you're going to be paying \$525 in taxes. Now that is over 10 percent of your income. Under this new option, you will get back, instead of \$375, \$775. Now I'd respectfully suggest that the speaker against this Bill, really hasn't...has not had time to fully analyze what the impact is. I would suggest that the substantial increase in assistance to someone I would consider poor. At least I think that 25 hundred dollars for a Senior Citizen would be considered poor. There's not much else to say except I think this Bill may have a chance of getting signed because it's not going to cost the Governor too much money. And I would respectfully ask the House's support of the Amendment or of the Bill, as amended."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise not to explain my vote but to ask unanimous permission for everyone who votes for this Bill to be listed as a Cosponsor. Because if this Bill is passed that will mean every House Member can campaign for reelection and say they Cosponsored the Bill that passed whereas, of course, only one Senator will be able to say that."





Speaker Redmond: "Please don't put me on involuntarily, I remember 990.

The Director of Local Government Affairs had some nice things to say about that. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. 165 'aye' and no 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared past. If you'll pardon an observation from the Chair, it took us about 15 minutes on a Bill that didn't have any negative votes. Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "Well, I would ask leave to add everyone as Cosponsors except yourself, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "We're going to have a Democratic conference immediately and in Room 114 on the subject matter of Workmen's Compensation and Unemployment Compensation. I ask all the Democrats to go down there promptly. We'll get the business of the conference over with and get back up on the floor in 45 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since the rules provide that a conference can not meet while the House is in Session, I would suggest that the appropriate procedure is for a motion to recess and I would argue against that motion. I think that on Workmen's Comp. and all these other issues we know how we're going to vote. We're coming up against a deadline and I would...object to the calling of a conference while the House is in Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, I don't think it's a good precedent for Members to object to calling a conference. The conference is a Democratic process and if we're going to start walking on each other's request, they've always been granted as a matter of courtesy. I think we're going to be in a lot of trouble, so I think..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor, for what purpose do you rise."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I join Representative Kane in objecting to that conference being called at this time."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm very reluctant to rise to oppose a recess for a conference because I have in the past requested conferences. But the last conference we had, I think, was suppose to be directed toward this issue and no one showed up to discuss it and we didn't get at it. And additionally, we seem to be under a deadline crunch. If we recess now I'm afraid we're not going to be in full Membership when we come back and many Members have Bills up here which are controversial, which are important to their district and important to the State of Illinois and I don't think we should be in recess when we're facing a strict deadline. I question whether it's advisable and if we have a conference, I think we ought to give notice to the Members at some point certain. Maybe in an hour or an hour and a half or two hours. But to call it at this time, I think, is inopportune."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly support Representative Hart and the fact of this conference taking place. You know, Representative Kane says we all know how we're going to vote on these issues. Well, I think there's some things that have to be discussed and they should only be discussed in conference and as far as important issues to our districts, this is going to effect all of our districts and I certainly hope that we can proceed and call a conference at this time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I would suggest that the proper procedure, under the circumstances, is for somebody to put a motion to recess and it requires a majority of the..."

Farley: "Mr. Speaker, I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Representative Hart, the Chairman of the conference, perhaps... Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you rise? Will the Gentleman standing between Representative McMaster and the Chair sit down."

McMaster: "Mr..Speaker, would it be unfair at this time, before you



Gentlemen decide whether you're going to conference or not, to find out from Representative Matijevich when we're going to adjourn tonight?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I move that we recess for 45 minutes for a Democratic conference in Room 114."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's... Representative Kane."

Kane: "I move to lay that motion on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart has moved that we recess for 45 minutes for the purpose of a conference. Representative Kane has moved that that motion lie on the table. The question is on... Representative Matijevich. It's not debatable you told me yesterday."

Matijevich: "Well I want to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Kane's motion to lie, Representative Hart's motion for a 45 minute recess. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The motion is to lie it on the table. Have all voted who wished? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I notice that there are a lot of Republicans voting 'on this motion to table. But this really involves a Democratic affair and I think...I'm pleading with... I'm not even going to go to the caucus but I'm pleading with Mr. Kane to remove his objection because he well knows that a certain percentage of Democrats can ask for a caucus and we've always honored that. And as long as a certain percentage wants a caucus, I think he ought to honor that. I'm not going to it and I've made up my mind. I've gone to too many caucuses and they've never really enlightened me too much. But I think as long as some Democrats feel enlightened, if they go, he ought to let them go."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to echo Representative Matijevich and I say to my Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this is a Democratic matter and I



think, in all deference to us Democrats that sometime have many scraps among ourselves, I...we would appreciate it if we can see a truly reflective vote on the board and I would ask that, in all deference, if they could allow us to fight it out among ourselves and let us just vote on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian... Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I have a point of information. I would like to know what the very next Bill is that will be on the agenda and also would like to know when the first Workmen's Comp. or Unemployment Comp. case is coming up, to see how much time we have."

Speaker Redmond: "The next Bill is 254. Priority of Call, you'll see that... I don't know what the subject matter of all these Bills are but the order is 455, 459, 492 I understand, will be out of the record, 583, 704, 810, 842, 849, 851, 853, 858."

Mugalian: "Excuse me... All I was asking... I wonder if the Sponsor of the Workmen's Comp or Unemployment Comp. could tell us about when the case is on the agenda."

Speaker Redmond: "Any of the Bills on the Priority of Call that are Workmen's Compensation Bills? 853, I think is. Is that the first Workmen's Comp. Bill? That's Representative Daniels. It's about 10 Bills down. Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, maybe to facilitate this we could take this motion out of the record and we could try to work it out on our side of the aisle and just go on with the legislation before us and maybe we could resolve our differences on whether to have a conference or what the agenda could be and make it a productive conference, then get right back to it. If we could maybe take this..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know how we'd do that. It's a motion and we've taken... We put the question."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the maker of the motion... Well the motion's going to lie on the table, the way the vote is. We could take the motion out of the record and just proceed on the legislation...work out the conference."



Speaker Redmond: "I don't know how... I don't know how I could do it. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 72 'aye' and 57 'no'. The motion to lie...the motion for recess prevails. 254."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 254. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this Bill and vie for any questions or comments and then ask that... the joint Sponsor, Representative Byers, to close before the vote. I'll be very brief. This is an issue that's been before us before. I think all of you are familiar with it. This provides a construction for the State Board of Elections. It consists of five people to be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of three-fifths of the Senate. This is the result of Supreme Court decisions, which has ruled unconstitutional, the existing requirements in law for the appointment of these people to the board and for the tiebreaking provision, which was basically the drawing of straws. It also sets up a procedure whereby the board's day to day operation is under the direction of an Executive Director and the board members meet to discuss and vote on policy and let the day to day operation go to their full time employees of the board. I think it's a good Bill and I would ask the support of this chamber for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been debated, I think, a number of times and most everyone knows what's in it and as Representative Kempiners has amply described the Bill, it is backed both by the Independent Voters of Illinois and Common Cause and I would recommend an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

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



voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 37 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 455."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 455. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan. Houlihan, James. 455."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'll take that out of the record."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I understand there was some opposition to that motion to recess for a caucus because of the last Bill, which it had nothing to do with it. Now that that last Bill is out of the way, I move that we recess for 45 minutes for the purpose of a Democratic Caucus."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I move to lay that motion on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich has moved that we recess for 45 minutes. Representative Kane has moved that that motion lie on the table. It's not debatable. It is not debatable, we've ruled that 100 times. Representative... The question is on the motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. We have ruled that time and time and time again.  
Robert's Rules of Order... Robert's Rules of Order. Representative Hart."

Hart: "I just want to make an observation. I have always thought that the City of Springfield could make a lot of money if it would charge admission at the city limits when the Legislature is in Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted... Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to explain my 'aye' vote to lay this motion on the table. We don't need a recess at this time. We're moving along. The caucuses that I've been to over the last three months have produced absolutely no information or direction and I see absolutely



no reason for recessing at this point for a caucus that nobody is going to go to. And I would urge an 'aye' vote to lay that motion on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to explain my nonvoting. It's apparent that what we have here is a split within one side of the House and it seems to me the decision to be made within that one side of the House should be made by that side and not by any of the Members of this side. I'm staying out of it, it's their decision."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I confess that I'm absolutely astounded at the Minority Party voting against the Majority Party to have a caucus. That means that we can keep the Republicans from having a caucus anytime we want to. They really have got to be not aware of what they're doing because frankly, in our hands from this point on will rest whether we ever let them have a caucus again."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 59 'aye' and 69 'no'. The Gentleman's motion loses. Now, we'll revert to Representative Matijevec's motion that we now recess for 45 minutes for the purpose of a Democratic caucus. The question is on that motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. We'll now recess for 45 minutes. Room 114."

Doorkeeper: "All persons... Testing. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order, the Members please be in their seats. The Order is Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading on which Joint Resolution 27 appears. Representative Hudson, do you want to handle this for Representative Greiman? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I'd like to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 44. I was absent from the floor and



it will not change the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Representative Byers objects.

It takes unanimous consent. Representative Dyer has moved that House Joint Resolution 27 to be put on the Consent Calendar. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection... Seconded by Representative Hudson. Messages from the Senate. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 353. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 451. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 458. A Bill for an Act in relation to Executive Orders. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 538. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to Fire Protection Districts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 590. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Board Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1200. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "If you go over to the Senate you'll have to wear your coat in the Senate, Representative Laurino. Kosinski has entered the Chamber. Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "I'm just glad I went to the caucus, I enjoyed it."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I wish you'd go down to 114 and get the rest of the Members, they're still down there. Tell them that the show is over and that... I said the good Kosinski had entered the Chamber. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If it's appropriate at this time, I would request leave of the House to suspend the necessary rules for posting for Bills in Appropriations II on Tuesday, May 24th. There's a list of Bills. I'd like to read them. This has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle so that they know what





the Bills are. House Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Bills, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "House Bill 974. House Bill 1005. House Bill 1226. House Bill 2269. House Bill 2372. House Bill 2384. House Bill 2391. Senate Bill 344. Senate Bill 428. Senate Bill 1098 and Senate Bill 1199. All of those Bills will be heard Tuesday, May 24th at 2:00 p.m. in Appropriations II."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave was granted previously. Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner, right down here in the blue shirt and the red tie."

Skinner: "Leave was granted to Representative Barnes to post? Gene?"

Speaker Redmond: "Leave was granted."

Skinner: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I'd like to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 44. I was absent at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Representative Kane objected, so you don't have unanimous consent. Well he was right here and he yelled at me. Representative Matijeovich. Representative Matijeovich."



Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 35(g) so that the May 21 deadline for hearing the following Bills on Third Reading be extended until June 4, and that the Bills be placed on the Calendar under the Order of Substantive Bills awaiting companion Appropriation Bills. House Bill 41, 219, 555, 715, 820, 993, 1025, 1030, 1046, 1059, 1091, 1098, 1178, 1390, 1428, 1571, 1633, 1835, 1942, 2000, 2127, 2212 and leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose."

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

Schlickman: "Question of the mover."

Matijeich: "You're the shaker, I'm the mover. Go ahead."

Schlickman: "What is Rule 35(g), John?"

Matijeich: "That's the deadline, May 21 deadline and I'm extending that two weeks to June 4..."

Schlickman: "What is the characterization of these Bills?"

Matijeich: "These are all substantive Bills with companion Appropriation Bills."

Schlickman: "Okay, thank you, John."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker. do we have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, may I add House Bill 1822 to the list, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Chairman."

Matijevich: "Is that substantive..."

Catania: "Yes, it is awaiting House Bill 2393, which is on Second Reading."

Matijevich: "All right, 1820 what?"

Catania: "1822."

Matijevich: "All right, add 1822, Mr. Clerk, on that list."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be recorded 'aye' on..."

Speaker Redmond: "No, I can't entertain that motion now. It would put me in a great spot here. Representative Peters... Representative Ryan... Peters shows up everywhere."

Peters: "Will the... John, our staff people have talked to you about 2 or 3 Bills. Were they taken off that?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Sir. Those have been removed."

Peters: "All right, just one more question. Is 2313 on that list, John?"

Matijevich: "No, it's not. Should it be there?"

Peters: "I think it...I think it should."

Matijevich: "All right, 2313."

Peters: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "Do we have leave?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. We'll use the Attendance Roll Call on that. Representative Matijevich."



Matijeich: "Yes, now Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to suspend Rule 18, the posting provision, so that the following Bills, originally posted for Wednesday, May 25th, can be heard in Appropriations I Committee on Tuesday, May 24, in Room 114 at 2:00 p.m. We received word that the Appropriations Committee, in addition to meeting Wednesday, will also meet on Tuesday at 2:00 p.m. The Bills are 643, 715, 1023, 1031, 1047, 1090, 1092, 1349, 1369, 1391, 1439, 1637, 1808, 1834, 1943, 2001, 2077, 2126, 2213, 2292, 2296, 2356, 2359, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2381, 2383, 2396 and Senate Bill 342. Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call?"

Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "That's all. Good-night."

Speaker Redmond: "We have another expatriarch here. Senator D'Arco.

Do that again, please, I didn't have any film. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Could I have leave? I've been told that when I mentioned those Bills, Substantive Bills, I said 715 and it should have been 714. Have you got that, Jack? 714, rather than 715."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich has another idea."

Matijeich: "No, I was told that...put those on Substantive awaiting companion Appropriation Bills. There are some of those Bills that are Postponed Consideration. Those must remain on Postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "All right. Representative Geo-Karis wants to..."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, some of us, in good faith, did not go out to eat. We didn't move out of this chamber, thinking in 45 minutes, an hour at the latest we'd get to resume business. Now, we've been gone almost 2 hours. I think it's high time we put the show on the road or quit tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. 583."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 583. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unified



Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

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

Bill 583 would establish a uniform statewide probation program, which would take about 2 years to gear up, so that it would take the Administrative Officer of the Illinois Courts, Judge Gulley, that length of time to coordinate efforts with the chief Circuit Judges of the courts. But the program, when it was finally going would provide that there would be uniform probation in each of the counties. The problem right now, of course, is that the authority of probation is extremely uneven. Occasionally one finds an excellent individual probation program, such as that run by Judge Earl Strayhorn, in Cook County, who has taken it upon himself to take a personal interest in his probationers. But in Cook County, for example, a typical probation officer has 200 clients to receive. And throughout the state in the other 101 counties, some have good probation programs, others have poor ones, others have none at all. This would establish a program in which the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts would set standards to be observed by the individual circuit. But beyond that, the circuits would control their own probation system. They would appoint from lists provided by the Circuit Courts but they would appoint their own officers to oversee the running of their probation programs, as well as ancillary supported programs. This Bill was testified on extensively in Judiciary II. It has also had extensive hearings in the Judiciary II Subcommittees on Probation over the last couple of years. Judge Roy Gulley said that this was his first choice as a suitable Probation Bill in Illinois. It has his full support. It is also supported by the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association, the Urban Counties Council, the League of Women Voters and numerous other organizations. I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the matter of probation



is a vital issue within this state in terms of criminal justice. Also, in terms of..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise? Please come to order. The younger generation, be quiet."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I took 455 out of the record. 459 was on the Priority of Call. We did not call that. Is there some reason that Bill has been skipped over and we went to 583?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's my intention to go back to that one next. Proceed with 583."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I mentioned earlier, the subject of criminal justice is a very vital and critical issue. And more specifically, that of probation. Because it's through probation that we have the opportunity of promoting a reduction in the rates by which crime is repeated. Now, the Judiciary II Committee considered three different approaches to the matter of probation. and a statewide probation system. One Bill by Representative Getty, as I recall, there was another Bill that had bipartisan Sponsorship and then the Bill presently under consideration. Each of them approaches the matter somewhat differently but each of them is on the same road, headed towards the same direction. Now, as the Sponsor of this Bill mentioned, her ... ideally is the best of the three. It also happens to be the most expensive of the three in terms of appropriations. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this House take the same approach as the Judiciary II Committee. And that is to pass it out so that more time can be given to take these three Bills through the Legislative process and come up with a compromise that will be acceptable, particularly with respect to the fiscal aspects. If I had my druthers, if the money was available, I would enthusiastically support 583. If it was the only Bill, I'd certainly vote for it. But I do think, in terms of the process, this Bill ought to be passed and you can be assured that one of the three Bills



that we have...had under consideration, including this one, normally would be back to us by Conference Committee and thereafter on the Governor's desk. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I notice by the Digest here about the fiscal impact, could you give us some type of a fiscal impact. I see where it says there's no fiscal impact as far as this fiscal year, 78, but what is the fiscal impact in the future. Just give me...in round figures give me a range of what we're talking about."

Catania: "There has since been a Fiscal Note filed, which was submitted by Judge Roy Gulley from the Illinois Supreme Court. It says that in Fiscal 78 he would spend approximately \$254,800 and it would be about the same in Fiscal 79. But we are talking about a uniform statewide probation system, in which all of the probation officers would go on the state payroll so that in the future, perhaps in Fiscal Year 80 or 81, the fiscal impact in total would be approximately 18 million dollars. But I would point out that federal money is available for that and in the Bill the Division of Probation is empowered to seek such funding."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... Mr. Speaker, I can't hear too well but I thought the response was something like the fiscal impact... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Gentleman standing between Representative Ebbesen and the chair please be seated. Your noise tolerance is not very high."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Did you say the fiscal impact, Representative Catania, was 18 million dollars?"

Catania: "Representative Ebbesen, I said that for Fiscal Year 79 and for Fiscal Year 80, for each of those years, the Fiscal Note that's now on file with the Clerk says \$254,800 each year. After that, however, since we would be putting probation officers around the state on a state payroll, the total impact would be between 18 and 20 million dollars once the system is going, in about



Fiscal Year 81. But the federal money is available to help with that and under the Bill, the Division of Probation in the office of the courts would be empowered to seek that federal funding."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill and I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and perhaps Representative Catania can respond. But we're talking about, according to the Digest, the effective date of this Bill is July 1, 1979, which would mean Fiscal Year 1980. And we're talking roughly in the next two years of only a little over \$100,000. But when we go from \$100,000 to implement what she's talking about, even with federal funds...and I know...even if it was on a fifty-fifty basis and I would like some information, if she will respond, maybe in explaining it in her vote or in closing. What we're talking about... To commit ourselves to go from \$100,000 plus to something two years from now, millions of dollars, I think everybody in this House should take quick note of this in terms of this particular piece of legislation. As it stands right at this particular time, I'd have to be in opposition to the Bill, unless what she has to say later would change my mind."

Speaker: "Representative Deuster. Please come to order."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for one or two questions, Representative Catania, would this proposal relieve our counties of the present expenditure in connection with probation services?"

Catania: "Yes, Representative Deuster, that's precisely what it would do and it would guarantee that we would have uniform probation around the state. Right now the level is very spotty. But this would completely take the burden off the counties and it is strongly supported by the Urban Counties Council for that reason."

Deuster: "My second question is, could you outline one or two or three or four of the benefits that would result with respect to,





oh, either the caseload or the training or anything else. What would be the improvements that we might expect, oh, in say Lake County or some other county as a result of this that you would envision?"

Catania: "There would be uniform training and orientation as probation officers. There would be inservice training, there would be support services, there would be just a whole range of advantages, which almost none of the counties now have. As I said, even in Cook County, the quality of probation is spotty. We have some individual instances of excellent probation. Judge Earl Strayhorn, for instance, has a personal interest in it. But, probation officers for adult services in Cook County, have caseloads of about 200 people and they simply find it impossible to communicate with those people and this has a direct result in flooding the courts. You know, they can't keep track of their probationers. This is what results in the repeat offender syndrome and as we all know, if we don't regulate the probationers they get in trouble again and they end up in the prison system, where they cost us \$10,000 a year."

Deuster: "My last question is this, I guess this would be one of the advantages, but I wanted you to indicate whether it's so or not. Would, as caseloads from one county to another shift or differ in severity, would it be possible for the probation people to be shifted from one county to another to assist, since I gather they would be under the supervision of the state rather than the county. Would that be possible or is that not one of the benefits?"

Catania: "It certainly could move within circuits, because they would be regulated by the chief judge in each circuit under the regulation of the Administrative Office of the courts. So there would be total flexibility within a circuit and I would expect that from circuit to circuit there might be some exchange."

Deuster: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion?? The Gentleman from LaSalle, {  
Mr. Anderson."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicated he will."

Anderson: "Susan, is this Bill modeled after any other State's  
legislation that's now on the books?"

Catania: "This was developed originally by the Council on Evaluation  
and Diagnosis of Criminal Defendants here in Illinois. After  
extensive consideration of the problem, it is really, essentially  
an Illinois product. It has also had, as I said, thorough  
Subcommittee hearings in the House Judiciary II Committee. But  
is really tailored to the Illinois system, where probation is  
handled in the courts."

Anderson: "All right. I'm serving on a Subcommittee on Prison. And  
one of the things here in Illinois is probation has gone down  
from the national average of 43% to 37%. This is one of the  
reason the prison population is suppose to skyrocket in the  
next couple of years. Do you see any way that this Bill is  
going to help with that problem?"

Catania: "Yes, absolutely. As I said, many probation officers in  
Illinois now have a caseload of over 200 people and that means  
that they simply can not have a personal relationship, which  
is the key to good probation, with each of their clients.  
Consequently, we see people coming in as repeat offenders.  
So, people on probation are committing crimes and this is  
the cycle that we're seeing repeated, which is being blamed,  
by many people, for the rising crime rate. And the increasing  
prison population, because obviously the judge has been under  
pressure to take people off probation and put them in prison,  
where they cost \$10,000 a year to the taxpayer. So this  
ultimately is a very cost effective approach to part of the  
corrections problem."

Anderson: "Would it also mandate that the prisoners on probation will  
be watched more closely and more uniformly than our present  
system?"



Catania: "Absolutely, because it does provide for orientation and training as well as inservice programs for probation officers. So they will be able to do a better job of counseling and developing good relations with their probationers. So, it is an essential part of a good probation...good corrections program. We heard testimony in Judiciary II that it had to go hand in hand, for instance, with the Determinate Sentencing Bill, which we just passed, that Representative Getty sponsored earlier this afternoon."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed, the previous question has been moved. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In closing, I would like to point out that this is a program which will be cost effective. It is an essential part of a good corrections program. The Governor has told us that we must seriously address the corrections program in Illinois. The Federal Courts are now telling us the same thing. This Bill is supported wholeheartedly by the Illinois Office of the Supreme Court, the Illinois Probation Court Services Association, the Urban Counties Council and numerous other organizations. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 583 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Hart: "Well thank you very... I hadn't intended to speak on this Bill at all, but there needs to be a county...a statewide system of probation. I happen to live in a county in a second judicial circuit, which immediately adjoins counties in the first judicial



circuit and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Hart: "I live in a county that's in the first circuit and adjoins counties in the second circuit and we've had people who go on probation from Williamson County, for instance, that live in Franklin County and they can commit, go ahead and commit violations in Franklin County that would have revoked their probation in Williamson County and nobody knows about it. And so there's no correlation between the circuits, as far as the probation system is concerned..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Catania has described the situation exactly when she says that Judge Gulley of the Administrative...the Court Administrative Office has said that this is the ideal Bill. It can not be afforded at this time. However, I don't think this Bill calls for any expenditure of money. I don't think it's a bad idea to put it into the legislative process in order to have that goal in front of us. There are several other Bills on statewide probation and I support all of them. Representative Houlihan has a Bill, Representative Getty has passed a Bill and I think that this is the goal ultimately that we are seeking. And I think we ought to get toward that goal and set it up there as something that we have to achieve. For that reason, I would strongly recommend an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman. The timer is on."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Schuneman: "Susan, did I understand...did you make the statement that this Bill would cost something in the area of 14 million dollars in two years?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Catania."



Catania: "Ultimately, Representative Schuneman, it will cost between 18 million and 20 million for this. But as I said, Federal Funding is available and that totally relieves the counties of the burden of probation and it establishes uniform probation throughout the state, which then results in less expenditure in the Department of Corrections. Where, as you know, cost is skyrocketing."

Schuneman: "What will be the ultimate cost to the State of Illinois?"

Catania: "As I said, it will be between 18 and 20 million dollars, overall. But there will be Federal Funds available and it will be reduced from..."

Schuneman: "Well how much will it cost the State of Illinois? You say there are Federal Funds available..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. We're on explanation of votes. I believe your questions are out of order. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jones, was that your point? The point is well taken. Any further explanation of votes? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, very briefly, I think the Lady has put a great deal of time, thought into the particular problem. I don't have all the answers for all problems, nor do I think that this Bill is all things to all men. Nor is any Bill all things to all men. But I think it's worthy of consideration. I think we ought to pass it over to the Senate. They're probably going to modify all of the Bills anyway and we will get the proper choice back to us and this seems a fair way to do it. I would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

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

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that this Bill ought to pass too. Because, my observation is that there is many a prosecutor and many a judge that is not being given the proper advice and proper assistance by the probation officers in this state. Because the officers are untrained and ill-equipped to handle the...the people who are coming before them that they



have to judge in terms of whether or not they are to be given the benefits or denied parole and probation. I think that this is a breakdown in the whole judicial system in Illinois and that one of the most important things that needs to be done is that we need to assist these people and we ought to assist the Judges."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to point out, as the Sponsor did, that this Bill is not going to cost the state more than a couple hundred thousand dollars for the next, I think, year and a half. So, that certainly fits in with the call to keep the expenditures down. It is a good approach. Those of us who are law and order and who sat on the Adult Corrections Subcommittee, heard over and over again from police officers, that the one area that would really improve the administration of justice and keep criminals from coming back into the system would be an effective probation system. There is no such thing at the present time and that is the single most often repeated reason, by the law enforcement people, the Chief of Police, a lot of people keep coming back into the criminal justice system. So unless..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As I pointed out, what we have on our hands in corrections is a very serious problem right now. We have 10,000 people in the Illinois Department of Corrections..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Whoever got that balloon, kindly put it away. Mrs. Catania, please continue, I'll start the clock all over again. Mrs. Catania, please proceed."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the Department of Corrections we have such serious problems, there are three federal law suits pending and what this Bill does is to address that problem where it starts. In many cases, which is with the probation system, to give the probation officers a chance to



function in the way that they would like to function, which is in a way that will help their clients instead of getting their clients deeper into the criminal justice system, where it only ends up costing us a great deal of money. I ask for your support of this Bill. We need seven more green lights."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, what's your point?"

Greiman: "Well, I have a problem. I think we have a rule about passing things that are informational. And it seems to me if we would restrict ourselves and if we can't pass out information we certainly ought to not be passing out advertising promotions. I can't believe that the Speaker gave permission to pass out balloons."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe that is out of order. The balloons will be removed from the chamber of the floor on both... Well, just throw them away. And the Doorkeepers will be ordered to throw them away. You know, I know it's been a long day. It's been a long couple weeks. But in turn, I believe, that every Member of this House should have an opportunity to present his Bill in an orderly fashion. And the Lady is asking for your attention on a very important Bill, in her estimation. And she's entitled to the decorum and the attention of this floor. And I don't...I believe that it's demeaning in many ways to see balloons being passed out, busted on this floor at any time. And I would hope the Member who is passing them out would eliminate that procedure. And I would hope that the Membership would give proper attention to every Bill that is presented to this House. And I would hope that the House would be in a proper frame of mind and mood so that everybody is listening.

The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, it may be a good idea in this Bill but I can tell you it's only a chip in the iceberg. The money you're going to spend this year is just the seed money that's going to



millions of dollars down the road. There's another thing I don't like about this Bill and this is the beginning of the aspiration of power by the Supreme Court and the court system, which is now becoming a little empire all of its own. They want it to be out of politics and yet they say they want to take over this system and take over that. And this is just another power grab."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 'ayes', 44 'nays', 17 recorded as 'present'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't know."

Peters: "Please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're taking the Roll Call, we'll be with you in one second. According to my records, you're voting as 'no'. We'll check it with the Clerk. Mr. Clerk, how is Representative Peters recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly change him to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McMaster: "Will you please change me from 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative McMaster as 'no'. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to delay this House by a verification but there are dozens of switches around here being voted and the people are not here. And again, just through courtesy and interest of time, I'm not going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen, could we kindly ask that you be in your own seats and kindly as...no... No, he said he would...kindly ask that you vote your own switch. We'll dump that Roll Call and we'll go with another Roll





Call. Dump that Roll Call. The question is, shall House Bill 583 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell, to explain his vote. Kindly vote your own switch."

Caldwell: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this measure, I think it's a good Bill. In weigh of the fact that Representative Getty, I think, has gotten a Bill out of here earlier this Session, it's probably over in the Senate. And I see no reason why this Bill shouldn't go out. It's well drafted. As a former probation officer, I'm aware of the fact that we have probation officers who probably have two other jobs. And that accounts for some of the...recidivism that is occurring in our jails. And I think it is high time that we did develop a statewide system and have real professionals doing this work. And I think the state would save money in the long run..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Roll. On this question there are 82 'ayes', 36 'nays', 11 recorded as 'present'. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, may I have a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, you may, Ma'am. Just waiting till the Clerk gets the Roll Call. The Clerk will proceed to call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Beatty. Bluthardt. Brady. Brandt. Rich Brummer. Capparelli. Dawson. Domico. John Dunn. Edgar. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Griesheimer. Harris. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Dave Jones. Kelly..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Representative Dave Jones wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Excuse me... The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, if this Bill receives the votes for passage on this, I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We heard you."



Clerk O'Brien: "Kornowicz. Kosinski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Coles, for what purpose do you seek... Would you kindly record Representative Edgar as 'aye'. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino. Madigan. Madison. Mann. Marovitz. Lynn Martin. McBroom. McLendon. Mudd. Nardulli. O'Daniel. Pechous. Richmond. Schumpert. Simms. Stanley. Stearney. Taylor. Terzich. Van Dwyne. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the call? On this question there are 84 'ayes', 36 'nays', 11 'present'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania. Record Representative Kelly as voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Could you record me as 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "85 'ayes'. The Lady asks leave for Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objection it's Postponed Consideration. House Bill 459. Representative James Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 459. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 459 provides that no appointee to the State Board of Elections can involve himself or herself in partisan politics while that person is an appointee of the State Board of Elections. Representative Lechowicz and others have indicated that this is a good Bill. What it provides is that we take out political involvement by those Members who are making decisions about how the political process should run. How the electoral process should run. I think there should be general agreement on this Bill. It's a simple Bill and it provides equity in the system and I would urge an 'aye' vote for House Bill 459."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "What is the basis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Houlihan, there's a question."

Schlickman: "What is the basis for appointment to the present  
Board of Elections, which has been declared unconstitutional?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's not germane."

Schlickman: "Well, what is the basis for the appointment to the  
State Board of Elections?"

Houlihan: "I believe the basis of the appointment is that the  
Governor should appoint, from those recommendations of the  
Legislature, people that the Legislature deemed to be  
qualified to serve as board members of the State Board of  
Elections."

Schlickman: "Isn't it true that there shall be an equal division  
of the membership on account of political belief?"

Houlihan: "There is a provision which no party shall have more than  
two or a majority of members on the board. But, Representative  
Schlickman, what we're addressing here is not party affiliation  
but rather party activity at the time that the person is  
serving on the Board of Elections."

Schlickman: "How do you determine an individual's belief without  
allowing that person to be actively engaged in the implementation  
of his or her belief?"

Houlihan: "Representative Schlickman, an individual can participate  
in elections, can vote, but what he's required to do is avoid  
over practice in promoting one party by partisan politics.  
And he makes that sacrifice on serving on the Board of Elections.  
And I think it's legitimate and valid that he do that because  
we have to have the Board of Elections above and beyond the  
partisan contests that go on at election time."

Schlickman: "Well, when you talk about partisanship, you talk about  
participation in the two party system. Is that correct?

What is so dirty or obscene either about being an active Democrat



or an active Republican."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Schlickman, do you have any questions on the Bill or do you want to address yourself to the Bill?"

Schlickman: "Well, that was not a rhetorical question. I'd like to know what's in the mind of that Gentleman that suggests that there's something dirty or obscene about being either an active Democrat or an active Republican."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Knowing Mr. Houlihan, he has nothing dirty or obscene in his mind at any time."

Schlickman: "Well, what's in his mind at all?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "His wife and family. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get back to you, if you behave yourself."

Harris: "I'd like to speak in opposition the Bill 459. I'm a former member of the State Board of Elections and I was a County Chairman, Chairman of the 24th District and Vice-Chairman of the state. There's a member serving on there now by the name of Don Adams, who's Chairman of the Republican Party. There are people in this, Democrat, Republicans, we're not second class citizens, we should be allowed to serve on any board in this state. I feel like this is wrong. It's dead wrong. There's nothing right about it. I just...I feel like if there are two members that were on there that held political office were just as good as any other two. The two on there now have...maybe don't hold a political office. They're real good members. But there shouldn't be any guidelines that you can not hold any political office, such as Chairman or State Representative or State Senator. That is not right and we all know it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Pierce: "Mr. Houlihan, I take it your rationale for the Bill is, if



the people that administer elections should be somewhat separated from the political melee and have a...some, even though they belong to a party and vote, or they should not be involved in day to day political affairs and should be somewhat insulated from politics. Is that correct?"

Houlihan: "From the time that they are serving on the board and making decisions which would effect the outcome of those elections, I...I feel that they should not be involved. That's correct. That they should not be actively involved in the political melee while they're making decisions and how that decision will be effected."

Pierce: "Well, if that's so, then wouldn't the same principal apply to County Clerks? Don't County Clerks administer elections? Make decisions on petitions for County office, on objections to petitions? Don't County Clerks administer the polling places and pass the ballots and so on at elections, why don't you extend this Bill to prohibit County Clerks who administer elections from being involved in the political melee or the political thicket. Why don't we insulate them from all these, from all these partisan activities?"

Houlihan: "Representative Pierce, there's a major distinction between County Clerks and members of the State Board of Elections. One, County Clerk's run for election and if they get involved in partisan politics and operate inappropriately they can then be not retained. They can not be reelected. Additionally, when a County Clerk runs an election or an Election Commission runs an election, they...that procedure can be appealed to the State Board of Elections, which is the ultimate authority with regard to those elections. And I think that that makes a major distinction between County Clerks, which are administering our election law."

Pierce: "Well, thank you. I can see the theory of your Bill. Personally, I've always wondered, I know in Boards of Elections Commissioners, they don't involve themselves in day to day politics. They are...belong to a party. They are appointed because they belong to



a party but they try to avoid day to day partisan activity. But I always wondered why County Clerks administer elections in areas where there is no Board of Election Commissioners at the same time they're running for office. They're administering the very election when they're running for office. And to me, that's been wrong. I think maybe you should address yourself to that problem so that the election official of the county is not administering the very election where he's a candidate for reelection himself. That is an anachronism that I think should be changed and maybe you should address that in your next reformed proposal."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye'. All those opposed. In my opinion, the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative James Houlihan, to close."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, In the City of Chicago, the Election Commission which I am familiar with, the particular board members are specifically prohibited from being involved in partisan election activities. Mr. Canary, who was Chairman of that board for a period of time, indicated to me...Francis D. Canary..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Houlihan: "That the Commission had felt that that was a good rule. I think it's a good rule for the State Board of Elections. I'm sorry, Representative Schlickman, that you have such strong feelings about this Bill but I think if you would examine it, there is a logic and a philosophy behind this Bill which is consistent. Which says that no member, who is monitoring the elections, who is the ultimate source of disputed decisions being rendered, would be a person who should be involved in that dispute. It's a basic separation of those powers and a



distinction... I don't think we ought to have someone who is either the State Chairman or the County Chairman or an elected partisan official being involved in those decisions as to how those elections are determined. That is in no way a suggestion that those people are not good, that their involvement is not appropriate or that it's not something desirable. It's just that while they're serving in the position to make a determination on those issues, it is wrong."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 459 pass?

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'.  
The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am somewhat surprised that the Gentleman across the aisle is taking such strong exception to this. Certainly there's nobody in this House, who because of the very nature of our jobs, thinks that politics is dirty or obscene. But I would remind him that Judges may not participate in politics whatsoever because of the nature of their job. Board...Members of the Board of Elections, by nature of their job, in a sense, are judges too. And I think this is an excellent Bill. It makes absolutely good sense that members of this board should be removed from politics while they serve on it because they are the ultimate judges of many disputes that arise out of elections. If they are partisan, I don't see how they can be objective in their decisions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holewinski, to explain his vote."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I think this proposal is an entirely reasonable one. That is the practice that is generally found with the Chicago Board of Elections. It simply says that those who are making decisions, making judgements on...regarding electoral matters, shall not be actively engaged in political matters, which doesn't say that they should not be a Democrat or a Republican,



they indeed should be. But what it does say is that they should not be so active that it might interfere with their judgement in the matter. I think that this is a good proposal and I would encourage all of you who are not voting to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell, to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting 'no' and I don't want to take much time of the House but whether it be the judges or whether it be the State Board of Elections, you take the stripes off a zebra and he's still either a Republican zebra or a Democrat zebra. It doesn't make a damn bit of difference which."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, there may be some misunderstanding about this Bill. I'd like to poll the absentees and try to get it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "As soon as we get the record. The Gentleman asks a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes. Blüthardt. Rich Brummer. Caldwell. Daniels. Corneal Davis. Deuster. DiPrima. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Garmisa as 'aye'. Greisheimer. Hoffman. Kelly. Kempiners. Kornowicz. Leverenz. Luft. Luft 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Luft as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mann."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative DiPrima is 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino. McBroom. McLendon. Nardulli. Pechous. Porter. Pullen. Schoeberlein. Schumpert. Stearney. Taylor. Telcser. Tipword."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword,





wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Wikoff. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman... Representative Taylor wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Taylor. Schumpert 'aye', Yourell 'aye', Pechous 'aye'. Representative Gaines, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman...Mr. Von Boeckman, how do you want to be recorded? He wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Von Boeckman. The Gentleman from Tazewell. No... The Gentleman asks leave to have this on Postponed Consideration. Leave is granted. House Bill 459 is Postponed Consideration. House Bill 704. Representative Tuerk. Before we proceed on that order of business, let me just ask that the House give us some order here. Ladies and Gentlemen, I know it's been a long day but let's give Representative Tuerk some order. House Bill 704. Thank you!"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 704. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the law on Teacher's Retirement today provides that any period after July 1, 1963, for which a teacher took an authorized leave of absence, would get credit for the time that that person was on leave of absence. Now, there's nothing magic about that date in 1963. It just so happened that that's the date that's in the statute. Now, what House Bill 704 proposes to do is to roll back that date to 1955. Now there happens to be 6 or 8 teachers who took authorized leaves back in that period between 55 and 63 that took an authorized leave and paid for their own expenses. And what these people would like is an opportunity to buy into the



system for that period of time in which they were on leave. As opposed to those who later in the system, when sabbaticals became very popular and were allowed to take a leave of absence with pay and get the full credit for it. The people that were talking about here tonight are those people who paid their own expenses and were asking for a favorable vote of the House to allow those people to butt into the system at no expense to the State. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I know that there are some other people that want to speak on this particular Bill. I support Representative Tuerk's Bill 100%. I think that he's already outlined the changes. They're not major ones. There's no large impact in this particular Bill but I think it's a just Bill and it brings in...give continuity to the particular system that was changed as far as authorized leaves. And I would encourage everyone of the people that feel this way to support this Bill. I think it's a good one."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Beatty: "Could you tell me if this has been approved by the Pension Laws Committee or..."

Tuerk: "Pension Laws Commission? I don't know what their position is. This went through the Pensions Committee and it got a favorable Roll Call there."

Beatty: "What will be the position, financially, of the person who wants the pension. Will they be required to pay in their share? Will they be required to pay in interest? Will they pay in the employer's share?"

Tuerk: "They're going to pay the whole freight. They pay their own share and the State's share, with interest."

Beatty: "Thank you."



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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe I was here when the Bill was passed which allowed this up till 19...or back to 1963, but if I had been, I certainly would have opposed the Bill. We set up a bad precedence and I really can't see any justification for expanding that bad precedence. What we're being asked to do is permit teachers to get retirement credit for periods of time when they don't teach. This doesn't make sense. It's opposed, according to our staff analysis by the actuary and it has been in the past opposed by the Pension Laws Commission. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "A question of the Sponsor. The number that you gave, did that include those that were on sabbatical at that period, that you exempted?"

Tuerk: "To the best of my knowledge, about six or eight throughout the state that would be the beneficiary of this type of legislation. These are the people that are older and took their Masters and Doctor's Degrees at a time when they had to take their leaves and pay their own expenses all the way, lose their personal income at that time and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I did have two questions of the Sponsor but they have been answered. First of all, the fact that the number is few. Second, that they do have to pay or buy their way back into the pension. So I would like to speak in favor of the Bill and would ask your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question... The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk, to close."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think this subject has been covered well. The questions have been answered. It's



a few people involved here and I think it's a matter of equity and parity, I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 704 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 129 'aye', 7 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 810. Representative John Dunn. John Dunn. Take it out of the record. House Bill 842. Representative Terzich. Take it out of the record. House Bill 849. Representative Cunningham."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 849. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Code of Criminal Procedures. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the greatest pleasures I have in serving in the House with you incomparable people is the chance to be on the Law Revision Committee. It's under the able leadership of Representative Robert Terzich. And we are blessed by the wisdom of professor Harry Finns, a man who served without any remuneration. He's dedicated to the revising of the law to remove any inconsistencies that might it might be a perfect document as far as the printed statute is concerned. It was pointed out in the Law Revision Commission by States Attorney from Hancock County, his name is Patrick Corcoran. I don't know what his politics are but his letter indicates that he has a scholarly mean. And he made the observation that Chapter 38, Section 114, Subsection A, Sub-Sub 6, States... too long... Provides that there is statutory basis for... in criminal cases, they're enumerated there, six of them and one of them is that you make a motion to dismiss, based on a lack of jurisdiction. This State's Attorney observed that that's



archaic, in that since the adoption of the Civil Practice Act, 1933, Circuit Courts of the various counties have general jurisdiction. These are lawyer words, whether they be general or restricted jurisdiction. Prior to that time there were Circuit and County Courts and the jurisdiction of County Courts was restricted in certain types of criminal situations. The Law Revision Commission agreed with the...the observation of State's Attorney Corcoran, that that provision in the statute should be removed so that the law would be accurately reflected. And that's why I came here, at the direction of the Commission, to ask you to give a green light to House Bill 849."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would point out that this Bill, which does come from the Law Revision Commission did not come from the Judiciary Committee. Rather, it came from the Executive Committee and I'm not quite sure myself what the impact would be of this Bill. I have suggested to the Sponsor that I thought that this particular Bill should have been recommitted to the Judiciary I or the Judiciary II Committee, as were approximately 6 or 7 other Bills from the Law Revision Committee. And the Sponsor's of both Bills acceded to that request. What I am concerned about here, as far as not knowing what the impact of this does as far as removing a ground as a basis for a motion to dismiss a charge for lack of jurisdiction, is to how this ties to the criminal provision on venue. Now it's easy enough to say that we have a single Circuit Court, in consequence this is outdated. But the fact of the matter is, that this provision of the Criminal Code was approved in 1963, subsequent to the Judicial Article of 1962. Now there is no immediacy, as far as this Bill is concerned. If you would understand the Sponsor, that this is an archaic provision. Well if it's archaic, we've learned to live with it this long. We could learn



to live with it a few months longer, but at the same we could do it by having it referred to the appropriate Committee to review it, either Judiciary I or Judiciary II. And in view of the intransigence of the Sponsor to accept this request, I ask that we oppose the Bill."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Johnson: "Representative Cunningham, are you using the terminology 'jurisdiction' in its accurate legal sense or are you really talking about venue of a specific Circuit Court?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "The Commission is using it in its proper, legal sense.

Now, you might be making the argument that the jurisdiction there referred to the various types of judges, whether they be a Circuit Judge or an Associate Judge. It isn't that at all. The reference...is to the courts."

Johnson: "In speaking to the Bill then, I would rise in opposition to House Bill 849 and simply state that jurisdictional requirements in the civil aspect and in the criminal aspect are absolute requirements for taking of a valid judgement or in the case of a Criminal Court for obtaining..jurisdiction, I guess, in this broader sense, over a particular charge. And I don't see any purpose...I guess I'm really confused over what the intention of this is. But without more explanation than that, I would think that this is something we shouldn't tinker around with and I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this particular Bill did come through the Law Revision Commission. And regardless of what the opinion is of the previous speakers that the Commission does consist only of Legislators, which there are 10, of which 9 and I happen to be the only one who is not a lawyer. But this was recommended and we did go through Bills that were either unconstitutional or obsolete.



Granted, like Representative Houlihan did state, if it is unconstitutional, we can live with it. But at the same time, the Law Revision Commission did present 55 Bills this year to bring down the amount of statutes that we are carrying on our books. And with 2,000, over 2,000 Bills presented in this General Assembly, you can certainly appreciate why we should get some of them off the books rather than continuously putting them on. And I would urge support of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham, to close."

Cunningham: "I respectfully urge you to believe my great and good friend, Representative Houlihan, said that I was intransigent. What I am in this situation is victimized. I come in here on behalf of the Commission, at the urging of Professor Finns, after Representative Houlihan's lawyer, Lee Schwartz, approved the theory of the Bill. I ask you to believe that the Law Revision Commission is right. I pledge to you that if you'll get it over to the Senate that it will be referred to the Judiciary Committee in the Senate. I have absolutely no control over the fact that it went to the Executive Committee. That's the basis of the objection, apparently, that it went to the Executive Committee. And you musn't hold the Bill hostage for that purpose. I desperately need 89 votes and will be grateful always."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 849 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, to explain your vote. The timer is on."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to oppose this Bill. A question of jurisdiction still can exist. We shouldn't remove that defense. What happens in a capital case, if a body is found lying in one county and we know who killed the person and the indictment is brought and then it turns out the killing took place in another county. That's a matter of jurisdiction, not venue. Only the county where the felony took place has



jurisdiction over the defendant and the defendant will have the right to raise that point. Even though the body may have been found on one side of the county line, the indictment must take place, jurisdictionally, in the county where the murder or offense took place. This removes that defense. It's not well thought out. I don't blame the Gentleman, he's just a messenger boy here. He's a mere courier for a Commission. The Bill should have gone to Judiciary II and not Executive and therefore, it should be recommitted and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lawrence to explain his vote... The Clerk will..."

Cunningham: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to seem intransigent, I like that word. But in this particular situation and if the Bottle Bill comes up again, Representative Pierce, I'll be inclined to go along with you. The basis we ought to be mentioning here is the Constitution, Section 8, Article 6, as to the original jurisdiction of the Circuit Court. Tomorrow, those that have licenses and have spoken against this will be sorry. But it will be...it will be too late, at that time, to right the wrong that's done. Dan, move it up to 70, let's check the annotation on Article 6, Section 6. If I'm wrong, I'll apologize and if you're wrong, we'll still be friends. Now, we got 72, let's go for 89. Vote..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 51 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman asks leave to Postponed Consideration. Postponed Consideration. The next order of call is House Bill 851 by Representative Terzich. May I point out to you that that Bill has been reassigned to the Interim Study Committee. So, the next Bill to be called is House Bill 853. Representative Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 853..."





Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment, Jack. Roscoe, behave yourself.

Could we have a little order, please. Please proceed, Mr. Clerk.  
House Bill 853. Representative Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 853. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections  
of the Workmen's Occupational Disease Act and Sections of  
the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 853, as you all know, at  
this point in time, is a bipartisan effort in which to amend  
the Workmen's Compensation Bill. At this time, I would like  
to point out to you that the Chief Sponsors of this legislation  
are Representative Bradley, Representative Schuneman,  
Representative Hart, Representative Tuerk and myself. Mr. Speaker,  
I'd like at this time to yield to Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McClain, Representative  
Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House  
Bill 853, as amended, Amendment #7, provides for five  
different changes in the Workmen's Compensation legislation.  
It provides the death benefit cap of \$250,000 or 20  
years, whichever comes first. We are changing the average  
weekly manufacturing wage to base the claims on to the  
average weekly wage. And let me say, on that issue, that  
we are the only state in the union that uses the average  
weekly manufacturing wage in determining these benefits.  
Thirdly and maybe most importantly, is that we are deleting  
the increases that would be provided under the present legislation,  
the increase that would give 166 and 2/3 percent increase  
in 1979 and a 200 percent increase in benefits in 1981.  
We are leaving the increase, the 133 percent increase that  
will take effect as of July 1 of this year. And in relation  
to that, with changing the state's average weekly manufacturing  
wage to the average weekly wage and reducing that amount and  
accepting the 133 and 1/3 percent increase effective July 1 of  
this year, we will be not reducing the benefits. And let me



reiterate, not reducing the benefits but we will be increasing them over and above the \$234.00 that is the average weekly manufacturing wage today that they base the claims on. Simply, it is the differential provided in the permanent partial as opposed to the total temporary in judging claims. And let me make it very clear, for the record, our intention is very clear. We expect to reduce, by 75 percent of 66 and 2/3, for the purposes of adjusting permanent partial claims. Now, what is a permanent partial claim? We have circulated in the House today a synopsis by one of the staff members, that I think is certainly erroneous and poorly written, at best. They're indicating that we did something with the minimum. That we reduced the minimum by 70...by 25 percent. That is not true at all. We...and it is certainly not that...our intent. We have checked with law firms up and down the State of Illinois that practice in this field and they have told us we did nothing with the minimums and it certainly was not our intention to do anything with the minimums. A man who is making \$120.00 a week is still eligible for \$100.90 under the law as it's presently written and as it will remain to be written. I had some people in my office today that I came down and said the only thing we're concerned about are the rules that you're providing. We are providing the Commissions to provide rules. They said all we're concerned about if you'll make this change, if you'll make this deletion, we can support the rules. I said, 'I'm glad you're here. Did we do anything with the minimums because some people tell us we did.' And we said, 'No. No, you didn't do anything with the minimum.' But then I get a letter back saying now, from the same two Gentlemen, after they evidently thought we might pass this, that... 'Yes, now...now you effect the minimum.' I don't believe it. From all the work that we've done on the Bill, I simply don't believe it. It's not our intent. Let me make that very clear. If we do provide and we mandate that the Industrial Commission shall provide rules. There was some



debate on another Bill about the panel of physicians and many Members showed...spoke to me about the panel of physicians. That they had some concern. The one thing, more than anything else that's very clear to an injured person, if he can't go to his own doctor he resents that fact. We do not have any panel of physicians in this piece of legislation. So let me again suggest to you, there will be no reduction at all, in my opinion, in the minimums nor in the 234.50, because the 133 percent increase will come as of July 1. Even with the average using the average weekly wages instead of the average weekly manufacturing wage. I'd like to go to another part of it that's very important to me, politically and personally, because many Democrats are wondering why I have this Bill and why I'm doing, trying to make some changes in Workmen's Comp. And I'll tell you why, because Democrats came to me last fall and said, 'We've got to do something with Workmen's Compensation.' And we held meeting after meeting after meeting. It was at the suggestion of the downstate and upstate Democrats. And why...why are they concerned? They're concerned because we left Senator Bob McCarthy home in Decatur on the unemployment. He's eligible for Unemployment Insurance. Zeke Giorgi ran first in his district consistently. He ran third this time and we left Guy Stubblefield at home. Secondly, in the same vein, we have in McClain County probably as prosperous a county as any county in the State of Illinois and we have people who are losing their jobs, Eureka Williams laid off 160 people, General Electric is laying off people and let me ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, what good is an increase of benefits to you if you don't have a job? And that's what's happening in Illinois. We're losing jobs in Illinois. I'm concerned about that. I want to keep jobs in Illinois. I want to keep a healthy business climate in Illinois. And you and I are well aware that we're losing industry. They're building plants in other areas, they're not coming to the State of Illinois. I urge, respectfully, an 'aye' vote on House



Bill 853."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you'll look at the Digest, House Bill 853 originated out of the Pension, or not the Pension but the Law Revision Commission. And this Bill was to clarify the procedures for appeal to the Supreme Court under the Act. At no time was this Bill to be used as a vehicle for the Workmen's Compensation Bill. I am a little disappointed in the fact that this Commission is being used. Now, when these Bills were given out, they were given to all of the Commission Members with the trust that they would be carried out with the wishes of the Law Revision Commission. And I certainly feel, by the Amendments that were put onto this Bill, that this trust was broken to me and every Member of the Commission. I don't think that if someone has got some Workmen Compensation Bills, let them write them up themselves and let them present them on their own merit and they shouldn't be using a Commission Bill to use this. And just on that principle alone, I would urge each and every one of you to vote against House Bill 853 and protect the sanctity of the Commission. You shouldn't have to go out and put Bills out here and have someone attack them by Amendments. We do have a couple of Bills on the Calendar dealing with the Workmen's Compensation. They're excellent Bills and I would urge your support of Representative Mautino's Bill, 1205."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks to have his name removed as a Cosponsor of 853. Does he have leave? Would you also include Ted Lechowicz to have his name removed as Cosponsor of 853? Thank you. There's no objections. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Steele... Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have my name removed as Cosponsor of this Bill also. I'm a Member of the Law Revision Commission and my name was originally placed on that Bill as a Member of that



Commission and I would like, at this time, to be removed as Cosponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That a boy, John. Any objection? Leave. The Gentleman from...No, I'll recognize someone else. Representative Steele, please proceed."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill and frankly would ask leave that I be added as a Cosponsor on this legislation. There have been many people on both sides of the aisle that have said they believe there's a need for some meaningful changes in the Workmen's Compensation Law and here's that chance. We ought to vote for some of these meaningful changes. Here's a chance for us to keep our word and to do something that's meaningful. The job producers here in Illinois need some relief and here's an opportunity to give that relief. Now, it's been said that the insurance companies are making money and ripping off the employers of this state. And I say to you, if that is the case, why are many compensation carriers leaving Illinois? Refusing to write in Illinois? And I say, why are many companies and employers finding it very difficult to even find a carrier that will write their Workmen's Compensation Insurance? I say to you that there are many companies..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Steele: "There are many companies in our state who are having to self-insure themselves. The A.O. Smith, in my own district, the A.O. Smith Plant has had a 300 percent increase in their compensation costs. This has nothing to do with insurance companies, this is a natural cost increase. The American Steel Plant has had a 400 percent increase. The Olin Corporation at Alton, Illinois has had a 250 percent increase in costs, Granite City Steel has had a 200 percent increase. So there's not been an insurance rip-off. These are self-insurance companies. These are the hard and cold facts and they show that actually, we, the Legislators, are not only ripping



off the job producers of this state but we're actually running off the job producers of this state. One large employer in my district, in Alton, recently laid off 800 permanent employees. There are 14 other plants, this was their home office, this was their flagship plant of their whole entire industrial empire and they're laying off 800 employees and beefing up their production in other states. This is the situation which is causing jobs to leave this state and I say to you, 'Let's do something meaningful. Let's put.....back up our words with some action. Here's that chance and let's support this good legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Greiman: "All right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Tuerk...He indicates he will."

Steele: "What?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to take it out of the record? No, there's a question being asked. He indicates he'll yield. For what purpose does the Gentleman from McClain, Representative Bradley, seek recognition?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, it's usually the custom of the House, when we have two chief Sponsors, that you recognize the other chief Sponsor for a few remarks."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We will. Just relax. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, I wonder if either of the chief Sponsors would tell me if they know what the impact of this Bill, of the enactment of this Bill would be insofar as insurance premiums are concerned. What are we talking about?"

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is sort of one of those red herring type of questions. When I get to the point where I am able to make a few remarks, I can point out..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Can you answer the question or not?"

Tuerk: "Will I answer the question?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "No, I said, can you answer the question?"

Tuerk: "The insurance premiums... You're asking the question, what effect this is going to have on insurance premiums. Nobody but nobody is going to stand on the floor of the House and tell you that the insurance premiums are going to go up, sideways or down. Now, for the simple reason that we're realistic... We are realistic enough to know that the benefits, come July 1, are going up by 33 and 1/3 percent. Now, if you don't know that at this point, that's the reason I'm telling you. It's been said many times on the floor and there... The benefits themselves, come July, are going to be higher than they are today. Now, if you want me to tell you that insurance premiums are going to go down, I'm not about to tell you that. But I'm not about to tell you that they're going up either."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, on the Bill."

Greiman: "Yeah, my question really was not whether they're going up or down but rather what the impact would be. And there has to be some impact, otherwise we're just conning the public. I'm not Cosponsor of this Bill. If I had gotten an answer that was meaningful, I think I would remain a Cosponsor. I would make one other comment that anybody who has met our new Member from Rockford can probably understand why the other Democrat was not returned and my guess is it probably it probably had nothing to do with Workmen's Compensation. I would ask leave to have my name removed as a Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to have his name removed. Hearing no objections, his name is removed. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to be very brief in my remarks tonight. I think that there's one overriding factor that should be pointed out to every Member of the House. Now some of us are genuinely concerned that we not cut workers...injured workers benefits to any great degree. I'd like to reiterate what Representative



Bradley has said. If we pass House Bill 853 and after the 33 percent increase becomes effective on July 1, this year, the maximum benefits under Workmen's Compensation in Illinois will be higher in August than it is now. There's no way we can stop that. You've got these built in inflation factors in the law that was passed in 1975. What we're doing here tonight is trying to moderate in some small way the future impact of costs on employers in Illinois and the impact on jobs in Illinois. I would urge your support of this very good, bipartisan Compromise Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I would like to first of all ask a question of the previous speaker, who I understand is the principal Sponsor and then be recognized to speak on the Bill. If he would yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he'll yield. Are you talking about the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Stuffle: "Representative Schuneman, I understand, is the hyphenated principal Sponsor. I'd like to direct the question to him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He'll yield."

Stuffle: "Representative Schuneman, if indeed you can't speak to the question of the insurance rates, then what are we trying to accomplish by this Bill?"

Schuneman: "We're trying to reduce costs, whether they are paid to an insurance company or whether they are paid directly from an employer to an employee."

Stuffle: "Thank you. Speaker to the Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Stuffle: "It seems to me that Representative Bradley's comments ought to be mentioned here. He says the Democratic staff analysis says indeed that the minimum would be tampered with by the 25 percent reduction. But indeed, that is not what the Democratic staff analysis says. What the Democratic staff analysis says is something even more important. It says that it is a possibility that this Bill would be interpreted to





reduce those minimums in that amount. And it says that a court, indeed, could so rule. And it's very important to also look at what Representative Bradley said, as I interpret that and that is, as I interpret it, that that could indeed be the case. And we may well be tampering with those minimums and I would add that if we're really trying to get at something to help the business climate and I think all 177 Members want to come to some sort of compromise agreement, that this isn't it because this is not a compromise agreement reached by two sides. Because it takes two parties, at least, to compromise and that is not the case on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan." Not on this... The timer is on."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "House Bill 853 is presently to be voted on by the Members of the General Assembly, it's considered an anti-union vote. Let me put it better, it's an anti-injured-persons vote. Some Members of the General Assembly feel that, maybe that trade unions have too much to say about government, about issues such as this. Let's take that aside. Let's now talk about what House Bill 853, as amended, will do to the injured worker. I have a lot of friends and I worked many years as a carpenter... To the carpenter, there's about 60 to 100 thousand maybe in Illinois, to the building trades, maybe a quarter million, by adopting this Bill you would be negating the benefit level that that carpenter or that building tradesman may acquire if an injury happens to take off an arm, a leg, a foot, a hand, ears or anything else. This Amendment not only reduces that tradesman ability to have a decent kind of disability income but really what happens is it really negates the gains that, I thought, that the Democratic Party stood for in trying to bring about a good Workmen's Compensation law in line with the Nixon, the Nixon Commission recommendations. Now to set standards in this... to say that somehow the Industrial



Commission is going to equate a person who is possibly a carpenter that loses his arm, the right arm for example and an auditor or an accountant or a secretary who loses her or his arm is just pure foolishness. Those kinds of standards just don't hold up in a reasonable request to adopt a good Workmen's Compensation Law. Even the Nixon Commission recommended and understood that. The biggest issue...the biggest issue seems to be is that we're somehow driving industry out of Illinois. But somehow when we passed and adopted the Workmen's Compensation Laws of 1975 the...business fell apart. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, the facts are that we suffered under a Nixon-Ford economy and the whole country fell apart economically. Not Illinois, but the whole country. And coupled with...coupled with, not only a disastrous politically economic plan of the Nixon-Ford years but with that we developed, we developed... and it just so happens for the first time in Illinois, a reasonable Workmen's Compensation Act. So lo and behold, the greedy, the greedy insurance companies saw their chance. And what did they do? They bought off the Department of Insurance that sets rates in Illinois. They bought them off by even acquiring the former Director by employing him with the very agencies that requested the rate increases and then had the audacity to intimate that somehow the Legislature is ruining the economy of Illinois and the Legislature has gone too far. The real culprit, without any doubt, is the greed of the insurance companies desires not only to make a lot of money but the desire to have high reserve. Look at the record. The record's that it can't lie. The computer spits them out. Look at what it costs the business community of Illinois for 70 million dollars more in payouts over a 2 year period. It costs the business community 260 million dollars for that greed of high reserves and the greed of higher profits for insurance companies. I heard a former speaker say that the insurance companies are going out of business in Workmen's Compensation. Well I say to him, he



doesn't know what he's talking about. Because today, in Illinois, 229 insurance companies write Workmen's Compensation. He just don't know what he's talking about. The real complaint in the business community is the high rates and how they come about. There's a court suit and it's being...going to be ruled on, I predict, within a month, that will really reduce premiums and that's the issue here, to reduce the rates and reduce the premiums. If nothing else, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the first time in the history of Illinois, I think more Legislators understand the difference between Unemployment Compensation and Workmen's Compensation. For the first time. The biggest problem we have here is understanding the law, the complications of the law. But to change..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Gentleman kindly bring your remarks to a close?"

Hanahan: "But to change from the manufacturing work week and I say this, that those who are great proponents of this Bill, you just don't know what you're doing. I predict the folly that you're following because we have no other standard in Illinois to compute a work week except the manufacturing work week. That's the reason why it's in the law. No other reason. And if you adopt this Bill as law you are completely, not only fools but you're goofing up a system that is working and has the ability to function..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hanahan. The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that we adjourn until 9:30. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. The House is adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1-2	9:30	Speaker Redmond	House to Order
		Rev. Krueger	Invocation
		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call for Attendance
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Agreed Resolutions
		Speaker Redmond	
3		Giorgi	moves adoption - explain
		Speaker Redmond	Agreed Resolutions adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 2308, Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
4		Speaker Redmond	House Bills, Second Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 48, Second Reading
		Spekaer Redmond	Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads House Bill 107, Second
5		Spekaer Redmond	
		Totten	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 107 - Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 217
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 375
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Absences
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Absences
6		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Griesheimer	Inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Dunn is here
7		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amt. 2 to H.B. 375
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 409
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 767
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 788
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
8		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 798
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 885
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 954
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 962
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	TOOR 962
		Ryan	
9		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 964
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	Explains Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Opposes Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	Speaks on Amendment #1
10		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	Explains Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Opposes Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 fails
11		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	Explains Amendment #3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Opposes Amendment #3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
12		Kosinski	
	9:50	Mulcahey	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
12		Mulcahey	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 fails
13		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 966
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #5
		Speaker Redmond	
		Sandquist	TOOR - H.B. 966
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 911
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 944
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1008
14		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Robinson	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	Introduction
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1034
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Williams	
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:00	Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1099
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1115
		Speaker Redmond	
15		Friedrich	TOOR - H.B. 1115



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1180
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1220
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1391
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1429
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1593
16		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #6
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR - H.B. 1593
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1594
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.L.	
	10:00	Speaker Redmond	TOOR - H.B. 1594
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 1724
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 2341
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads H.B. 2358
17		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2360
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2362
		Speaker Redmond	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2363
		Speaker Redmond	To Third
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2365
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2366
18		Speaker Redmond	
		Unknown	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1115
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2367
	10:10	Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1115 back on Second
19		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2367 to Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2373
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2375 to Third
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 613 to Second for Amendment
		Ryan	Can't hear
		Speaker Redmond	Leave Granted
		Leverenz	Table Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Leverenz	Explains Amendment #2



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
20		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment is tabled
		Leverenz	
21		Speaker Redmond	
22		Tipsword	Move to Second, H.B. 2339
		Spekaer Redmond	
		Tipsword	Explains Amendment #1
23		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
24		Skinner	Question
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
25		Epton	Yield?
26		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
27	10:32	Peters	
28		Barnes	
	10:35	Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted - Third
		Clerk O'Brien	Sup. Con. Cal. Third - II
29		Speaker Redmond	Passed Consent Calendar
30		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 106 Third Reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
31		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	
32		Ebbessen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dunn, J.	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 156 - Third Reading
33		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
34		Barnes, E.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holloway	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	Introduction
35		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 560
36		Younge	
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:47	Ewing	Motion
		Younge	Moves to lie on table
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	Not debatable
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
37		Ewing	Personal privilege - motion to re-commit
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Renews motion to table
		Speaker Redmond	motion to table prevails
38		Simms	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
39	10:53	Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Caldwell	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
40		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Davis	
		Speaker Redmond	
41		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 560 passed
		Leinenweber	Point of inquiry
42		Skinner	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 993
		Winchester	Point of inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
43		Matijevec	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
44		Clerk O'Brien	
		McLendon	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
	11:07	Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1702 - Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
45		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2154



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	Explains H.B. 2154
		Speaker Redmond	
46		Jones	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
47		Speaker Redmond	
		: Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
48	11:15	Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 318 - Second - No. C.A.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 340 - Second - No C.A.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 486 - Second - Amt. 1 adopted.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	Parliamentary Inquiry
49		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	S.B. 486 to Second
		Clerk O'Brien	Motion to Table Amt. #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	TOOR
		Speaker Redmond	
		Gaines	S.B. 486 - Opposes motion
50		Speaker Redmond	
51 - 52		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
53		Greisheimer	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Gaines	Responds
		Speaker Redmond	
54	11:29	Kosinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
55		E. Barnes	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
56		Anderson	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion to table fails
		Davis	
		Speaker Redmond	
57		Waddell	Introduction



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
58		Houlihan	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2325 - Third Reading
(Bradley in Chair)		Speaker Bradley	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hart	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	Question
59		Hart	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	Yield?
	11:41	Hart	Responds
		Speaker Bradley	
61		Leverenz	Question
		Hart	
		Bradley	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McCourt	
		Hart	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Telcser	Question
		McCourt	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
62		Hart	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewell	
		Speaker Bradley	
63		Friedrich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Winchester	MPQ
		Bradley	
		Hart	To Close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Satterthwaite	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevec	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewell	
64	11:50	Speaker Bradley	H.B. 2325 passed
		Waddell	Introduction
		Speaker Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Motion to eliminate introductions
		Matijevec	
		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2321 Third Reading
65		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed
		Madigan	Moves recess till 1:00



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
66		Speaker Bradley	House to Order
67		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bills, First Reading
68		Speaker Bradley	
		DiPrima	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
69		Klosak	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
70		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	
		Terzich	
		Clerk O'Brien	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan	
71		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	
		Ryan	
		speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Bradley	
	1:20	Speaker Bradley	
72		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1650 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
73		Marovitz	Sponsor
74		Speaker Bradley	
75 - 76		Williams	Against
77		Speaker Bradley	
78		Johnson	
		Speaker Bradley	
79		Birchler	Against
		Totten	Yield to Williams
		Ewell	Point of Order
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
87		Waddell	Explains vote - 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
88		Peters	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 1650 passed
		Marovitz	'Thank you'
89		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 921 - Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
	1:55	McClain	
		Speaker Bradley	
	1:57	Schureman	Against
90		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Davis	Support
		Speaker Bradley	
		Tipsword	Support
91		Speaker Bradley	
		Hoffman	Yield
92, 93, 94		McClain	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		McClain	To close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	Against
95		Speaker Bradley	
		Epton	Supports
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Matijevec	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevec	
		Speaker Bradley	
80		Williams	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Daniels	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Williams	Continues
81		Speaker Bradley	
		Katz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Williams	Continues
		Speaker Bradley	
82	1:40	Ewell	Support
83		Speaker Bradley	Question
		Ewell	
		Friedrich	
84		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevec	'Aye'
85		Speaker Bradley	
		Darrow	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Marovitz	
86		Speaker Bradley	
		Waddell	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 1039 passed
96		Conti	Point of pers. priv.
		Speaker Bradley	
97	2:14	Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
	2:15	C. Davis	
		Speaker Bradley	
98		E. Jones	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Tr Miller	Point of pers. priv
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1328 - Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	Explains H.B. 1328
		Speaker Bradley	
99		Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
100	"	Telcser	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Houlihan	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
101		Martin	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
		Greiman	
		Bradley	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
102		Taylor	MPQ
		Matijeviceh	Rule 35(g) - Suspend Rules
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	Question
		Matijeviceh	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	Add H.B. 1822
	7:39	Matijeviceh	
		Jones, J.D.	Leave of House
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	Question
		Matijeviceh	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Matijeviceh	Rule 18 - leave to suspend
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Schlickman	
		Catania	
103	2:25	D. Houlihan	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	Explains 'no' vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kent	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
104		Houlihan	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Gaines	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		D. Houlihan	PPC
		Speaker Bradley	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Bradley	
105		Telcser	Point of pers. priv.
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1500 - Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
106		Getty	
		Speaker Bradley	
107		J. Davis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kosinski	
		Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Katz	
108	2:40	Speaker Bradley	Passed H.B. 1500
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1543 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
109		Lechowicz	Sponsor
		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mugalian	Questions Sponsor





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
110		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Stiehl	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	
111		Speaker Bradley	
112		Tipsword	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Younge	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Cunningham	
113		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummer	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	Poll Absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
114		Clerk O'Brien	Polis absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
115		Ryan	Asks verification
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Ca-1
	2:55	Ryan	Questions Affirmative Roll Call
116		Speaker Bradley	
		E. Jones	Change to 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Totten	Change to 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Walsh	'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
117		Ebbesen	'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	change to 'no'
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 1543 passed
		Bluthardt	Introduction
118		Speaker Bradley	
		Kane	Move to reconsider
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	Introduction
		Speaker Bradley	
		Porter	Leave of House
		Speaker Bradley	Objections
119		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1547 Third Reading
	3:08	Bowman	Sponsor
120		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	Asks for order
121		Speaker Bradley	
122		Bowman	Continues
		Speaker Bradley	
		McClain	Point of order
		Speaker Bradley	
		Bowman	Continues
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
123	3:17	Darrow	Against
		Speaker Bradley	
124		McAuliffe	'no' vote
		Speaker Bradley	
125		DiPrima	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
126		Gaines	Support
		Speaker Bradley	
127		P. Martin	Support
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijeovich	M.P.Q.
		Speaker Bradley	
128		E. Jones	
	3:30	Speaker Bradley	
		E. Jones	
		Speaker Bradley	Matijeovich withdraws motion
		E. Jones	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Wolf	
		Speaker Bradley	
129		Greiman	Support
		Speaker Bradley	
130		C. Davis	Supports
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Supports
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
131		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
132	3:41	Bowman	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
133	3:43	Madison	Question
		Speaker Bradley	
134		Deuster	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Willer	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
135		Friedrich	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		E. Jones	
		Speaker Bradley	
136		Cunningham	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mugalian	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Catania	
137		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Katz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Abramson	
138		Ewell	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley	
139	3:55	Stuffle	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Younge	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
140		Kosinski	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Sandquist	
		Speaker Bradley	
141		Daniels	
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 1547 - Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1714 Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		McGrew	Leave of House
		Speaker Bradley	Objection raised
142		Lauer	
143		Bradley	
144		Mudd	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Taylor	MPQ
	4:12	Lauer	To close
145		Speaker Bradley	
		Byers	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond in the Chair	
146		Mugalian	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schoeberlein	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1785 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
147		Steczo	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
148		J.D. Jones	H.B. 1811
		Speaker Redmond	
		Willer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Willer	Questions Sponsor
		Jones	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Teleser	Yield?



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones	Discussion
		Telcser	Question
149		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1811 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1898
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 1930
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
150		Mahar	Yield?
		Kelly	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
151		Kelly	Continues discussion
		Mahar	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mahar	Speaks on H.B. 1930
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2176 Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
152	4:30	Simms	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Rigney	Question
		Simms	
		Speaker Redmond	
153		Totten	Yield
		Simms	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Totten	Speaks on Bill
154		Speaker Redmond	
		McMAster	
		Simms	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	Question
155		Simms	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Speaks against
		Speaker Redmond	
156		Simms	To Close
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2176 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	Third Reading H.B. 2180
		Speaker Redmond	
		Meyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Meyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
157	4:38	Johnson	On the Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
158		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2256 Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	Discussion
159		Lucco	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell	Question
1		Speaker Redmond	
160		Lucco	Discussion
		Ewell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		VanDuyne	Supports Bill
161		Speaker Redmond	
		Martin	Opposes
162		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	Discussion
		Kent	
		Speaker Redmond	
163		Lucco	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	Supports Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	
164		Speaker Redmond		
		Lauer		
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2256 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 2355 Third Reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Taylor	Asks to return to Second	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5 H.B. 2355	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Taylor	Asks to table Amt. #4	
	165		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #4
			Speaker Redmond	Amendment #4 tabled
			Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #5
		Speaker Redmond		
		Taylor	Explains Amendment #5	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading, H.B. 775	
		Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Jacobs	Questions motion.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Jacobs	Objects	
166		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond	Motion to suspend Rule 72 to put H.B. 775 on Second Reading	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #3, H.B. 775
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Moves to table
		Houlihan	Moves to table
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 tabled
167		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #4, H.B. 775
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Moves to table
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #4 tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Explains Amendment #5
168		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #5 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	Postponed Consideration H.B. 44
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads House Bill 44
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Explains H.B. 44
169		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones	Supports Bill
170		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell	Question of Sponsor
171		Skinner	Discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ewell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schoeberlein	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	Previous question moved
173		Skinner	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Explains vote
174		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	Announcement
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Objects to Demo. Conference
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Taylor	Objects to Conference
175		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Farley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Farley	Moves recess
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMaster	Opposes Conference



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
176		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	Moves recess
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Moves to lay motion on table
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	Vote on motion
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
	177		Barnes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mugalian	Point of Information
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	Moves take motion out of record
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion
178		Speaker Redmond	Motion prevails
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 254 - Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	Explains Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
179		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 254 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 455
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	TOOR



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	Moves recess
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Moves motion lie on table
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Explains 'aye' vote on motion
180		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion passes - House recesses
		Doorkeeper	
		Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Waddell	leave for 'aye' on H.B. 44
181		Speaker Redmond	Objections raised
		Clerk O'Brien	Senate Bills, First Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Leave to suspend posting rule
182		Speaker Redmond	Leave Granted
		Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	Leave for 'aye' on H.B. 44
		Speaker Redmond	Objection.
183		Matijevich	Moves suspend Rule 35(g)
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Question
		Matijevich	
184		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	Add H.B. 1822 to motion?
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	Okay
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	Question on 2313
		Matijevich	Okay
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
185		Matijevich	Leave suspend Rule 18
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	House Bills Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 583
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	Explains H.B. 583
		Speaker Redmond	
187		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	Point or Order
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Continues
188		Speaker Redmond	
		Ebbesen	Yield?
		Catania	
189		Ebbesen	Speaks on Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	Yield?
		Catania	
190		Deuster	Discussion
191		Speaker Redmond	
		Anderson	Yield?
		Catania	Discussion
192		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ewing	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Catania	Closes debate
		Speaker Lechowicz	Vote
		Hart	Explains vote
193		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hart	Continues
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Lauer	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schuneman	Yield?
194		Catania	Discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ewell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Younge	
195		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Catania	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Catania	
196		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedrich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	
197		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Peters		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		McMaster		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	198		Caldwell	
			Speaker Lechowicz	
		Catania	Poll of absentees	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads absentees	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
199			Clerk O'Brien	Continues
			Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Simms	'aye'	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Postponed Consideration	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 459 Third Reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Houlihan	Explains Bill	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	Schlickman	Sponsor Yield?		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
200		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Questions Sponsor
		Houlihan	
200		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Discussion
		Harris	Opposes H.B. 459
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pierce	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pierce	Questions Sponsor
201		Houlihan	Discussion
202		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	Closes debate
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	
203		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Willer	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Holewinski	
204		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Campbell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	Poll of absentees



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
205		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Gaines	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Gaines	"aye"
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 459 Postponed Consideration
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 704
		Tuerk	Explains Bill
206		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	Sponsor yield
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	
		Tuerk	Discussion
207		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Waddell	Questions Sponsor
		Tuerk	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Lucco	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tuerk	
208		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 849
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Cunningham	Explains Bill
209		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	
210		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	Sponsor yield?
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	
211		Speaker Lechowicz	
"		Cunningham	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pierce	Explains vote
212		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Cunningham	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	Postponed Consideration
213		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 853
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	Explains Bill
		Speaker Lechowicz	
214, 215		Bradley	
216		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Terzich	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Dunn	
217		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Steele	
218		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	Sponsor yield
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	
		Tuerk	
219		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tuerk	
		Greiman	Speaks on the Bill
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schuneman	
220		Speaker Lechowicz	
	9:05	Stuffle	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stuffle	Questions Sponsor
		Schuneman	
221		Speaker Lechowicz	
222 - 223		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	Moves House adjourn
		Speaker Lechowicz	House adjourns



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES