

Doorkeeper: "Would all persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Thomas Jefferson said: That government is the strongest of which every man feels himself a part. Let us pray. Almighty God, who dost command that all men everywhere should dwell in peace and harmony, sharing with his fellow man the burdens of the day and the safekeeping of the society in which they have their being; Grant to the Members of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois such insight into Thy will for mankind that they may affect such government that administers for the good of all, rather than control and rule for the privilege of a few. Whatsoever here may be done, may it be done that all persons in the state may feel a mutual responsibility for the benefits which are to be derived. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken May 23, 1978. Reported the same back with the following recommendation, do pass House Bill 3377 and Senate Bill 1569."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions." Former House Member, Class is in the chamber. Former House Member."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 869, Brummer. 870, Kelly. 871, Bowman. 872, Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution, Brummer, 869 talks about a golden wedding anniversary. Kelly's 870 honors the Knights of Columbus. 871 by Bowman, condemns the American



Nazi Party march. And 872 by Kelly talks about the criminal Judge of Cook County. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I certainly think, Representative Bowman will have a chance to vote on Nazi Bills this year. I don't think we ought to let an Amendment or a Resolution out on agreed basis."

Speaker Redmond: "What Resolution are you referring to?"

Skinner: "The one that Representative Bowman is apparently..."

Giorgi: "871."

Skinner: "Sponsoring in order to justify voting against the Nazi Bills. Would you please take it out."

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

Skinner: "What is the number on that?"

Giorgi: "I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption on the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 871, Bowman."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 3339, will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3339, a Bill for an Act to abolish certain Committee's, Councils and Commissions and repeal certain Acts-parts of Acts in connection there with. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, leave of the House to call 3339 back to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to have 3339 returned to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, 3339 will be returned to the Order of



Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1....."

Totten: "I want to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Totten. Amends House Bill 3339 on page 1, line 2 by inserting 'amend or' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 is the way the Committee wanted to have the Bill drawn. It had been part of House Bill 1703, was referred back to the Committee and chopped into three sections. This is one of the sections. The Bill exempts...the Amendment exempts the Commissions that the Committee wanted exempted and is now in the fashion that the House Select Committee on state organization wanted it and I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion....Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor if he would yield."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan: "What is the difference between the Bill as introduced or as reported from Committee and as would be with your Amendment #2. You referred to, if I understood you correctly, that the Amendment will exempt certain Commissions. Could you tell which ones they are exempting?"

Totten: "Yes, I will. The following Commissions are not abolished in Amendment #2. Cities and Villages, Municipal Problems Commission, Dangerous Drug Advisory Council, Economic and Fiscal, Illinois Legislative Council, Inter Governmental Corporation Commission, Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, Public Aid Advisory, Audit Commission, LIS, Legislative Investigating, Legislative Reference Bureau, Legislative Space Needs, School Problems, Senate



Operations, State Employee Group Insurance, Transportation Study in County Problems Commission."

Houlihan: "Which ones are left?"

Totten: "There is quite a few."

Houlihan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? The question is on Representative Totten's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have and the motion carried, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3340."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3340, a Bill for an Act to reorganize and consolidate certain legislative service agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I would ask leave of the House to bring House Bill 3340 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, 3340 will return to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Totten. Amends House Bill 3340 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is purely a technical Amendment. Again when the Committee...when the reference bureau split up the Bill, one of the Bills did not get out, one of the three Bills did not get out of Committee. In order to reflect 3340 without those changes, all references in Amendment #1 to Joint Committee's had to be stricken and that is what Amendment #1 does to 3340. And it is purely technical in nature, in revising the Amendment to agree with what the purpose of it and it provides a transition schedule. I move the adoption



of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Catania."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Catania: "Representative Totten is this the Amendment that destroys several Commissions?"

Totten: "No, it does not. This is reorganization of legislative... creates a legislative coordinating council."

Catania: "This is a completely different one, this is not the one that I found floating around yesterday...to destroy parts of Commissions...."

Totten: "This is not that one."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1? Is that correct, Representative Totten? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Does anyone else have a Bill that they want to return from Third to Second? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, I have one but the Amendment isn't on my desk yet and I don't know what the procedure you prefer to follow when we move it back to Second. Leave it there or..."

Speaker Redmond: "You better leave it where it is until your Amendments...."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else have an Amendment...Bill on Third and want to move it back to Second? Representative Huff."

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, does that order of call include the



Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't gotten to that yet."

Huff: "All right. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you want to take one off of there and amend it, is that correct?"

Huff: "That's correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we might as well do that. And which Bill is it? On the Order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 1274, is that correct? Is that your Bill, Representative Huff?"

Huff: "That's right, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff is recognized."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this...when this Bill came up, 1274, it expoundsto be a Study Commission and that and nothing more. However, there was some objections made to some of the language that they thought was conclusive. And what this Amendment does is simply take out all of the mandatory conclusions and declaratory phrases and makes the language more consistant with the intent of the Bill which is to be a Study Commission. I move for the adoption of this Bill....Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, do you first desire to have House Bill 1274 returned to the Order of Second Reading?"

Huff: "No, I would like...it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objections? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I don't have an objection, Mr. Speaker but I do wonder where this Bill is on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "It is on Consideration Postponed, page 12. Does the Gentleman have leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Now on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Huff. Amends House Bill 1274 on page 1, line 27 by deleting 25 and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question? I'm sorry, Dan, I was off the floor, I didn't hear your rationale for the extension."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "What the Bill would do, Bob, would be to provide after the applicable time frame within which an agreed party could institute a charge with the Fair Employment Practices Commission, that the Commission would have a period of one hundred and twenty days thereafter to convene a fact finding conference with the view to resolving or to make a disposition of the charge that has been filed with it. If at the conclusion of that one hundred and twenty day period the Commission has failed to resolve the matter, then the Commission can determine as is presently the law, to institute a formal complaint or to dismiss the charge on the basis that there is inadequate evidence to support it. The net effect then of the Bill would be to add an additional one hundred and twenty day period to the charging procedure under the Act. When I stated that this was in response to a decision, a recent decision of the Illinois Supreme Court which held that the time frames presently set up in the Act are mandatory, although the Commission was regarding them as directory. In consequence there was approximately thirty-two hundred of these cases which have been dismissed. I think now you're familiar with it....."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 127 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have standing



next to me the Mayor of the City of East St. Louis, the Honorable Dr. William E. Basin. The Mayor of the City of East St. Louis. Would you welcome him please."

Speaker Redmond: "2877."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2877, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin....out of the record. 2878, Representative Jesse Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get to my switch on 2875 and I couldn't. I ask leave of the House to be recorded 'aye' on House Bill 2875, it will not change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 2879? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 2878, who is the Sponsor of 2878?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2878, a Bill for an Act to restructure the comprehensive Health Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is the Sponsor on the floor? Out of the record. 2879."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2879, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Act on the aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is the Sponsor of 2879? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the House, if we take this Bill out of the record as Representative Holewinski did. Will we get back to these Bills...."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't guarantee anything."

Marovitz? All right, we'll go with it."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk? Proceed, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2879 would create the



Legislative Advisory Committee on aging. This Bill has been agreed to by Members on both sides of the aisle and the Illinois Department on Aging is totally in favor of the Bill. We expand the present council on aging, the Legislative Members and add additional Members, four more Members. One from both sides of the aisle, of the Human Resources Committee and one from both sides of the aisle on the Senate Public Health Committee so that those Committees which deal with senior citizens would be represented both on the council and on the new Legislative Advisory Committee on aging to deal with all problems of senior citizens in the State of Illinois and make legislative recommendation to the House of Representatives. This would give the Legislative Body the leadership role in handling and solving senior citizens problems. I ask for your support, I have talked to Members on both sides of aisle. Taken out any provisions that may have been objectionable and reached agreement with Republicans, the Department of Aging, the Governor's Office and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield to a few questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Please give the Lady order."

Geo-Karis: "Representative Marovitz, you know that there is a council on aging now that has been operating for the very same reasons that you propose to incorporate in your Bill. Now where does it differ...where does your Bill differ from the present council of aging mandates and establishment."

Marovitz: "This is not the council on aging. The council on aging is thirty-five members and only eight Legislative Members. This is the Illinois Legislative Advisory Committee on Aging which will be composed of Legislators only and give the Legislative Body the leadership role in handling and solving problems of senior citizens. The



council on aging is in agreement with this Bill, Representative
I've talked to Representative Anderson, right behind you.
He's in agreement with the Bill, I've talked to the...."

Geo-Karis: "You never talked to me and I'm a member of that
council."

Marovitz: "Well, I've talked to all the members on the council
that wished to meet. I've talked to Mrs. Oblinger, who
is the Director of the Department on Aging. She is
totally in favor of the Bill, I've spoken to the Governor's
Office. I tried to deal with everybody that has wanted
to talk on this Bill, I've held the Bill. I think it is
a reasonable compromise and the kind of Bill that will
provide senior citizens with the kind problem solution
that they need in the State of Illinois. And I might
add, Representative Geo-Karis, that you as a member of
the council on aging would be a part....would automatically
be a member of the Legislative Advisory Committee on
Aging. Automatically."

Geo-Karis: "Well, what I would like to know is, what does your
Bill do for....what does your Bill do anymore than the
present council on aging can do?"

Marovitz: "Well, the present council on aging is really an
executive....an arm of the executive branch. The Legislative
Advisory Committee on Aging would be a legislative branch
and would give the Legislators a leadership role in
investigating senior citizens problems and proposing
solutions to legislative problems and...."

Geo-Karis: "How are you going to work then, if you will answer
my question."

Marovitz: "Sure."

Geo-Karis: "How will your proposed council on aging....according
to my analysis here, it says what your doing is changing
the members of the council on aging from thirty-one to
twenty-three. Is that right?"

Marovitz: "No..no. Let me make that correction and perhaps



Representative Anderson.....I would yield to Representative Anderson, there was a problem, I sat down with Director Oblinger, Representative Anderson, Representative Jacobs, people from the Governor's Office. We worked out a compromise which was adopted by this House in Amendment #2, which is now part of the Bill. We add to the council on aging."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, but you took all subpoena power out the council of aging didn't you?"

Marovitz: "No. I took the subpoena power out the Legislative Advisory Committee...out of this Bill. I did not change the council on aging one iota except...except, Representative Geo-Karis, to add four Legislative Members. One Republican from Human Resources Committee, one Democrat from the Human Resources Committee, one Republican from the Senate Public Health Committee and one Democrat from the Senate Public Health Committee. That is all we did to the council on aging."

Geo-Karis: "But the present council on aging does have Legislative Members on it."

Marovitz: "That is correct."

Geo-Karis: "Well then what is the purpose of your Bill?"

Marovitz: "I would like to yield that to Representative Anderson, right behind you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Representative Geo-Karis, I don't think you were able to make the last council on the aging meeting."

Geo-Karis: "No."

Anderson: "But the council is in favor of this Bill. What it does, it sets up a twelve man Legislative Advisory Committee to the council on aging. Now these twelve Members of the House and the Senate will also be a member on the council on aging. And they will sort of give an oversight to any senior citizen legislation that is offered. So that we will know where we're going. You know all the Bills



that have been entered here for senior citizens and this will act as sort of a screening and coronating Committee of the council. Now there is no money involved, we will use the staff of the council on aging as far as any secretarial work. The Governor's Office is in favor of it, the Director is in favor of it. What other questions do you have?"

Geo-Karis: "I would like to address myself to Mr. Anderson then. Have you talked with Mrs. Oblinger about this Bill?"

Anderson: "You bet I have."

Geo-Karis: "And what is her position about the need of this additional Bill."

Anderson: "Under the last administration the council on aging was a rubber stamp and that is all it did. They are now starting to give input to the the Members of the House and Senate and this will sort of be an oversight Committee that will help with any legislation that is proposed. To make sure the senior citizens get the best of both worlds."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I will refer back to Mr. Marovitz. Then are you.....Mr. Marovitz, then what you are saying in your Billy you're not touching the council of aging...."

Marovitz: "Not at all. All we did was add four members to the council of aging. That is the only effect that this has to the council on aging at all. We add four Legislative Members because we found that the Committees that dealt with senior citizen problems were not represented on the council on aging. They were not represented so, we added four Legislative Members, two Republicans, two Democrats to the council on aging. That is all we did."

Geo-Karis: "And that is all that your Bill does?"

Marovitz: "No, that isn't all the Bill does but that is all we did to the council on aging, Representative. I spent an entire evening with Director Oblinger, talking about this Bill. She thought it was an excellent idea, she thought



there was a need for this Bill and I sat down with her and the Governor's Office and Representative Anderson and Representative Jacobs...."

Geo-Karis: "I believe through you had talked with some assistant to Mrs. Oblinger, before then had you not? Mrs. Elmore."

Marovitz: "I spoke to Mrs. Elmore, who is in favor of this.... testified...."

Geo-Karis: "Yes....because I checked this myself and I believe that she had talked to you before, Mrs. Oblinger even knew anything about it."

Marovitz: "And afterwards, I spoke to Mrs. Oblinger and I spent four hours with Mrs. Oblinger and she was totally in favor of this Bill. And we spoke to her right in the back with Representative Anderson there and she was totally in favor of the Bill."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis are you through? Representative Geo-Karis are you finished?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "I have been assured by Representative Anderson that the Director, a very cable Director, Josephine Oblinger is in support of this Bill. I have questioned this because the present council on aging can do the very same things that this new Bill also purports to do with the additional members. However, if I'm assured and I guess I am assured by Representative Marovitz and Representative Anderson that the Governor's Office is for this Bill. The Director of aging is for it, therefore, I may have to withdraw any possible objections that I had on the basis that this Bill superfluous, unnecessary and more political boondoggery."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland." Please come to order.



Representative Friedland."

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

Whew!!! I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Please give him order."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen

of the House. This is a Bill that has been worked on for some time and compromised on and agreed by Members of both sides of the aisle. It is important to senior citizens throughout the state, it is important to people throughout the state and it will give those of us in the Legislature the leadership role in providing solutions to all problems of senior citizens across the State of Illinois without any problem of partisanship. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this important Bill."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Lady order. My goodness the decibel limit here is higher than the jets. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "This Bill is duplicative, we already have a council on aging now this takes up another Committee on aging. It will not do anything the council on aging doesn't already do. It is an absolute waste. I would like to call to your attention the fact that in the very Bill it indicates that members of the Human Resources Committee of this House will be on this Legislative Committee. And I would also like to point out that a brief perusal of the Digest will show that this House of Representatives and



Body across the hall is already a Legislative Committee on Aging and all this will do is create more legislation and I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'aye' and 34 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Lucco has been traded by the St. Louis Cardinals. Representative Lucco for an announcement."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A matter of introduction. We have some students from the Dubois school here in Springfield. Mrs. Clemy Webster the teacher, they are represented of course by Representatives Robinson, Kane and Jones. They are in the balcony to the rear of the House. Glad to have them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I would like coach Lucco to apprise the Members, is there any truth to the rumor that the Springfield Redbirds are now going to be in the major leagues? Joe, have you heard that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco has been recalled, I've been corrected. He has been recalled by the Cardinals. 2878, Representative... Representative Waddell for what purpose do you rise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. To the gallery to our left is Mr. & Mrs. Howard Westerberg and guests and he is a township supervisor of Washington township in Will County. And at the home of our good Representative Jack Davis at Beecher, Illinois. Also Representative Leinenweber and Van Dwyne, would you welcome them please."

Speaker Redmond: "2877...is it? We passed 78. 2877, Representative Holewinski."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2877, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children



and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, that 2878 is the Bill that you just passed."

Speaker Redmond: "2878, I'm sorry."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2878, a Bill for an Act to restructure the Comprehensive Health Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, late last year the Health Services Subcommittee in the Illinois House, Subcommittee of Human Resources held hearings on the subject of state compliance with the National Health Resource..Planning and Resource Development Act...Federal Act. This legislation is a product of the recommendation....a product of those hearings and based upon the recommendations made to us during those hearings. What the Bill does is...first do some relatively technical things in terms of bring the language in our State Health Planning Act into concurrence with the Federal Act. It further....it goes further though and defines the responsibilities and structure of state-wide Health Coordinating Council. It specifies the size of the council, fifty-six members and by Amendments adopted in this House the size of consumer representation on that council. It requires health systems agencies be represented on the councils and allows the councils to adopt its own operating procedures, rules and regulations. And to select its executive secretary which replaces the current procedure by which the executive secretary.....is appointed by the Governor. The Bill also establishes the Office of Health Planning and Development which really in effect, in the Department Public Health right now and requires line item budgeting so we know how much money is being spent for health planning and can properly



allocate and provide that that office shall provide assistance to the statewide Health Coordinating Council and its performance of its duties and that is, to come up with state health plan. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to answer any questions and would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Why do you substitute for the Governor appointing the Executive Secretary a system where they are elected. Is that required by federal law or is that a choice that is made."

Holewinski: "That is a choice, Representative Katz. It is not required by federal law. What it was felt was that most of your councils and Commissions, that we reviewed and looked at, also allow the selection of their Executive Secretary, their spokesperson so to speak. By the council or Commission itself, this is one of the very few councils in which the Governor made the appointment. It was felt and is felt that this decision is concurred in by the council itself, that it ought to be in a position of selecting its own Executive Secretary so that person could act as an advocate for that agency rather than as an agent of the Governor's Office."

Katz: "Well, does this agency play a part in making recommendations that will involve the expenditure of state funds?"

Holewinski: "The agency role is really review and comment. The development of state health plan and review and comment on the plans presided by the various health systems agencies. So it really does not...you know, while it will make recommendation, comments on plans that are adopted by health related agencies, it really does not mandate or cannot mandate the expenditure of funds."

Katz: "Yes, well I would want to state that I do have considerable doubt about a procedure under which the executive of the state doesn't select the head. It does seem to me that



to a considerable extent we have been involved in the process of selecting people who make decisions, for example, in the health care field or the education field are other fields where their interest seem solely related to health care whereas, as a practical matter the programs that are set forth have to be financed by the State of Illinois and there does seem to me to be a very good reason for having the Governor who is elected by all the people appoint the person who is going to be running agencies where huge amounts of funding are involved, such as health care."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "This...what is the current mandate with regard to federal law or state law on the size of the statewide Health Coordinating Council?"

Holewinski: "I believe it is no less than twenty-five."

Kempiners: "No less than twenty-five and your Bill will increase it to fifty-six. Is that correct?"

Holewinski: "Our...no, our Bill will statutorize the current composition of the Board which is fifty-six members."

Kempiners: "So that will be the minimum number, fifty-six?"

Holewinski: "That will be the number, not the minimum, the number."

Kempiners: "That would be an increase of thirty-one people."

Holewinski: "No, that is incorrect, Representative Kempiners. The council is currently made up with fifty-six members what this does is recognize that size as the size that should be maintained. Not the minimum but the size."

Kempiners: "Okay, so...but we are mandated to have twenty-six. So in effect we are mandating an increase...from that minimum of twenty-six. The next question I have regard House Amendment #5. According to the synopsis and Digest, that Amendment will require that the health facilities



plan devised by the Health Facility Planning Board, would have to be approved to buy the council, is that correct?"

Holewinski: "No, it would not have to be approved by the council. It would have to be reviewed for consistency. But, I've got Amendment #5 in front of me if you will cite the Section you're looking at, I would be glad to review that."

Kempiners: "Okay, it would be line 17 through 20, the state-wide coordinating council shall review the health care facilities by the Illinois Facility Planning Board and shall determine if it is consistent with the state health plan developed and adopted under this Act."

Holewinski: "That, I think clearly states that all they do is review it to make sure that it is consistent....they can't.... so."

Kempiners: "So what if it's not consistent?"

Holewinski: "Well, the purpose of the entire council...the structure of national health planning now and the establishment of the SHCC is that the body is created for advise and comment to try and provide some sort of consistency in the development of health...of a statewide health plan. You know, all we're doing is trying to cover the bases and allow that the other elements in the system are somehow at least maintaining a dialogue with the statewide health coordinating council."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, may I address this Bill please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition. I think that statutorily mandated twenty-six being increased to fifty-six because we have that number, is unnecessary. A former Governor, one of his last acts before leaving office was to increase the size of this Board. Now I receive communications from this Board regularly and they do hold quite a few meetings and if we're going to have these meeting...fewer people



would be of less cost to state. I think that's one reason for my objection. This has nothing to do with the percentage of consumer vs. provider representation on the Board. I don't object to more consumers and providers, however, I don't think we have to have fifty-six people on this Board. Another concern that I have is Amendment #5 that was discussed here when the Health Facility Planning Act was passed and I was the House Sponsor of that Bill. One of our concerns was input at the local level by at that time, area wide comprehensive planning agency which are now the HSA. So that the decision making of....decision making would be at the lowest level, that level closest to the people. What this Bill would do would be, to take the state agency and even put this SHCC above that state agency. Now the Sponsor says that their review doesn't mean anything and that may well be. However, my concern is that power be given to the people at the local level and not power given to the people at the statewide level. I think the people at the local levels are the ones who are better able to determine what is best for their particular area. And I would urge your 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Holewinski, following up on the comments of Representative Katz. Who appoints the members of the council?"

Holewinski: "The Governor appoints the members of the council now, that is one of the reasons that it was felt, that the Governor has enough of a say, you know, in what is going to ultimately be the policy of the SHCC to make those appointments."

Madison: "So the implication of Representative Katz's that by



making this change the Governor is being cut out, is not exactly true in that the council in appointing the Executive Secretary...in effect acts as agents of the Governor. Is that correct?"

Holewinski: "That is correct."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 2878. This is a great example of creating more bureaucratic garbage to put on the state statutes and allow the bureaucrats to run state government. And get their hands and the tentacles and every other type of consideration that this government can provide. This is an example of a state agency now wanting more power, expanding itself and if you want to place controls and constraints upon government the best way is to vote against legislation like House Bill 2878. This is nothing more than a bureaucrat haven to hire more people, to put more people on the payroll and to create more of a bureaucratic type institution. So the best favor that could be done to the citizens of the State of Illinois is get an overwhelming vote of 'no' on House Bill 2878."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm very sorry but I have to oppose this Bill because one of the members of this statewide coordinating council is a chap by the name of Paul R. Booth. And this fellow is a member of the SDS, it's a student for a Democratic Society. This fellow enjoys inciting riots and I'm sure ain't going to condone having a man like this on this kind of a set-up. This fellow teaches confrontation tactics to radicals and promotes redistributing social wealth and power. I haven't got any wealth or power but that's what this fellow does. This subsidy is no fluke Congressman Henry Hyde points out at the Mid-west



Academy is headed by Heather Booth, former member of the SDS, subversive students for a Democratic Society. Her husband, Paul Booth; former head of SDS is a consultant with the Mid-west. Heather Booth just happens to be part of Brown's appointed Citizens Review Board and the action region in which Mid-west Academy is located. These are only a few of the reasons that the House Appropriation Committee is investigating action. Consequently, I'm in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot of arguments but hardly any on the merits of the legislation. The appointments of this council are made by the Governor of this state. All this Bill does is define what the structure of that council, which we are mandated to have by state law...shall be. It doesn't mandate who shall serve on that council. If you've got a complaint, Representative DiPrima, you ought to take it up with the Governor's Office when he makes those reappointments. Representative Kempiners statements about the size of the council and the great council packing activities of prior Governor's is totally inaccurate. Under that Governor, the size of the council went from 99 to 56, it went down in size. The council attempted to stretch the rhetoric to say that the minimum is now...or that the size of the council is 25, currently it is completely erroneous because the size is currently 56 and what we seek to do is add some stability to that council by defining its size. Also the point about the powers of the statewide Health coordinating Council that were raised and that would be given under this Bill are completely wrong. It does not have a check on....state health policy. But what it does have is some input and that is purpose of the council in the first place. There is not one additional job provided for in this legislation,



and Representative Simms was completely wrong. There is no additional hiring, there is no additional bureaucracy. What it does do is recognize the process that we have in place now and attempts to add some subtility to that process. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?"

Geo-Karis: "I would like to ask Representative Holewinski, how long has Mr. Booth been on that council?"

Holewinski: "Ask the Governor, Representative Geo-Karis, I don't even know."

Geo-Karis: "I'm asking you because you're pushing the Bill. I suspect that he is a hold over and I would like to speak against this Bill because it is going into bureaucratic astronomical proportions making more payrollers instead of payrollers on the outside. The state taxes have to be paid by the people just so we can support more unnecessary payrollers and I would rather trust the discretion of the Governor to appoint an Executive Secretary rather than having an Executive Secretary appointed on a political basis, if we can appoint anybody that he likes at any salary he likes in this type of a Bill. . Therefore, I oppose the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

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

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

Holewinski: "I thought I had closed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought you did too but Representative Geo-Karis didn't. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Simms. Have all voted who wished? Representative Mann."



Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask that some of those red lights not be swayed by a couple of hand written documents from the John Birch Society. There is nothing extreme or radical about this measure, there is nothing that would justify this kind of a reaction or response. There is a time when we had genuine difference and we debated them on the floor, we win some and we lose some. But in this particular instance a few people have been given speeches, which they have read...which for some reason or another are being interpreted as being some kind of a far out Bill. And it is a good Bill, it makes sense and really I would ask that you not engage any kind of automatic knee-jerk opposition just because somebody reads some material that somebody else said to them. That's not like this House, we're a deliberative House, we don't get in traps by these kinds of things. And I would ask you respectfully to take another look at your vote in this matter."

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

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker I don't want to prolong this except to say, Amendment #5 which was raised by the other side of the aisle was an Amendment that was worked out with the Department of Public Health in order to make the Bill consistant with their thinking on the subject matter. The only area that I was aware of was that in debate was the question over the Executive Secretary's appointment and none other. And yet a lot of other extraneous issues have been raised here. To me really the most ridiculous being, the personalty or background of one of the fifty-six memebers who happens to currently be a labor union representative for AFS-CME."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think you might almost say I'm rising to a point of personal privilege but I am rising



to explain my 'present' vote. I did not push a red button in a knee-jerk reaction to one of the former Representatives remarks, his remarks would almost impel me to vote 'yes' if I really felt that these HSA, you know were doing the job they were intended to do. I respect the responses so much and I appreciate what he is trying to do but I did serve for a full year on a local, the Cook, DuPage HSA. And I did feel that there is tremendous bureaucracy here and that a lot of money is being spent in administrative overhead rather than delivery of health services. Therefore, I'm voting 'no' for the reasons that Representative Kempiners mentioned. And I certainly think it was not correct for Representative Mann to impute negative emotions to all of us who chose not to vote for this specific Bill."

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

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I usually wouldn't comment when I see a board like this but it does concern me that this House is not voting on House Bill 2878. I'm not sure what this House is voting upon but it is not House Bill 2878, which does not create the SHCC. It does not abolish the SHCC, it does not create HSA, it does not abolish HSA. But it does provide some structural securities so that we have a framework within which to work. I'm sorry to see a Bill of this nature which can help health planning, be voted down, not on the basis of effect, not on the basis of the Bill but on the basis of extraneous comments."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this quesiton there are 41 'ayes', 89 'no', the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 2898.Rep.....Representative Madison, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madison: "For the purpose of an announcement, Mr. Speaker. We're



fortunate to have with us today, in the gallery to the rear, the 8th grade class of the Blessed Sacrament School from the westside of Chicago. With their teacher, Mrs. Sterman and their principal, Mrs. Mary Miller who happens to be the sister of our own Representative Thomas Miller. They are from the westside of Chicago and represented in the 21st District by Representative Vince Molloy, Walter Shumpert and myself. I wish you would welcome the Blessed Sacrament 8th grade class."

Speaker Redmond: "2898, Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2898, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2898 as originally introduced amended Sections of the Pension Code to provide for the exclusion of employees who are program participants under the Federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Commonly know as CETA and it provided from participation in the State Employment Retirement System and Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund for many reasons. Amendment #1 removed the language and in turn amended Sections to provide for the establishment of separate employer contribution rates for CETA participants and authority to refund a portion of the employer retirement contributions made on the behalf of CETA participants. The legislation is of an emergency nature and became necessary as the result of promulgation of a regulation by the United States Department of Labor. Basically this rule prohibited the use of CETA funds to fund retirement cost of CETA participants who participate in state and local retirement programs beyond the level necessary to provide for the current service cost of CETA participants based on their age and turnover characteristics. That briefly is what the Bill does



and I'll be delighted to answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Now that you have described the Bill as it was originally introduced, I'm wondering if you could relate to us the provisions of the various Amendments which effect other subjects."

Yourell: "Which Amendment would you like to talk about, Sir."

Schlickman: "1 through 9."

Yourell: "Any what would you like to know about them."

Schlickman: "What each one of them does."

Yourell: "Amendment #1 to House Bill 2898 became the Bill.

The language of the Amendment was jointly recommended by the Administrators of the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund and State Employees Retirement System. The Amendment deals with the problem created by new regulations formulated by the Department of Labor. And that is what I explained to you in my initial remarks."

Schlickman: "What about Amendment #2 then. And what will the effect that will have on the fiscal integrity of the Judges Retirement System."

Yourell: "Amendment #1 has nothing to do with what you referred to, it will save about five million dollars to the fund."

Schlickman: "No, I'm referring to Amendment #2."

Yourell: "Amendment #2. Amendment #2 adds clarifying language to the widows and survivor Section of the Judges Retirement System Article of the Pension Code. This Amendment was recommended by the Board of Trustee of the Judges System in order to clarify the eligibility of surviving child who is dependent due to physical or mental disability. You want to know what that will cost?"

Schlickman: "Yes."

Yourell: "Thirty thousand dollars."



Schlickman: "Okay. How about Amendment #3, which affects the Chicago Policeman's Annuity and Benefit fund."

Yourell: "Amendment #3 amends the Chicago Police Article Pension Code. This Amendment provides for staggered terms of Elected Board of Trustee members and so forth. You want to know what that is going to cost?"

Schlickman: "If there is any."

Yourell: "Amendment #3 cost nothing."

Schlickman: "Okay. How about Amendment #4 which amends the Chicago Labor and Retirement Board, Employee Annuity and Benefit Fund Article."

Yourell: "You want to know what that will cost?"

Schlickman: "Well what it will do and cost, both."

Yourell: "It won't cost anything, Sir. It would allow members of the Chicago Labor Annuity and Benefit Fund to participate in Chicago Municipal Employee Credit Union. And it doesn't add any cost to the program."

Schlickman: "What about Amendment #5 which amends the Chicago Municipal Employee Officers and Officials Annuity and Benefit Fund Article."

Yourell: "Amendment #5 amends the Chicago Municipal Employee Retirement System, was included in House Bill 741 which was passed by the House last July 1st with 120 affirmative votes. That would cost a hundred ten thousand dollars. Amendment #....."

Schlickman: "A hundred and what?"

Yourell: "Hundred and ten thousand."

Schlickman: "Where will that come from?"

Yourell: "It comes from the fund, Sir."

Schlickman: "Is that an additional cost that is imposed upon that fund? And is there any provision for funding?"

Yourell: "I've been informed that there is an Amendment in the Senate to this Bill that will provide for the cost from the contributor as well as the fund and so there will be no cost whatsoever. What we're suggesting is, that the



employee, to get into the fund would have to pay both costs. So it will be no cost to the fund."

Schlickman: "What about Amendment #6 amending the General Assembly Retirement System."

Yourell: "This is an Amendment, I think is probably the best Amendment to the Bill because it affects each and every Member of this House. It amends the General Assembly Article of the Pension Code to provide, that if a Member is convicted of a felony and is therefore ineligible to receive benefits he may elect to forfeit his right to a refund of his contributions, whereby upon his death his surviving spouse and children would be entitled to receive widow survivors benefits as provided by law. Presently survivors of a convicted Member are not entitled to benefits. And I don't think it is quite fair to deny a benefit to dependents of such a Member once he has passed away."

Schlickman: "Do you have any estimate of the cost of that particular Amendment?"

Yourell: "Five hundred thousand dollars."

Schlickman: "Five hundred thousand dollars."

Yourell: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "What about Amendment #7."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, we're getting into a dialogue here and you know we do have some limit as to the number of questions. I think we've had eight or ten questions here, would you like to speak to the Bill?"

Schlickman: "Well, let me ask two more questions. What is the total cost to the various retirement systems by this Bill as it is amended?"

Yourell: "Yes, the total cost as the Bill is passed into law will be one million six hundred and forty thousand dollars. But Amendment #1 will save about five million dollars, so we're talking about a net of about three hundred and fifty thousand....three million five hundred thousand



dollars...in a savings."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Further questions?"

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

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

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question? Buzz, as I read this Amendment #1 right, does that restore all pension benefits to the CETA employees... are CETA employees entitled to state retirement benefits?"

Yourell: "Yes, they are."

Wikoff: "I'm 'again' it'."

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

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

On this particular Bill and I do have great respect for the Sponsor, but you know, it appears to me as I look at this and you know we've had many pieces of legislation gone through this House that look like Christmas trees. This is another one of the, it would appear to me that we've got about eight separate proposals on here and to come up with a figure....talking about what it will save and what it will not save. I just don't think we are getting the true picture and I think that eight different Amendments is eight different laws, eight different changes in the pension system and I think if it was broken up into individual segments that....some have merit and some do not have merits. So I would just advise every Member of the House to take a very very careful look at this proposal. Because you really in essence are voting upon eight different proposals on this one particular Bill that started out as one thing and ended up as something else. So I myself am going to have to vote against it just based on that."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves the previous question. All



in favor of the Ladies motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell to close the debate."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this Bill is an legitimate emergency and is necessary because of a regulation by the Department of Labor. While it is difficult to determine a specific dollar amount regarding the cost of implications involved with this Bill, it can be estimated that, anywhere from four million to five million in federal funds could be lost by the State Employees Retirement System and the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund if this Bill fails to become law. Thus allowing both systems to comply with federal regulations by October 1, 1978. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2898."

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

Katz: "Yes, explaining my vote, I believe that if this legislation was necessary it should have been confined to that part that is necessary so that the Members of this House might have had an opportunity to vote separately on all the other matters that has been put in here. And I believe that the Bill ought to be stripped of a lot of other issues that really in my opinion make very complicated the question of how to vote. I think that in its present form I'm going to have to vote against it because I believe that there are a lot of matters embraced within this Bill that we ought to have separate Roll Calls on. But put together, I'm going to have to vote 'no'."

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



Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention to the Members of the House that all of these Bills were unanimously passed by the House on the Amendment stage. All of the Bills....all of the Amendments, I believe have been agreed to on principle by the Pension Laws Commission on either previous Bills or previous consideration. Some of the figures that were mentioned as to the cost were very very questionable for my experience in dealing with pensions as to the facts for example on the survivors benefits for the General Assembly. There is no way that we can tell who is going to exercise this benefit, if any, there is no way to tell whether or not a widow of a Member of the General Assembly is going to survive that Member or predecease that Member. So all these are....are simply guesstimates and I think they are inaccurate guesstimates. I don't see any portion of this here Bill that would be bad in concept....needless to say, that anytime you amend any type of a Pension Bill, you won't have a cost involved. And I would urge support of House Bill 2898."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have: 75 'ayes', 74 'nays' and 7 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Would you have the Clerk poll the absentees please."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will poll the absentees. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "If it should receive 89 votes, I ask for verification."

Speaker Bradley: "You will receive it."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Jane Barnes, Brandt...."

Speaker Bradley: "Brandt, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, Chapman, Jack Davis, Ewing...."

Speaker Bradley: "Ewing, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Friedrich, Greiman, Hoffman, Hoxsey..."



Speaker Bradley: "Hoxsey, 'no!'"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Wait a minute. Hanahan....change Hanahan
' from 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brein: "Madison, Mautino, McBroom, Meyer, Molloy,
Mugalian, Pierce, Schisler and Younge."

Speaker Bradley: "Younge wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'.
On this question there are 78 'ayes', 75 'nays', 7 voting
'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Would you please place this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "Place this Bill on Postponed Consideration.
2903."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2903, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to return this
Bill to Second Reading for the purpose of considering
an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave to return it to
Second Reading? Hearing no objections, the Bill will
appear on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Kane. Amends House Bill 2903
as amended by deleting all of Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane on
Amendment #2."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
Bill 2903 is a School Aid Formula Bill. And Amendment
#2 which is being offered to House Bill 2903 is identical
to the Amendment which was offered and adopted last
week to the School Formula Bill that was Sponsored by
the School Problems Commission. And briefly to recap
what the Amendment does and what the effect of the
Amendment is. You have to go back and look at....Mr.
Speaker, could we have some order please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Give the Gentleman some order please."



Kane: "In the last five years under the resource equalizer formula is that the State of Illinois has contributed some five hundred and forty million new dollars to schools. And if we look at where those dollars have gone, Chicago, with 22% of the students, has received 41% of the dollars. The suburban area of this state with 37½% of the students have received 30% of the dollars and downstate with 40% of the students has received only 28% of the dollar. House Bill 2903 in its present form would continue and compound the inequities in the school aid formula. Because with the provisions in House Bill 2903, Chicago would receive 50.2% of the new dollars going into the formula this next year. Which means that Chicago would get more than twice the number of dollars that it has students. And for those of us downstate, I think we need to look at the provisions and the results of that formula. Is it the changes in House Bill 2903 would generate eighty-six million additional dollars for schools. And only five hundred and seventy thousand out of those eighty-six million dollars would come downstate. The idea behind Amendment #2 is to redistribute the new dollars on a more equitable basis. So that Chicago with 22% of the students would receive no more than 30% of the new dollars. And what the Amendment does is, reduce the share that Chicago would receive from the school aid formula in the new dollars next year. We're not talking about reducing any of the dollars that any of the areas of the state did get this year. We're only talking about the new dollars for next year. The Amendment reduces the share that Chicago would receive from 50% to 30% and it takes that 20% reduction and give downstate an additional 12%, in the suburbs an additional 8%. The particular provisions in this Amendment, in this formula is to increase the guarantee level to thirteen hundred dollars per student. It increases or decreases



the maximum tax rates for its students...for a school district to receive their maximum share from the state, seven points for unit districts, 4 points for elementary districts. It raises the ceiling on increases in state aid from 25% to 35%. It put in 90% hold harmless, it increases the add on for Strayer-Haig districts from 25% to 50% and lowers the maximum title one waiting from .75 to .675 and increases the title one minimum from .375 to .45. But basically what we're interested in with Amendment #2 is to allocate the new dollars going into the formula, next year on an equitable basis around the state. And the result of that would be to give Chicago 30%, 30.5% of the new dollars, suburban Cook and the suburban areas around Cook County, the five collar counties, 55% of the new dollars and downstate 13%. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Chairman of the Education Committee, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I see no problem with adding another Amendment to this Bill which has had a lot of discussion. What we're doing is basically what we did last week and as long as the House agrees to adopt previous Amendments to another Bill, I see no problem with adding this one and giving us a couple of vehicles with which to deal. The decision again as everybody knows will be made, June 30th...maybe July 1, at two or three in the morning. So we may as well adopt the Amendment and send it over to the Senate so we can get into the nitty-gritty and the discussion of what we're really going to come up with."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Gentleman yield to a real quick question?"



Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Winchester: "Representative Kane, do you have a breakdown by Legislative Districts how this Bill will be beneficial to downstate Legislators?"

Kane: "No, I don't have a breakdown by Legislative Districts. There is a printout available from the Office of Education which shows allocation by school district. I do have figures that I filed in a fiscal note and have before me which shows the general allocation to the major areas of the state. The City of Chicago, the suburbs and downstate."

Winchester: "All right, thank you, Representative Kane."

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

Leinenweber: "I have a question for the Sponsor. I understand what Representative Schneider said that this is probably all irrelevant but, let me ask you one question. I think it can be answered very simply without beating around the bush. If I was the President of the Board of Education of a district that had relative low assessed valuation per pupil and a rapidly growing student body, would I be for your Amendment and in the second half of the question would be; If I was the President of the Board of Education of a district that had a rapidly decreasing student body with the corresponding rapid increase in the assessed valuation per pupil, would I be for your Amendment? Which ones of those hypothetical Presidents of Boards of Education would be for your Amendment?"

Kane: "Is this a unit or dual district?"

Leinenweber: "We'll start out with unions."

Kane: "Okay." "If you're rapidly increasing in enrollment, you would be for this Amendment because it raises the ceiling on state aid from 25% to 35%."

Leinenweber: "If we're rapidly decreasing enrollments...."



Kane: "No, rapidly increasing enrollments, you would support."

Leinenweber: "You would support. Now the other guy would be against it then or when he be for it also."

Kane: "No, he would be for it also because there is 90% hold harmless in there."

Leinenweber: "I can't believe that this is a perfect Bill, even better than a pay raise."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. I think maybe it is appropriate that I do say a few words on this and if I'm listed on the Bill as the Joint Chief Sponsor of this piece of legislation. I think it is only fair to say and I think Representative Stuffle would agree, that he and I set forth with this piece of legislation to try and come up with an agreement that was equitable and fair to the entire state. As it has been said in previous debate on other Bills, that there are over two hundred seventy-five school superintendents who wrote in support of this legislation. What we tried to do here was set up an equitable Bill in the formula and also consider that we're going to talk about funding the categorical grant. To talk about either of these with a separate division of them, like one exist without the other, cannot be done in school funding. To say that Chicago gets a certain percentage of money that may be unreasonable to percentage of students it has, is just erroneous to talk about the Bill in this way. Chicago profits nothing from the Strayer-Haig add on in the formula. Chicago doesn't profit from increasing the excess from other school districts. Chicago doesn't profit in any other way except in money of the formula this year. The most important element of this formula Bill is 90% hold harmless, not only for this year but future years...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brady...let's give the Gentleman some order please."



Brady: "When we discussed this Bill originally, the 90% hold harmless factor in the change in the formula is not a one year item. It will go on and it will help downstate school districts in proportion far more than it will ever help Chicago school districts. And Ladies and Gentlemen, because of this we bargained in good faith to come forward to put ourselves, my name along with Larry Stuffle, on this piece of legislation as the Chief Joint Sponsor. It was my understanding that we were going to go through with this Bill and press for a vote for its passage. I was not even on the floor when this Bill was brought back from Third Reading to Second Reading. I was not informed that this process was going to take place, Mr. Speaker. I think this is highly irregular, certainly is the Chief Sponsors right, I'm sure, but I don't want everybody to be miss led that this is a agreeable tactic. If the Chairman of the Education Committee is correct, we should tack things on all sorts of formula Bills, send them across...vote willy-nilly on it and hammer it out June 30. I think this is pretty silly procedure for this House to follow. I would urge, Ladies and Gentlemen that when we bargain in good faith we set forward to produce what we did with those results and I for one stand in opposition to this Amendment because it changes the entire concept of what we were driving for in the original Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I think there is some corrections to be made here. Representative Brady did begin as one of the three principal-sponsors on this Bill. There is no doubt about that, it was supported and is supported by school superintendents. Only more so now, with the Kane Amendment without question. I've talked to school superintendents throughout this state, unit, elementary, high school districts. They favor the



the Kane approach. Secondly, I should point out, Representative Brady was aware this was coming up. It's not our fault he wasn't here, this Bill reached on the Calendar this morning in the right order of business it came up in direct order. We moved it back in that order, secondly the Amendment has been on his desk for two days now, third we did talk to him...he was aware of the possibility that this would be brought back. And I say most importantly, when you look at the vote last week on the Kane Amendment, the vote was nearly two to one to adopt that Amendment to House Bill 2757. I might also add that each of the other sponsors that I have talked to on this Bill and with regard to this Amendment support the Amendment and support amending the Bill. In support of the Amendment I would also add, that Chicago does get 31% of the new school aid dollars under this Bill with this Amendment despite the fact they have 22% of the students...31% of the new money. I think it's fair in that sense, I think it is fair in that distribution and I might add and reiterate that the groups that Representative Brady mentioned and that I mentioned are more so than ever in support of this Bill with this Amendment. I can understand why he would now oppose the Amendment since it does cut the amount of money to Chicago. But as Representative Kane said, I don't see why it is equitable to give 50% of the new money this year and 45% of the new money since the change in the school aid formula in '73, to one city that has 22% of the students in the state. Every out stater, every downstater, every suburbanite ought to support this Amendment whether this Bill or other Bills goes to Conference Committee or not, whether it is hammered out at the last hour or before that. This Amendment is fair...fair to all and ought to be adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Edgar."



Edgar: "Mr. Speaker would the Sponsor of the Amendment...."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Edgar: "Representative Kane, it seems like this Amendment has something for everybody downstate and maybe I missed it but, what is the cost on this Amendment?"

Kane: "The Amendment...if the Amendment is adopted the total cost of this Bill will drop four million dollars. So this Bill would be, not only a better Bill for us, it costs less money the way that it is."

Edgar: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support Amendment #2, Representative Kane and congratulate him on the thoughtfulness and research that he has put into it. Frankly, it seems to me that we are beginning to get closer and closer to a meaningful revision of the school aid formula. Frankly this provides part of the things that are in the Hoffman Bill that we are attempting to adjust. We are downwardly working on the title one provision of the resource equalizer, Representative Hoffman's Bill would have a freeze on that to cap in three years. We're beginning to look at the differences between the accessibility for the unit districts, elementary districts. Representative Kane has taken the recommendation of the Illinois Office of Education in this regard. We are...the best parts perhaps of the Bill is that they included two parts... two separate Bills that I had introduced and sponsored before the Elementary Secondary Education Committee, lost by only one vote. Frankly because we didn't have attendance there. We are indeed attempting to do something for the increase of assessed valuation around the state. We are saying that we will have a larger guarantee per student for all the students in the State of Illinois. as well as doing the 90% hold harmless. I think if you



examine this Amendment..it does a lot, it does a lot with less money and it offers something that needs to be done, the resource equalizer. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're looking at approximately one-third of the budget of the State of Illinois. I suggest to you there are some who would compare apples and oranges. The school formula is not a simple thing, it's something that can be maneuvered, rigged and jiggled. It's like a little slot machine and now we're changing the rules. I suggest to you that what this Bill does is indeed rip-off to City of Chicago by saying that they are getting an undue amount of money. That is not the case, the school aid formula consists of many sources of revenue and we have in a situation... if we try to compare the cost for handicapped children, the cost of educating blind, surely all of you would agree that the cost of educating the blind has got to be more than the cost of educating other children. If we pointed out that perhaps the cost of aiding the cost of the crippled or the mentally retarded is a little greater than aiding all the other children, you would agree. In the school aid formula we have another group of handicapped people, those who are handicapped by poverty. What you are doing with this Amendment is taking out money that would have been appropriated for the education of these children and your talking about title one funds. Both from the state and federal level, you're jiggling the formula around and saying now, no, poverty is no handicap. It was a handicap when we passed the formula, we have gone along with the formula in the sense of good will and fair play. There has been no Committee hearings, no experts to testify on this particular Amendment, just an Amendment in the night. It's like an



abortion, swift, silent no reprieve. They will tell you that the Bill will be all right when it comes back from the Senate. But I say to you, what you are watching is an abortion of the handicap children in the City of Chicago. In good conscience...inequity, you cannot vote for a Christmas tree for yourself at the expense of others. It is unreasonable and you will hear no one from the City of Chicago....no one who comes from a handicapped district, will tell you this is a good Bill. Yes, there will be those who will say it will give more money to my school district. Yes, I want to hold down my taxes but Ladies and Gentlemen, poverty is a handicap. And I suggest what you are going to do when you rearrange this formula is abort and assassinate the poverty children in the City of Chicago and other areas of the state. Gentleman, this is a Bill designed greed rather than need. It is a bad Amendment and it should be defeated. If we can work out a solution in the Senate, hopefully they can, but surely we should not attach this Amendment to this Bill and assassinate all the handicap children."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane to close the debate. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk. Your light is not flashing, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen on the floor and to all the lobbyists in the gallery. If you ever wonder why a Legislator is sometimes gun-shy about Cosponsoring a piece of legislation, this is a perfect example of what happens. For the best laid plans of mice and men sometimes go awry. One time a Gentleman from Chicago was one of the Chief Sponsors 'in the middle of the night' a young man from Sangamon County came in with an idea that changed the whole attitude of what we were going to do this year in regard to education. What we did the other evening is something that we should have done earlier. It should have been in the main Bill but it just wasn't determined



that it should come out. So it was done by Amendment, this Amendment will have no further effect. It's an Amendment that should go on because what is going to happen as you all know, Jones in Chicago knows, both Jones's in Chicago knows that on the 30th of June, we'll come back with the Conference Committee and we'll hammer out at the very very late...late hour what is actually going to happen. I think this Amendment should go on the Bill, it's already been passed out of here. It's time we move on to another issue."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane to close the debate."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just very very briefly. I think we've heard an awful lot of crocodile tears from the City of Chicago this afternoon. We're saying that we are gutting the handicapped and we're eliminating the handicap for poverty, well that's just simply is not the case. We are still are still weighting title one students by two-thirds of a student. So for every title one student that student will be counted for... by one and two-thirds. That's not gutting the handicapped. Chicago will still get 30% of the new dollars next year, it won't get half of the dollars next year but then I think with 22% of the students, less than a quarter of the students...Chicago should not get half of the money. I think we're being eminently fair, I think that 30% of new dollars...since over the last five years Chicago has gotten better than 40% of the new dollars. I think that we can say that we have been more than fair to the City of Chicago and it is now time to look at some of the other districts around the state that are working under very very severe handicaps and I urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed



by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. Houlihan to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had hoped to ask a question during debate but I noticed that the board was not...probably cleared of the presiding officer. But I think Representative Kane here has begun the first honest discussion of the school aid formula that I can recall on the House floor. What he has done and whether you agree with his division or not, has to admire the forthrightness of which he is presenting it. Rather than taking some complicated formula and saying that that in itself give you the right to spread money around. He's moving backwards from where the money is going to go and devising a formula that will implement that division of money. And I think that is more honest than any of our discussions on the House floor have ever been. What we've got to do is, move away from the sanctity...the words of the School Problems Commission, it says, the formula was engraved and granted and moved towards actually talking about dollars. Who is going to get what and how much and I think because of this reason, Representative Kane deserves our support."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 50 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the motion and the Amendment is adopted. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by which Amendment #2 to House Bill 2903 was adopted I move to reconsider that vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 was adopted. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane on that motion."

Kane: "Move to lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "He moves that that motion lie on the table."



All in favor of Mr. Kane's motion to lie on the table say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, that motion lies on the table. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Stuffle-Kane. Amends House Bill...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I would like to withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Withdraws Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 2916."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2916, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2916 is an emergency Bill that provides for an emergency increase in the debt limit provisions of the School Code relating to our schools. What we have throughout the State of Illinois...in some places we have declining enrollment and other places we have accelerating enrollment. It happens in my district and some other parts of the state, we have some schools that have their school population leap frogging rapidly and this has coupled with inflation and the high cost of constructing schools, made it impossible under the existing debt limitations for schools to build the new classrooms that are needed to house the school children. House Bill 2916 provides an emergency and one time escape from the existing school debt limit by providing as follows; that where a school population, the enrollment increases either 35% or by two hundred students from one year to the next. And is necessary to build class rooms or additional facilities and this need and the exact cost are approved and certified by the regional superintendent of schools and the state superintendent of schools and where a referendum is held by the voters that's a front door referendum and the notice



of the election and the ballot also indicates the particulars that where the voters approve in a referendum, the issuance of bonds, they may be issued. And this is up to a limit of 15% of the assessed valuation. This Bill has been review and the concept by the respected law firm of Chapman and Cutler who many of you recognize as a conservative law firm that review bond issuences. They have advised me that they feel this concept in this Bill is fiscally sound and is an excellent idea that's needed. The Bill has been amended, Representative Steele had an Amendment that provides an addition to the criterion that I've outlined. Where it is necessary to meet a state mandate or to provide quality education and the voters vote for it by a two-thirds vote where bonds may be issued. I think this is a Bill that you all can support for the following reasons. One, it does not spend one penny of state money, it does not change the formula. It does not take away money from one group and give it to another as many of the formula Bills do. It costs no money to the state, no change in the formula, doesn't take away money from anyone else. And the only thing that it really is, is a self help Amendment so that the school district in question that has this leap frog rapid enrollment can go to the voters and with the voters approval...issue these bonds. I would be happy to answer any questions, I encourage your favorable support for House Bill 2916."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Gentleman could tell us if the school district in question is smart enough to have conferred with the local municipality in question and required massive developer donations or payments, front-end payments so that such a referendum would not be necessary."

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Skinner that is a good question as it happens the Hawthorne school which is one of them, located in



central Lake County, actually on the border between my district and District 31...has extracted from the builders not only cash donations but donations of land. But notwithstanding all that they still have...not able to construct what they need. And they've done everything possible to get donations of cash and land but they still need this lifting of the debt limit up to 15% in order to take care of the boys and girls that are going there."

Skinner: "Thank you. I would merely observe to those of you who want growth to any price, that growth does have a price and some of the parts of the state such as my district, would as soon, that if there is any growth to be had in the State of Illinois that it be in your district, not mine."

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

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question? Don, there is a referendum, is there not in this Bill because I don't see it in my analysis."

Deuster: "There is absolutely a provision for a referendum and the Bill provides that the notice of the election shall state that the amount of the indebtedness proposed to be incurred would exceed the debt limit. So the notice itself tells the people what this is all about and the ballot question, the ballot will state what the percentage of equalized assessed valuation will be outstanding in bonds if this bond issuance is approved. So the voters and the notice of the election and the actual ballot that they vote on will know that this will be an extraordinary debt limit that they are approving or that they are being asked to approve."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "I speak in favor of this Bill because I'm very cognizant of the need of the schools in Lake County. I



come from the other district in Lake County, 31. The south end of our district the enrollment is falling down and the north end of our district and the west end is going up. This is a very good Bill because the taxpayers will be completely apprised by the notice as to what the referendum will be about, there is nothing hidden or secret in it and the people are going to have the right to determine it. It is not a back door referendum, it is a direct referendum and I ask your support for this very important Bill to help this various school districts that are likewise affected in other areas besides lake."

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

Deuster: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this came out of the Elementary Secondary Education Committee with a vote of 21 to nothing, I think it is fiscally sound, conservative and much needed in those areas where school enrollment is rapidly expanding. And I ask for your favorable support for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Campbell, would somebody push Chuck Campbell's switch over there. Mr. Giorgi, would you please push Mr. Giorgi's switch 'aye'. Mr. Barnes wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', 5 'nays', 3 voting 'present' this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2926."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2926, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli. Is he in the chambers? Out of the record. 2932, Mr. Schneider...who is the Sponsor of 2932, Elementary Secondary? For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman arise?"



Schlickman: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."

Schlickman: "We were provided with a priority of call Calendar and I'm wondering why we're not complying with it."

Speaker Bradley: "We're going down today's Calendar as instructed by the Speaker of the House."

Schlickman: "Well, who developed this priority of call Calendar and caused to be distributed on our desk and add to the confusion? And don't we normally at this state of the Session, go by the priority of call in fairness to everybody involved?"

Speaker Bradley: "I believe that the Speaker has the option of going with the priority of call or going with the Calendar and he told me to go with the Calendar."

Schlickman: "Where is the Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "He is on the floor...just a minute ago. Mr. Speaker....2932."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2932, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp on 2932....out of the record. 2941."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2941, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to the Clerk's of Courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2941 proposes to raise the minimum and maximum for the Clerk of the Court, of the normally called Circuit Clerk of the various counties, other than Cook County. This Bill originally started out as something different. We changed the nature of this Bill to make it reflect the same figures that House Bill 2256 does. Which is now on Postponed Consideration, raising the maximum and minimum of the other county officers. And there are no questions, I would ask



for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor....Mr...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he would."

Schlickman: "We are increasing the salaries for the county officials?"

Flinn: "No, what we're doing is permitting the County Boards to do that. But we're raising the maximum...some have reached their maximum...some of the larger counties have reached their maximum and we are now in effect holding a lid on them. Some of the others are still at the minimum, I would hasten to add that there are a few counties that are still at the minimum. It would force an increase on some of them but by and large it doesn't affect of them except by action of the County Boards."

Schlickman: "You say it would force an increase on some of the counties?"

Flinn: "A few of the smaller counties, yes, I'm not sure of the number of counties."

Schlickman: "That would be a mandated state program would it?"

Flinn: "I don't think so."

Schlickman: "Why not?"

Flinn: "Well, I don't...because we don't pay any of the salaries of the county officers with the exception of the State's Attorney and he's not involved."

Schlickman: "Well under a Bill that we passed yesterday we would."

Flinn: "I don't think we would in this case."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'....oh, I'm...Mr. Walsh, the Gentleman from Cook."

Walsh: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman indicates that he will."



Walsh: "Did I understand that this does increase the minimum salary?"

Flinn: "Yes, it increases the minimum salary for the Circuit Clerks depending on the size of the county. And it also increases the maximum allowed. I frankly believe that we should get out of the business of maximum and minimum so far as the county officers are concerned and leave it up to the County Boards all the time. But since we do have these things and the people involved in the House Bill 2256 for example, cannot get a raise until 1983. The County Boards can't even give them a raise if we don't pass it. And all we're doing with this Bill is trying to make the Circuit Clerk the same as the other county officers. That's what this Bill does."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that's the longest response that I have ever had to a question that required a 'yes' or 'no'. The fact that we increase the minimum certainly does mandate that we pay...that the county pay at least that amount of money. Now the habit has been in many counties, for the County Board to pay no more than the minimum. They reject any maximum and therefore, the counties come to us and ask us to increase the minimum. So that the effect of it is that we are raising the salaries of county employees...of county officeholder. Now I suggest to you that that is wrong, that's the responsibility of the County Board, not of us. And I would agree certainly with the Gentleman. We ought to do away with the minimum. I have no objection to keeping the maximum but we should do away with the minimum because, the way the minimum is used is that's the salary and if we increase the minimum the salary is increased accordingly and we get the rap from the County Board to the taxpayer for making that increase. I urge that you defeat this Bill, Mr. Speaker and maybe the Gentleman can take it back to Second



Reading an remove the minimum."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? Mr. Flinn to close the debate."

Flinn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been an advocate for many years that the Legislature should get out of the business of setting the maximum and the minimum salaries on local county officers. And that ought to be the duty of the right and the responsibility of the County Boards. This Bill does not do that, this Bill does raise the maximum and it raises the minimum. It does not affect very many counties except by action of the County Boards. There are a few smaller counties that this would involve. One of the smallest counties, Polk County is already above the minimum. Now, I'm not willing to take it back and amend the Bill at all. I'm saying to vote it up or down just like it is but I'll be back next year trying to knock out both the maximum and the minimum."

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 DuPage, Mrs. Dyer to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Well I hope it won't be necessary. I'm just going to urge a red light on this because we are mandating counties to pay at least this new minimum we've set to these Clerks of the Circuit Court. It goes just contrary to what Mr. Yourell was promoting yesterday. It is imposing something on counties without giving them a means of paying it and I'm delighted to see that we do not have 89 votes. And please, let's everybody put a red light on."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Someone record Bradley, 'aye' back there please. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 92 'ayes' 44 'no'."



The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I would like a verification of this Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Mr. Flinn asks to poll the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Antonovych, E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes, Campbell, Chapman...."

Speaker Bradley: "Chapman, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Friedrich, Gaines, Giglio, Griesheimer, Hanahan, Hart, Hoffman, Emil Jones, Kane, Laurino, Levin, Mahar, Mautino...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mautino, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom, Meyer, Peters, Pierce, Ryan, Von Boeckman and Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "O'Brien, 'aye'. Call the affirmative roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Anderson, Bartulis, Beatty, Bennett, Bianco, Birchler, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Capparelli, Chapman, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, Deavers, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewing, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Geo-Karis...."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis arise?"

Geo-Karis: "To 'no' please. Switch it to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "You wish to be recorded as voting 'no'?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Correct? Record the Lady as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Getty, Giorgi, Harris..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Adams wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Right? Record him 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Harris, Dan Houlihan, Hoxsey, Huff, Jacobs, Johnson, Dave Jones, Kelly, Kempiners, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Lucco, Madigan, Madison, Matejek, Mautino, McAuliffe, McClain, McGrew,



McLendon...."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster arise?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, will you change my vote from 'present' to 'yes' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Change the Gentleman from 'present' to 'aye'. Continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "McMaster, 'aye'. McPike, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Polk, Pouncey, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sharp, Shumpert, Stanley, Steczo, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipword, Van Duyn, Vinson, Vitek, R.V. Walsh, Winchester, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Question of the affirmative. Turn Mrs. Dyer on."

Dyer: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Abramson."

Speaker Bradley: "Abramson...he's over in the window."

Dyer: "Okay. Representative Bartulis."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Bartulis, he's 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."

Dyer: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Brummer...he's in his seat."

Dyer: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Capparelli...he's 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."

Dyer: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Darrow is in the rear of the chambers."

Dyer: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Johnson....."



Dyer: "Dawson. D A W S O N."

Speaker Bradley: "Dawson, is in his chair."

Dyer: "Representative DiPrima."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative DiPrima....he is in the rear of the chambers."

Dyer: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Bradley: "Laurino."

Dyer: "Domico. I see him."

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

Dyer: "Looking very handsome. Representative John Dunn."

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

Dyer: "Representative Ebbesen."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Ebbesen...I can't...his chair is turned around. He's not in it, is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Dyer: "Representative Farley."

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

Dyer: "Representative....."

Speaker Bradley: "Now just a minute....he's not in his chair. Is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Dyer: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Johnson...he's not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll and Mr. Capparelli has returned. Put him back on. Representative Hanahan wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. And Mr. Giglio wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Dyer: "Representative Kozubowski."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Kozubowski is not in this chamber. How is he recorded?"



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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll. Take him off first then I will recognize you to be voted as 'aye'. Otherwise the Clerk....it's tough enough. Further questions?"

Dyer: "Yes, thank you. Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Bradley: "Leverenz...he's over....."

Dyer: "Representative Lucco."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Lucco...he's in the aisle."

Dyer: "Representative Madison."

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

Dyer: "Representative McAuliffe."

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

Dyer: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "He was in Farley's seat and.....he's here."

Dyer: "Okay. Representative Molloy."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Molloy...."

Dyer: "He's there."

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

Dyer: "Representative Mike Madigan."

Speaker Bradley: "Michael Madigan....he's not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? Take him off the roll."

Dyer: "Representative Mudd."

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

Dyer: "Thank you. Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Bradley: "Mugalian is in his seat."

Dyer: "Representative....oh, he has just returned. Representative Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Schisler is in his seat.

Michael Madigan has returned to the chamber. We'll put him back on the roll."

Dyer: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Stuffle...he's right in front of you."

Dyer: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "Taylor is in his seat."



Dyer: "Okay. Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Van Duyne is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? He's down here in front."

Dyer: "Representative Vinson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Vinson...there is a Gentleman standing in front of his seat and I can't...he's in the aisle though. Right behind you."

Dyer: "All right. Did we verify Representative Mudd?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Mudd is in his seat, yes."

Dyer; "Yes, he's there, I couldn't see him. All right I believe that's all."

Speaker Bradley: "Emil Jones wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Ebbesen has returned to the chambers, we'll put him back on as voting 'aye'. Mr. Mahar wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Antonovych wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. No...no. Mr. Vinson...have we caught up Jack? Mr. Vinson wishes to change his vote from 'aye', to 'no'. Mr. Bartulis has returned to the chamber, put him back on the roll. Mr. Neff, what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to change from 'no' to 'aye' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Reilly for what purpose do you wish...you wish to go from 'present' to 'aye'."

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Von Boeckman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 47 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2943, Mr....."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2943, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."



Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, this Bill is a Bill that passed the House with a 134 votes last year and fell one vote short in the Senate. Otherwise, I wouldn't be back with it this year. What it does, it finishes up the job that we did in the 78th General Assembly when we knocked out liens to the aged and the blind and disabled in order for them to qualify for public aid. What this does is knock out the back liens. There is some seven million dollars liens which about only 50% of the value of the property lies there. And I contend that we're rapidly arriving at the point where it would cost as much money to collect the liens as the state realizes in revenues. And I would ask your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions? If none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? Mr. Schlickman, the Gentleman from Cook your light is not ever flashing, that's why I don't recognize you. Is it working?"

Schlickman: "It is here."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I'm sorry, it's not here."

Schlickman: "I'll call out next. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Flinn: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "According to the fiscal note, this Bill if approved would decrease the state's revenue by approximately six hundred thousand dollars for fiscal year '79. An estimate given by the Department of Public Aid. Is that correct?"

Flinn: "Well, I'm not sure it is correct. I used the figures that one of the members of the Department of Public Aid testified in Committee. I was not able to get a fiscal note from the BOB down there because they were covered up. So, I decided that I would use that figure but I would assume that maybe near correct but it does not include the cost of collecting liens, they going to court and that sort of thing."



Schlickman: "Well do you know what the cost is?"

Flinn: "Nope, I sure don't."

Schlickman: "So that the best figure that we have with respect to this Bill is by its passage and approval, it would reduce state revenue by over a half million dollars or six hundred thousand as estimated by the Department of Public Aid."

Flinn: "Yes, but it doesn't take into the consideration, Gene, that the facts are that the law was very unfair in the first place. It was placed on the aged, blind and disabled and no other public aid recipients were required to sign liens to start with, when I started out I had to amend the original Bill and amend this part out. Because the Welfare Administration wouldn't hold still for it. Now that is the only way I could get my Bill signed, was let the Governor use his amendatory veto power on the thing and we came back and approved that. And all I'm trying to do is knock out what I consider a very unfair law."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further questions? If none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Vote Bradley 'aye' please. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes'...119 'ayes', 18 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2944, Mr. DiPrima. 2944."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2944, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Commission on Pioneer Memorial Plaza. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative DiPrima on the floor? Take it out of the record. 2946...out of the record. 2979... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, what purpose do you



arise?"

Brady: "Are you going down the Calendar, did you pass 2963 for any reason?"

Speaker Bradley: "I sure did, back up to 2963. I'm very sorry, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2963, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Brady: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. House Bill 2963 increases the Illinois State Scholarship Commission monetary award grant up a hundred dollars, the maximum award....from fifteen fifty to sixteen hundred and fifty dollars for a full-time student. This was approved by the Board of Higher Education, it was in the Governor's allocation budget. Senator Regner is the Sponsor of the Appropriation Bill which has cleared the Senate Committee with this full amount in it. And I urge your favorable support."

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

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we get too carried away I would like for the House to realize what you're voting on. This would cost an additional...State Scholarship Commission to provide an additional fifty dollars per student. The only students in the State of Illinois that would be eligible for this additional fifty dollars would be those attending private schools. When we were in Committee and the question was specifically asked, how many students could be covered with the same amount of dollars...the Executive Director of the Scholarship Commission suggested that we could cover three thousand, I repeat, three thousand additional public school children the same amount of dollars that this is going to cost."



All of which would be going to the private schools around the State of Illinois. I submit to you that all the colleges, both private and public are facing the same financial crisis, that it is not just a matter for private schools to address. I tell you, I have three private schools in my own legislative district so it is not an easy matter. But I think if you look at a reasonable request and the amount of students that can be help, the only vote on this should be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell to explain you vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, that's exactly correct. It is very easy to be generous but I think you have to concern yourself with trying to just in some cases. This does reflect upon the public schools and the public schools have it in the tradition American economy, have been the backbone of all those who have sought their climb from different statuses in life. And I think at this time for us to turn a deaf ear to the public institution is not the wisest thing. And I have to agree with McGrew, if you can't take care of public institutions at the same time you're doing the private perhaps we are indeed doing an injustice. And therefore, I have to vote 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 131 'ayes', 20 'nays'....Mr. McAuliffe...131 'ayes', 20 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe, what purpose do you arise?"

McAuliffe: "I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

McAuliffe: "I would like to share with some of the other Members who may not have the opportunity to ride the CTA



in Chicago, some poetry that the CTA is putting on all the buses in Chicago courtesy of the Illinois Arts Council. I'm going to read this poem to you because I know you would all like to share with us...."

Speaker Bradley: "Wait a minute. Mr. Collins, we would like to get his attention on this. He would be very interested."

McAuliffe: "I hope everybody is listening. This says, 'discipline, run one mile each day in all weathers. And never twice run the same direction'. Then in parentheses it says, 'avoid running into the lake', then it says, write one poem each day in all moods and never twice write the same poem. And then again in parentheses, it says, 'avoid running into the lake.' Now this has got a beautiful picture here of space ship circling the Sears Tower and some guy running along the rocks in Lake Michigan. So anybody that wants to come over and take a look at this, now this is being put on all of Chicago CTA buses. I know the downstate people don't have an opportunity to share this poetic scene and I wanted to bring it to your attention. So anybody that wants to come over and take a look at it, it is courtesy of the Illinois taxpayers so I thought you would all like to know."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "I just wanted to say, how nice it was to have Roger McAuliffe read poetry to all of us."

Speaker Bradley: "He was always that kind of guy. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, the champion of the Art Council."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, what Representative McAuliffe didn't tell you was that this poem was written by a man named Friedland, well there was a Democrat named Friedland who was the Republican candidate for the Mayor of Chicago. I guess he just decided to go straight."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker inasmuch as we're on the matter of personal



privilege, just for another moment. I was just handed a newspaper except from the Paddock Publications; it says, Governor James Thompson is willing to trade jobs, roads or bridges for an ERA vote. And I want to publically plead with my colleague, Timothy Simms from Winnebago to change his vote and vote for ERA so we can get the North South Highway passed."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 2979, Mr. Gaines. Mr. Simms's name was used in debate....."

Simms: "I appreciate the Gentleman from Winnebago bring that to my attention. I will discuss that with him tonight in the cafeteria as he has his evening meal."

Speaker Bradley: "2979."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2979, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense for the Illinois Commission on Human Relations. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is just what the Clerk says, it has been carefully scrutinized by the Bureau of the Budget and cut. And carefully scrutinized by the Appropriations Committee and cut and we are asking you to approve what is left. Thank you."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've asked before and I know that I have and other Members have on appropriation matters that the Sponsor would indicate how much it is and how much of an increase it is over the preceding year."

Gaines: "I don't have how much of an increase it is....I don't think it is. And it's...the original one was four hundred and eighty-nine thousand, five hundred. It is now four hundred and eighty-six thousand, nine hundred



dollars and it is only six hundred dollars more than last year. I don't think there are very many budgets that are that close to last year's budget."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I happen to be on the Appropriation Committee that studied this matter... with some delight. We find on this particular Commission that the average salary is nineteen thousand, five hundred and eight-two dollars per person for everyone enrolled and working under that particular Commission. This is particular enlightening in view of the fact that in 1977, it would cost the State of Illinois an average of seventy-six dollars for every case that came before us and the estimated 1979 budget will be one hundred and fifty-two dollars per case which is a two hundred... excuse me, which is a 100% increase over two years ago in terms of a case load. I suggest that this is a very interesting budget and you should take a hard look at it."

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

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I too serve on Appropriation Committee and the Chairman of this Commission admitted 30% of the work is duplicate and I think if you want to find a good Commission to do away with, the best way to do is not to give them any money and vote 'no' on this appropriation."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if any of the employees who earn over twenty thousand dollars, are receiving raises this year? It would seem to me inappropriate that appointed officials should be receiving raises when the elected officials who are obviously are more competent...we wouldn't be



here are not."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I also serve on the Appropriation Committee and I can't for the life of me understand what cost per case, Representative McGrew is talking about. This is a Commission on....this is a Commission on Human Relations. I don't know what cases he is talking about that cost a dollar and eighty-two or a dollar fifty cents... a hundred fifty dollars per case. I think we ought to pass this Commission Bill and go on the rest of the business of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 92 'ayes', 39 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2995."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2995, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last year Representative Telcser and myself passed some nineteen Bills affecting the Condominium Property Act. Due to some confusion in the language the Condominium Association were required to include developer within their public liability coverage. This requirement has resulted in several insurance criterions, refusing to renew the condominium in coverage because of the additional uncertainty in expense. Quite frankly, this is just some clarifying language which will alleviate the Condominium Board from insuring the developer long after he has divested himself of any interest in terms of units or in terms of serving on the Board."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is,



shall this Bill pass? All those in favor...the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Are you saying that under your Bill, Representative that the developer would be excluded from all liability and he would only be included as an insured in his capacity as a unit, owner or board member?"

Speaker Bradley: "Did you hear the question, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, yes I did. Adeline, I had hoped that your mood would improve as the day went on. Quite frankly. Adeline, all we're doing with this Bill and it was an oversight in the previous Bill. And we, in the previous Bill locked in the Condominium Board in the Condominium Association into insuring the developer of the condominium years after the developer had divested himself of any unit ownership or of serving on the board. So the developer has sold out his interest completely to unit owners who have come in and purchased those units. And we are presently requiring, under the language that is in the new Condominium Property Act that we passed. We are presently requiring those Condominium Boards to insure the developer for liability on that building long after he has divested himself of any interest in the building whatsoever."

Geo-Karis: "What you're doing then is eliminating the necessity, if I understand you correctly of insuring the developer from all liability?"

O'Brien: "No, what we are doing is eliminating the necessity of the owners of the condominium units and the board from insuring the developer of his liability. He will have to incur that expense himself. The only thing that the condominium owners will have to insure is their public areas such as their garages, their swimming pools, their halls and so forth."

Geo-Karis: "Well just to show you that I'm not really in a bad mood, I will vote for your Bill."



Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Tipsword, would you record me as 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we 155 'ayes', no 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitution Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3002."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3002, a Bill for an Act to change certain laws pertaining to libraries. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a rather simple Bill, it amends the Library...the Local Library Act and provides procedure dissolving for a public library of an incorporated town and village or township. There has been quite a bit of activity on this Bill in the last several days here in the House but I want to assure you that it is back now to its original form with all of the Amendments off of it and it purely makes some arrangements for dissolving of a village, library district. The situation that precipitated this Bill was in New Athens, a small village in St. Clair County. And the situation was, they had a library but later the township had...developed a library district and there is absolutely nothing in the present statute to provide a method of dissolving the library...the village library district within the village. And so, therefore, they have a possibility of double tax jeopardy and that's what this Bill addresses itself to. It sets up a method of dissolving which provides... that would allow for fifty voters to petition for an election to held on the question of desolving a village or township library. If the election is successful, the Board of Library Director is to sell all property and equipment of the library and pay all debts and obligations."



Including the principal and crude interest of all the outstanding bonds. Any surplus remaining is to be turned over to the village or township to be used for its corporate purposes. I think it is probably self explanatory but if there are any questions, I would attempt to answer them."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm a Cosponsor of House Bill 3002 and it does just what Representative Richmond says it will do. The City of New Athens found their selves in a quandry of having two library districts, a city library and a district library. They couldn't dissolve either one of them without some legislation, it was just a flaw in the Library Law. Representative Dwight Friedrich was also on the Bill, he isn't here today but he too would urge that you support Representative Richmond in 3002, by voting affirmative. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Pullen: "Mr. Sponsor, I noticed in some of the analysis that are floating around the floor that there was one time an Amendment on this Bill. And as I recall, the Amendment has been taken off. Would you verify that please."

Richmond: "Yes, that's true. I think Representative Huskey's last Amendment restored the Bill to its original state. Which addresses only the proposition of the dissolution."

Pullen: "So that makes it a great Bill, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Madigan, would you turn around and vote me 'aye'. Have all voted who



wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 156 'ayes', 1 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3006."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3006, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code and Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3006 is a Bill which clarifies and makes certain corrections to House Bill 1500, the Criminal Justice Reform Bill which we passed last fall. I want to emphasize that the changes are technical in nature to reflect the intent of the House at the time that it was passed. There was a technical error that we had in there that provides that a...where there is a felony conviction while armed, the offense would be treated as either a Class I, or such greater offense as it might be. For example, a rape while armed would be Class X, but other lesser offenses while armed would be Class I. Through an error in the drafting, we have an anomaly where Class I would prevail even through a person was armed while committing the rape. The second change is another technical change to permit the Prisoner Review Board, which is the successor to the Pardon and Parole Board to grant paroles in three member panels as they have historically done for those prisoners that will still be under the old parole system. The third change is a...clarifies any credit that is given is...when set sentences given is earned to the date of the parole hearings and is not to take into consideration anticipated good time, it must be earned in the future. The fourth clarification is in an area of the...those documents which must be provided to the court. It clarifies the language to provide that a... in effect a presentence investigation or other confidential



material, is not intended to be impounded by the courts but rather the finding by the Judge is to be kept as a permanent record. The fifth change is to put back into the law the requirement, it was inadvertently taken out that the presentence report to be made available to the Department of Corrections when the person is sentenced to the penitentiary. The next change is purely a technical change by the Legislative Reference Bureau to conform Section 5.53. And finally, the last provision would make a third conviction of a Class II or greater offense, a Class X felony. Due to a drafting error in the Bill, we provided that a third conviction of a Class I or II offense but we omitted in drafting to provide for the possibility of one of the prior convictions being Class X. As the Bill passed out of Committee, I don't recall that there was any opposition to it through the recommendation of the Criminal Sentencing Commission. This was approved that was a newly created Commission under House Bill 1500. And it also take...took the posture that no substantive changes be made and we have conformed to that recommendation. And I would move for passage of House Bill 3006."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion. Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? Pardon me, the Lady from Cook, Miss Peg Martin."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Martin: "Mr. Getty, are there any provisions in House Bill 3006 that will provide for day for day or time off for good behavior for those persons who are doing twenty years or more?"

Getty: "No, that would have constituted a substantive change in the law. The recommendation of the Criminal Sentencing Commission was that we address ourselves for a least a year period. To no substantive changes in the effect of House



Bill 1500 but rather we restrain ourselves and only make technical changes such as these here or clarifications."

Martin: "Wouldn't that then mean that this House Bill 1500 along with your present Amendment, doesn't that mean that that might make that unconstitutional, the entire House Bill 1500 inasmuch as you did not address yourself to these good behavior time for those people sentenced twenty years or over."

Getty: "This Bill, 3006 does not address itself to that at all. There was a substantial discussion last fall as to whether day for day good time would apply to everybody or whether it would apply only to those people who opted to come under the day for day good time provision who are already doing time and were sentenced to a period of less than twenty years. And it was that provision, less than twenty years that prevailed. That is the law now, this Bill doesn't change that or address that subject one way or another. There were people on both sides of that issue and that was the position that prevailed."

Martin: "Thank you very much."

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? Danny O'Brien, vote me 'aye' please. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 157 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3010. Schoeberlein, 'aye' on that Bill....3010."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3010, a Bill for an Act to provide for the registration of container trade marks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dan Houlihan on the floor? Mr. Brady... Mr. Houlihan's Bill. Take it out of the record. 3012."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3012, a Bill for an Act making



appropriations for the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring before you the education television consortium for west or central Illinois hopefully for the last time. If you will but pass this we need not come to the trough anymore. This would conclude the development of educational television for the west central Illinois including thirty-sixth Legislative Districts, 37, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 51st. It is now a consortium that would include Blackhawk Junior College, Sangamon State University in Springfield, Bradley in Peoria and Western Illinois University in Macomb. The fact of the matter is, it will be 2.1 million people that will be affected by this, 1.9 million do not have any education television whatsoever available to them. The State of Illinois will be providing about 28% of the money, Federal Government providing 24% of the money and the public at large has pledged 48% of the money for it so, what it boils down to is that for one dollar of bond money we will be spending over the next two years, two dollars and forty-seven cents. It is a good investment in anyone's book and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Leinenweber: "Only incidentally...you ought to vote against this because it is not in the Governor's budget and will undoubtedly be vetoed. But that is not a particularly important reason to cast your vote for or against this. The best reason is that it is just plain and simple a bad Bill, a bad concept to use taxpayers money for forms of communication. I think I've made this speech probably six years in a row. I think Representative McGrew has had this Bill six years in a row. I haven't been successful in the previous five years and I'm sure I won't be today."



However, whenever you get into the area of public financing of communication of ideas you're asking for public control of those same dissemination of ideas. Because I don't want my taxpayer dollars...my tax dollar to be used to disseminate socialistic ideas or other ideas and I don't think other people on the floor who may prefer socialistic ideas want their tax dollars used to disseminate capitalistic ideas. I think the 48% that they got from the public is fine, they ought to go back to the public and pick up the other 52%. You ought not ask the taxpayers to spend their tax dollars in this way and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It wasn't the Appropriation I Committee finest hour when this Bill got out. The light of reason and fiscal responsibility had dimmed rather noticeably. Now this Bill has been up before, the Governor has vetoed it before in various varieties. He points out that the cost at this point is 2.16....two million, one hundred and sixty-eight thousand and five hundred dollars. But you need to recognize, it has been pointed out before by other Representatives on this floor, particularly Representative Totten. When you measure this over the years future taxpayers has to pay back in excess of 3.7 million dollars. In addition there is a rather large additional cost each year for the maintenance of this expensive system. I have yet to find anyone who knows a thing about it who has any doubt about the present excellence of Western Illinois University. It is a marvelous school as it is, it doesn't need another infusion of taxpayers financial resources that are not available. The Governor's Office has to make a determination of what projects are entitled to priority. And on the Capital Development Program this year the expenditures are being held to 22.8 million dollars. The priority wasn't there, perhaps



next year when this Sponsor brings the Bill back, it might be possible. But we've got to hold the line unless we want to burst the budget. I urge you that this is one place that you can hold the line without doing any harm to anyone and particularly not to Western University. Vote 'no'."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the purpose of an introduction, a former Leader in the Senate, a man who served sixteen years in that great Body, a good friend of ours. Judge Bob Cherry, Bob welcome again to Springfield."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew to close the debate."

McGrew: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Once again just let me iterate that we now have the entire consortium set up with the agreement of the secondary schools, the private schools, the junior colleges and major universities in the area. The House of Representatives has passed this Bill on four different occasions. Governor Walker did provide the original startup money, we know own the tower at Bluffs in Jacksonville. We already have the station on the air in Peoria, we are moving onward and upward and I do honestly believe that this program will soon become on the air in full force and I ask you to please give me the 89 votes necessary."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow to explain his vote."

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



House. You folks from the metropolian area enjoy culture and education and take advantage of the number of universities and universal...university projects and plays and dramas in the Chicago area. Out in western Illinois we aren't so fortunate. In my community we're able to watch educational television produced by the university of Iowa and by the state university of Iowa. Illinois has no educational programs in our area, we have very few educational or cultural events other than in the large metropolian area such as the quad cities and Macomb. There is a great territory in between these cities, there is a number of people living in that area that need this type of entertainment. We would appreciate if those who are able to benefit from events in Chicago would join with us in bring a little culture to Forgotonia in western Illinois. Thank you."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this item was passed before...in fact, five hundred thousand dollars was expended in behalf of this appropriation. What the Gentleman is asking for now is the continuation of the development of the educational television station at Western Illinois University. It's a good program, it's a program that has been developed not only at this university...incorporating the western part of the state but it is a successful program within the City of Chicago college system. Ladies and Gentlemen I think that this is the way...much of education is going to be going in future especially with the declining enrollment, you get a larger base. Going to educational T.V. when you've got the best teachers available and I believe that the two million dollars expansion of the committment that was passed by this General Assembly four years ago. I would strongly recommend that the people



that are voting red or not voting, give this matter some serious reconsideration and give it an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr....have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote having been in education twenty one years, I can guarantee you that education...educational television is not the direction that education is going to take. I've mentioned this on the floor of the House a number of times, that most experiments that I've have seen and that we've gone through educational television in terms of delivery of educational service, is practically nil. Our school went through this ten or fifteen years ago and it turned out to be a disaster. Noway can educational television compete with commercial television. All you have to do is look at the direction that WTTW and other stations have gone to tell you the change in their format. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to explain my 'no' vote on this particular program."

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

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that we would get a few more...we have enough green lights up but I think we ought to have more. Legislation such as this will open up a complete new avenue in education. Educational television, education to an area that we do not have anything at type...west central Illinois. And let's keep in mind that almost 50% of this money that will be used is going to be put in for private enterprises. They're not asking....the group of people in this area are not asking for the government or the state to finance all of it, they are only asking for about 50%. I would hope that we would



have a few more green lights. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 98 'ayes', 57 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, for what purpose do you arise?"

Totten: "For purpose of requesting a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has requested a verification. Mr. McGrew requests a poll of the absentees. We'll poll the absentees. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien what purpose do you arise?"

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. A point of personal privilege. In the gallery around the floor right behind me we have a constituent from the great 13th Legislative District of the State of Illinois and also the Chief Clerk of the Board of Election Commissioners, Bill Rummel."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman Christian, Mr. Tipsword, for what purpose do you arise?"

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I move you that for the remainder of this week while we are working on House Bills that must be out of the House by the 26th of May. I move you for that time period only that we suspend House Rule 55 (I), that being the rule for the introduction of guests.... for the remainder of this week so we might proceed with the business of the Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "That.....did everybody hear the motion, that was only for the this week, til Friday, till the deadline, is that right? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the.... we have now suspended Rule 55 (I), the introduction rule for the rest of the week. Mr. Houlihan, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I have to go over to the Senate to follow my legislative program. I wonder if I could be verified now?"



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten, you wouldn't want to interrupt Mr. Houlihan's Legislative program. He's verified, all right. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes, Caldwell, Deuster, Ebbesen, Farley, Friedrich, Laurino, Madison, Marovitz, McBroom, Pierce and Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "Call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Bartulis, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, J.M. Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Johnson, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Kelly, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Margalus, Matejek, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Meyer, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, O'Brien, Pechous, Polk, Pouncey, Reilly, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Schuneman, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, E.G. Steele, Stuffle, Sumner, Taylor, Terzich, Tipword, Tuerk, Van Duyn, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R. V. Walsh, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Question the affirmative. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Beatty. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Totten: "Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Brummer is in his seat."

Totten: "Byers."

Speaker Bradley: "Byers is not in his seat, he's in the rear of the chambers."

Totten: "Doyle."



Speaker Bradley: "Doyle is in the center aisle."

Totten: "John Dunn."

Speaker Bradley: "John Dunn is in his seat."

Totten: "Greiman."

Speaker Bradley: "O'Brien."

Totten: "Greiman."

Speaker Bradley: "Greiman is in his seat."

Totten: "Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "Hanahan."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Totten: "Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Bradley: "Dan Houlihan, is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Totten: "Huff."

Speaker Bradley: "Huff, is in his seat."

Totten: "Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Jaffe is not in his seat, is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Johnson. I see him."

Speaker Bradley: "Johnson."

Totten: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Bradley: "Kornowicz. How is the Gentelman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off. And Dan Houlihan has returned to the chambers, please put him back on."

Totten: "Kosinski."

Speaker Bradley: "Kosinski. How is he recorded?"



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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Leverenz."

Speaker Bradley: "Leverenz is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Luft."

Speaker Bradley: "Luft is in his seat and Kosinski has returned to the chamber and put him back on."

Totten: "Madigan."

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

Totten: "Mann."

Speaker Bradley: "Bob Mann, Representative Mann is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and Mr. Kornowicz is coming down the aisle, put him back on the Roll."

Totten: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Bradley: "Mulcahey...where is Mulcahey? He's up in the balcony. Now Leverenz has returned to the chambers. Put him back on the Roll."

Totten: "Nardulli."

Speaker Bradley: "Nardulli is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz arise?"

Marovitz: "Please record me as 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Further questions?"

Totten: "O'Brien."

Speaker Bradley: "O'Brien is not in the chambers. How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Totten: "Robinson."

Speaker Bradley: "Robinson is in the window seat."

Totten: "Schuneman."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien is in the aisle right next to you, we'll put him back on the Roll."

Totten: "I don't think he wants to go back on."

Speaker Bradley: "Further questions?"

Totten: "Did you take Schuneman off?"

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Totten: "Stuffle."

Speaker Bradley: "Stuffle....is in his seat."

Totten: "Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "Taylor is in his seat."

Totten: "R.V. Walsh."

Speaker Bradley: "R. V. Walsh is in his seat."

Totten: "Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "Is in her seat."

Totten: "Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Williams. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Totten: "Sharp."

Speaker Bradley: "Sharp is in his seat."

Totten: "No further question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon?"

Totten: "No further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 57 'nays', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing



side, I move to reconsider the vote by which 3012 passed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman having voted on the prevailing side with which House Bill 3012, now moves to reconsider that vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that that be tabled."

Speaker Bradley: "Moves that that motion lies upon the table. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion is tabled. Second Reading, House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 2949. Representative Corneal Davis."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2949, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to permit lessees to receive a rent credit for paying certain lessors' obligations. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook....are there any motions relative to Amendments #1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Corneal Davis. Amends House Bill 2949 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment is the result of conference we held to straighten out the objections that had been raised. And this Amendment differs from the original in that it allows the tenants to petition the court to appoint a receiver to collect rents. Rather than to allow them to withhold a portion of that rent. And the receiver will disburse the portion of these funds to pay the overdue utility bill. The original provided that the tenant acquired service in their own name and this is what the utility companies objected to. Thereby, they made it more difficult for the utilities to collect back charges from the landlord."



And now....instead paying some eight thousand or nine thousand dollars all at once, a receiver will be appointed. And he will receive the rent and he will disburse them and keep up the current bills. I move the adoption of this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, what purpose do you arise?"

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, did you call 50? 2949-50 goes with it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madison: "On a point of information, Mr. Speaker. And it has to do with the motion that Representative Tipsword made sometime earlier. I understood the spirit of the motion that he made relative to the Rule 55 (I), but I think, Mr. Speaker that the motion....the passage of that motion had the opposite effect that he desired. The problem is, that Rule 55 (I) has been flagrantly violated by this House and probably what Representative Tipsword ought to do is move the enforcement of Rule 55 (I), to do away with the introductions."

Speaker Bradley: "Let me point out that the Speaker and the Minority Leader has appointed two Gentlemen to do the introduction on their behalf. And by passing the motion that Mr. Tipsword made, I assume, removes the two Gentlemen that were doing the introduction on their behalf and I've talked with them. So I think that Mr. Tipsword is right where he wants to be with the motion. We talked about that."

Madison: "Okay, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "For the edification of the Members, the Speaker informs me that we will go through Second Readings



now, we'll be here until nine o'clock this evening and we'll go through the Second and then back to Third Readings and continue to work for another five hours and... four hours and forty-five minutes. Anyway we're shooting for nine o'clock. 2950."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any motions relative to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Neff. Amends House Bill 2950 as amended on page 2, by adding...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff on Amendment #2 to House Bill 2950."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that Amendment has been distributed yet, I haven't received a copy of it."

Speaker Bradley: "Turn on Mr. Neff. I understand that it has been distributed, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Would you hold that please."

Speaker Bradley: "Well we're getting late and you will have to talk with the Chief Sponsor as to holding it. He has the prerogative to move it to Third Reading. Mr. Davis."

Davis: "This is the Amendment that the distinguish Gentleman asked me. he said, if you will agree that we just try this. Do you recall...."

Neff: "Yes, I'm sorry...."

Davis: "You said let's just try this."

Neff: "I'm sorry, I was mixed up on the legislation...."

Davis: "It is his Amendment and I agreed to it and God Bless him for agreeing to just try this thing until '80, wasn't it? Just try it, let's just try it and I said, all right, let's just try it."



Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "I move the adoption of....."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2950. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 2951. At the request of the Sponsor we will take it out of the record. House Bill 2973."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2973, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Industrial Commission. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record. 2978."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2978....."

Speaker Bradley: "Miss Catania on the floor? Take it out of the record. 2986."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2986, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Financial Institutions. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any motions relative to Amendment #2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #2 by Representative Neff."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Neff on the tabling motion on Amendment #2."

Neff: "I move that Amendment #2 be tabled."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that Amendment #2 to House Bill 2986 be tabled. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, is maker of the motion the Sponsor of the Amendment that is being tabled?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Neff, is that your Amendment?"



Neff: "No it isn't and I'll change that, I do not move to table it."

Speaker Bradley: "You withdraw your motion then?"

Neff: "I withdraw, yes."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Amendment....then there are not motions relative to those Amendments. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Leverenz. Amends House Bill 2986 on page 2, by deleting line...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz. Turn Mr. Leverenz's on."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is just a technical change in correcting a total in the second Amendment. I move for the adoption of this Amendment so we do have correct totals."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 3040. Mr. Katz, who is handling 3040? Take it out of the record. 3057."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3057, a Bill for an Act in relation to clarification and enforcements of the rights of handicapped persons."

Speaker Bradley: "Who is handling the Bill, Miss Chapman? Is Representative Skinner on the floor? Human Resources Bill, 3057."

Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading of the Bill...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments #....this Bill was read a second time previously. Amendments #1, 2 and 3, were adopted and the Bill was held on Second Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any motions relative to those Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No motions. A fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, we would like to go back to, I believe it is 2986."

Speaker Bradley: "Well let's....we'll get back to it."

Leverenz: "For the purpose to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. With leave of the House we will return to House Bill 2986 and there is a motion to table now, Mr. Neff. Is that your Amendment #2?"

Neff: "That's Committee Amendment but we would like to table it."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Now...the question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten on the motion."

Totten: "Yeah, I think you've got to get the Bill from Third to Second first."

Speaker Bradley: "I asked if there was leave....maybe you're correct. Are there any objections to moving the Bill back to Second Reading? Hearing no objections the Bill will be on Second Reading. Now, Mr. Neff moves to table Amendment #2. All in favor of Amendment #2....of tabling Amendment #2 signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes have it and the Amendment is tabled. Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Yes, on 2986 a question of the Chair. The Sponsor of Amendment #3 indicated that Amendment #3 made a technical correction that was created by Amendment #2. Now that we have tabled #2, what happens?"

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer Representative Totten, we must table #2 and put #3 on and it merely puts the right total in Amendment #3 and that is the



status of the Bill now."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 3138."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3138, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #.....this Bill has been read a second time previously. The next Amendment is Amendment #8, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3138 as amended in the title and in Section I and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw Amendments 7 through 22. They are in improper form."

Speaker Bradley: "All right now, we've already passed 7, I'm informed. You want to withdraw #8 through 22, then?"

Skinner: "That is correct."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman withdraws Amendments #8 through 22. Amendment #23."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #23, Simms. Amends House Bill 3138 on page 9, by deleting line 23 and so forth."

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

Simms: "I would like to table that Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman tables....withdraw the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #24, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3138 as amended...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw #24, which was not printed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #24. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #25, Simms. Amends House Bill 3138 as amended in Section 235...."

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

Simms: "I wish to table that Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "He withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #26, Porter. Amends House Bill 3138 as amended...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter. The Gentleman is not on the floor....yes, here he comes."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #27 provides.....is this #26 or 27?"

Speaker Bradley: "#26."

Porter: "Amendment #26 provides that where you have a reassessment that that reassessment will be not effective in the year that it is made but there will be a one year delay before it is applied in the....to the tax Bill. And I think that there is a great advantage to doing this. First it will provide a notice to the homeowner and will give him or her a chance, if they wish, to file a complaint and have that complaint resolved ahead of time. Secondly, if they don't want to file a complaint or if it is refused, then it will give them some time to get their finances together in order to meet the cost of an increase in assessments. And thirdly, I think it will be of great advantage to units of local government to know far ahead of time what the assessments are going to be in order to plan their own budgets. And so, I would recommend adoption of Amendment #26."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker as Chief Sponsor of the Bill and very brief opposition to Amendment #26, the Amendment proposed by Representative Porter, applies to Cook County. The Bill as presently enacted...when it is enacted, it would not apply to Cook County. The intent of the Bill is to validate untimely publications non quadrineal real estate assessment increases. I worked assiduously with those opponents to incorporate both, Representative Tim Simms Amendment and Chuck Campbell's Amendment into one Amendment #26. And I would resist any other Amendment that will....I believe jeopardize passage of what I believe



is much needed legislation to validate these....otherwise we face a loss of tremendous amounts of revenue in many counties of the State of Illinois. Therefore, I would rise to oppose this Amendment and ask for your help in beating down this and other Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The question is, shall the Gentleman's motion prevail. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify....do you want to close the debate, Mr. Porter? Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what Representative Matijevich means about this applying to Cook County. This Amendment would apply throughout the state and it seems to me it's a wise type of Amendment that will do a great deal to help those units of local government and the taxpayer. And I would recommend its adoption and ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting '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 are 47 'ayes', 62 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. For the information of the Members, we have 44 Amendments on this Bill. 46 Amendments on the Bill, somebody corrects me. Further Amendments? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in light of your announcement concerning the number of Amendments filed on this Bill. For this Bill only I would move that the debate be restricted to the proponent of the Amendments and the...one person in opposition."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Gentleman's motion, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent that the Democrats do not care for tax reform this year. And it has never..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner, on the Gentleman's motion not



on tax reform."

Skinner: "Making of this motion which will restrict debate on tax reform, just two people in the General Assembly. That is just absurd in my opinion. Unless, of course, the Democrats really are against tax reform."

Speaker Bradley: "You are out of order, Mr. Skinner. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion 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 there are 82 'ayes', 68 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Amendment #27."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #27, Porter. Amends House Bill 3138 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman arise?"

Schuneman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."

Schuneman: "How many votes does it take to shut off debate in the House? Or to limit debate?"

Speaker Bradley: "On that particular motion, majority."

Schuneman: "By a majority vote of this House we can shut off debate or limit debate. Isn't that a matter of changing the rules, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Telcser: "Doesn't it take 89 votes to change the rules?"

Speaker Bradley: "What rule are you referring to?"

Telcser: "Well the rule that gives the Members the right explain their vote to whatever they are trying to suspend. That's 89...rule change, you know take another Roll Call...fine, I may very well support it but..."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws the motion. The



Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #27 provides that in Cook County each of the four quadrants would have a separate equalization factor or multiplier. The reason for it is that where in a period like we're in now and probably for the foreseeable future, there are ever increasing real property values and therefore, assessments. Where one of the quadrants in Cook County is reassessed and the other four...other three aren't and the assessment goes up. That quadrant bears a disproportionately high amount of the county-wide taxes that are to be paid. And it seems to me in fairness that each quadrant ought to have its own multiplier and I would recommend Amendment #27 to the Members."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again in quick opposition. The Bill in its original form does not apply to Cook County. This Amendment does, the thrust of the Bill. And I want to remind the Members that the Department of Local Governmental Affairs had given advice based on prior case law that had for many years indicated that untimely publication in and of itself would not be enough to provide for a tax refund. That's the importance of this validating Act that we're attempting through House Bill 3138. And I don't think any Amendment should jeopardize what is very important legislation and means so much money to many school districts, counties and other units of local government. And therefore, I request your 'no' vote on Amendment #27."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner on the Amendment."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I reject the fallacious arguments of the previous speaker. There is nothing sacrosanct about this



Bill and the content of this Bill and there is nothing that's going to endanger its passage considering the Amendment that the Sponsor of the Bill has proposed. I believe it is Amendment #46 which...just glancing at it, it looks like it will eliminate most opposition. Now since it doesn't....since this is the only Amendment that would affect Cook County, it is the only one that Cook County have to worry about. I believe the Amendment should be rejected on its merits or rather its demerits. And for those of you in the suburbs, I suggest that you reflect for a moment, the proportion of real estate in the residential class that exist in your quadrant. If it is a higher percentage of real estate to industry then it is in the City of Chicago or a lower percentage. Now I would contend, without much fear of contradiction that the assessment base in Chicago is more heavily leaning on commercial and industrial assessments. That means that they will have a relative high assessment, if you equalize assessments and all four quadrants in Cook County and don't do it on a class by class basis. By voting for this Amendment, you will end up raising the assessments on homeowners outside of Chicago. Now if that's what you want to do, fine. You ought to vote 'yes' but if that is not what you want to do, I would seriously suggest that you vote 'no'. Now that doesn't mean an Amendment cannot be drafted that would mandate the equalization of assessments on homeowners throughout Cook County on a quadrant by quadrant basis. Or a township by township basis and...sure the Sponsor of this Amendment, he has plenty of time to get them ready."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. 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 there are 15 'ayes', 77 'nays', 1 voting



'present' and the Gentleman's motion is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #28, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3138..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, this Amendment is one that we could call the, St. Clair County Amendment but I won't talk about St. Clair County this time, I will let someone else talk about St. Clair County if they care about it. I'm going to talk about Will County. There are some counties in the State of Illinois where the Board of Review equalizes the assessments on a township by township basis. Will County is not one of those counties. The assessments within Will County, on homes range from about 25% to 35%. 25% in Shanhand township being the low township and 35% in DuPage township being the high township. Now I don't know why the Board of Review refuses to recognize this incredible inequity and it is an incredible inequity but since they do not recognize it and since it is...we are capable of recognizing it, as indeed any fair minded person, I believe. I submit Amendment #28 is the answer, it is the answer to assessment equity for homeowners. Assessment #28 mandates that the highest assessed township for homeowners shall not be more than 5% above the lowest assessed township. Or the Department of Local Government Affairs shall equalize. That is all it does, it gives the local authorities the option of following a state legislative mandate to equalize assessments but if they fail...it says, that the Department of Local Government Affairs shall go in and do the job that they refused to do. Now as you know, I'm an advocate of local government... about as much of an advocate as you can get. Until you prove that local government is just incompetent or is made up of men who are not of goodwill and refuse to



follow the laws of fairness. They have refused to follow laws of fairness in St. Clair County and I read you the quote from, Mr. Costello two times already so I won't repeat it. I've picked out Will County where it is obvious well....at least there is no indication that there is any racial overtones whatsoever, but there are incredible inequities. The homeowners in the highest assessed township are assessed about 30 to 40% higher...actually closer to 40% higher than homeowners in lowest assessed township. And it is just not fair because they all pay taxes to to the same county-wide tax districts. I would respectfully solicit your support for this Amendment. Which I would contend will provide meaningful property tax reform for Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman applied most of his quote 'tax reform proposal' and he got his Roll Calls the other day. I would urge the Membership that this Bill not be the vehicle for that again. And I also want to remind the Members of the House because, someday we're going to pass all of these, 'tax reform measures'. And let me tell you, that when we talk about reform of any kind.... everytime I heard the word, 'reform' bandied about, later on in years to of passed...years later, were here in the Legislature. Then trying to respond to what somebody called, reform. Everytime....there is only one reform to the matter of tax equity and that the matter of cutting government spending. Cutting cost, that's the only way the local taxpayer is going to get relief. That's the only way, let's not kid ourselves. I would urge the defeat of this Amendment #28."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye'.... I'm sorry, Mr. Skinner to close the debate."



Skinner: "Again the Democratic spokesman on property tax reform apparently doesn't know what he is talking about. There are two aspects of property taxes, one is reform and the other is relief. So far the Democrats have been unable to approach reform. They have done a good job of relief, they are really talking about relief. They...you know, some of the proposals actually will provide relief. We may not be able to afford them but they know what they are talking about. On reform, they don't know what they are talking about and they prove it through the prior speaker comments. He didn't mention reform... administrative reform once...not once. And that's what is the problem in this state, it is a problem of equity. As high as property taxes are, if you can't give relief you can guarantee fairness. You can guarantee that one homeowner in one part of the county will be assessed on the average, at the same percentage of fair market value as another homeowner. And that is what this Amendment will do, but only...and it will have the state do it but only if the local officials absolutely refuse to follow the state mandate that has been passed...probably before the Sponsor of this Bill was ever elected."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #28. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'."

Skinner: "Roll Call, Mr. Speaker. We're going to create a new record here for the Democrats."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting '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 we have 63 'ayes', 62 'nays'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin, Peg Martin. If there is somebody in gallery behind me taking pictures, it is not allowed in the rules of the House and the doorkeeper is drawing it to my attention that somebody is taking pictures. You



cannot take pictures in the House. Miss Martin."

Martin: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is she recorded?"

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

Martin: "Please record me as 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Lady as voting 'no'. On this question there is 63 'ayes', 62 'nay'. Mr. Rigney for what purpose do you arise? Mr. Rigney wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Edgar wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Adams, 'aye'. Mr. Gaines, 'aye'. Mr. Stuffle, 'aye'. Mr. Ewell, recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Totten...Mr. Polk, I'm sorry, 'aye'. Mr. Madison wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Ryan wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave....I'm going to let my people back home know that the Republicans don't want all these taxing districts to get their money. I table House Bill 3138."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman tables 3138. The Bill is tabled. 3186. It won't be recorded.... 3186. Is Mr. Brady on the floor? Out of the record. 3187 out of the record? 3259, Mr. Barnes. He is not on the floor... out of the record. 3287, Kempiners....out of the record. 3296, the Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell. Read it a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3296, a Bill for an Act in relation to peer review Committees for long-term health care facilities and the professional staffs of such facilities. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Bowman. Amends House Bill 3296 on page 1, by deleting line 16 and 17 and inserting in lieu thereof; the following and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "If Emil Barnes is within hearing distance of



my voice would he please come to the floor of the House.
The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
House Bill 3296 which I'm offering some Amendments. Creates
a long-term care Peer Review Protection Act. Now at the
present time we have a situation with respect to nursing
homes in the State of Illinois. In which the quality
of some of these homes is called into question. The
response of the industry is to come before the General
Assembly through this House Bill and ask that we allow
them, as an industry to establish by contract amongst
themselves, Committees who review the quality of care
in nursing homes. And then to provide the members from
those Committees and the people who work with those
Committees complete immunity and liability from many of
the criminal statutes and civil prosecution arising out
of investigations which may be made. The problems that
I see with House Bill 3296 in its present form, is that
we simply give the nursing homes carte blanche to set up
their contracts amongst themselves in anyway that they
see fit. Essentially by...if we were to pass this Act...
Bill unamended, we would be simply turning over the
entire review process to the nursing home industry without
any state supervision whatsoever. Now my feeling is,
and it is embodied in Amendment #1 that we are considering
at this time. is that the Peer Review Committees are
good idea except, that we ought to establish standards
in the state laws to exactly how those Committees should
be formed, what kind of procedures they should follow,
and not to simply abdicate our responsibility in this
case. It seems to me that if we abdicate our responsibility
at the present time we are essentially foreclosed from
ever coming back and saying, that...and taking that
responsibility back again. So all that Amendment #1 to
House Bill 3296 does is to simply say, okay, you can have



these Peer Review Committees but we're going to establish them by state law or by regulation under the Department of Public Health for example, or by federal law or regulation and not simply to allow the industry to agree amongst themselves how they are going to set this thing up. That is all Amendment #1 does."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell on the Amendment."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor in the first place was talking about the Bill and not necessarily about his Amendment #1. But this does create a new Act and it permits the long-term care health facilities to establish their own Peer Review Committees and most of those Committees, and you know to be effective they have to have immunity. And this immunity is more restrictive than what is in the Medical Practice Act that you will find. And it has also been patterned after the National Health Care Association, recommended by the National Health Care Association. It is in effect in about thirty-eight states and it's patterned after a law in Indiana. And this Amendment #1 simply guts the Bill and takes the authority away. And we've heard on this House floor a number of times about nursing homes and so forth and long-term health care facilities and this gives them an opportunity to set up their own house and clean it up. And I think we certainly should do it and I would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. The question is on the adoption of Amendment #1. Do you want to close the debate, Mr. Bowman. Close the debate."

Bowman: "Just briefly so that everyone understands exactly what the Amendment does. The Bill would read as follows if this Amendment were adopted. That Peer Review Committee means a Committee organized either under a state or federal law. That is all it does, if this Amendment is



adopted it means that we're going to let them get started and set up, but we're going to require that they conform to state laws. That's all we're doing, we're not going to give them carte blanche to whatever they damn well please. That's all."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of this adoption of Amendment #1 to 3296 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 there are 17 'ayes', 100 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Bowman. Amends House Bill 3296 on page 2...."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A second deficiency in the Bill pertains to the basically the burden of proof. And in this case we are presuming that everyone who brings actions or statements, any information to the organization that are acting in good faith. And that malice shall be required to be proven by the person claiming to be aggrieved and I think that if we simply strike that, there will be no inherent presumption and that the Act will thereby be improved. So I ask an Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Act would be improved just about as much as the first Amendment, if this Amendment were adopted. It would restrict what the Peer Review Committees can do and I ask you to vote 'no' on the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Bowman to close. Do you wish to close, Sir? All right, adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The



determination of the Chair is, the motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Bowman. Amends House Bill 3296 on page 2, by deleting line...."

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

Bowman: "The Amendment simply deletes the following language from the Bill. And I will read this for your benefit. 'The proceeding and records of a Review Committee shall be held in confidence and shall not be subject to discovery or introduction into evidence in any civil action against the long-term care profession rising out of matters which are the subject of valuation or review by such a Committee.' Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if these Peer Review Committees are indeed going to be doing their job and that's just one thing. But if in fact, there is any malfeasance and misfeasance and for nonfeasance on the part of the Peer Review Committees... it would absolutely impossible ever to determine that if this language remains in the Bill. And that is why I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker as I said before, he is correct in saying that it deletes the language protecting the records of the Peer Review Committee from use in civil action. It also, for persons attending meetings of a Committee may not be required to testify in civil action and it deletes language allowing a reviewed provider to see the records, charges and determination made by the Committee. I simply say to you, that every Peer Review Committee and all of the people that testify, this isn't any different than other Peer Review Committees in other sections of statutes. And from that stand point, all over the United States. And here again, I think it is very important that we establish a Peer Review Committee and let them clean up their own house and I ask you to



vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Okay; let them clean up their own House. This Amendment...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bowman, pardon me. Mr. Madison do you have a question of the Sponsor?"

Madison: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know...."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Madison: "I would like to know from the Sponsor of the Amendment if in his opinion, this Peer Review Committee would be subject to Open Meetings Act?"

Bowman: "No, because the Peer Review Committee is not a governmental entity. In fact, by rejecting House Amendment #1, we don't even require that they be established according to state law. They can be established according to contract among private parties. They would not be subject to the Open Meetings Act."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly."

Madison: "It seems to me, Mr. Speaker that we ought to avoid at all cost any secret meetings being given sanction by the State of Illinois, by this Legislature. And I would suggest that we all vote 'aye' on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Yes, I agree with Representative Campbell that we ought to let the nursing homes clean up their act. However, I want the House to understand precisely what kind of immunities that we're giving...not only the people who participate in that process but the information that derives therefrom. Any information that they may obtained will absolutely be immune from subpoena in the course of civil action, prosecution arising against any nursing home in question. And really basically what this Bill would do if it is not amended, would be to...in my opinion, make the nursing home industry completely a law



unto itself and I urge the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion 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 there are 37 'ayes', 84 'nays', the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Bowman. Amends House Bill 3296...."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this leaves House Bill 3296 intact. It simply adds a Section providing for the posting of hearing notices and a report...quarterly report to the General Assembly and to the Governor on homes that are substantial out of compliance with state rules and regs. and federal rules and regs., and in danger of losing their licenses."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the first place the Sponsor didn't have the courtesy to show me any of these Amendments or to talk to me about any of these Amendments before he had them distributed. And the Amendment that he's putting in here now is House Bill 2073 that was defeated. He only got 68 votes on it last May 10th. And I'm getting sick and tired of people trying to put their Bills in my Bills when they couldn't pass their own Bill. And I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #4. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'nos' have it and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. 3337."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3337, a Bill for an Act making certain revisions in the consolidated schedule of election. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any motions relative to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Who is handling this Bill? For the Election Committee. Mr. Bluthardt, all right. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Mahar. Amends House Bill 3337 on page 3, by deleting line 5 through 7 and so forth."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2...basically what the Bill does, it says that Park Districts and Library Boards that are coterminous will hold their election in April. What this Amendment does is that it just says that all Park Districts will hold their election in April. There is a couple of good reasons for that, number one, in growing areas like the metropolitan area where the boundary of Park Districts are changing all the time and they may be coterminous at one time but the municipality may annex more land... subdivision or the Part Districts may annex more land which would change their elections back and forth, from April to November. So I think in the theme and theory of consolidation and having things uniform, Amendment #2 ought to be adopted. Which as I said, would make all Park District elections in April, along with the coterminous Park Districts and Library Boards. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The demonstrative duo, which one. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I oppose the Amendment although it wouldn't be fatal to the Bill if it were



adopted. But I oppose it for the reason that this Bill was designed specifically for those municipalities that have coterminous village and village boundary with their village libraries. Also, in those few instances where there is coterminous Park Districts with the village or municipal boundaries. And I did it because the village library really is an integral part of a Village Board. The appropriation ordinances, the attached levy ordinances are such of the village library are part of the village municipal appropriation ordinance and tax levy. And I think for orderly government we ought to have those trustees to the library district and in those few instances the Park District elected at the same time as the municipal officials. I'm fearful that if you bring in all Park Districts and Library Boards, those that are not coterminous...that what you're going to do is have only in the non partisan election in November, the only elections that you will have then will be the School Board Election. Your community colleges, your school district and high school and so forth. And if that happens, I know what next will follow. What will follow is that a Bill will be put in that will authorize the counties to levy a special tax to pay the cost of running school elections. Because the cost of schools is going to be so tremendous under the new consolidation of the elections that they are not going to be able to afford to run those elections without additional tax authority. And because of that, I object and ask you not to vote for Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Tuerk: "Did I understand you to say, Representative Mahar, that this encompass all Part District elections?"



Mahar: "Yes, and it does not encompass any other library districts. We're not talking about library district.... we're talking only about all the Park Districts holding their election on the same day."

Tuerk: "In April, is that correct? In April?"

Mahar: "Yes, in April."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "I arise in support of the Amendment. In Peoria, for example, our Park District has been holding its election in April for a number of years. And as a result of holding it in April, we're able to save a considerable amount of money. Maybe that's perhaps...the people in Peoria have been a little farther ahead on consolidation of election. We've been able to save money on elections, I think this is a good Amendment and I would ask for your support in its behalf."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell on the Amendment."

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Yourell: "Representative Mahar, can you tell me or do you foresee any difficulty in describing the jurisdiction of each voter in a Park District that is not coterminous, through the municipal corporation. When you have overlapping jurisdictions. How do you provide for the voter to know in what jurisdiction he's going to vote in."

Mahar: "Well, they can vote the same way they are voting right now. Which you have Park Districts that are not coterminous, that vote at the same time that the municipals have their elections. They are doing it in our area now. Another flaw in this particular Bill as drafted, is that it doesn't provide for Park Districts that are coterminous with more than one municipality. The Park District that I happen



to live in is coterminous with two municipalities and therefore, cannot have a April election but must have a November election. It just seems to me, the interest of your Bill and what I heard you speak of last evening, a consolidation here that Park Districts per se ought to be having their election on the same day. And by the way, I might say the Park people are in favor of this. They would rather not have one Park District in April and the adjacent Park District election in November, just because they are not coterminous."

Yourell: "Well, I'm delighted to hear you say that, Representative because that's a different tune you're singing today than you sang before. Because you had great concern over the jurisdictional voting when one unit of government was not coterminous with another unit. Where a school district for example, of either one, two or three counties. And how are we going to determine how those people or where those people are going to be voting. I support this Amendment, Sir. And I'm glad that you're seeing the light as far as consolidation of elections are concerned. I don't think I mentioned anything about the voting last evening."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar to close the debate."

Mahar: "Well, I think that the questions that were asked by those who questioned the Amendment, explained the Amendment and I think it is a step in the right direction if we're going to have consolidation we certainly ought to have Park District all at one time. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #2, to House Bill 3337. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting '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 are 48 'ayes', 15 'nays' and the



Gentleman's motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted.
Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 23...3259."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3259, a Bill for an Act in relation to the off-track pari-mutuel system of wagering on horse racing. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Any motion relative to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. What purpose do you arise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, because of additional information and to get this Bill into the shape that it will be in on Third Reading. I would like to move to table Amendment #1, which is aCommittee Amendment. It will all be incorporated into another Amendment which is coming down."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jimmy Houlihan, what purpose do you arise?"

Houlihan: "A question of the Sponsor of the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Houlihan: "Gene, there are many Amendments following and I wonder if...by tabling this Amendment some of those Amendment have been put out of order and a subsequent Amendment is adopted. Would then put an Amendment out of order, you know technically...Whether you will hold it or consider that Amendment...if it is already filed and obviously not dilatory by tabling this Amendment and putting on a subsequent Amendment."

Barnes: "Well, what I was going to suggest to all those Members and everyone has had an opportunity. I purposely left this Amendment lie. Amendment #14 which will be the Bill, there is I guess at least another thirteen or fourteen



Amendments filed after that. So they will, all of the Members I think will have an opportunity to....or have had an opportunity and has filed and are printed, Amendments to the Amendment which will be the Bill. But if Amendment #14....I have to table this one and suggest to the Members for Amendments 2 through 13, to withdraw those then I will offer #14 and everyone will have an opportunity that that Amendment can be heard on its merits and fit into the right place."

Houlihan: "Gene, my concern is for some of those Members either who had an Amendment between 2 and 13, or some of them who drafted them...addressing Amendment #1. Whether they will be given the opportunity to come back amend #14."

Barnes: "To the best of my knowledge all of them have, as I say, I offered this Amendment to lay there for a long time. To the best of my knowledge all those have been re-filed in additional numbers that follows #14. Also talked to many of the Members. I tried to keep up with them as best I could to let them know that Amendment #14 would be the Bill. So, Mr. Speaker, I would renew my motion on the tabling of Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "For the edification of the Chair, Mr. Barnes. If you're saying the Bill is Amendment #14....."

Barnes: "It will...."

Speaker Bradley: "What will we do with Amendments 1 through 13?"

Barnes: "What I'm doing, Mr. Speaker is, I'm moving to table #1. I'm going to suggest and I can merely suggest to the Members that they would withdraw Amendments #2 through 13. Because Amendments #2 through 13 will not be amending the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, the....."

Barnes: "The Bill will be amended, 14."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion



signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. What purpose does the Lady from Lake; Mrs. Geo-Karis arise?"

Geo-Karis: "Purpose of an inquiry of the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "Turn Mrs. Geo-Karis on please."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, if I understand correct and I happen to hold in my hands right now...."

Speaker Bradley: "You have to address the question to the Chair."

Geo-Karis: "May I address my question to the Sponsor?"

Speaker Bradley: "A question on what?"

Geo-Karis: "On his Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "His Amendment, he just tabled Amendment #1."

Geo-Karis: "Okay. Now, did it....a point of parliamentary inquiry then, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand that he's going to table Amendments #1 through 13?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, he can't do that. There are other Members who have Amendments.....Mr. Telcser has an Amendment.... two Amendments. Mr. Mugalian, Kelly, Pierce, Mahar, Skinner, Sandquist, Skinner, Skinner and Sandquist. Now if those Gentlemen will withdraw their Amendments. Mr. Telcser, Mr. Sandquist, Mr. Skinner, because Amendment #14 is the Bill and if we get to that and adopt Amendment #14 then your Amendments will be not in the correct form. That's what I am told."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, Mr. Speaker, what you're saying is that if these Amendments should be tabled then we go back to the original Bill and #14 will amend the original Bill and then that will be the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "#14 evidently strikes the enacting clause and puts in the new Bill."

Geo-Karis: "All right, thank you, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "It appears that the other Amendments are not in the correct form with the tabling of Amendment #1. All right, it might be easier to go through them



one at a time then. Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Mr. Speaker, might I comment that there may be a bit of presumption that Amendment #14 will be adopted. What if Amendment #14 were not adopted, then what would you do with 1 through 13? I simply pose that question to you as a possibility that could occur....."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendment #1, struck everything after the enacting clause and was what you were amending. So now, that has been tabled."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to withdraw my Amendment but I simply make the point that, Representative Barnes's Amendment #14 may not be adopted. That is conceivable. Right?"

Speaker Bradley: "Point well taken."

Telcser: "In which case, Amendments #1 through 13, whose Sponsor's have been betting on the come that #14 would be adopted are going to be out of the ballgame."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, #1....."

Telcser: "I'll Take that change since...."

Speaker Bradley: "#1 was tabled...."

Telcser: "The odds look pretty good that #14 will be adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, #2, he has withdrawn. Amendment #2. Amendment #3...."

Telcser: "What kind of odds are you giving that #14 will be adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "Whatever the track odds are."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Telcser....."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the principles which are embodied in Amendment #2 and 3, are taken care of in what Amendment #14 provides. Assuming that it gets adopted. And so bearing that in mind, I will withdraw Amendments #2 and 3."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws...."



Telcser: "And have some comments on #14...."

Speaker Bradley: "You will be recognized for that. The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Mugalian...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mugalian on Amendment #4."

Mugalian: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #4."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Kelly."

Speaker Bradley: "Kelly, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to withdraw Amendment #5. But isn't there some way that we can have a leave of the House to table or to withdraw the Amendments 1 through 13?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws. Leave. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Pierce."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Mahar."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Bradley: "He withdraws Amendment #7. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8, Skinner."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw all four of my incorrectly drawn Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "7-8-2."

Skinner: "Amendment #14."

Speaker Bradley: "What's that, 8, 9, 10, 11...."

Skinner: "Beats me, I've thrown them away already."

Speaker Bradley: "8 and 9, he request leave to withdraw Amendments 8 and 9...and they are withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #10, Sandquist."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, I would like leave to withdraw #10 and also #13."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraw #10 and 13. Further



Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11 and 12 were Representative Skinner's and they are withdrawn."

Speaker Bradley: "They are withdrawn now."

Clerk O'Brien: "And #13 is withdrawn..."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14, Eugene Barnes. Amends House Bill 3259 by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, the following..."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one correction I want to make is that, this Amendment does not strike everything after the enacting clause. It amends the original Bill. It doesn't strike the enacting clause which is the correction."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, maybe Representative Barnes is addressing himself to this but I understand the Clerk, who has read that this changes the title and then moves on from there?"

Clerk O'Brien: "By deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, the following."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have had a parliamentary ruling that we are not able to delete the title within an Amendment. I believe that was made with regards to the Elections Bill which was before the House. The Consolidation of Election Bill were there were Members who were interested in the consolidation of elections, although they had a difference of opinion with the Chief Sponsor. They wanted to consolidate and open up elections and therefore, have open primary considered within the consolidation of elections. And I believe the Chair ruled that any Amendment which deleted the title was not in order. And I would ask at this point for a ruling of the Chair on this particular Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "I understand that that was not the ruling of



Chair, Mr. Houlihan, that the Parliamentarian had ruled that it was not so what....that you...by striking that we can still consider the Amendment in its proper form."

Houlihan: "Would you...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epstein is back here...if he will just come to the podium we'll clear it up."

Houlihan: "I think, Dr. Schwartz is knowledgeable and adverse in this but...."

Speaker Bradley: "He just informed me that they made that ruling at that time, Mr. Houlihan. All right, back to the Amendment then. Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I guess this is the one that most people have been waiting for. This is Amendment #14, this Amendment as I indicated, makes certain changes and I they will meet many of the objections that have been involved or many suggestions...let me put it that way. That have been involved in many of the Amendments that were withdrawn. This Amendment which in fact will be the Bill and there will be a couple of additional substantive change Amendments that will be coming down, so that a couple of the Members that had pointed out to me some form corrections. Those form corrections will be made. Basically, this Amendment makes basically four additional changes from the original Amendment which was tabled. Two major changes embodied in this Amendment⁺, one is, no longer embodied in this Amendment is...there any eminent domain powers for the off-track betting corporation. Nor is there any bonding authority for the corporations other than to borrow money. There is no bonding authority whatsoever, but the corporation is given the power to borrow money and issue negotiable notes but no such notes will be constituted as a debt of the state. There were another major change from the original Amendment and that was on the makeup of the regional corporation...."



now the core city will receive only one of those members on the Board of Directors, eight of the Directors will be elected by the municipalities involved in the corporation. Based on a weighted vote of the purse and originally based on a weighted vote of the population, using the latest census count that is available to us. The fourth change is on the special....the fourth change is on the special assessed....the fourth change is on the special assessed that will be assessed on the...for the purposes of the municipalities on the off-track betting facility which has been changed from 5% to 7.5%. All of that.... all of that will go to municipalities in which the bet is made. None, except the amount that goes to the Core city that has made...in that core city plus operating procedures, will go to that city. All of that will go to the municipalities of which the bet was made. Those are the major changes in this, let me add this. Prior to going to additional...any additional questions or to any additional Amendment. It now breaks down in this fashion using the figures that were produced by the Governor's Revenue Study Commission. At a four hundred million dollar level in 1982, the breakdown would thusly. That the state would receive approximately twelve million dollars which includes the breakage and outage on the exotic wagers. The thoroughbred and standard breeders fund desired approximately seven hundred thousand. The trackmen would receive approximately 17.25 million, the horseman would receive approximately twelve million, the regional corporations would split approximately forty-two million and the municipalities would split approximately thirty million. That's basically the breakdown using the four hundred million dollar base level. I would solicit your support for Amendment #14 and I am prepared to answer any question relative to that Amendment."

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



Houlihan, J."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I have one question on the substance. Were we able to get a ruling from the Parliamentarian or did the Chair...."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I thought we had satisfied you. The Parliamentarian had ruled that we are in order with the Amendment as it now exists on to this Bill."

Houlihan: "Okay. Representative Barnes, you indicate in your second point that you delete all bonding authorization."

Barnes: "That's correct, Jim."

Houlihan: "And you indicate that you replaced that with a facility or a capacity to borrow and that borrowing can be, I suppose, funded through the instruments of short term notes, is that correct?"

Barnes: "That's correct."

Houlihan: "And that, I assume, you indicated also that doesn't have the full faith and credit of the state behind it."

Barnes: "It specifically prohibits, no such note shall constitute a debt of the state."

Houlihan: "But wouldn't those notes, as you described them now, be virtually identical to the notes that the Illinois Housing Development Authority issues. A short term note to implement its project."

Barnes: "No, because as I understand those bonds that you are referring to has a moral pledge of the state involved and this Amendment specifically says that no such pledge is involved relative to the state."

Houlihan: "Representative Barnes, I believe that this Legislature has been told by counsel....bonding counsel and by other authorities that that full faith and moral responsibility has the effect of nothing. And it in fact does not put the state behind those bonds. This was brought out when we discussed their increased authorization. People were concerned about the states getting into an increased indebtedness. And so, I would suggest to you that this...."



these notes puts the racing authority...the corporation that would run off-track betting in the same position that the Illinois Housing Development Authority would be, it would issue short term notes and they could use those notes to finance construction of a stadium just as the Illinois Housing Development Authority uses short term notes to finance some of our housing projects throughout the state."

Barnes: "Well, as I understand bonding and I'm no authority on it, perhaps you are. But these notes would constitute no more moral obligation of the state than would any local municipality who issues notes, and most of them do. And that would constitute a moral obligation relative to that financing. This simply does not do that."

Houlihan: "I understand that it doesn't constitute a moral obligation but it is no different from IDA and so in that fashion they are similarly situated and therefore, are able to float those short term notes if they desire to construct a race track sports stadium complex. And they would not be permitted in this case."

Barnes: "Well one of the things here, Representative, is this is different from IDA. IDA is a state....a state obligated agency as I understand. One of the things that you cannot....you cannot do here and that is one of the things that is embodied in this Amendment. Is that you cannot construct a race track or a sports arena or anything else. The racing...the OTB will be leasing available property from the various municipalities. A complex cannot....cannot be constructed in any way...be built within the confines of this Amendment as it has now been drafted. You simply can't do it."

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

Bowman: "A question of the Sponsor, will he yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Bowman: "Representative Barnes, could you be more precise about



exactly where that language occurs in the Amendment...that says that the state does not back the bonds in anyway."

Barnes: "Page 22, lines 13 through 15. You will find that it says, 'such funds in the council and payments of such notes no such notes shall constitute a debt of the State of Illinois.' Nothing in this Act shall be construed to enable the regional corporation to oppose any ad valorem tax on property."

Bowman: "Okay. While we're on that page, it also indicates there that the State of Illinois...starting on line 31, sub paragraph (f). Pledges to and agrees with the holders of the regional corporation issued pursuant to this Section, the state will not limit or alter the rights and powers vested in regional corporation by this Act as to impair the terms of any contract made etc. Now supposing we decided after a few years of operation, that the off-track betting was not a very good ideal and we wished to abolish off-track betting and abolish regional corporations. It sounds to me, as if there are any notes outstanding we would be locked into that and would not be able to do that. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "As I understand the statutes, Representative...."

Bowman: "The Amendment or the statutes?"

Barnes: "Well, if you just let me answer your question."

Bowman: "Okay."

Barnes: "As I understand the statute and I understand laws in the eight years that I have been here. Any Act that any Legislature puts in can be repealed at any other given time by the procedures that we have...."

Bowman: "Well..."

Barnes: "They could, any future General Assembly, could very well repeal this Act based upon the procedure that would be involved at that Legislature."

Bowman: "Well, Representative Barnes, to continue the questioning. On page 23, it says, the regional corporation is authorized



to include these pledges and agreements of the state in any contract with the holders of notes issued pursuant to this section. Representative Barnes, now if there are such pledges included in the agreements, then does not that bind the state in a contractual relationship with the holders of the notes. In other words, while it is true we may abolish this Act we are still left with our contractual relationship with the note holders. Is that not correct, Representative Barnes?"

Barnes: "Well, all it is saying is that the state may not contract with anyone to take away the power of the corporation to repeal what to the Legislature to repeal an Act that was instituted by the Legislature. The Legislature can repeal it, that's all it is saying."

Bowman: "Can you tell me then what the practical effect of the language on page 23, line 7 through 10. Where it says, 'the regional corporation then includes this authorized to include the pledges that we have just been discussing, and agreements of the state in any contract with the holders of notes issued.' What is the practical effect of that then? Assuming that the regional corporation issued notes and had contracts with the note holders and included the agreements of the state that we wouldn't alter the terms of the notes. Such as abolishing the OTB."

Barnes: "Well, as I see it, Representative and as I say I'm not a bonding authority, as I see it the practical effect of that language is simply...to say to whoever will be buying these bonds on the market, that we aren't going to turn around and make these bonds....we aren't going to create problems in trying to sell these....and they aren't bonds. These are notes, they aren't bonds, we aren't going to turn around and impair the sale of these notes on the market. If these notes would have to be used. That's all that language is saying...."

Bowman: "Okay..."



Barnes: "As I said before, it still does not in anyway have the full faith and credit of state behind these notes."

Bowman: "Okay."

Barnes: "That's clear."

Bowman: "Let me shift....I'm not sure I quite agree with you but let me....let me just ask, is there any limit to the amount of notes that can be issued?"

Barnes: "As I understand, that will be determined by the market place."

Bowman: "Okay, but there is no limit...."

Barnes: "And I believe, Representative Bowman, that is not unusual."

Bowman: "Well, okay. However there is no limit. There is an interesting feature of this Amendment, I believe on page 19 now, where we talk about the....you know it gives the corporation of the authorization to issue notes. And it provides in lines 14 through 18, that the regional corporation may issue or exchange or deliver its notes.... exchange for any outstanding notes, including accrued interest, without advertising or submitting such notes for public bidding. In other words, it seems to me that we have given the corporation the privilege to roll over their notes without any additional bidding. So once the notes are issued, the same note holders can continue to hold the debt of the corporation virtually ad infinitum, there is no limit on the amount of notes that can be issued and I'm a little fearful the powers that it gives the corporation. Can you tell me whether there is....there would be anything to prevent the notes from being rolled over and held by the note holders ad infinitum."

Barnes: "The answer is, yes. If you will turn to page 20, line 6, you will see through 6 through 8, it says. No note or any renewal thereof shall mature at any time or times exceeding five years from the date of the first issue of such note. It specifically says in there, in language



that they cannot be rolled over."

Bowman: "Well, it seems to me that the renewal would constitute a separate note issue and I'm not sure that language really does the trick."

Barnes: "Well, I...."

Bowman: "Okay....you answered the question although I don't quite agree. Thank you, Representative Barnes."

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

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker...."

Kozubowski: "Oh, no you don't. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

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

All in favor the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes to close the debate."

Are you joined by five Members? All right, we'll go back to the motion. The motion is, the Gentleman moves the previous question? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman's motion prevails. The question of the affirmative votes? Mr. Barnes to close."

Barnes: "Well, thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I said, this language in this Amendment has been laying on the....on all the Members desks for quite some time. We have tried and I think we have in a very positive way addressed various issues that was brought to my attention. I think we have a good comprehensive Amendment here and I would simply solicit your 'aye' vote on Amendment #14."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting



'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski to explain his vote."

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm really troubled at the way we are handling an Amendment as substantial as this one. There are a lot of questions that remain unanswered about the implication and the effect of this Amendment. For example, we didn't talk about...did we, the economic impact on the state, where the income is going to go and how much it is going to mean, what the cost of regulation is going to be as provided for in this Amendment. Nor did we talk about the composition of these Regional Boards in this Amendment. As I look at it, it looks to me like there are some problems. For example, how do we compose the Regional Board in the first instance? As I look at it, we see that they are eventually to be composed on the bases of pari-mutuel...the volume of pari-mutuel wagering in the various municipalities. But in the first instance, how do we make that decision? If you take a look at...if we do it on the basis of population, what it means in the Chicago region is that the City of Chicago obviously controls the Regional Board. The City of Chicago obviously does the hiring for the region. There is also another aspect of this Bill that I'm interested in and that is one Section that allows the communciation of wagers by telephone but only to the extent that the person, the wager has money on deposit with the regional corporation. Are we really putting ourselves in the business of being a bank for wagering. These are things...at least a few of the things and only a few of the things that we didn't get an opportunity to address during the discussion. I would suggest to the Membership that they seriously consider this Amendment and seriously consider voting against it."

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



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #14 is now the Bill and perhaps Third Reading is a better time to discuss the issue in greater substance. I must say, however, that I find myself in a dilemma. Just as prior speakers indicated, the Amendment is a very substantive one and also very lengthy. It is something which I think every Member of the House ought to consider and study very very diligently prior to First Reading. I too, have many many questions and reservations about what is contained in Amendment #14 to House Bill 3259. I hope that I have a chance to address a couple of these issues with subsequent Amendments to be heard this afternoon and perhaps again at some later date on the Order of Third Reading. I do want everyone in the House to know about my personal deep reservations about what is contained in Amendment #14. And with the end result of off-track betting for the State of Illinois generally. I do, however, feel that Amendment #14 certainly as it relates to two Amendments that I filed, is somewhat of an improvement the way the Bill was drafted originally. I was very deeply concerned about the ability of the off-track betting authorities to issue bonds. That is now out of the Bill with Amendment #14. I was also very deeply concerned and worried about the power of eminent domain which is also now out of the Bill. So those two questions alone in my mind make the present form of the Bill a little better. But let me emphasize to the Members of the House, that I personally, am very deeply concerned about what the impact of this legislation, as we know it now in Amendment #14 will have upon the voters of this state....generally at....and upon individual municipalities specifically. I think perhaps a better point in time to discuss these issues, is on Third Reading and so I would support Amendment #14 only because it is a very very slight....very slight improvement over



the way the Bill was originally drafted."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and Gentelmen of the House, you heard from the Minority Whip the most eloquent waffle. What in effect he is telling you is he doesn't know yet whether the deal has been cut. He hasn't been given his orders yet from Governor as to whether they are going to go for this particular proposal. What we're really waiting for is, when it is late in the evening and there is a Speaker up on the Chair who can put the whole deal together and we can get less money for education, more money for the crosstown, more money for the construction of the sports stadium, more money for the brick and mortar projects and Representative Telcser is telling ^{you} ~~that~~ he hasn't got the word yet. That's what he is telling you when he says, I've got reservations, I'm not sure, I'd like to look at it. He's sending out the signals, he hasn't had enough offered to their side yet. Well let me tell you, I think that we are going too far in offering state government for sale. Anything to bring in revenue, anything to bring in jobs, I don't think we ought to take that approach. I think we ought to look at it on its merits and decide on the merits, not on some extra issues."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann. The Chair from now on will rule when you talk in debate, you cannot according to the Rules of the House, explain your vote. So when I recognize....I thought I was recognizing you for some other point and I didn't know when you arose what purpose you were arising, Sir. But when you speak in debate, according to the Rules of the House, you cannot explain you vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."



Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I agree with almost everything the prior speaker said. Except that I think the deal has been made, the deal was made....the deal was made when the Chicago Republican candidate for Mayor moved to the suburbs because the Republican Governor of the State of Illinois was in bed with the Democratic Mayor of the City of Chicago. The deal has been made, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker we had no tax increase because we got crosstown. Now the only thing that we don't know, Mr. Speaker, is what else we're going to get because we don't know what the whole deal is but we know a deal has been made. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody that I have more confidence in and trust in and admiration in than for the distinguished Minority Whip on the Republican side of the aisle. But I've got to say to him that that last speech was a master piece of double talk...triple talk...waffle talk and every other kind of talk. I hate to say it but you can't have it both ways, you can't be against deals and you can't stand up and say, you have deep reservations because baby, you're right there in the pot with the rest of them. And when the bottom line is drawn and we're talking about welfare increases and we're talking about education and we're talking about the needs of the handicapped and we're talking about the general revenue fund. We're all going to be watching the deal that has been made and as far as I'm concerned, it nauseates me...it sickens me. The deal has been made, we just don't know all the details."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been so impressed by the comments of one of the speakers from the other side about the wheeling and dealing on this side when he has been one of the biggest wheeler and dealers in the whole House on pretext of independence



that I'm so nauseated from it, this Amendment is a better Amendment than the Bill. The Bill is a lousy Bill, I may not vote for the Bill but he so impressed me, I would change my vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 80 'ayes', 64 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Further....and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, Reilly. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in Sub-Section (c) and so forth."

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

Reilly: "The addition of Amendment #14 destroys any effect that Amendment #15 might have, I therefore, withdraw it."

Speaker Bradley: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16, Kane-Dyer. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended and so forth."

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

Kane: "I would withdraw Amendment #16."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #17, Skinner. Amends House Bill....."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, this place is crawling with secret service agents. Are we under siege?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, the Speaker has given permission I understand for two or three people to be here from the White House."

Madison: "It looks more like twenty or thirty to me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, they are undercover, I'm surprised you could recognize them. Mr. Skinner. On the Amendment, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, first of all I would like to know whether I understood what you said. Did you say the Speaker had



given permission for several members of the rackets to be here?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, what word did you use? The Gentleman on the Amendment, Mr. Skinner on Amendment #17."

Skinner: "Amendment #17 will allow you to let your constituents to make the decision for you...in effect. This requires a referendum throughout the state this fall on off-track betting. And allows any counties which does not give a majority vote to automatically be excluded from the off-track...the regional off-track betting corporation in its area. This is definitely...this would be one hell of a referendum. This might even rival RTA and I won't think of withdrawing it. This is just a superb Amendment, I'm sure I'm going to receive incredible support from the ^Bible belt down in southern Illinois on this and I know that I would love the opportunity not to have the patronage minions of Chicago walking around McHenry County selling off-track betting bets. I would respectfully ask...or with as much respect as I can give this Bill, your support for this Amendment which will make it even better."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes on the Amendment."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me make one thing clear here. That no one...no one in any of the counties...any of the 102 counties of the state. No one in any of the regions are bound to be involved in this regional setup. No one. For any county, for anyone within the county within the municipalities in the county to be involved in this regional setup...they then...they the local people must pass by ordinance to be involved in this whole structure. So we have embodied within the Bill that protection of the local people. No county, let me emphasize that again, no county that any of the municipalities within that county do



not pass an ordinance to be involved in this regional structure is involved...is involved. In all due respect to the mover of this Amendment, we have already embodied within this Bill that protection of the local people across the state and for those reasons, I oppose Amendment #17."

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

Deuster: "If the Sponsor of the Amendment would yield for a question."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Deuster: "Representative Skinner, apparently you have studied this Bill...probably more extensively than I have..."

Skinner: "I doubt it."

Deuster: "It's my understanding that if someone up in Lake County for example, Waukegan or someone in your county of McHenry or Woodstock, wanted to place an off-track bet they would have to do that by going to the nearest regional corporation office. Is that correct?"

Skinner: "Certainly."

Deuster: "Where would that office be....would that be the Chicago office."

Skinner: "Well, I would hope that it would not be in McHenry County or Lake County but some of your municipalities are, you know, sort of a little flaky. They might pass this."

Deuster: "Well, as I understand there is just six regions and one of them is Chicago, that's the nearest thing to our county..."

Skinner: "I'm sorry but your questions just don't approach the Amendment and I just don't know the answer."

Speaker Bradley: "I think we ought to stay on the Amendment, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well the Amendment is, there is going to be a referendum to let the people decide whether they want it or not. Presumably this referendum would take place in Chicago or Cook County but not Lake or McHenry, is that..."



Skinner: "Oh, no, this referendum will be held statewide. In any county in which it does not receive a majority then that county will be excluded from the off-track betting corporation."

Deuster: "Now, if Lake County and McHenry County voted not to be in this, what would be the practical and legal effect of that decision?"

Skinner: "Well we could remain as pristine as we are now."

Deuster: "Could our citizens participate in off-track betting anyway?"

Skinner: "Certainly, if want to drive across the Cook County border and that's assuming that the residents of Cook County would pass the referendum."

Deuster: "Thank you very much."

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

Levin: "I rise in support of Cal's Amendment and I think that people should have the opportunity to express themselves on this issue. I think there are certainly some very serious, moral implications and I don't think it should be left simply to a local level of government to make the decision. If I would question anything in the Amendment, that is the provision for an opt out, I don't know why we in Chicago should be stuck with this until our constituents be able to get out. But overall, I think it is a good Amendment, even if we do get stuck with it it at least allows the people that are affected to have a direct say and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "Sir, do you wish to close?"

Skinner: "I certainly do."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, just a minute, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Excuse me, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Houlihan: "In response to Representative Skinner's to Representative Deuster's question. You indicated that a person would have to go to a particular location to place such a wager. I believe you are incorrect and I would



like to...."

Skinner: "Please enlighten me."

Houlihan: "By the provisions of Amendment #14, I believe.... correct if I'm wrong, that you can place those wagers by phone."

Skinner: "What! That's sinful."

Houlihan: "So that your responses to Representative Deuster, were based upon being there in person...."

Skinner: "You're quite correct and I must be absolutely wrong. We'll have to look at further Amendments after this one passes."

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

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might remind the Gentleman from McHenry, that that phone call will have to be placed to Rockford from your district. To place that bet, Representative Skinner because you are in region II in McHenry County and so was Kane. Region I comprises, Lake, Will, DuPage and Cook which Chicago is the core city. Would it and maybe, Representative Skinner could enlighten me. Had he had this Amendment on the Regional Transportation Authority Bill, perhaps we wouldn't be in that sort of a mess in the collar county region now. Good luck with this one, Cal."

Skinner: "Indeed if we had....if we had had the Regional Authority going to Rockford, it wouldn't have even passed."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner to close."

Skinner: "Yes. Well this Amendment is a very simple Amendment. It just says, we're going to let the people vote on the issue. Those of you who don't have any campaign issues for the fall, this will give you one. Unless you're afraid that this won't pass a referendum, I can't see why you wouldn't vote in favor of it and I would earnestly solicit your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye',



opposed....."

Skinner: "Roll Call please, Sir. I'm sorry, I'm just a little gun shy. I went through RTA once and it went through so fast I can still hear the train roaring down...."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to say nothing because of the direction of vote."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that it is only fair to let the people of the various counties decide. I think we have overdone it with the RTA and don't stick it to us again."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 88 'ayes', 58 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion is adopted. Further Amendments?"

The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side of that question I would like to move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #18 was adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #18 was adopted....#17. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table that motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to table that motion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to table say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion is tabled. Further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #18, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, you mean the Sponsor hasn't tabled the Bill yet? That's happened every time I've gotten an Amendment on a Bill this year."

Speaker Bradley: "It might be coming don't get over confident."

Skinner: "Well, I would ask leave to withdraw this excellent Amendment....."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #18. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #19, Kane-Dyer. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended...."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #19 to House Bill 3259 is a very simple Amendment. What it does is take the revenue that will be generated to local and state government from off-track betting and deposit all of that money into the common school fund. I think what this would do....is generate approximately thirty to forty million dollars a year to the common school fund. Based on the estimates that were presented by the Sponsor of this Bill. I think that if we're going to have off-track betting we ought to know where the money is going to go. We ought to earmark that, I think everybody on both sides of the aisle....both candidates for Governor have said, that education is their number one priority. I think that it is now time for us to put our votes where our rhetoric is and I would urge the adoption of Amendment #19."

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

Houlihan: "Representative Kane, is there anyway that you could add to this provision a manner in which this would be an add-on. Because currently, if you have all those funds going to the common school fund that will just mean



that there will be less dollars going from the general revenue fund to fund the school aid formula. Can you think of anyway you can make this an increase in terms of the state's commitment because of the new funds."

Kane: "I'm not sure that we could mandate it in the statute. That would be up to the Appropriations Committee and to the House and the Senate and if we appropriate that extra money and if we know that that revenue is going to come into the common school fund, I think that since both parties and both candidates for Governor have made education their number one priority that both parties would be in line to appropriate that money to the common school fund and actually send it out to the school districts around the state."

Houlihan: "I'm in support of this Amendment but I am wondering if we couldn't go farther and in fact, we could go further..."

Speaker Bradley: "Farther or further?"

Houlihan: "You say further, I'll say farther."

Speaker Bradley: "This Amendment merits your consideration, additional consideration."

Houlihan: "My point, Representative Kane, is that we might consider this as an additional formula grant to the local school districts directly from within those regions. So that the funding formula is left intact and that those funds from the general revenue fund can continue to fund the formula and the grant...categorical grant program. But the funds from this particular wagering and off-track betting proposition would go directly to the local school districts. Because what I fear is, we earmark all these funds for the educational fund out of those common school fund. What we end up doing is just putting in less general revenue dollars and not changing the total amount and we have something similar to the hoax that we've put upon the people when we passed the lottery. We said money was going to go to education and ended up not even



making the formality of doing it."

Kane: "I would say to that concept then, I think if you think back to....there is one cent of the sales tax that goes into the common school fund and that's how that was passed back in 1958, I believe."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Houlihan brought up a very valid point. In that in the lottery almost a hundred and fifty million dollars net from the lottery went into the common school fund or that was gleaned for the school fund and there was no add-on, so you might say that some of the extra money is going into common school fund has been derived from the lottery. Very well put, there should be an add on to that Amendment of Kane's to really effectuate an add-on to the school fund."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. Emil Barnes....Eugene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm just going to....I think some points have been made by this Amendment and there is no need for me to go into it additionally. But I would suggest that the purpose of off-track betting is to try and get some relief to... not just to the state but to local and those local municipalities around the state. And here we are saying, to those local municipalities that it is okay for you to generate some money there but we're going to tell you what to do with it. I think that if we are in our truer sense trying to relieve those local municipalities and trying to address some of their problems, we should in the first instance allow them to make that decision what can be done with money that will be raised in those local communities. I oppose this Amendment as everyone knows here, I have always supported the common schools, the common school fund but I don't think this Amendment will in anyway address or increase anything going to that fund



that can be used in our school system. I oppose Amendment #19."

Speaker Bradley: "Eugene Barnes, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "On the Amendment he indicates that he will."

Waddell: "Has any consideration been given at all to the fact that, with off-track betting you may influence the number of people that go to the track or fail to go to the track and therefore, reduce the income that you have to the fair and exhibition fund."

Kane: "I'm not sure that is germane to this particular Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think that is germane to the Amendment."

Kane: "I think that's a question that should be raised on Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "That would be a question for the Bill when we get to Third Reading."

Waddell: "I would suggest that it is because what you're doing now is, you're setting criteria that is going to influence the other."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, not with this Amendment, possibly with the whole Bill."

Kane: "What this Amendment does, is just say where the money is going to go. Or redirect it from the municipalities in the state to the common school fund."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Hoffman: "Of the total amount estimated to be raised, percentage wise how much does your Amendment deal with?"

Kane: "The Amendment takes all of the money that otherwise would go to municipalities, other units of local government in the state and puts it all into the common school fund."



Hoffman: "Is that a 100% then of the money that is raised?"

Kane: "I understand that some would go....the amount of money that would still....that goes to the regional corporations to run off-track betting would stay with the regional corporations. What this does is take the money that is otherwise would go to municipalities, other units of local government, if any...in the state, puts it into the common school fund."

Hoffman: "All right, then what you're saying is, the only money that you are not taking by this Amendment would be the money it costs to operate off-track betting."

Kane: "That's correct and the money that would go to the tracks and to the other, you know the horse runner, the prizes.... none of that money is touched."

Hoffman: "But that would be considered operational expense."

Kane: "Those are operational expenses...."

Hoffman: "Both of those are operational expenses."

Kane: "We're just taking the profit of off-track betting and giving it to common school fund."

Hoffman: "All right, so then you're saying that the forty-two million that would go to the regional corporation.... the thirty million that goes to the prizes and type of thing or the seventy million would stay where it is in place and then the thirty-six million or thirty-seven million which is the amount that would come to the state and go to local units of government would all be redirected in to state common school fund and would be redistributed at by whatever formula we have in operation at that time. Is that correct?"

Kane: "Correct."

Hoffman: "All right, thank you very much. I think that explains what is happening in this particular Amendment. I think it is kind of significant to point out that we're taking a look at a cost of seventy million dollars to be handled by the regional corporation and to go to prizes and the



operation of the tracks and so on, in order to raise thirty-six million dollars. You know, some question in my mind if that makes any sense in terms of investment vs. return on the basis and when we think of the source of the money. I'm going to support this Amendment because I feel that this is a reasonable place to put the money. And if we must do this, this is where it ought to go. I'm inclined to think that we shouldn't do it at all, however."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk on the Amendment."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want to make one thing, as someone said, perfectly clear. What we're doing here is putting this money back into the general revenue fund, it is not going to go to the school system. It will be broken down then equally among all other departments. If you recall, the same thing was said by many people in relation to the lottery and if you check with the people on the streets today, people still come to me and say, I thought that eighty or ninety million dollars that we were going to put into the lottery was going to the school system. I have to tell them, no, it goes to general revenue, a portion of it goes to the school system but not the whole thing. Again if we put this in, which I'm sure this is motherhood and it's going fly but we're still going to have to tell the people in the district that it is not going to education, a portion of it will go to education but it's going into the general revenue."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting....Mr. Kane, do you wish to close?"

Kane: "I would yield to my Chief Cosponsor, Representative Dyer to close."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Dyer, sorry. The Lady from DuPage, Mrs.



Dyer."

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As several speakers have pointed out, the lottery was sold to many of us here in this House on the basis that the lion's share of that money would go to the common school fund. But something funny happened on the way to the bank and the general revenue fund got there first and got a big cut of it so that very very little trickled down to the common school fund. And I think you are still hearing from your constituents as Representative Polk and Representative Houlihan has just pointed out. So this really makes this whole Bill into a family Bill. This makes this Bill a kind of Bill that will benefit everybody. First you're making it possible for mother and father not to have to abandon the children and go out to the track, they can stay home and they can place their bets and then they will know that part of that money is going to improve their childrens schools. Now who could be against this marvelous family life concept. I urge you to vote for the American family, vote for this Amendment. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry to explain his vote."

Skinner: "I arise to correct several of my colleagues who have suggested that the lottery was passed to fund education. That is wrong as the transcripts will show. The lottery was part of the RTA deal and it was explained that the proceeds of the lottery would go to partially make up or to almost make up the amount ripped off the top of the general fund which otherwise would have gone to education and would have fully funded the aid to education formula for 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978."

Speaker Bradley: "Was that all in the Amendment? Have all voted



who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should try to kid the people. In the first place it doesn't make any difference how much money we put in the school fund or where it comes from. So long as the floor Appropriation Committee and the General Assembly hangs on to these strings of money... purse strings of the money, there is just going to be so much money going to the schools anyway. And so, it is a matter of which pocket it's in. I don't think this Amendment means a thing in the world to the schools, it's not beneficial at all."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker in explaining my vote, I would like to correct those who said that when we passed the lottery it was supposed to go to school fund. That was never said when we passed the Lottery Bill. Some thought it was said but it wasn't said. Because I recall the debate on that Bill, however, we do have a commitment that we made when we passed the Income Tax Bill. I was here in 1969, when we said that 1/12 revenue going back to local government was supposed to go to abate the local taxes and the local municipalities could give that to school districts. We never did that, we still have a commitment to education. I think those monies, and I agree whole heartedly with, Jim Houlihan when he presents that Amendment, it ought to be an add-on so that we can abate those local taxes. The Chicago shouldn't mind because all of this money will go to the Chicago school districts. It will go back where we really need it. And so I think it is good Amendment and that the further or farther Amendment that Houlihan's got coming up is better yet."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think some



thing has to be said about the general atmosphere surrounding this particular Bill. I know that those of us who oppose the Bill are sometimes characterized as outcasts. I don't mind being part and parcel of legislation if I have some input into it. But if I'm presented with legislation which involves deals with other people, with contractors with a whole lot of other things and I have no opportunity to participate in the decision making then I've got to defend myself to my constituency. And I cannot defend myself to a constituency when a piece of legislation constitutes a regressive tax on poor people and butters up the contractors in the establishment in the City of Chicago. So if we have some decision making maybe we won't be so damn independent....maybe we will be considered regular Democrats but give us a chance to have some input into what you're deciding for us."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'ayes', 77 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion....the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I would like a poll of the absentees and a verification of the negative Roll Call. I would ask for an Oral Verified Roll Call, that might be simpler."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, we will have an Oral Verified Roll Call. Everybody be in their seats. The Clerk will call the roll."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson."

Speaker Bradley: "If the Members will press their switch and holler loud enough for the Clerk to hear, we would appreciate it."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson."

Speaker Bradley: Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Adams."

Speaker Bradley: "Adams, pass."

Clerk Hall: "Anderson."



Clerk O'Brien: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Antonovych."

Speaker Bradley: "Antonovych, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "E.M. Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Jane Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Bartulis, Beatty."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Bennett, Bianco. Bianco, 'no'. Birchler, Birchler,
'aye'. Bluthardt. Bluthardt, 'aye'. Boucek. Boucek,
'no'. Bowman. Bowman, 'aye'. Bradley."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: Brady, Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Breslin, Rich Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Campbell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Christensen."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Collins."

Speaker Bradley: "Collins, 'aye'. He votes 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Darrow."

Speaker Bradley: "Darrow passes, he's got his switch on there
would you please press it 'present'?"

Clerk Hall: Corneal Davis."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Jack Davis, Dawson, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima..."

Speaker Bradley: "Deuster votes...how do you vote, Mr. Deuster?
Deuster votes 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."



Clerk Hall: "Dyer, Ebbesen, Edgar, Epton, Ewell, Ewing...."

Speaker Bradley: "Aye."

Clerk Hall: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich...pass. Gaines."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio...pass. Giorgi,
Greiman, Griesheimer, Hanahan, Harris...pass. Hart...pass.
Hoffman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Hoxsey,
Hudson...."

Speaker Bradley: "Aye."

Clerk Hall: "Huff."

Speaker Bradley: "Huff, 'no'."

Clerk Hall: "Hoxsey, Jacobs.."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Johnson, pass. Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane,
Katz, Keats, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leveranz..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Levin, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Mahar, Mann, Margalus...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mann, 'aye'?"

Clerk Hall: "Margalus...."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Marovitz...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass. Oh, there he is, Marovitz, 'no'."

Clerk Hall: "Lynn Martin, 'aye'. Peggy Smith Martin..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Matejek, Matijevich, Matula, Mautino...."



Speaker Bradley: "Mautino, 'aye' or 'no'. 'Aye', Mautino, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "McAuliffe..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "McBroom...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "No'."

Clerk Hall: "McCourt, McGrew..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "McLendon, McMaster...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, McGrew wishes to be recorded as 'no'. McMaster's."

Clerk Hall: "McPike, Meyer, Miller, Molløy, Mudd, Mugalian...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Mulcahey...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mulcahey, pass."

Clerk Hall: "Murphy...."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Nardulli...."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Neff...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Richmond..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Rigney...."

Speaker Bradley: "Aye."

Clerk Hall: "Robinson, Ryan, Sandquist, Satterthwaite...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Schisler, Schlickman...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sharp, Shumpert, Simms, Skinner, Stanley, Stearney, Steczo...."



Speaker Bradley: "Aye."

Clerk Hall: "E.G. Steele..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "C.M. Stiehl....'no'. Stuffle, Sumner, Taylor...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass....he votes 'no'."

Clerk Hall: "Telcser....."

Speaker Bradley: "Can't hear you down here."

Clerk Hall: "Telcser, 'aye'. Terzich, Tipsword, Totten,
Tuerk, Van Duyne...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Vinson..."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Vitek, Von Boeckman...."

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Clerk Hall: "Waddell...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "R.V. Walsh...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "W.D. Walsh, Wikoff, Willer...."

Speaker Bradley: "Willer, passes."

Clerk Hall: "Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass. Oh, I'm sorry. Williams, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Winchester...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Wolf, Younge."

Speaker Bradley: "Younge, votes 'no'?"

Clerk Hall: "Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "No. Mr. Farley....just a minute. Call the
absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson, Adams...."

Speaker Bradley: "Adams, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Anderson...."

Speaker Bradley: "Anderson, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Jane Barnes, Beatty..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."



Clerk Hall: "Rich Brummer."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Chapman."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Christensen...."
 Speaker Bradley: "No."
 Clerk Hall: "Excuse me, I missed Caldwell."
 Speaker Bradley: "Caldwell, passes."
 Clerk Hall: "Darrow, Ralph Dunn."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Farley."
 Speaker Bradley: "Farley, votes 'no'."
 Clerk Hall: "Friedrich."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Gaines."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Giglio."
 Speaker Bradley: "No."
 Clerk Hall: "Greiman, Griesheimer...."
 Speaker Bradley: "Aye', Griesheimer votes 'aye'."
 Clerk Hall: "Harris, Hart, Jaffe...."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Johnson, Emil Jones, Katz, Klosak."
 Speaker Bradley: "Klosak votes 'no'. Pass on Klosak."
 Clerk Hall: "Laurino."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Leverenz."
 Speaker Bradley: "Leverenz votes 'no'."
 Clerk Hall: "Luft."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "Madison, Peggy Smith Martin, McAuliffe."
 Speaker Bradley: "Pass."
 Clerk Hall: "McBroom...."
 Speaker Bradley: "Who did you call?"
 Clerk Hall: "McBroom."



Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Mugalian."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Neff."

Speaker Bradley: "Neff, pass."

Clerk Hall: "Pechous, Pierce."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Richmond."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Satterthwaite."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Schlickman."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Simms, E.G. Steele."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Sumner."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk Hall: "Waddell."

Speaker Bradley: "Waddell, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "R.V. Walsh."

Speaker Bradley: "Votes 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "Willer votes 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "And Winchester."

Speaker Bradley: "Winchester passes. Mugalian wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Ralph Dunn wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Representative Caldwell wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Push your button. Mr. Van Duyne wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Mr. Mulcahey is in the chamber and would somebody push his switch 'no'. He wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. And Satterthwaite,



if somebody would please push her button. Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Representative Abramson wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. For what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen arise?"

Pullen: "Thank you, change me to 'aye' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Change her vote from 'no' to 'aye'. All right.

Are there any other changes now before we announce the Roll. Okay, the Clerk will take the record. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Change...put me down for 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Please record the Lady as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 78 'ayes'....I'll tell you what position we're in now, there are 78 'ayes' and 77 'nos'. In order to get on the Roll....in order to get on the Roll you are going to have to unanimous consent because the Roll has been taken. So if, Miss Sumner has unanimous consent she can be recorded as voting 'aye'. Are there objections? All right....okay....the record has been taken and there is 78 'ayes' and 77 'nays' and the Amendment is adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that there was some people that were in the chambers seeking recognition and.... Mrs. Sumner being one...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair would have...."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Brummer was another one that I seen."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair would have to rule, Mr. Lechowicz that when we called for the Roll and we took plenty of time, Mrs. Sumner was in her chair and we said, take the record and when we do that the record is taken and you will have to get unanimous consent to get on the Roll. So the Amendment is adopted, 78 to 77. What purpose does, Mr. Houlihan arise?"

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #19 was adopted."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider, on that motion the Gentleman from...~~Mr. Kane~~ was the sponsor of the Amendment...the Gentleman from Sangamon."

Kane: "I move to lay that motion on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman move that that motion lie upon the table. All in favor of the Gentelman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion is tabled. Are you joined by five people, Mr. McGrew? One, two, three...on this question, on Gentleman's motion to table. All in favor of Mr. Kane's motion to table...Mr. Houlihan's motion will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Polk, for what purpose do you arise?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that there is a couple of votes up there that are people who are not here. Now we just went through a verification and I've seen some people walking up and down pushing buttons. I would like to have you dump this and let's vote...just vote our own switches and get on with it."

Speaker Bradley: "Well to save some time, would you point out whose voting that's on there that shouldn't be. Mr. Polk. Antonovych is in the balcony. All right, have all voted who wished? Representative Mudd is here, I see him. Is there anybody here that's voting....all right. E.G. Steele is voting 'present'. All right, have all voted who wished? On this question there is 79 'ayes'....take the record. On this question there are 79 'ayes' and 82 'nays' and the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I would ask for an Oral Verified Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, the Gentleman asks for an oral verification and he is entitled to that so....we will.... the Clerk will call the roll and Ladies and Gentlemen it would really be helpful and I know that you have all spoken very loud and clear when you're out on the campaign trail,



if you would ring out loud and clear, 'aye' or 'nay'.

So that the Clerk can hear. Call the roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, 'no'. Adams, 'aye'. Anderson, 'aye'.
Antonovych...."

Speaker Bradley: "Antonovych votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes...."

Speaker Bradley: "E.M. Barnes, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pass."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, 'aye'. Beatty, pass. Bennett, 'aye'.
Bianco, 'no'. Birchler, 'no'. Bluthardt, 'aye'. Boucek,
'no'. Bowman, pass. Bradley, 'no'. Brady, 'no'.
Brandt, 'no'. Breslin, 'no'. Rich Brummer, 'no'. Don
Brummet, 'no'. Byers, 'aye'. Caldwell, 'no'. Campbell,
'no'. Capparelli, 'no'. Catania, 'aye'. Chapman, pass.
Christensen, 'no'. Collins, 'aye'. Conti, 'no'.
Cunningham, 'aye'. Daniels, 'aye'. Darrow, 'no'. Corneal
Davis, 'no'. Jack Davis, 'aye'. Dawson, pass. Dawson,
'no'. Deavers, 'no'. Deuster, pass. DiPrima, 'no'.
Domico, 'no'. Doyle, 'no'. John Dunn, 'no'. Ralph
Dunn, 'no'. Dyer, 'aye'. Ebbesen, pass. Edgar, 'aye'.
Epton, 'no'. Ewell, 'no'. Ewing...."

Speaker Bradley: "Ewing votes how?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Aye'. Earley, 'no'. Flinn, 'no'. Friedland,
'aye'. Friedrich, pass. Gaines, pass. Garmisa, 'no'.
Geo-Karis, 'aye'...."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, for what purpose does the
Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan arise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, this appears to be some concern over
what's happening and in that light, I would withdraw
my motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #19
was adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "We're not on your motion, Sir. We're are the
motion to table which is Mr. Kane's. Turn Mr. Kane on."

Kane: "I will withdraw my motion."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws his motion to table your motion and you are withdrawing your motion to reconsider then. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that you can withdraw the motion in the process of a verified verification."

Speaker Bradley: "You need unanimous....."

Lechowicz: "It's before the Body."

Speaker Bradley: "...the Body to withdraw the motion. So does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw his motion to table?"

Lechowicz: "I object, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "Objection has been heard. Proceed with the Oral verification. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Can I withdraw my request for an Oral Verification?"

Speaker Bradley: "Not in the middle of a verification. Continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Getty, 'no'. Giglio, 'no'. Giorgi...."

Speaker Bradley: "Giorgi...pass? 'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Giorgi, 'aye'. Greiman, 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Giorgi votes 'no'."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Greiman votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Greiman, 'aye'. Griesheimer, 'aye'. Hanahan, pass. Harris, 'no'. Hart, pass. Hoffman, 'aye'.

Holewinski, 'aye'. Dan Houlihan, 'no'. Jim Houlihan..."

Speaker Bradley: "Jim Houlihan votes 'aye'. Jim Houlihan.

What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan arise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm rising to vote 'aye' but I'm going to withdraw the motion so we're just taking up extra time of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Not timely."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jim Houlihan, 'aye'. Hoxsey, 'aye'. Hudson, 'aye'. Huff, 'no'. Huskey, 'aye'. Jacobs, 'no'. Jaffe, 'aye'. Johnson, 'aye'. Dave Jones, 'aye'. Emil Jones, 'no'. Kane, 'aye'. Katz, 'aye'. Keats, 'aye', Kelly,



'aye'. Kempiners, 'aye'. Kent, 'aye'. Klosak, pass.
 Kornowicz, 'no'. Kosinski, 'no'. Kozubowski, 'no'.
 Kucharski, 'no'. Laurino, pass. Lechowicz, 'no'.
 Leinenweber, 'aye'. Leverenz, 'no'. Levin, 'aye'.
 Lucco, 'aye'. Luft, pass. Macdonald, 'aye'. Madigan,
 'no'. Madison, 'no'. Mahar, 'aye'. Mann, 'aye'.
 Margalus, 'no'. Was it 'no'? Margalus."

Speaker Bradley: "Margalus voted 'no'."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Marovitz, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Lynn Martin, 'aye'. Peggy Smith Martin, pass.
 Matejek, 'no'. Matijevich, 'aye'. Matula, 'aye'.
 Mautino, pass. McAuliffe, pass. McBroom, pass. McClain,
 'no'. McCourt, 'no'. McGrew, 'no'. McLendon, 'no'.
 McMaster, 'aye'. McPike, 'no'. Meyer, 'no'. Miller,
 'aye'. Molloy, 'no'. Mudd, 'no'. Mugalian...."

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

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, has the motion to reconsider...."

Speaker Bradley: "How do you vote, Sir?"

Mugalian: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mugalian, 'aye'. Mulcahey, 'no'. Murphy, 'no'.
 Nardulli, 'no'. Neff, pass. O'Brien, 'no'. Pechous,
 'no'. Peters, pass. Pierce, pass. Polk, 'no'. Porter,
 'aye'. Pouncey, pass....Pouncey, 'no'. Pullen, 'aye'.
 Reed, 'aye'. Reilly, pass....Reilly, 'aye'. Richmond,
 'no'. Rigney, pass. Robinson, 'aye'. Ryan, pass.
 Sandquist, 'aye'. Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Schisler...."

Speaker Bradley: "Schisler votes 'aye'.....Schisler votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schlickman, pass. Schneider, 'aye'.
 Schoeberlein, 'aye'. Schuneman, pass. Sharp...."

Speaker Bradley: "Sharp votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Shumpert, 'no'. Simms, 'aye'. Skinner, 'aye'.
 Stanley, 'aye'. Stearney, 'no'. Steczo, 'aye'. E.G.
 Steele, pass. C.M. Stiehl, 'no'. Stuffle, 'aye'.
 Sumner, 'aye'. Taylor, 'no'. Telcser, 'aye'. Terzich,



'no'. Tipsword, pass. Totten, 'aye'. Tuerk, 'aye'.
 Van Duyne, 'no'. Vinson, 'no'. Vitek, 'no'. Von Boeckman,
 'no'. Waddell, 'aye'. R.V. Walsh, 'no'. W.D. Walsh,
 'aye'. Wikoff, 'aye'. Willer, 'aye'. Williams, 'aye'.
 Winchester 'no'. Wolf, 'no'. Younge, 'no'. Yourell,
 'no'. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Records 'no'. All right now wait a minute.
 Mr. Boucek wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'.
 We're just trying to get everybody on there...all right.
 Mr. Skinner on a point of order."

Skinner: "The point to which I rise is illegally having put the
 Speaker light on when he is not in evidence. We are only
 supposed to push our own button...."

Speaker Bradley: "You are out of order, Mr. Skinner. Mr. Deuster
 wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Bowman, 'aye'.
 Mr. Klosak, 'aye'. All right the Clerk will take the
 record. On this question there are 74 'ayes', 81 'nays'
 and the Gentleman's motion to table fails and we revert
 to, Mr. Houlihan's motion to reconsider the vote by
 which Amendment #19 was adopted to House Bill 3259.
 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan on his motion."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, in light of the hour and number of
 Amendments we have I would like unanimous consent to
 withdraw this motion to reconsider."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman ask....."

Houlihan: "I would like to withdraw it, if the Chair rules
 that I need unanimous consent, I would like that. If
 I just need my....."

Speaker Bradley: "He asks for unanimous consent. Is there
 any objection to the Gentleman withdrawing his motion to
 reconsider the vote? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman's
 motion is withdrawn. Amendment #20....are there further
 Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #20, Mahar. Amends House Bill
 3259 as amended in Section I of the Bill and so forth."



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

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask to withdraw Amendment #20."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #20. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #21, Mahar. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in the last sentence and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar on Amendment #21."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In keeping the books and records of this corporation there is no mention of the fact that there be an audit by any outside source. Amendment #1 simply says that there will be annual independent audit by a certified public accountant. It seems to me that an organization like this, handling this kind of money, there ought to be available to the public an annual audit of the books and records. And I move its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Eugene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have read the Amendment, I agree and concur with Representative Mahar totally. And I would support the adoption of Amendment #21."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #21. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #22, Sandquist. Amends House Bill 3259....."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what my Amendment attempts to do is to prevent this from becoming a regressive tax. Now I know you are going to say that if people are going to bet, we might as well let them bet and let the state get part of it."



But what I think is wrong is to have advertisements going out...trying to get the people who can least afford to bet, that they should come in here and get some kind of great social or economic value. You know what has happened to the lottery, you hear those advertisements all the time. And all my Amendment does is a simple thing, it says you're not going to put advertising in in the promotion schemes that is going to say that there is economic and social value to placing bets. And I think it is a very legitimate thing....something that we should have and let the people who want to bet...bet. But let's not try to go after the poor people who can't afford it. And I ask your support of this Amendment."

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

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know the Sponsor and I know his sincerity. But I think the facts simply does not bear out what he's trying to get at in this Amendment. As I understand and I see advertisement every day relative to on-track betting. And I don't know that the situation that he described is a situation that is prevailing in the state. I see those....not only do I see those advertisements everywhere but I see them added on and adding in different demensions. Let me suggest to you that....and I believe there is only one comparable system that we could compare to this system and that's the system in New York that has been studied and studied. But I want bring to your attention the Sunday, Chicago Sun Times, the May 21st edition. That indicates even further that latest figures show that the average OTB player is middle aged man that is married in the upper mobility in the middle class. Now the lower hard pressed person that Representative suggests that he's addressing this Amendment towards. I believe that you will find that that is the case in New York, I believe that you will find that by-and-large that is the case in



Illinois. And in terms of advertisement, to suggest that you could not advertise for a marketing concept and bring the opportunities for place of wager off-track. Yet does not put that same restriction of wagers on-track. I just don't see the purpose of that type of Amendment because the on-track advertisement which is so pervasive as I'm sure you know, will still be there. So in essence this Amendment could not...could not in anyway try to clear up the situation that you described. And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would oppose Amendment #22."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Amendment. Although I did not support the lottery when it came up, I had no idea that we had given the lottery the authority to put out the type of advertising that they are putting out. To encourage people to become involved in an anti social activity like gambling. This falls under the category, it's bad enough that we have it where it is. Let us not encourage anyone else to do it by allowing them to advertise. Those who operate on this level in society will find it anyway, we don't need to encourage more people to go down there. And for this reason, I would support this Amendment."

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

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Holewinski: "Maybe just to clarify what I think is a misunderstanding about the Amendment, Representative Sandquist. The Amendment really does not prohibit advertising totally does it?"

Sandquist: "No, it doesn't prohibit advertising. It just says that if there's advertising you can't describe it as being



economic value or social value in it."

Hoffman: "So what you're attempting to do is just avoid the type of advertising that would lure people to gambling solely because of some promise or expectation....it's likely to be unmet about the...you know, the outcome and the rewards of doing it. You're not necessarily saying you can't put up signs that this parlor is located at this location and place a wager there. You're just saying you can't paint it in an extremely favorable advertising light so to speak."

Sandquist: "That's correct, that there is no pie in the sky. Or no panacea."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment is a good one. Because all it does is say that we shouldn't perpetrate a fraud upon the public and tell them that they can make money by gambling. And that's what he's driving at when he says, we shouldn't picture the gambling situation, this off-track, as being socially and economically beneficial. Because frankly, it isn't. There has been too many homes that have been lost by it and I certainly speak in favor of the Amendment."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have a problem with this Amendment. Elroy, the Rockford newspaper every day run the morning line at Arlington Park, Sportsman Park or -whatever. And we don't have any messenger services in Rockford, people might take the bus to Arlington Park but we have a full page devoted to race, line ups, the winners, the pay-offs and I don't know what they are doing it for because... you might say, Rockford is probably the conservative community in Illinois. Now, you're saying that you want to deny the newspaper from publishing the off-track betting morning lines? Is that what you're saying?"



Sandquist: "No, not at all. I'm not trying to hold back news, I'm not trying to hold back any kind of what you call legitimate advertising. Or saying that the race is going to be run here or you can come and place your bet here. What I'm saying is, I don't want the kind of advertising we've got going now in the lottery that people can come and place their hard earned money on some kind of a small bet and then think they are going to come away with a lot of money. And that...that there is economic value in this kind of thing and that is what I want to stop."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for just a moment on the Amendment. But when the lottery came to Illinois in 1974, we had experiences of a half dozen other states that had the lottery for about ten years. And they knew that you had to do a lot of selling, a lot of advertising, a lot of marketing and you had to have a lot of gimmickery. We knew we had to have a lot of innovation and a lot of imagination to sell lottery tickets. These two are not...they are not the same type of attraction for the people. You think you are getting your metaphors mixed up or whatever. But you're going to have to do some kind of huckstering to get the off-track betting working, if you are going to want glean any money for the common school fund. Now we don't want to hurt the kiddys. Now since World War II, we've skimmed about two billion dollars at the tracks, since World War II we've taken in two billion dollars at the tracks and we put that in the Agriculture Premium Fund and the Metropolitan Exposition and Authority Fund. And we brought the ribbons for the kids at the state fairs. You know, when they brought the strawberry preserves and the best swine, we gave them the ribbons and the ribbon money came from the gambling dollars. Now we don't want to cut that out, do you? I mean is that the kind of advertising that you're talking about?"



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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the type of advertising that Representative Sandquist is talking about is advertising that touts. And in my opinion, I think it is rather innocuous Amendment because it was my observation when the messenger service came out that was no touting, that was just simply a sign which allowed the people to know that they could place bets here and they responded accordingly. I think it should also be pointed out that a majority of the players in the messenger service were people who had never gone to the track. And I think this would be the same...true in this instance. Therefore, you don't need excessive touting no more than the logo or whatever the sign may be to signify that this will be a place where OTB."

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

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, without any offense to the Sponsor of the Amendment. I'm going to be voting 'no', the first reason that I'll be voting 'no' on this Amendment is that it is absolutely ineffectual. There is no way on earth that it can have effect whatever. It would be just as purposeful to tell children not to not to eat candy because it affects their teeth. This type of raising money automatically applies to the poor, the weak, and the defenseless. That's the whole theory of all gambling, that it panders to the weakness of those that cannot resist the temptation to believe that there is something for free in this world. If it weren't for that human trait there would be no gambling and that is why traditionally it has been the position of society to defend the weak against their inability to distinguish between true values. The second reason that I'm going to be voting against this Bill, it creates the basis for some of you salve your conscience and say, we're



going to be voting for the Bill because it has these safeguards built in. The third reason that I'm going to be voting against it is that we surely will get a signal from the second floor in this building very quickly in regard to this Bill. It is unthinkable that we would spend so many hours deliberating a Bill where there should be guidance coming from the Chief Executive of this state. Regardless of the Bill...the votes that have been coming from the Leadership from this side, I cannot believe...I refuse to believe that a Governor who is so proud of the fact that he is a law and order Governor, a Governor who is the author of Class X, wants to be the Godfather of OTB. And until we find...until we get a different signal, I think we are spinning our wheels because we're not going to have that in an election year. I'll be voting 'no' on the Amendment for the reasons that I have indicated."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Houlihan: "Representative Sandquist, you set up here in effect two classes. Because the race tracks could advertise in the manner which you prohibit for the off-track parlors. And what you do, if I can use an analogy, it would be similar to saying to in a liquor industry, when you served on a Liquor Board...saying that bars could not advertise. The people can come in and find the elixir of youth or that they could find happiness in the bars. But in fact, retail stores could make those ads and could make those claims. Isn't this kind of discriminatory in that fashion?"

Sandquist: "Well, I don't think it is. Because what we're talking about here is setting up a municipal corporation. I'm not saying that the tracks can't advertise or anything like that, I'm talking about this municipal corporation that the state is...that the state has a part in. And that



the public will be running, will be telling the wrong people that they should come in to place bets because there is an economic value in it. And I don't think that's different."

Houlihan: "Representative, the issue was raised as to whether you could enforce this. Wouldn't the interpretation of this be that any fees that were won to be advertised would be an alurement in terms of bettering one's life. And that you could not advertise that somebody won the trifecta because that might lure people into the off-track betting parlors and induce them to bet. Isn't that correct?"

Sandquist: "If it was part of an advertisement or a promotion, you're right. You couldn't do it."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have serious reservations about the Bill as amended in House Bill 3259 by Amendment #14. I think there are severe problems with it but I don't think this Amendment improves the Bill. I think the best that could be said about this Amendment is, that it may well be a fetcher to raise the cost of the deal between the Chicago organization and the Governor's Office. I don't see where it can be enforced, I think it will ultimately will be taken off the Bill if the Bill is passed. And I don't think we should be cluttering up a Bill just in an effort to defeat it on Third Reading. So I would urge a 'no' vote on Amendment #22."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Terzich moves the previous question.

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist to close the debate."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell my good friend in and fellow 13th District, Representative Jim Houlihan. I can assure you this is no part of anything



with the second floor and no kind of a deal. I'm very serious about this, I think that we should not try to promote the off-track betting with the people who can least afford to pay for it. Because that is a regressive tax and if we're going to raise money for schools or for municipalities let's do it in a correct way. Let's not take it from the people who can least afford it. And therefore, I ask for your 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. 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 there are 63 'ayes', 65 'nays and the Gentleman's motion.....Leinenweber wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mrs. Macdonald wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Vinson votes 'no'. All right now wait a minute. Dump that Roll Call. All right. Everybody in favor of the Gentleman's motion 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 there are 74 'ayes', 69 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #23, E.M. Barnes. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended...."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I indicated when we adopted Amendment #14 that there was a technical change that would be coming. And embodied in Amendment #23 is that change and this merely adds language that the Reference Bureau had left out of the original Amendment #14. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #23."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #23. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.



The 'ayes' have it in the opinion of the Chair and the Amendment is adopted. Further Ammdments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #24, J.M. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3259...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Jimmy Houlihan on Amendment #24. -On House Bill 2359."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker would you have the Clerk read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in the second sentence of Section 26.1 by changing 'state of municipal government' to 'elementary and secondary education in Illinois'. And in the last sentence, of paragraph (b), of Section 26.8 by changing 'general revenue fund' to 'common school fund' and be used for categorical grants to school districts under Section 18-8 of the School Code."

Speaker Bradley: "Have you got it now?"

Houlihan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe with the adoption of Representative Kane's Amendment it is not necessary and I move to table Amendment #24."

Speaker Bradley: "You don't need it. The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #24. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #25, J.M. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3259...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan on Amendment #25."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #14 indicated that it was drafted in response to two issues which were raised in Committee hearing and raised by many Members on the floor. And that was that the bonding authorization and the condemnation powers incorporated in the original draft of this Bill would be used to create a sports complex or a racing stadium sports complex jointly. And that those funds would be used to construct such a stadium quite possibly on the lake



front or some other area in the central core of our corporate...corporation location. It is my feeling that with Amendment #14, Representative Barnes indicated that they do have short term notes, those short term notes are similar to the short term notes that IDA has and there would be nothing in this Bill to prohibit them from using those....that power to have notes put out on the market for constructing a sports complex. And so what this Bill...this Amendment does is specifically prohibits from using or giving the authorization to any regional corporation to construct or invest or to contribute to the construction of a sports arena stadium or sports complex of any kind. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment #25."

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

Giorgi: "I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Giorgi: "Jim, what do you find so offensive about this using this money to help pay for the civic centers of Rockford, Peoria, Decatur, Springfield, East St. Louis and the rest of the secondary cities are building. What's wrong with that? You built McCormick Place out of the skim of the race track dollars now what's wrong with letting downstate enjoy some of this conspicuous skim?"

Houlihan: "Well, Representative Giorgi, you have five questions in there. Do you want to place them in the order you want them answered?"

Giorgi: "To the best of your memory, go ahead."

Houlihan: "Well, your question of whether we should support a Bill that would allow continuation of a practice that was questionable and I don't think we should. Now the issue of stadiums and convention centers for Peoria, Rockford, for some of the other major areas have been debated and battled here on the floor. Unfortunately



that was in most cases before I came here and it was when the downstate contingent didn't have that much strength to put through such a proposal. And I think that what the downstaters ought to do, who are concerned about those particular areas is marshal their forces to be able to implement and get a part of the proceeds. So they can make a construction of their particular pet project."

Giorgi: "I'm going to support the Amendment."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again to facilitate things here. I indicated in Committee that there was nothing in this Bill that would allow such action as the Sponsor of this Amendment has indicated. I indicated on the House floor when I amended this Bill with Amendment #14 and I indicate again that there is nothing in this Bill that would allow any kind of such activity. Now if, Mr. Houlihan wished for that to go on with this Amendment fine, because it does nothing. I have no problem with this Amendment whatsoever. I support it."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, the question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion is adopted...the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #26, J.M. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3259...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan on Amendment #26."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, one other issue that has been raised in the public debate concerning the off-track wagering and the establishment of a corporation to provide such off-track facilities, is the location of those off-track parlors. Now I have heard from people in our community



a number of neighborhoods have specifically requested that they would not desire an off-track betting facility in their neighborhood. And what we've done is we've given that corporation the power to locate all of those off-track betting parlors. This would merely subject any off-track betting location to be approved by the voters within the precinct and the contiguous precincts surrounding that site. This provision is similar to the provision in the liquor statutes which allows there to be a referendum if a particular liquor store is found offensive to a neighborhood, to a community...to the fibers of that area. The people can petition to have a referendum and have that precinct go dry. This would allow the voters in a precinct and the contiguous precincts to opt not to have a location of an off-track parlor in their area. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #26."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me point out three things very briefly here. One, to have any of these facilities your have to be local ordinance, you have to meet local zoning regulations. And the third thing which has been adopted here earlier, you have to meet a referendum, a countywide referendum that has been added to this piece of legislation. Now, Representative Houlihan again, as I indicated to you in the Amendment before....now you're saying you have to have a precinct referendum. Well, my God, how many referendums do you want. There is nothing in this Bill that forces anyone to have anything....anywhere. Again I point to you, one local ordinance prevails, two zoning prevails, three you have to have a countywide referendum and the first instance. I think that this Amendment is just what it seems to be on its face, it is simply not a good idea. It is not a good Amendment, it's an Amendment just to offer some....whatever for whatever reason



that the Sponsor has. I oppose Amendment #26."

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

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Madison: "Representative Houlihan, drawing from your analogy of local option where in a precinct can vote itself dry. Would the effect of your Amendment cause the precinct to vote itself wet as it relates to OTB?"

Houlihan: "Could you rephrase that, Representative Madison?"

Madison: "You used an analogy of your Amendment to local option wherein a precinct votes itself dry if it is not pleased with the location of liquor establishment. Effect of this Amendment is to cause the vote to take place before the fact rather than after the fact. Having the effect of having to vote a precinct wet rather than dry. As it relates to off-track betting."

Houlihan: "No, Representative Madison. There is no petitionary power within this Amendment. In other words, a particular precinct and the contiguous precinct could not vote to have a facility located there and then go to the Board and require them to locate that facility there. What would happen under the provisions of this Amendment would be that a particular announcement would be made by the corporation that we are going to locate an off-track betting parlor right next to the future President, Representative Jones son's house. The people in that precinct could, if they chose then organize a petition and a referendum to preclude that particular location. That precinct and all the ones that are contiguous. It would not give them the ability to vote to have the location there and then by that vote request and demand a location of a facility in a particular area."

Madison: "Well then, Representative Houlihan your analogy does not follow then does it?"



Houlihan: "Well, Representative Madison we have all learned that all analogies limp. Now this one does not limp in the way that you suggest that it does. But it does have its weaknesses. The analogy follows in that it is people, in a particular area...some say locally to what goes on in that area. Some say in addition to zoning and ordinances and for example, in an area in Cook County which is unincorporated, the corporation could locate without any local review."

Madison: "Representative Houlihan, I'm simply trying to determine if the effect of your Amendment is to cause the facility to be located there only to have the voters vote it out if they don't like it or is it necessary for the voters to act even before the facility can be located there."

Houlihan: "The voters could act...on my reading of the Amendment, could act prior to the location when it is announced or they could act subsequent to the location when the facility may be causing problems in the area...."

Madison: "Could a facility be located there without any action on the part of the voters? Without any action?"

Houlihan: "Yes, if...."

Madison: "That's not the way I read your Amendment, Representative."

Houlihan: "If no effort was taken, I believe it could be located."

Madison: "If I understand the language of your Amendment...I'm not finished, Mr. Speaker. No facility may be located in a core city unless...this suggests to me that there has to be action on the part of voters before a facility could be located. Your explanation is, that is not the case. Now, are we to accept your explanation or are we to accept the reading of the Amendment?"

Houlihan: "I would suggest the reading of the Amendment."

Madison: "Thank you."

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

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, if he would yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."



Houlihan,D:"Your Amendment refers simply to a referendum. At what kind of election would the referendum take place?"

Houlihan,J:"That would be established by the local racing corporation."

Houlihan,D:"As to whether or not it would be at a special or a general election?"

Houlihan,J:"They could decide whether it would be in an election for to fill a vacancy as an automatic election or whether it would in a general election upon re-election. They could use any facility or vehicle available."

Houlihan,D:"Do you have any estimated cost as to what it would be to conduct a referendum each time that they were looking for a site selection?"

Houlihan,J:"I do not have the specific cost item of what it would require. I did not conceive of the corporation mandating a special referendum each time. They might fold in some of those requests with the general election, primary election or special election as they came about. But they would be in power obviously under their rules and their directive to do that. The cost figure, I'm not certain of."

Houlihan,D:"Well, in addressing the Amendment, if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Houlihan,D:"I would rise in opposition to the Amendment for if no other reason, the practical one. As to the type of election at which the anticipated referendum under the Amendment would have to take place. The analogy to the Illinois Liquor Act, that kind of a referendum of whether or not a precinct should be wet or dry can only take place at a general election. If we were to strait jacket...really the corporation into the situation that before you could have a site^s selection you would either have to await the next general election, which could be as long as two years or to go the cost expenditure of a



special election in each instance, I think would be totally unworkable. I think the Amendment is completely impractical and I think it should be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, how many Amendments have been filed to 3259?"

Speaker Bradley: "Have been filed? I think there is 32...33, I understand now."

O'Brien: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schneider rise?"

Schneider: "Mike Madigan says I can't be from Cook. I'm from DuPage. Could I proceed."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman from DuPage."

Schneider: "O'Brien can, speak on the issue and then make a motion."

Speaker Bradley: "I realize that...we stretched the point..."

Schneider: "I would just like to make an observation as to an inquiry of the Chair. On a fiscal note does it have to be requested prior to the adoption of the Amendment or after....I remember we had some confusion on that."

Speaker Bradley: "Prior."

Schneider: "I would like to request a fiscal note regarding Representative Dan Houlihan's question to Representative Jim Houlihan. And that is the cost of the election. So I would so make that request, Mr. Chairperson."

Speaker Bradley: "You will have to fill out the proper papers."

Schneider: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from...."

Schneider: "And notarized."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...Mr. Houlihan to close the debate."



Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker in response to the points raised by the Sponsor of this Bill. First, in some areas in Cook County and I direct this to the suburban Members of the Legislature. There are unincorporated areas and they would not have any local say in those areas where a particular off-track betting parlor would be located. Secondly, the Representative raised the issue of a countywide referendum. Let me remind the Representatives that countywide referendum is directed towards the concept generally as to whether there should be a corporation and whether that corporation should include a particular area. There is not a specific reference to the location of a particular betting parlor. And finally in response to Representative Houlihan's questions about the practicability of this particular Amendment I would suggest that any corporation that is going to be effective is going to have long range planning. Any corporation that is going to map out an effective strategy to make off-track betting a reality and a profitable reality for the state and the local municipalities, would have a grand plan. And that plan would allow them over a period of time to adopt locations to target locations and to have the referendums approved in a timely fashion and probably at very little expense to the voters. And so I think...to suggest that it would be terribly expensive would be to suggest that the Board or the corporation would act capriciously. And I hardly think that we want to suggest that in this particular Bill. I would urge all of the Members who are concerned about off-track betting and the location of those parlors to give the residents of your precinct and the adjoining precincts the ability...the opportunity to review whether they want to have a parlor located in their area. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on Amendment #26."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #26 to House Bill 3259. All in favor of the Gentleman's



motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.
The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Would the
Chair rule as to whether or not an individual who raised
questions of the Sponsor and did not speak to the issue,
is that person considered to have spoken in debate?"

Speaker Bradley: "If you asked questions...yes, Sir."

Madison: "But did not speak to the issue."

Speaker Bradley: "That was during the debate time that you
were speaking, if that is what it was, wherever it was then he
would be considered in my opinion that he spoke in debate."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted
who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this
question there 54 'ayes', 64 'nos' and the Gentleman's
motion fails. Further Amendments? The Gentleman from
Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker can I have a poll of the absentees?"

Speaker Bradley: "I already announced the results of the vote...
I think we have been very lenient in every request that
possibly been made. You persist, Sir? The Gentleman
persists in a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Adams, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Don
Brummet, Caldwell...."

Speaker Bradley: "Caldwell votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman, Conti...."

Speaker Bradley: "Conti votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Daniels, Dyer...."

Speaker Bradley: "Dyer votes 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ebbesen, Edgar...."

Speaker Bradley: "Edgar votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell, Ewing, Friedrich, Gaines, Griesheimer,
Harris, Hart, Hoffman, Hudson, Kelly, Kent, Klosak,
Laurino, Luft, Mahar, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek,
McAuliffe, McBroom, Miller, Mugalian, Mulcahey...."



Speaker Bradley: "Mulcahey votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pierce, Porter, Richmond, Ryan, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schlickman, Schuneman, Sharp, Steczo, C.M. Stiehl, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk...."

Speaker Bradley: "Tuerk votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Van Duyne..."

Speaker Bradley: "Van Duyne votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "R.V. Walsh, W.D. Walsh..."

Speaker Bradley: "Walsh votes 'no'. R.V. Walsh votes 'no' and W.D. Walsh votes 'aye'. It's a stand off between the Walsh's. Always was between the Walsh's."

Clerk O'Brien: "Willer..."

Speaker Bradley: "Willer, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Williams, Winchester, Wolf, Yourell."

Speaker Bradley: "There are 60 'ayes', 68 'nays' and the motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #27, J.M. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in Section...."

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

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment tries to do something similar to what Representative Kane's did in his Amendment #19. But what it does is make grants directly to the school districts. We have read a great deal about not only the City of Chicago but various core cities having problems in their school systems with desegregation. It is a very serious problem which I think we have to address very directly, the state superintendent has urged a desegregation plan upon not only the Chicago Board of Education but upon all of the school districts to come into compliance with the state standards. Now what Superintendent Cronin has asked is that every district supply an affirmative action program. In my particular school district, the City of Chicago, Superintendent Hannon has put a price tag on that in addition to the regular funds that he receives from



the State of Illinois, through the formula and through the categorical grants. Now since we're dealing with a core city concept in off-track betting and we're dealing with the idea of establishing revenue centers based around large metropolitan areas and since those large metropolitan areas are the ones that have the most serious problems in their school desegregation plans. It was my feeling that we ought to direct the additional revenues that are accrued to those core cities and to the corporations to implement the desegregation plans of the particular area. It seems to me that this would address the problem that Representative Polk mentioned, and that is, we're not playing a shell game by adding more money to the school fund and therefore, reducing the money obligated out of the general revenue fund. We are actually making direct grants for the specific purpose of implementing the desegregation plan as approved by the state superintendent and is necessary to make our core cities viable today. I would urge the favorable consideration of this Amendment and hope that those Members who spoke out against Representative Kane's Amendment because it didn't go far enough, would join me in this particular Amendment."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr....I move the previous question."

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

All in favor of the motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Houlihan, do you wish to close the debate? Mr. Houlihan do you wish to close the debate?"

Houlihan: "You slipped that request by me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "His was the only light flashing, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I would ask for a favorable consideration on House Amendment #27."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #27. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by



voting 'no'. If I would have known he was going to make that motion, I wouldn't have recognized him. It wasn't necessary because there weren't anybody else seeking recognition. Have all voted who wished? Mann votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 31 'ayes', 76 'nays', 7 'present' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #28, Kelly. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended by deleting all of the last sentence of paragraph (e) and so forth."

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

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Now that Amendment #19 has become a reality on this proposal, it seems even more important that we adopt Amendment #28. Because under Amendment #19 all of the funds went to the common school fund and it did not allow for...let's say, any expense factors or considerations in the area of the municipalities. Who we all know will have a certain amount of cost factor in the area of additional police and many other areas that will be financial problems. Now this legislation takes a portion of that fund within the district itself, and redistributes a small portion to the municipalities and also to the park districts and to the school districts. And these are two other areas...certainly the park districts, we have all heard from our park districts and we have the endorsement on this Amendment by the park districts, organization, to provide this additional money to the park districts. It provides for a 1/5 portion to go the park districts, 2/5 to go to the school districts and 2/5 portion to go to the municipalities. Ladies and Gentlemen, I feel very strongly that...and those particularly that are in favor of the municipalities knows that there is going to be a cost factor and this will give a profit to the



municipalities as well as the local schools....I don't think this will dilute Amendment #19 that much and I do think it will correct from our deficiencies in that area that I pointed out. And I ask for your favorable support."

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

Adams: "Mr. Speaker, I think we should move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous question prevails. Mr. Kelly to close the debate."

Kelly: "I would just ask for your support in this good proposal."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion on Amendment #28, signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "It's not important."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 26 'ayes', 98 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #29, Jacobs-Flinn. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in Section..."

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

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #29 is a Bill that we had talked to the Sponsor of, in which he agreed to. And it says that, at the end of each month regional corporations shall pay an amount equal to .05% or $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% of the total amount wagered on off-track parimutuel wagering for that month in the regional corporation to the municipality in which the tracks are located. In a proportion that the wagers made in the regional corporation for racing at those tracks, in a month bears to all wagers made in the regional



corporation in the month. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Representative Jacobs indicated, he has spoke to me about this. He and Representative Flinn, they pointed out the much need for this Amendment, I can concur with them and I urge all the Members to support Amendment #29."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, J."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Jacobs could you give us the dollar estimate as to what the cost is of Amendment #29, in terms of additional computing?"

Jacobs: "It totals...the total for downstate...all of the downstate tracks would be approximately two hundred thousand dollars. And that includes Cook County also. The idea of this was...the fact that where the municipalities. that where the tracks are located in municipalities the municipality has to furnish the police and the fire protection, they have to run water and sewer out because most of them are located right at the edge of the city. And therefore, there is a cost to and the fact that there will be some loss in the amount of people going to the tracks and thereby, the cities where the tracks are located would lose a certain amount of sales tax. And that's why this was...."

Houlihan, J: "Representative, would you indicate in addition to the cost directly incurred by the municipalities, there would probably be some additional cost in terms of the financial arrangements in adding this 5% to the local communities. Would you ascertain what the administrative costs would be?"

Jacobs: "It is not 5%. It is $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% and the cost would be '0'."

Houlihan: "Thank you very much, Representative."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Sponsor of the Amendment could tell us who loses by this Amendment. Are we taking away from schools or cities or who...whom...who...whatever? Whom."

Jacobs: "This would be included in the expense of the corporation."

Skinner: "Well that means there will be less money going to the common school fund, right?"

Jacobs: "Well, I wouldn't know because I don't know whether there is going to be any money left."

Skinner: "You mean this may take up all the money....all of the profits?"

Jacobs: "No...with the previous Amendments. I couldn't tell you how much money is going to be left."

Skinner: "Well, if I may speak to the Amendment. It appears to me...."

Jacobs: "It is part of the operation."

Skinner: "It appears to me, Mr. Speaker that this Amendment will take money away from school kids and give it to Cities that have tracks. And if that is incorrect.... perhaps someone can correct me. But if not, it seems to me that we ought to defeat the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Further debate? If not, the question is on the adoption of Amendment #29 to House Bill 3259. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion 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 there are 84 'ayes', 27 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #30, Mahar. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in Section 26.19 and so forth."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #30 deals with the composition of the Board



in the first regional corporation. As you know there is a five....nine member Board and the region encompasses Cook County, Will County and Lake County and DuPage County and in the interest of having each county have some say in what's going on in the corporation and in view of the fact that there will be off-track betting parlors in all the counties. The Bill simply says that the core city shall have the most of the directors and the chairman shall be from Chicago but also there will be one director from Lake County, one from Will, one from DuPage and two from suburban Cook County. I think it is a good Amendment and should be adopted."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this an example of what's going on here. If you read Amendment #14, what Amendment #14 said, is that the core city would get one appointment on this board. Eight would be elected by the municipalities within those regions on a weighted vote. The original weight would be on the latest census that we have available to us. After that it would be based on the weighted amount of the wage of bet in those municipalities. It's clear...it's clear that any municipality....all of the municipalities may have all the directors under Amendment #14 as it was introduced. The core cities simply gets one...only one...one member, the director on that regional corporation. I can't see the need for this additional Amendment here which says in fact to those municipalities that if you have the necessary weighted vote, that your vote don't mean anything, that we're going to have these people alive in this way, you're saying in effect, the same thing that you came to me and said the original Bill did. But you asked me to change it, I did change it...changed it based on the most equitable manner available to me, the census and the weighted number



amount of wágered vote. Now you want to turn that around saying that five of those members must be in this manner made by this appointment process. I think that's contradictory on its face and I would solicit a 'no' vote from the Members of this Body because in effect, what this Amendment says is that we're going to go back to the original Bill...the only difference is that I am going to name who these five directors shall be. That is all this Amendment does, I oppose the Amendment because the most equitable manner is for the election by the municipalities that are involved in the regional corporation."

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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To correct two of the things that the previous speaker said, I think were slightly in error. Number one, under the original Bill it said that the majority would come from Chicago and four of them would come from the other area. Which of course would leave control of the regional corporation in the hands of Chicago. Now what this one says is that the chairman will be from the City of Chicago and the other eight from the municipalities and the county chairman in the outlying counties. But it's on a population basis for the first year...up to July 1, 1979. Now the population happens to be that, if Chicago wants to appoint all nine of them they can under this Bill. Because they have the population in the central city and the outlying counties do not have the population as of the 1970 census. So let's make sure that there will be some directors from the outlying areas. Now I can agree that the majority of the take is going to be in Chicago after the Bill is established and it also says that after the Bill is established the people who will have off-track betting will be voting on the basis of the amount of off-track betting in their municipality. Which means that many municipalities will have



no control at all, this just simply says, as long as you're going to have Cook County, DuPage County, Will County and Kane County, somebody from those counties is going to be on the off-track betting board whether they are authorized bookie joints by ordinance or not. So I think it is a fair distribution of the directorship and should be adopted. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #30. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "This is a new and innovative way to pick board members. In fact, if adopted by this General Assembly, I am certain that I'm going to find a way to attempt to amend the RTA Act so that the board members are selected according to a weighted vote determined by the amount of money each transportation area pays in. In which case, Chicago will get 31% of the votes."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83(sic) 'ayes', 66 'nays' and the motion... 66 'nays' and the motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #31, J.M. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in the second sentence and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan. Mr. Houlihan. Amendment #31."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment being further down the line of the farthest number of Amendments that we have considered...much further than we ought to. And since it duplicates the Amendment adopted in Amendment #19 by Representative Kane, I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment #31."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #31. Further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #32, Conti. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended in Section 26.19 and so forth."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of you have concerned yourselves as to the control of the board, I think my Amendment will take care of the problems. And Cal, you ought to be interested in this too. In Section 26-19, it says that the corporate authorities governing body of the regional corporation shall be a board consisting of nine directors appointed as follows. Eight directors elected by the Mayors, Village Presidents, County Board Presidents or chairman or members of municipalities. Such elector may cumulate his vote for as many candidates as he may chose to support. The chairman shall call the election, the initial election shall use the population under the 1970 census instead of the dollars wagered as the measure of the vote. Now my Amendment will delete the last sentence in paragraph (e), because it says there in paragraph (e) that the core city is a regional corporation in addition any other municipality may join that regional corporation by passing an ordinance therefore. And it goes on to say, if the regional corporation decides that it will not place any off-track parimutuel wagering facilities in that municipality, then the municipality is no longer a member of regional corporation and may not rejoin for a whole year. So in other words, if a town like Oak Park, Cicero, with 67 or 74 thousand people, if they are not favorable to the board members that are going to be elected by the City of Chicago the core city will not put in a parimutuel or an off-track betting station in that particular town. Now you cumulate your votes, you don't have to vote for each memeber but you cumulate your votes and the suburban vote in Cook County or in the core city of District 1, would have enough



cumulated votes to appoint the chairman of that board, or any members it so desires by the cumulative voting. But if they are eliminated the first year...then they have to go by the amount of money that is spent. Well the people in Elmwood Park or the people in River Grove, Franklin Park, Schiller Park, they work downtown, the suburbs are the bedrooms of the City of Chicago. They will not be placing their bets in the local municipalities they will be placing their bets on LaSalle street. So the money will not be there for them to make that cumulative voting at the end of the year. So if you delete that last sentence and cumulate your votes then you will be able to vote the board members that you want. I move for the adoption of the #32 by deleting the last sentence in Section 26-19, paragraph (e)."

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

Kane: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Kane: "Under the OTB Bill as I understand it now, Springfield is a core city. What would be the effect of your Amendment on say...the relationship between, you know, the towns around here like Auburn and Chatham to Springfield. I am not...I don't quite understand when you're talking about the suburban areas up in Cook County."

Conti: "If the core city of Springfield...and Litchfield is not favorable to anyone of your directors...."

Kane: "What do you mean by not favorable to any of the directors?"

Conti: "If they may not be favorable any directors that you're going to appoint. They would not have a voice in the selection of those members that you're going to appoint because you wouldn't put an off-track betting parlor in their municipality. Therefore, they could not vote."

Kane: "Okay, what protection would your Amendment give to the people of Litchfield?"



Conti: "Well the people of Litchfield now would be able to vote their census, 1970 census on accumulative basis because there is no way that they can vote now because if there is no money that has been waghered the first year." In other words they can vote their census, their popoulation census."

Kane: "Okay, so if I wanted to protect the people of Litchfield and Hillsboro, I would vote for your Amendment?"

Conti: "That's right. All the surrounding towns would be protected because they would have accumulated vote than in the selection of who isgoing to sit on that board."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane, are you finished?"

Kane: "Well, I...how long does this stay in effect? Is this just for the first year or would this...."

Conti: "The provisions in Bill....in the Amendment #14 is that the very first year...the fact that there has been no waginger that you would have to go by your 1970 census. Now if we leave this without my Amendment in there, it says that any municipality that doesn't have an off-track betting parl r could not join this region or the core city for one whole year. Therefore, they could elect all their members...do anything that they want and at the end of the year, then they will include these large municipalities around the City of Chicago who are probably not favorable or the large municipalities around Springfield who are not favorable to your appointments on this board."

Kane: "Okay, so if I wanted to protect Lichfield and Hillsboro and Macomb, I would vote for your Amendment."

Conti: "That's the way I look at it."

Kane: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This sounds like a good Amendment and I would urge its adoption."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe that Representative Conti has pointed out



a deficiency and has tried to address that and I urge you to support it as amended."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #33, Bowman. Amends House Bill 3259 as amended...."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, the effect of this Amendment is to delete the note issuing authority of the regional corporations. The bonding authority has already been deleted, let's make this Bill even better by eliminating the note issuing authority. I introduced this Amendment only after I had a chance to question the Sponsor, Representative Barnes. I don't believe he responded to my inquiries adequately. The language says very clearly in here that the regional corporation does have the ability, the legal authority to roll its notes over. They are not limited by that five year period. I'm not sure that he understands what's in this...these two Sections authorizing...I'm not sure anyone here fully understands what's in those Sections authorizing those. So for that reason, I think that whether than give the corporations unlimited authority to issue that instruments in any quantity...anyway they see fit and to put the state on the hook for making sure they have adequate revenues. I think we ought to just get rid of those Sections altogether."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll be very very brief here because I think I have addressed this clearly. And what I see here in this Amendment is simply to tell this corporation, you've got no way to start. Now if that is the case, I don't know



if that's what all of these Amendments I've been seeing flying around here....is trying to address but apparently that's what this Sponsor is saying in his Amendment. I oppose the Amendment, I happen to think that this is a... this originally proposal this original Amendment was a good Amendment. We addressed this issue of bonding, we took it out and I don't see that we can go any further in that direction except...unless this particular Sponsor to the Amendment simply wants to say that they do not want to have the where-with-all to start this program whatsoever. I oppose the Amendment."

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

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the Amendment offered by Representative Bowman. I think we've discussed at some length the issue of the power of the OTB corporation to issue notes. I think if you take a look at the Bill you will find that what we also do by this Bill is that the state covenants with those note holders...to come up with the cash if the revenue produced by the corporation is not sufficient to pay the note. What that has effect of... the effect of that is then to hold the state financially responsible for the notes issued by these regional corporations. And I would urge everyone to consider an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor....the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to speak in favor of this Amendment. Because on paragraph....on page 22, of this Bill in paragraph (e), you are letting this corporation covenant imposed and to continue to impose taxes under Section 26.8 and in addition there to as subsequently authorized by law. Well, I submit that you're giving a limited taxing power because all this Assembly has to do when it has a majority



votes when other people are sleeping, add additional taxing powers by simply adding to this Bill. And if you're going to add additional taxing powers you are letting the taxpayers suffer more and more because somebody has got to pay these bills and we say these corporations have to pay the bills, who are these corporations. The minute they become a public corporation they are an agency of the state and there isn't any money to pay the bills, the taxpayers are going to be taxed to pay them. I speak in favor of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bowman to close the debate."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Barnes, is not leveling with you. He is not telling you what is in this Bill, if you look on page 16, it says, in addition any member municipality may contribute or contract to contribute money or personal property for any period or periods of time as it may deem fit. In other words, these corporations can borrow from the member municipalities and every core city is automatically in one of these regional corporations. They have a source of funds right there, let me tell you. If the monies raised by this off-track betting scheme are going to be sufficient to give municipalities enough cash that they can do what they want....well, let them come up with the cash to get this thing started."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor 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 there are 63 'aye', 74 'nays' and 3 voting 'present'. Mr. Bowman, what purpose do you arise?"

Bowman: "I would like to poll the absentees and a verification of this Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. Call the....poll the absentees. Mr. Bowman."



Bowman: "I will withdraw that request."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay. 63 'ayes', 74 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #34, Simms."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Amendment 34 is a very simple Amendment. It simply strikes the enacting clause. We have debated House Bill 3259. The issues are clear. Those that oppose off-track betting have the opportunity right now to kill it once and for all. It has been amended to pieces and I think the best service to the citizens of the House and to the state can best be served by adopting this Amendment."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. I realize that he may have some strong feeling on the Bill and I'm sure he's desirous of some strong publicity back home in Rockford. However, this is an extraordinary motion. Very seldom in the history of the House has it carried. I certainly think that this matter is of such importance that it ought not to be stricken by this method. Regardless of your feeling on the Bill, you ought to vote on the merits of the Bill and not on a technical motion such as this."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, on the Gentleman's motion."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't think there is a bigger opponent of off-track betting than I am. However, under no circumstance would I support the Amendment offered by Representative Simms. I think every subject, no matter what, should have an opportunity to be voted upon upon its merits and I think that this is just a bad move. And I strongly urge the Members to oppose the Amendment."

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

Stearney: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Stearney: "Well, Representative, are you proposing this motion purely and simply because you're opposed to gambling? You are?"

Simms: "Yes."

Stearney: "Well, are you aware that the Appellate Court in the First District has ruled that the messenger services are now permissible



because the state's policy is not regarded as being opposed to gambling. You're aware of that Appellate Court ruling, are you not?"

Simms: "Yes."

Stearney: "You're aware that it was written by Judge Romiti and Stamos, two of the most outstanding jurists sitting in the Appellate Court."

Simms: "That's a matter of opinion."

Stearney: "Now, let me say this here to you, Mr. Simms. You see, if the Supreme Court now were to affirm... were to affirm the Appellate Court ruling, that means that the messenger services that are now prevalent in Chicago and Cook County would continue to operate. And I think everyone recognizes that many of these operations are purely and simply bookie operations. If we were to do nothing in this matter now, if we were not to pass any Bill regarding off-track betting, what we may very well have is legalized booking in this state for the next year or two until the General Assembly next meets. Now what I say is this and everyone recognizes this fact. What we do here may be for nought because once this Bill gets to the Senate and to a Conference Committee, it may come out altogether different. But I'd say we do need an off-track betting Bill purely and simply because we're going to have legalized betting in this state and we're having it now and it continues to operate. We need off-track betting to compete with the messenger services and hopefully, to put them out of business. For that reason, I'd say that we should oppose the Gentleman's motion to strike the enacting clause because this legislation no matter whether we agree with it or not how it comes out, it is a necessary matter. Maybe it's an evil, but it's going to be the lesser of two evils. And for that reason, we should vote 'no' on this particular motion. Thank you."

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

Mulcahey: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Mulcahey: "Representative Simms, why did you file this Amendment?"

Simms: "To save the time of the House of Representatives on a matter that most people have already made up their mind."



Mulcahey: "Would you explain exactly the purpose of the Amendment?

Why you filed it?"

Simms: "Well, I know you're a product of the Rockford school system,

Mr. Mulcahey, but I think you can read."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Amendment?"

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly"

Mulcahey: "I'm somewhat shocked that the Gentleman from Winnebago would file a motion, would file an Amendment such as this. I'm shocked because under the leadership of the Mayor of Rockford, of Representative Giorgi for many years down here, Winnebago County in northwest Illinois have been relatively crime free. And this Bill right here is going to do exactly that. It's going to keep it that way. And it surprises me and amazes me as to why an individual would file an Amendment to kill a Bill like this in this fashion. I think each and every Member of this House should be allowed to vote on it, up or down. But more importantly, the County of Winnebago which has operated so well over recent years under great leadership will not have that opportunity if this Bill is killed. This is a bad Amendment. This is a poor way of attacking anything and let's beat it."

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

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In the eleven years I've been down here this motion has carried twice, been successful twice. And I don't, I can't think of anything that brings out the question of the meritoriousness of the entire Bill than this question. And that is, shall we strike the enacting clause? Bring it to a head. I personally support the motion. I think it's a proper motion. It's a legitimate motion. There's nothing wrong with it. It's recognized in our rules. And I feel very deeply about this subject matter. I have never voted for a gambling Bill in those eleven years. I've heard the promises of how much money was going to be reaped to the benefit of the taxpayers. Actually, it's taking the money away from the poor and the taxpayers. It's the wrong way to finance government. It's immoral. It's improper. It's the wrong path for this state to go. And I would urge you to support the Amendment."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christain, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a kind of a remedy that you use only in very unusual situations. This is a Bill in which the Sponsor has not been high-handed. He has not been arrogant. He has worked hard on this Bill. He has worked with those who had Amendments. He's accepted many of the Amendments and suggestions that have been brought to him. Now, I don't favor the Bill and I intend to vote against it when the Bill comes up for Third Reading if it does. But this is not that kind of a situation in which this kind of a motion, I think, is properly brought. It is legally brought, but I'd say not properly or morally brought in this situation. I think this Bill has a right to have an airing because this Gentleman has moved through the rules of the House. He has not shocked the conscience of any of the Members of this House by the proposition that he proposes. It is a matter that has been discussed and it is a matter that exists to some degree throughout our state at the present time and perhaps maybe needs some control. I don't see that this is the Bill that is going to provide that kind of control or a Bill that is good for the State of Illinois, but is a Bill that should go up or down upon its merits upon Third Reading. And I urge you to not pass this Amendment."

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

W. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know what those people who talk as though we ought to debate this measure more think we've been doing for the last three hours. We have been debating this question. Everyone here knows as much about and knows how they are going to vote on the question of off-track betting now as well as they will tomorrow or a week from tomorrow when the Bill is heard on Third Reading. We can vote on it very easily. Now as to the sensibilities of the Sponsor, I would not do a thing to hurt the Sponsor of this Bill. He is one of the most able people in this House. We all know that. And by my voting for the Gentleman's motion to table is not a vote against Gene Barnes, it's a vote against the substance of this Bill. I am unalterably opposed to it. Gene Barnes realizes that. He



realizes that you are unalterably opposed to the substance and not to him. To say that this is not a proper procedure is absolutely wrong. It's a perfectly acceptable procedure. And I daresay that ninety percent of the people who have been here more than ten years have voted 'yes' on this question before. It was raised on the question of congressional reapportionment. It was raised on the question of the legalization of marijuana. And everybody can find themselves on one side of the other of that. This is a deep, moral question that we're voting on. We all know how we're going to vote. It's been thoroughly debated. I urge you to vote 'aye' on the Gentleman's Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to close the debate."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, the issue is very simple and I'm disappointed at the colleague from rural Winnebago that's an advocate of off-track betting. But very simple, this is the opportunity if you're for off-track betting to vote opposite of the Amendment. But if you are against off-track betting and you want to kill it and you want to stop legalized gambling in Illinois from expanding, you'll vote for the Amendment. I urge a green vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #34 to House Bill 3259. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote for one minute."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I fall into that ten percent category who have been over here ten years, Billy-boy, who've never voted for a motion to strike the enacting clause. I think that to do that is to not only insult the Sponsor, but really you insult the legislative process. We just don't do this. This Bill will be on Third Reading. But it sure is interesting if you take a look at the votes on previous Roll Calls except on this one, you've seen some interesting ^{constellations} ~~constellations~~ with it. In any vote, Mr. Speaker,



I vote 'no'."

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

Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 40 'ayes', 107 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #35, J. Houlihan: Amends House Bill 3259 as amended and so forth."

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

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't... I'm not sure what the Amendment does because we don't have it back here and I'm not sure whether or not..."

Speaker Bradley: "I think it's being distributed right now."

E. Barnes: "Okay, thank you."

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

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when we debated the Amendment #19 to House Bill 3259, we discussed the impact of sending or earmarking the funds raised by this betting corporation that would sponsor off-track wagering to the financing of schools. Representative Kane in his Amendment corrected the Amendment to require that all those funds be deposited in the school... Common School Fund. The issue was raised by Representative Polk and others that this would really end up being in some fashion a hoax on the people in Illinois because it would suggest that there's going to be additional money going to schools. And those people argued that when you put more dollars into the Common School Fund and you have the same basic formula, all you are doing is requiring fewer general revenue dollars to be spent to fund that formula and it's really taking from Peter to pay Paul. What this Amendment does is directly send the dollars that accrue to the corporation that sponsors off-track betting to the school districts within that region. It sends the dollar directly to those schools in addition to the formula money which they receive. So it will be an add-on. It will be additional dollar to the local school districts. Also what it does is it sends to the school districts on a very simple formula based on the average daily membership. It takes



all the school districts within the corporation boundaries and sends those funds directly to that school. I believe it is an important Amendment if we are going to have off-track betting, legalized gambling in this fashion. I believe that this will probably be the most effective way to use those dollars and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment." I realize that it is late and I realize that we have been for quite awhile on this particular Bill. But I would urge every Member to look at Amendment #35 and I would hope that you would positively consider this Amendment and adopt it."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Giorgi: "Earlier he was successful in passing an Amendment that including off-track betting facilities to certain precincts, wards and counties. My question is, in the event a precinct in his district that has a school in it agrees to have off-track betting. Will that school be prevented from the gleanings of the off-track betting moneys? That's my question."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult question to answer."

Giorgi: "Try your best."

Houlihan: "It poses a hypothetical problem and the premise of which is based on erroneous information. Representative Giorgi has stood on the floor of the House and told us that House Amendment #26, the Amendment which he voted against, was adopted. Mr. Giorgi, if you look at the record you will see that Amendment was defeated. Therefore, your question....."

Giorgi: "I'm apologizing. My apology. It should have been...."

Houlihan: "And you have gone down a bad path."

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

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



I rise in support of this Amendment. Because as I said earlier, I think we broke faith with the people of the State of Illinois when we adopted the income tax. And all the debate that I recall back in 1969, when the income tax was proposed was that this was going to solve the needs of education. That this was going to provide so much money towards education that the local taxes would be abated. We were not only providing more money for education, we would at the same time help the local taxpayers. We didn't do that. We provided 1/12 to the local governments to local municipalities and even at that the debate said that the local municipalities could permissibly give those monies to local school districts. That wasn't done to my knowledge except twice since 1969. So we haven't helped education, that will always be our greatest priority. That will always be greatest need. Now I would have some trouble voting for a OTB Bill if it weren't for the fact that I know that the Appellate Court has made the messenger service legal. I think that that is going stick, I would rather see the monies that are going to be provided by off-track betting be used for legitimate purposes. I would like to see that money go towards the needs of education. I would rather see it spent for that purposes than the knowledge that the syndicate, that the bad people are receiving the profits from the messenger service. I think we all know that.... we really don't have any choice, I think. We can all be morally right in our minds and say, that gambling money should never be used for governmental purposes. But I think that there is no other choice now, we have the choice now to regulate it by government and I think that the good purposes that we can use it for are education, so that we can finally have faith with the people that we broke faith with when we passed the income tax. And therefore, I rise in support of Amendment #35."



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

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, of all the uses that we could put this money to, I really feel that spending it on an empty class room chairs is probably one of the most fool hardly. I don't know if anybody paid any attention to Representative Houlihan's explanation of this Amendment but he very cleverly....attempts to change the prior Amendment, Representative Kane's Amendment, which sought to send this money into the Common School Fund to be apportioned to school districts based upon our school formula by changing it to empty class rooms chairs. I don't think that money can properly be used for empty class room chairs which is the proper meaning of the term, number of pupils enrolled. So I think that this is a bad Amendment and ought to be opposed."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if we adopt this Amendment, what we are doing is short changing our students who are from rural areas. We aren't going by any formula, we aren't going to be using our Strayer-Haig formula. We aren't going to be funding programs for the mentally retarded and the disadvantaged children. What we have here is a dollar for dollar trade off. It's not fair, it's not equitable and those individuals who are not from the wealthy areas of the state where the people go and bet and where there is large race tracks, will suffer. The people in rural areas of the state would not benefit from this nor will be the disadvantaged. So I too would oppose this."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers. Mr. Davis, the Gentleman from Will."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must agree with my colleague from Will County, Representative Leinenweber. That the Amendment is cleverly worded, Representative and I must oppose it for the same reason. I'm perfectly happy with



with Amendment #19 of Representative Kane's and we'll live on that. So I think we should oppose Amendment #35."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Amendment and I did support Amendment #19. I believe that this is destroying what we in downstate Illinois got from the Amendment #19. This means that most of the monies would go to the City of Chicago and downstate Illinois would not get its proportionate share as we intended it to under Amendment #19. And I urge an opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Here I am. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Mr. Houlihan to close the debate."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Let me try to respond to Representative Darrow's misrepresentation of the impact of this Bill. It would not hurt rural districts. What it would do, it would take all the school districts within a particular corporation area and then divide the dollars among those school districts. It would not be based, as many of the other suggestions and formulas are. They are based on who does the voting, where the dollars come from. It would merely take the geographic area of the off-track betting corporation and then take the school districts within that area and divide the proceeds among those school districts, based on the number of students that are in attendance at those schools. With regard to Representative Leinenweber's reservation, let me suggest to you that this is not....this is not a rewriting of the formula. This is not taking and changing average daily attendance, to average daily membership for all of the dollars in the



Common School Fund. In fact, Representative Davis, this is an add-on to those dollars. There is no way, as Representative Polk pointed out, that you will get additional dollars by Representative Kane's Amendment, Amendment #19. It will merely give you a different source of the dollars. They will all be the same in amount but you'll get from different funds. It won't increase the amount that the schools will get. What this will do is increase the local schools proceeds, it will give them money not based on attendance but on membership. Because all school districts have to plan for and accommodate for, a membership roll. If you have people enrolled in classes you have to pay and have some costs based on whether they are there or not. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment. If we are truly going to use these funds to help education, I think this is the most direct, the most clear, and cleanest way to do it."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain... to explain your vote? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 31 'ayes', 103 'nos', 1 'present' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker was a fiscal note required on the... filed on the amended Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "A fiscal note has been filed."

Holewinski: "On the amended Bill, Mr. Speaker? The fiscal note that I saw attached to the Bill was attached to it prior to the Amendment process and I filed....request a fiscal note for the Bill as amended."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Holewinski: "Substantial Amendments."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I heard the last Speaker sitting up there say that this Bill went to Third Reading and his request is untimely."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you are right. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my request was filed far before the Bill was moved to Third Reading. And I don't think it is necessary for you to stand on the floor of the House and make a request for a fiscal note, we've never followed that procedure. As long as the request was filed prior to the Bill moving to Third Reading. And it was indeed it was, it was filed at least an hour or an hour and a half ago."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the request for a fiscal note, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pursuant to House Rule 32, I hereby request a fiscal note be supplied for House Bill 3259 as amended. Representative Holewinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker when was that fiscal note request filed? Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to Rule 32 (f), which says it must be upon a motion of any Member adopted by a majority of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute...wait a minute. The Parliamentarian advises me that under the provisions of Rule 32 (f), the procedure to any Floor Amendment to a Bill which would substantially affect a fiscal or a judicial note previously filed shall be deferred until the Sponsor of the Amendment presents a revised note upon the motion of any Member adopted by the majority of the House. So the point is, that the request does not fit within the purview of the rules. The rules provide that the Amendment...the consideration of the Amendment should be deferred and it



requires a motion and adopted by the majority of the House which was not the procedure that was followed. And therefore, I rule that the previous action of the Chair in moving it to the Order of Third Reading is correct. 3347. Representative Matejek."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3347, a Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2604. Representative Leinenweber."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2604, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second Reading of the Bill, this Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Or any motion of Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Redmond: "We will...first of all we will adjourn at nine o'clock. I would suggest that we only have a few more Second Reading and in fairness to the Members, if we don't move them along today the chances of reaching them are pretty remote. There is only a few."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a motion on my part to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the motion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Leinenweber. Amends House Bill 2604 as follows: on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 to House Bill 2604 is an Amendment which will become the Bill to the marital property provision in the uniformed Marriage and Dissolution of the Marriage Act which we adopted last term. It is



a product....I would like to add, of Mr. Esptein, of the Democratic side, Mr. Harris, the Republican side, of the Chicago Title and Trust Company. And also of certain attorneys who have been involved in divorce and income tax law in the State of Illinois. It is an attempt to have our cake and eat it too, it attempts to alleviate the problem which has been faced by people who own real estate and trying to convey real estate when they are married and business property because of the fact that the title companies in this state have been requesting the signature of both spouses, whether the property is marital property or not, because of the fact there is a presumption in the statutes of marital property. It is an attempt also to get around the probability that upon dissolution of prop....upon the dissolution of marriage where marital property is parceled out to the spouses that this will be a taxable event. This has been an Amendment which has been written and rewritten over and over and over again and finally it seems to have the concurrence of all parties. Which will provide that.... will continue....the marital property provisions, it will not require during marriage a signature of a non...owners of the spouses who is not in ownership. But it will also not subject to the spouse who is entitled of a capital gain treatment. So I move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion....Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "No, go ahead, we'll clear it up later....no, I have no questions."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."



Collins: "Can I be recorded as voting 'no' on that Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record...yes."

Collins: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Be sure the records show that Representative Collins voted 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2707."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2707....."

Speaker Redmond: "2770."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2770, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment....this Bill has been recalled to Second Reading and held."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, 2770. It's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been recalled to Second Reading and held."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, you want to hold it, it's on Second now. It's on Second, it appears on the Order of Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor? Representative Leinenweber, you almost...."

Leinenweber: "There was an Amendment adopted in Committee and we held it today in case any Member wanted to file motions."

Speaker Redmond: "All right, is there any motion with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments.,

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2808."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2808, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Insurance Code....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Question, Mr. Speaker on House Bill 2770. What is the status of the Amendment? Is it on the Bill or off the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #1, there was no motion filed so it is on the Bill. And there was no Floor Amendment."

Madigan: "Is the Amendment correct, Mr. Speaker? Has the parliamentarian examined the Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Parliamentarian...where ever you may be. It is already engrossed in the Bill, Representative Madigan. It is pretty hard to say what it is."

Madigan: "I regret that."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want a motion to unengross it? 2808, Representative Epton."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2808, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, Epton-Madigan-Ryan. Amends House Bill 2808 on page 2, line 19 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This was a Bill which was introduced to correct a previous Bill that we.....a very good Bill that we passed in the last Session. Which unfortunately had some holes, Representative McPike asked a particularly pertinent question before the Insurance Committee at which time I gave the wrong answer. I reviewed the file there after and this Amendment corrects that particular mistake. In effect the insurance companies must pay to the municipalities the proceeds on a fire loss to cover the demolition expense and any past due taxes. At the same time I was making this Amendment, Representative Tipword and Representative Madigan made two additional corrections to tighten up the Bill. It makes a good Bill better and I solicit your adoption of Amendment #1."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Mr. Epton, are you sure it was Representative
McPike that asked the pertinent question?"

Epton: "I checked that out. He had a name tag on. At
least it looked like McPike."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, any further questions? Motion is
for the adoption of Amendment #1. Further questions?
Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption
of Amendment #1. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed.
The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Amend-
ment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2837, Representative Matijevidch.
Matijevidch, 2837."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2837....."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. On the Order of Third
Reading appears House Bill 2619, Representative Emil
Jones is recognized. Emil Jones, 2619 Third Reading."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like leave of
the House to take House Bill 2619 back to Second Reading
for the purpose of an Amenment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no
objections, leave is granted. Could you read the Bill,
Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Emil Jones. Amends House Bill
2619 as amended by deleting the period at the end of the
first sentence and so forth."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen
of the House. This is a very simple Amendment, all it
does is phase in those funds for title one students over
a three year period. And I move the adoption of Amendment
#3."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative



Skinner."

Skinner: "If I understand this Amendment correctly, what it does is to delay the tracking of the title one money to the students for which it was originally intended in 1973, when the resource equalizer was passed....for three more years. It will take three years until it gets there and that in my opinion is not a very good compromise I think the money ought to be there....should have been there last year and that you shouldn't cave in and I don't think you have to cave in. I think you've got the allies to pass the Bill as it is right now."

Jones: "Representative Skinner, under the proposed Amendment it's just a phase in over three years. It is not a caving in, I consider it a victory. So I move the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill, Third Reading appears House Bill 1270, Representative Porter is recognized. Porter, 1270. Representative Bowman, pardon me."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to ask to move back to Third...Second Reading...move it back to Second Reading for purposes of a technical Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 1270 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Hear any objections? Being no objections leave is granted. It will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Is there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Bowman. Amends House Bill 1270 as amended by deleting the last sentence and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill pertaining to general assistance at the local level. And the idea behind the original Bill, which this Amendment is supposed to simply reinforce is that the local people are not going to be able to pass the burden of their general assistance programs on to the state. And so this Amendment provides the language which absolutely guarantees that that will not take place."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Darrow. The motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3193, is there a request on that? Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer, will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, 3193 on the Order of Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3193, a Bill for an Act to establish the Illinois Insurance Regulatory Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Sponsor of this Bill is Bill Laurino. He has been detained for a number of days as a result of a family illness. He has asked that this matter be brought back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that this Bill is back on Second Reading...before it is advanced to the Order of Third, I would like to question the fiscal note Act."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Rich Brummer. Amends House Bill 3193 on page 1 and so forth."

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

Epton: "A point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the point?"

Epton: "I'm afraid that.....I certainly want to give Representative Laurino and Representative Brummer the chance to have this Bill heard but I'm afraid that the discussion on the new Bill...the Amendment will take quite some time. And might interfere with your nine o'clock schedule. I'm just wondering, is there anyway we can accommodate the Sponsor without tying up the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "You tell me how."

Epton: "I don't know but I think it is only fair to warn....to tell you that it's a twenty-five page Amendment and there are any number of questions that I think he would want us to ask. And I....."

Brummer: "No, you don't need to ask them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I was just going to indicate to Representative Epton that he really didn't have to ask any questions.....maybe I wanted to ask questions..."

Epton: "I would be happy to refrain from question but I can promise you that you'll get it from other areas."

Brummer: "The Amendment itself strikes everything after the enacting clause and submits a basically new Bill. I would suggest that all the questions could be addressed on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I have already requested that this be held on Second Reading for compliance with the rule regarding the fiscal notes. And a question regarding the applicability of the fiscal note that was filed on Second Reading which I do not believe



is in compliance with the fiscal note Act."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "A point of order, that request is really nothing because it is in the nature of a request. The only option that the Member has is that with a Floor Amendment being offered that he make a motion. The Speaker just ruled on the prior Bill that he make a motion to defer action on the Amendment until the Sponsor provides a fiscal note and that's got to carry by a majority. Well look at the rules, Representative Kempiners because that's what the Speaker just ruled on the Bill on OTB that we just went by."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would join in the general suggestion or request made by Representative Epton. This subject of regulating insurance property and casualty rates when it is combined at a late hour like this, of striking the enacting clause of a Bill that has been heard in Insurance Committee and completely rewriting the Bill...even the simple matter of having this Amendment heard, you're likely to have someone request a verification. You're going to have all kinds of questions, we do have Wednesday and Thursday and Friday, there is no need to rush through this. And I just think the House is going to get tied up in a terrible snarl that we don't like to get tied up in at this time of night. And I would join in the request that the Bill not be....that the Amendment...writing a new Bill not be promoted at this time."

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

Kempiners: "I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that you recognized the other Gentleman because I was seeking recognition. I'm afraid that the Gentleman from Lake, misunderstood my request. I was not asking



for a fiscal note on the Amendment, I was asking for a ruling on the Chair with regard to fiscal note which was filed on the Bill. That was my request, Mr. Speaker. Because it is my understanding and I haven't got the rule in front of me that, if the fiscal note is not proper this Bill cannot be advanced to Third Reading. And the fiscal note according to my interpretation of the Fiscal Note Act, is definitely improper and this Bill must remain on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't....Representative Davis."

Davis, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Kempiners is quite correct and that Representative Deuster spoke the truth when he indicated that there is significant opposition to this Bill and this Amendment. And frankly, I haven't had time to read the Amendment and I know that the Bill went through the Insurance Committee in the late hours of the Committee activity when there was a bare quorum present. I was not present in the Insurance Committee that night due to another commitment in the Transportation Committee, I think we are going to tie this House up for a long time with questions and with verification and I think Representative Kempiners' request on the fiscal note applicability should be honored at this point and this Bill left on Second until tomorrow sometime."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners will you indicate specifically what you think is wrong with the fiscal note."

Kempiners: "Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker. The fiscal note was filed by the Sponsor of the Bill and he is the only one signing that. And if you look at the statutes regarding the Fiscal Note Act, it requires that the agency affected supply the fiscal note. The Department of Insurance which is affected by this particular Bill has not filed the fiscal note...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer for what purpose do you



arise?"

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we just spent two or three hours on some thirty-five Amendments. I thought we could cover one Amendment before we adjourn for the evening. But in view of the controversy, I request that this be left on Second Reading and we could consider the Amendment tomorrow."

Speaker Redmons: "Take it out of the records. We're taking it out of the record. Representative Keats, for what purpose do you arise?"

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Concerning the fiscal note for this Amendment of which I have filed the correct form, I just want to make sure that before we move, that it is on the record today that we would like a fiscal note filed from the appropriate source on this Amendment."

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

Kempiners: "Well again, Mr. Speaker, to repeat my request that the Chair rule that the fiscal note filed on the Bill by the Sponsor....."

Speaker Redmond: "I know quite frankly, if you pardon a little indiscretion on my part. Nothing is gained by repeating the same thing over and over again. The Bill is on Second Reading now, is being held there and when we have a chance to consider it we will make a ruling at the proper time. On the Order of Consideration Postponed, page 12, Representative.....1357, Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I would like to move this back to Second Reading so that some of those who had questions about the Bill can amend out some Sections."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd. Representative Mudd. Representative Mudd objects. Representative Mudd objects, Representative Robinson moves.....Representative Mudd, state your point."

Mudd: "This is the one that you ruled that there wouldn't be



anymore Amendments on."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't know how I could do that, the Member has the right to ask leave to have it returned to the Order of Second Reading. And I asked if he had unanimous consent and the answer was 'no'. Under the rules a Member has the right to put the motion. Now the question is on the Gentleman's motion to return the.... House Bill 1357 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Now the question is on the motion, those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wished? Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Well, I appreciate the votes. I think that the Amendment will make it acceptable to most of the Members of the House and I would appreciate it if we could get 89 votes so that we could put it in shape so that when we get back to Consideration Postponed, we can vote on it. Thank you."

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

Mudd: "Well, Mr. Speaker to explain my vote. The other day we had this Bill before us and there were Amendments being filed. The Amendment by the Sponsors...that had been filed this Amendment....they got to hear their Amendment but mine was filed also and you ruled at that time that you didn't want to delay any time of the House. I just wonder if the Sponsor is going to bring it back for Amendments...is he going to hold this Bill on Second Reading. Is he going to give me a chance to put my Amendment on it this time?"

Robinson: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Your Amendment is on the table here."

Mudd: "Go ahead you've got enough votes."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye' and 16 'no' and the motion



prevails. It's on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #13, Mudd. Amends House Bill 1357 as amended in Section 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson....Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #13. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and motion carries. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #14, Ewing-Bradley-Vinson-Deavers. Amends House Bill 1357 as amended in Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing. Bradley. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, there was an error when the Clerk read.... I am not a Sponsor of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I want to question the Clerk, how many Amendments and the numbers and I think possibly there is some confusion in the numbering of these Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "We have Amendment #14, 15 and 16, pending."

Ewing: "I believe that my Amendment should be #16."

Clerk O'Brien: "No, you have Amendment #16, that was original #14...we haven't gotten to it yet. It was printed as #14."

Speaker Redmond: "The next time I listen to anybody on one of these simple non controversial matters...."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, could I get that straight. The latest Amendment that was filed, is what number, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of parliamentary inquiry and a point of order. These Amendments should be explained, it is nine o'clock and I think we should be in order to adjourn. We're too tired to go into anymore."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing. I quite frankly think that is out of order. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am still waiting for the Clerk... if he could enlighten me as to the last Amendment that was filed. Ewing-Deavers and Vinson. What number is that?"

Clerk O'Brien: "#16 was the last one."

Ewing: "All right. I would like to move to withdraw Amendment #14 then."

Speaker Redmond: "#14 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #15, Ewing-Bradley-Vinson-Deavers..."

Ewing: "I would move to withdraw that."

Speaker Redmond: "#15 withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #16, Ewing-Deavers-Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "We left Representative Bradley off. This Amendment is much like the Amendment which was considered on this Bill by the same Sponsors back when it was on Second Reading. And basically it does two things, it strikes everything after the enacting clause and the Amendment becomes the Bill. And the Bill then requires that we restrict ownership to non resident aliens. Second, the Bill requires reporting by aliens, corporations, partnerships, trusts and fiduciaries and land trusts. The objective of this Amendment is to limit any rush into this state by non resident aliens to purchase farm land. Second part of this Bill is a reporting section to the Secretary of State's Office whereby we can find out if we have a problem with large corporate ownership. If we have a problem with alien ownership then we can come back in January or some other year and solve that problem. Now the Bill also has the self destruct clause on it, after 1985, the reporting ceases unless the Bill is renewed. And I would move for its approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Deuster."



Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield to a question. It is my understanding, Representative Ewing, that if your Amendment...as the Bill stands now, we prohibit corporations and aliens from buying the farms."

Ewing: "Yes, large corporations."

Deuster: "But your Amendment would allow corporations to own farms but not aliens."

Ewing: "Would restrict...to alien ownership as individuals and would restrict any corporation where in aliens owned over 10% of the stock in owning."

Deuster: "I ask you this question. The #14 Amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees the equal protection of the law to every person. Now my question is this, do you believe that your Amendment makes the Bill Constitutional? Because...do you believe that a non resident alien or an alien that you still prohibit from owning farm land is a person or not?"

Ewing: "I think I must admit that course in law school but.... and I don't want to second guess what the Supreme Court's done but we know that they have passed legislation like this in a number of other states. I'm sure it has been tested in the court and if we pass it here and they want to test it....and the courts hold it unconstitutional, of course that would be the ruling. I think it is Constitutional."

Deuster: "Thank you for your opinion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion....Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't....would the Sponsor yield for a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Ewing, I don't understand the rationale behind this self destruct clause...or did I misunderstand you. You said something about, if nobody contests or something it would self destruct in 1982, or whatever?"



Ewing: "Well, I don't think we need to perpetuate bureaucracy in this state. And if after five years of reporting we see no need to continue it, the Bill will self destruct. If we want to continue reporting after five years, then we're going to have to re-enact legislation or reconsider. It's a type of sunset law. So that we just won't go on in perpetuity reporting and reporting when....if we have no need for it."

Van Duynes: "Well, I understand the reporting procedure would only be on a check to see that no illegal alien had bought any property, right? Will how would you guarantee if you cease and desist in....after five years of checking whether or not they had in essence come in after that and bought. All you're doing is delaying it five years."

Ewing: "No, we're not delaying it, we're going report. We're going to have reports for the next five years, from '80 to '85. If after 1985, we want to continue having those reports we will have to do so by legislation. And I think by '85, we'll have a good handle on the problems of alien ownership of farm land, large corporate ownership of farm land and we'll know where we want to go."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #16. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "That Bill goes to Postponed Consideration...."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, Postponed Consideration, you're right."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "You're right. On Postponed Consideration 1973, Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "I ask leave to return House Bill 1973 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of offering an Amendment."



First, having voted on the prevailing side I would move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was approved."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? Hearing no objection, it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I need to table Amendment #1, if I may before I offer Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your motion again?"

Chapman: "I...my intent is to table Amendment #1 prior to offering Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "I think...recorded Roll Call, they tell me you have to move to reconsider the vote by which..."

Chapman: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Deuster. Representative Simms....we have an....Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, could the Sponsor simply explain to us what we're doing here."

Speaker Redmond: "This is a vote to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 'ayes', 44 'nos' and the motion carries. Now, Representative Chapman moves to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried and the Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Chapman. Amends House Bill 1973 on page 1 and so forth."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is very similar to Amendment #1. But I've worked with individuals who had raised



questions about Amendment #1 and have tried to resolve them through offering Amendment #2. I have deleted a number of the clarifying terms which I thought improved the Bill but I'm happy to remove in order to resolve some potential opposition. I move to adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I don't remember what all the Amendments were and I would appreciate if the Sponsor would explain what they were. But as I remember one part of the Bill provided that essentially, school teachers could get sick leave for pregnancy. Is this to your Amendment or that you've either taken off or put on have anything to do with that part of the Bill or what part of the Bill do they relate to."

Chapman: "Mr. Deuster, if you were talking about the Section relating to sick leave on page 7, of Amendment #2. This is identical to the provisions of Amendment #1 which was previously adopted in which we now have tabled."

Deuster: "Well, I'm sorry I have to repeat the question. Can you answer 'yes' or 'no' or tell us....Is sick leave for pregnancy in the Bill or out of the Bill?"

Chapman: "Well, I did try to answer your question, Mr. Deuster. I directed your attention to page 7, Section 24-6, sick leave and indicated that temporary physical incapacity is covered and at the present time by the way, the present school code provides that this is temporary physical incapacity is no longer grounds for dismissal."

Deuster: "Well, I'm sorry that you felt compelled to muddle so because I see from looking...."

Chapman: "Mr. Deuster...."

Deuster: "At the Bill that it is still in. I was simply asking..."

Chapman: "Mr. Deuster..."

Deuster: "It must be the acoustics, Mrs. Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "9:15, Representative Deuster. The question



is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 'aye' and 39 'no' and the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. The Order of Motions. There is House Bill 3380. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a motion on House Bill 3380 which is presently in a Subcommittee of the Appropriation I Committee. House Bill 3380 is a Fund Transfer Bill with the Department of Transportation need to meet its June payroll. This was sent to a Subcommittee, chaired by Representative Mudd. I believe....I don't think I am putting words in his mouth. He now joins with me in this motion, it is very crucial that we get moving on this Bill so that we can meet the payroll. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was.....Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was assigned to my Subcommittee and we looked at the Bill and see no reason that it should be delayed. And it would be in this posture if we would have had worked on it when it came into Committee. So I have no objection, I'm sure no one else on the Appropriation Committee does and I suggest that we support the motion made by Representative Reilly."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I now don't have objection because Representative Mudd did work out the difference with Jim Reilly. Except that I would ask the Sponsor to hold that on Second



we do have that one Amendment that the Democratic Staff is preparing. And I want to make sure you hold it until I'm on the floor again."

Reilly: "Yes, well the Amendment....the motion is to put it on Second Reading, First Day. So, tomorrow will be fine anyway."

Matijevich: "All right, we're with you now, Jim."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I notice in a newspaper article that Thompson said, he was open to trade patronage jobs for ERA. I wonder if anybody got any patronage jobs in return for ERA vote on....as result to moving this out of Subcommittee."

Matijevich: "We're still working on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to using the Attendance Roll Call in support of the motion? Hearing no objection, the Attendance Roll Call will be used in support of the motion to discharge the Appropriation I and advance House Bill 3380 to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Senate Bill 1475, Representative Jack Davis."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion on Senate Bill 1475 is to advance the Bill to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day without reference to Committee. The Bill is identical to House Bill 2669 which this chamber passed out of here almost unanimously some weeks ago and now resides in the Senate Rules Committee. And this Bill is identical to that, it was introduced to the Senate at the same time but in all fairness to the House of Representatives we are much more expeditious than they are. So the Senate Bill is over here now, Sponsored by Senator Sangmeister and I've talked to both the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader, the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, Representative Pierce and Representative Ewing and they do not oppose this motion. The Bill refers only to Lake and Will County it's curative in validating action



for actions taken by the County Board with reference to the tax delinquency extension date under accelerated method of taxation. Only to the date itself, the delinquency date."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Madigan: "Mr. Davis, do you plan to move this Bill along expeditiously?"

Davis: "As far as I'm concerned I'm going to."

Madigan: "Have you talked to Mr. Skinner?"

Davis: "To Mr. Skinner?"

Madigan: "You know him."

Davis: "That fellow down there."

Madigan: "That loud noise...."

Davis: "That balding blue eyed fellow down there. No, as a matter of fact I haven't, Representative Madigan. He hasn't talked to me either."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the Gentleman....the Gentleman has moved to discharge the Revenue Committee and advance Senate Bill 14.....Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, I join in this. It is an urgent Validation Act, it's not the Validation Act that I had earlier today that Representative Skinner screwed all up for us and I'm sure that he won't do this to Representative Davis. It is a Revenue Act and he could make it a Revenue Reform Bill or Tax Reform Bill if he wants. I know he won't do that to Jack Davis because I knew what he did to me was as political as can be and he really hurt a lot of school districts, a lot of units of tax.... units of local government, park districts and the like and they are going to hear about. And I know where the blame lies."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. The question is on Representative Davis's motion to discharge the Revenue



Committee and advance Senate Bill 1475 to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there any objection to using the Attendance Roll Call. Hearing no objection the Attendance Roll Call will be used in support of the motion. Senate Bill 1475, Revenue Committee is discharged with respect to Senate Bill 145 and is advance to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Tipword. Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Do I understand that you just used an Attendance Roll Call on that 1475?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's why I asked if there was any objection."

Tipword: "There is so much going on....so much noise that you can't tell. I was waiting for a vote on it. I must vote 'no', Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, inasmuch as Representative Tipword and Representative Dunn did object, I was in error in using the Attendance Roll Call. The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'aye' and 4 'no' and the motion carries....Senate Bill 1..... the Revenue Committee is discharged with respect to Senate Bill 1475. Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you arise?" This is the last one."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We had some disagreement on House Bill 2898, which was the Pension Bill. And I have talked with the....some of the objectors on both sides of the aisle and I would ask leave to move House Bill 2898 back to Second Reading for the purpose of withdrawing an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it now?"

Yourell: "Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to take 2898 from the Order of Consideration Postponed to Second Reading. Is leave granted? Hearing no objection....."



Yourell: "I now move, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House to withdraw Amendment #6 to 2898."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the status of Amendment #6, Mr. Clerk. Was that a Committee Amendment?"

Yourell: "It was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "It was put on Consideration Postponed. Representative Kempiners. If you will look on page 6, you will see it is under House Bills, Third Reading and it had considerable difficulty earlier in the day and it was put on Consideration Postponed. You'll find it on page 6, under Third Reading. Amendment #6 was a Floor Amendment? It looks here like it....was #6 a Floor Amendment? Who was the Sponsor? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #6 was adopted, May 11, and was Sponsored by Representative Beatty. Floor Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Was there a record vote on it?"

Giorgi: "No, Sir, it was a voice vote."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to rise in support of this, I helped Representative Yourell. I had objections to this Bill, I worked with a lot of people on both side of the aisle and I certainly would concur and I think the feeling is that the people that we contacted were raising objections when the Bill was called and failed to receive the necessary votes. earlier that if we remove this Amendment....so, I certainly... we have an excellent chance of passing. So, I would certainly encourage the House Members to support this."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #6 was adopted by a voice vote so the motion to table is in order. The question is on Representative Yourell's motion to table Amendment #6? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried and Amendment #6 is tabled. Representative Yourell, anything further with this Bill?"



Return to the Order of Postponed Consideration. Representative...any announcements? Any announcements? Representative Madigan. Ten o'clock."

Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, allowing two minutes for the Cler, I move that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Gentleman's motion that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. We now stand adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports, Representative Matijevich, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriation I which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 23, 1978. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass House Bills 2538, 2843, 2851, 3049, 3128, 3231, 3368 and 3384. Do pass as amended House Bills 2911 and 3062."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I never got a chance to make an announcement. Since we were in late tonight, the Executive Committee will not meet tomorrow as scheduled."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1416, Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bills First Reading. House Bill 3397, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to authorize research concerning production of ethanol at the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3398, Kelly. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Messages from the Senate. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles in which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Rep-



representatives to-wit; Senate Bills, 1561, 1565, 1591, 1618, 1710, 1852, 1187, 1465, 1470, 1506, 1509, 1513, 1517, 1550, 1556, 1558, 1574, 1575, 1580 and 1587. Passed by the Senate May 23, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills First Reading, Senate Bill 1465, Bluthardt. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Commission to survey and study cities, villages and incorporated towns. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1506, McPike-E.G. Steele. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Capital Development Board for the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1509, Tipsword. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission for Economic Development. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1513, Mautino. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1558, Bluthardt. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Elections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1574, Geo-Karis. A Bill for an Act to make appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1575, C.M. Stiehl. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Lieutenant Governor. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1580, Stearney. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Medical Center Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1587, Telcser. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations...reappropriations to the Capital Development Board for permanent improvements, grants, and related purposes. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1561, Bowman. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Legislative Information System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1565, Hart. A Bill for an Act



making appropriation to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. No further business the House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	1:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond	Roll call	
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee reports	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed resolutions	
		Speaker Redmond		
2		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Resolution	
		Speaker Redmond	Committee on Assignment	
	1:10	Clerk O'Brien	HB 3339, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Totten	Leave to return to 2nd	
3		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1	
		Totten	Withdraw	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Totten		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.	Yield	
4	1:13	Totten		
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, 3rd	



2.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3340, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	Leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	Yield
		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, 3rd
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 1274, 3rd
5		Huff	Leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Question
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
7		Speaker Redmond	
	1:20	Huff	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2875
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	



3.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
8		Speaker Redmond Mann Speaker Redmond Houlihan Speaker Redmond	Passed
9		Younge Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	HB 2877
	1:25	Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	HB 2878, 3rd
	1:26	Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	HB 2879, 3rd
10		Marovitz Speaker Redmond Geo-Karis	Yield
11-12		Marovitz Speaker Redmond	
13		Anderson Geo-Karis	
14		Marovitz Speaker Redmond Friedland Speaker Redmond Geo-Karis Speaker Redmond	Proceeds
15		Friedland	MPQ



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
16		Pullen	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2879 passed
		Lucco	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
	1:38	Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	Introduction
		Speaker Redmond	
17		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2877, 3rd
		Holwinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2878, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	
18		Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
19		Katz	Question
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
20-21		Kempiners	Yield
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
22-23		Madison	Yield
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Simms	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
24		DiPrima	Oppose	
		Speaker Redmond		
25	1:52	Holewinski		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis	Question	
		Holewinski		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Wikoff	MPQ	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski	To close	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2878	
26		Mann	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski		
		Speaker Redmond		
27		Dyer	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Chapman		
		Speaker Redmond	Lost	
28		Madison		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2898, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
29		Yourell		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
30-31		Schlickman	Yield?	
32		Yourell	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Wikoff	Yield	
		Yourell	Discussion	
	2:10	Speaker Bradley		
		Ebbesen	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis	Moves previous question	
33		Speaker Bradley	Motion carries	
		Yourell	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Katz	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Terzich	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Poll the absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Simms	Verification request	
		Speaker Bradley		
34		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Postponed consideration	
	2:17	Clerk O'Brien	HB 2903	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Stuffle	Bact to 2nd?	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
36-37		Kane	Explains #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schneider		
		Speaker Bradley		
38		Winchester	Yield	
		Kane		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leinenweber	Question	
39		Kane		
		Speaker Bradley		
40		Brady		
		Speaker Bradley		
41		Stuffle		
		Speaker Bradley		
42		Edgar	Yield	
		Kane		
		Speaker Bradley		
43	2:30	McGrew		
		Speaker Bradley		
44	2:35	Ewell		
		Speaker Bradley		
45		Polk		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	To close	
46		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
		Houlihan, J.	Explain vote	
		Brady	Amendment #2 adopted	
		Stuffle	Move to reconsider vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	Lie on table	
47		Speaker Bradley	Tabled	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3	
		Stuffle	Withdraw	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2916, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Bradley		
48		Deuster		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	Question	
49		Deuster		
		Speaker Bradley		
50	2:48	Geo-Karis	Yield	
		Deuster		
		Speaker Bradley		
50	2:48	Geo-Karis	Yield	
		Deuster		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Deuster	To close	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 2916 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2926, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
51		Schlickman	Point of order	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2941, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
52		Flinn		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman	Question	
		Flinn		
		Speaker Bradley		
53-54		Walsh	Yield	
		Flinn		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Walsh		
		Speaker Bradley	HB 2941	
		Dyer	Explain vote	
	3:00	Speaker Bradley		
55		Dyer	Requests verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis	No	
		Speaker Bradley		
56		Clerk O'Brien		
		McMaster		
		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll	
57-58-59		Speaker Bradley		
		Dyers	Questions affirmative roll	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
		Neff	Change to aye	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 2941 passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2943	
		Speaker Bradley		
60		Flinn		
		Speaker Bradley		
61		Schlickman	Yield	
		Flinn		
		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2944, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
62		Brady	Question	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2963, 3rd	
	3:20	Brady		
		Speaker Bradley		
63		McGrew		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ewell		
64		McAuliffe	Point of personal privilege	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Collins		
		Speaker Bradley		
65		Giorgi		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Simms		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2979, 3rd	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Gaines		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten	Question	
66		Gaines		
		Speaker Bradley		
	3:26	McGrew		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Byers	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
67		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2995, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien		
68		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis		
69		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3002	
		Speaker Bradley		
70		Richmond		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Dunn, R.		
		Speaker Bradley		
	3:35	Pullen	Yield	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Richmond		
71		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3006, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
72		Getty		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Martin, Peg		
73		Getty		
		Speaker Bradley	Passed	
74		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3012, 3rd	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McGrew		
		Speaker Bradley		
75		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Bradley		
76		Cunningham		
		Speaker Bradley		
		McGrew	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
77		Darrow		
		Speaker Bradley		
78		Lechowicz	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
	3:53	Hoffman	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
79		Neff	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Totten	Verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		O'Brien	Point of personal privilege	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tipsword	HR 55-I move to suspend	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Leave to be verified	
80		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
		Speaker Bradley		
81-82		Totten	Questions of affirmative	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Marovitz	Aye	
83		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten	Further questions	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 3012 passed	
84		McGrew	Move to reconsider vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leverenz	Move it be tabled	
	4:09	Speaker Bradley	Tabled	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2949, 2nd, #1,2 adopted	
		Speaker Bradley		
85		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3	
		Davis, C.		
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #3 adopted, 3rd	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
		Madison	Inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2950	
86		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
87		Neff		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Davis, C.	Supports	
		Neff	Moves adoption	
		Spekaer Bradley	#2 adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2973	
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2986	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Motion to table #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Neff	On motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison	Inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		
88		Neff	Withdraws motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Leverenz	On #3	
		Speaker Bradley	#3 adopted, 3rd	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
89	4:20	Clerk O'Brien	HB 3057	
		Speaker Bradley	3rd	
		Leverenz	Back to HB 2986	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted	
		Neff	Table Amendment #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten		
		Spekaer Bradley	HB 2986 #2 tabled, 3rd	
		Totten	Question of the chair	
		Speaker Bradley		
90		Leverenz		
		Speaker Bradley		
	4:25	Clerk O'Brien	HB 3138, Amendment #8	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	Withdraws #8 thru #22	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #23	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Simms		
		Spekaer Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #24	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	Withdraws #24	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #25	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Simms	Withdraws #25	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
		Speaker Bradley		
91		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #26	
	4:29	Speaker Bradley		
92		Matijevich	opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Porter	To close on #26	
		Speaker Bradley	Fails	
		Madigan	Moves debate be restricted	
		Spekaer Bradley		
		Skinner		
93		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #27	
		Spekaer Bradley		
		Schuneman	Point of order	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Withdraws motion	
94		Speaker Bradley		
		Porter	Explains #27	
		Speaker Bradley		
	4:35	Matijevich	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
95		Skinner		
96		Spekaer Bradley	Fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #28	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
97		Skinner	Explains #28	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich	Opposes #28	
		Speaker Bradley		
98		Skinner	To close	
99	4:42	Speaker Bradley		
		Martin, P.	No	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich	Tables HB 3138	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 3138 is tabled!!!	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3296, 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley		
100		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Bradley		
101		Bowman	Explains #1	
		Speaker Bradley		
	4:50	Campbell	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
102		Bowman	To close	
		Spekaer Bradley	#1 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bowman	Explains #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Campbell	Opposes	
103		Speaker Bradley	#2 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bowman	Explains #3	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Campbell	Opposes	
104		Speaker Bradley		
		Bowman	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison		
		Bowman	Discussion	
		Speaker		
105		Bowman	To close again	
		Speaker Bradley	#3 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4	
		Speaker Bradley		
	5:00	Bowman	Explains #4	
		Spekaer Bradley		
		Campbell	Opposes	
106		Speaker Bradley	#4 fails, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3337	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar	Amendment #2	
	5:02	Speaker Bradley		
107		Bluthardt	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tuerk	Yield? Supports	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	19.
108		Mahar	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Yield?	
109	5:07	Mahar	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar	To close	
110		Speaker Bradley	adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3259, 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes	Table #1	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan	Yield?	
111		Barnes	Discussion	
112		Speaker Bradley	#1 is tabled	
		Geo-Karis	Parliamentary inquiry	
113	5:15	Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendments #2,3	
		Speaker Bradley		
114		Telcser	Withdraws #2,3	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mugalian	Withdraws #4	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kelly	Withdraws #5	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20.
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #7	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar	Withdraws #6,7	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #8	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	Withdraws #8,9	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #10	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Sandquist	Withdraws #10 & 13	
115		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendments #11 & 12	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendments #11 & 12 withdrawn	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #14	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes	Explains #14	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Clerk O'Brien	Rereads	
	5:22	Houlihan, J.	Asks for ruling of chair	
116		Speaker Bradley		
117		Barnes, E.	Continues on #14	
118		Speaker Bradley		
119		Houlihan, J.	Yield?	
		Barnes	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
120	5:30	Bowman	Yield?	
121-122-123		Barnes	Discussion #14	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kozubowski	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails	
		Barnes	To close #14	
124		Speaker Bradley		
	5:40	Holowinski	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
125-126		Telcser	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
127	5:45	Mann	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
128		Geo-Karis	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley	#14 prevails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #15	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Reilly	Withdraws #15	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #16	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	Withdraws #16	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #17	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Madison	Inquiry
		Speaker Bradley	
129		Skinner	Explains #17
		Speaker Bradley	
130	5:50	Barnes	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
		Deuster	Yield?
131		Skinner	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	Supports
		Speaker Bradley	
132		Houlihan, J.	Yield?
		Skinner	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
	5:55	Davis, J.	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	To close #17
133		Speaker Bradley	
		Hoffman	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	#17 is adopted
		Deuster	Moves to reconsider vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Wikoff	Moves to table that motion
		Speaker Bradley	Motion tabled



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
134		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #18
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	Withdraws #18
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #19
		Speaker Bradley	
135-136		Houlihan, J.	
		Kane	Discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Giorgi	Wants an add-on
		Speaker Bradley	
137		Barnes	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
		Waddell	Yield?
		Kane	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hoffman	Yield? Supports
138-139		Kane	Discussion
	6:10	Speaker Bradley	
		Polk	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kane	To close, yields to Dyer
		Speaker Bradley	
		Dyer	Closes on #19
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	Explains vote
140		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
		Flinn	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevec	Explains vote	
	6:15	Speaker Bradley		
141		Mann	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #19	
		Kane	Poll of absentees	
142-143-144		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees, verifies roll	
145-146-147		Speaker Bradley		
148		Pullen	Aye	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Sumner	Aye	
		Speaker Bradley	#19 is adopted	
		Lechowicz		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Reconsider vote	
149		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	Motion lie on table	
	6:20	Speaker Bradley		
		Polk		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	Oral verified roll call	
150		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Calls the roll	
		Speaker Bradley	Withdraws motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	Withdraws	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	25.
151		Speaker Bradley Lechowicz Speaker Bradley Kane		
	6:45	Speaker Bradley Clerk O'Brien Speaker Bradley Houlihan, J. Speaker Bradley	Continues with verification Withdraws motion again	
152		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Bradley Mugalian	Continues Aye	
153		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Bradley Skinner Speaker Bradley Houlihan, J. Speaker Bradley	Continues with roll Point of order Motion to table fails Tables his motion to reconsider	
154		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Bradley Mahar Speaker Bradley Clerk O'Brien Speaker Bradley Mahar Speaker Bradley	Amendment #20 Withdraws #20 Amendment #21 Explains Amendment #21	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
	7:00	Barnes, E.	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley	#21 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #22	
		Speaker Bradley		
155		Sandquist	Explains #22	
		Speaker Bradley		
156		Barnes, E.	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Holewinski	Yield?	
157		Sandquist	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis	Supports	
		Spekaer Bradley		
		Giorgi		
158		Sandquist		
159		Speaker Bradley		
		Huff		
		Speaker Bradley		
160	7:10	Cunningham	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan	Yield? Opposes	
161		Sandquist	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Terzich	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley	Question is moved	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	27.
162		Sandquist	To close	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #22 prevails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #23	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes, E.	Explains #23	
163		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #23 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #24	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Withdraws #24	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #25	
		Speaker Bradley		
164	7:17	Houlihan, J.	Explains #25	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Giorgi	Yield?	
165		Houlihan	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes, E.	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #25 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #26	
		Speaker Bradley		
166		Houlihan, J.	Explains #26	
		Speaker Bradley		
167		Barnes, E.	Opposes	
	7:25	Speaker Bradley		
		Madison	Yield?	
168		Houlihan, J.	Discussion	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	28.
		Speaker Bradley		
170		Houlihan, D.	Yield?	
		Houlihan, J.		
	7:30	Speaker Bradley		
		O'Brien	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley	Question moved	
		Schneider	Fiscal note?	
		Speaker Bradley		
171		Houlihan, J.	To close on #26	
172		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison	Inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Poll the absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
173		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #26 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #27	
		Speaker Bradley		
174		Houlihan, J.	Explains #27	
	7:40	Speaker Bradley		
		Terzich	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	To close on #27	
175		Spekaer Bradley	#27 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #28	
		Speaker Bradley		
176		Kelly	Explains #28	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	29.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Adams	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley	Question moved	
		Kelly	To close on #28	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #28 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #29	
		Speaker Bradley		
177	7:45	Jacobs	Explains #29	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes, E.	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Yield?	
		Jacobs	Discussion	
178		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner	Yield? Opposes	
		Jacobs		
		Speaker Bradley	#29 is adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #30	
		Speaker Bradley		
179		Mahar	Explains #30	
		Speaker Bradley		
180	7:50	Barnes, E.	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
181		Mahar	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	30.
		Skinner	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley	#30	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #31	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Withdraws #31	
		Speaker Bradley		
182		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #32	
		Speaker Bradley		
183		Conti	Explains #32	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kane	Yield?	
184		Conti		
		Speaker Bradley		
185		Barnes, E.	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley	#32 is adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #33	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bowman	Explains #33	
		Speaker Bradley		
186		Barnes, E.	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Holewinski	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley		
187	8:07	Geo-Karis	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bowman	To close on #33	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	31.
		Bowman	Poll absentees & verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
188		Bowman	Withdraws	
		Speaker Bradley	#33 fails	
189		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #34	
		Speaker Bradley		
	8:10	Madigan	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kelly	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
190		Sterney	Yield? Opposes	
		Simms	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
191		Mulcahey	Yield? Opposes	
		Simms		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bluthardt	Supports	
192		Speaker Bradley		
		Tipsword	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
193	8:20	Walsh, W.	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Brummer	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley	PQM	
		Simms	To close on #34	
		Speaker Bradley		
194		Mann	Explains vote	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	32.
		Speaker Bradley	#34 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #35	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes	Don't have Amendment	
		Speaker Bradley	Being distributed now	
195		Houlihan, J.	Explains #35	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Giorgi	Yield?	
		Houlihan, J.		
		Speaker Bradley		
196		Matijevich	Supports	
197		Speaker Bradley		
	8:30	Leinenweber	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Darrow	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
198		Davis, J.	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Lucco	Opposes	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Flinn	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley		
199		Houlihan, J.	To close on #35	
		Speaker Bradley	#35 fails, 3rd	
		Holewinski	Fiscal note	
200		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	33.
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Holewinski		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads filing of fiscal note	
		Speaker Redmond		
	8:35	Collins	Inquiry	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 3259, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3347	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2604	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Leinenweber	Table #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Redmond		
202		Leinenweber	Explains #2	
	8:40	Speaker Redmond		
		Johnson		
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted	
203		Collins		
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2770	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2808	



34.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
204		Madigan	Inquiry on HB 2770
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2808 again
	8:45	Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Epton	Explains #1
205		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	Yield?
		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	#1 is adopted, 3rd
		Jones, E.	HB 2619 back to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2619
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	HB 3193
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jones, E.	
		Speaker Redmond	#1 adopted, 3rd
		Bowman	Back to 2nd, HB 1270
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
207		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	Explains #3
	8:50	Speaker Redmond	#3 adopted, 3rd



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	35.
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 3193, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brummer	Back on 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kempiners	Questions fiscal note	
		Speaker Redmond		
208		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Epton	Point of inquiry	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brummer		
		Speaker Redmond		
209		Kempiners		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich	Point of order	
	8:55	Speaker Redmond		
		Deuster	Joins with Epton	
		Speaker Redmond		
210		Kempiners		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Davis, J.		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kempiners		
		Speaker Redmond		
211	8:58	Brummer	Left on 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR HB 3193	
		Keato		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	Back to 2nd, HB 1357
		Speaker Redmond	Mudd objects
		Mudd	
212		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	Prevails
		Clerk O'Brien	#13
213		Speaker Redmond	Carries
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #14
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	Not a sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	Question of Clerk
		Clerk O'Brien	
	9:03	Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Parliamentary Inquiry
214		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	Withdraws #14
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #15
		Ewing	Withdraws #15



37.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #15
		Ewing	Withdraws #15
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #16
		Ewing	Explains #16
		Speaker Redmond	
215		Duester	Yield?
		Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	Yield?
216		Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	#16 adopted, 3rd
		Leinenweber	Postponed
		Speaker Redmond	Postponed Consideration
217		Chapman	Return HB 1973 to 2nd
		Chapman	Reconsider Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Chapman	#1 reconsider the vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion prevails, #1 tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
218		Chapman	Explains #2



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	38.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Deuster	Yield?	
		Chapman	Discussion	
219		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted PP	
		Reilly	Motion on HB 3380	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond		
220		Matijeovich		
		Rielly		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Brummer		
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
221		Davis, J.	Motion on HB 1475	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Yield?	
		Davis		
	9:20	Speaker Redmond		
		Matijeovich		
222		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Tipsword	Wanted roll call vote	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
		Yourell	HB 2898 bact to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted	
223		Yourell	Withdraws #6	
		Speaker Redmond	Consideration postponed	
		Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	39.
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ebbesen	Supports Yourell's motion	
224		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries #6 tabled	
		Madigan	Moves to adjourn till 10 A.M.	
		Speaker Redmond	House stands adjourned	
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee reports	
		Mudd	Announcement	
225-226	9:30	Clerk O'Brien	Contineus, HB's 1st, messages from Senate. SB's 1st	

