

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

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. It is written in the Book of Proverbs, 15:33: The fear of the Lord is the instruction of wisdom, and before honour is humility. Let us pray: Eternal and everliving God, we give thanks this day for those who serve in the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois. We are grateful, O Lord, for their reverence of Thee as the basis of their wisdom. As they continue to ask of Thee, provide them with both the humility and knowledge that they may flourish in Thy honour and grace. We ask this in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2508, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2509, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to require that all resident leases and consumer agreements shall be be written in nontechnical language. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2510, Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the East St. Louis Depressed Land Area Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2511, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hall: "House Resolution 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502 and House Joint Resolution 58."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution #484 by Schlickman, notes the 60th wedding anniversary of Harold Burnison. 485 by DiPrima talks about a Patrick DeFilippo who was awarded Eagle Scout rank. 486 by Ewell talks about the Southtown Economist newspaper that received three journalism awards. 487 by Von Boeckman, notes a 60th wedding anniversary. 488 by Von Boeckman talks about a 50th wedding anniversary. 489 by Sanquist, hired as the executive director of the Lincoln Park Conservation Association, Joan Martin. 490 by Brummer; talks about Belle Wilson's 100th birthday. 491 by Bluthardt, denotes the teacher of the year. 492 by Hudson, tells about a scholarship dinner, Mark Thompson. 493 by Skinner, notes his interest in legislative intensive 494 by Kelly, talks about a 60th wedding anniversary. 495 by Madigan on Sister Patricia Egan. 496 by Wolf, says that Michael Nedza gets an Eagle Scout award. 497 by Wolf, talks about Matthew Mutusik winning an Eagle Scout award. 498 by Wolf, does the same thing for Eric Charles Kindahl. 499 by Schlickman, talks about Drengwitz's 50th wedding anniversary. 500 by Conti, talks about Don Cartagnini who raised fifteen thousand dollars on behalf of Muscular Dystrophy. 501 by Mudd, notes our colleague William O'Daniel lead in the General Assembly could become Executive Director of the Illinois Agriculture Stabilization of Conservation District. And 502 by Redmond honors Elmer Raymond Fanstill who retired on the occasion of his 70th birthday. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions and I have one House Joint Resolution 58 which talks about Naomi Hiett's twenty-three years of service to the Commission on Children. I move the adoption of all Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any discussions? Representative Hart."

Hart: "Wonder if we could get leave to have all the Members be shown as Cosponsors on the Resolution to congratulate



Representative O'Daniel's on his appointment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear House Resolution 467 on the Breslin matter in the Agreed Resolution list. Is that included?"

Giorgi: "He's out of order."

Bluthardt: "No, I'm asking a question. Where is House Resolution 467, I thought that would be an Agreed Resolution."

Giorgi: "It must be on the Speaker's Table, there is no unanimity on that one."

Bluthardt: "Really... well thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have the all the Members added as Cosponsors? Hearing no objections leave is granted. They will be added. Representative Giorgi. Representative Mudd. The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' the motion carries and the Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk Hall: "House Joint Resolution 59."

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

Clerk Hall: "Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman on Appropriations II, to wit: the following Bills referred. Action taken November 4, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations do pass as amended, House Bill 2489."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi is recognized for the purpose of moving the House recess."

Giorgi: "I move that the Regular Session recess until...."

Speaker Redmond: "12:20."

Giorgi: "12:20, I move that the House recess."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House stands in recess until 12:20. The ^{times}time of 12:10 having arrived the First Special Session... now in Session. Representative



Giorgi with a motion in respect to the Roll Call."

Giorgi: "I wanted the Roll Called used for the Regular Session to be used for the House Special Session #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, the Roll Call for the Regular Session will be used as the Roll Call for the First Special Session. Committee Reports."

Clerk Hall: "Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken November 4, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations do pass House Bill 21."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi for the purpose of moving the First Special Session recess until after the adjournment of the Regular Session."

Giorgi: "I move that the Special Session #1 be recessed until the adjournment of the Regular Session."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the First Special Session will stand in recess until the adjournment of the Regular Session. Second Special Session will come to order. Representative Giorgi, in respect to the motion on the Roll Call."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Roll Call used for the Regular Session be used for the Special Session #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Roll Call of the First... of the Regular Session will be used for the Roll Call of the Second Special Session. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Hall: "Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken November 4, 1977. Reported the same back with the recommendation do pass as amended House Bill 4."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi with respect to the motion to recess for Second Special Session and until after adjournment of the First Special Session."

Giorgi: "I move that the Second Special Session be adjourned until after the First special Session is adjourned."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the Second Special Session will stand in recess until the adjournment of the First Special Session which will convene upon the adjournment of the the Regular Session. Let the records show that Representative Walsh is in the chamber for the Second Special Session. House Bills, Regular Session. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 2433."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2433, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the State Board of Election.... Education. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2434."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2434, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Department of Children and Family Services. One Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any motion filed with respect to Committee Amendment #1?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2464."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2464, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Medical Center Commission. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2467."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2467, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation for certain claims against the State of Illinois.

Second Reading of the Bill, one Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Is there any motion filed in respect to the Committee Amendment?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2468."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2468, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois Governmental Salary and Study Commission.

No Committee Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2469."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2469, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Liquor Control Commission. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 failed in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2470." Okay, we'll take this one out of the record, a Floor Amendment has been filed. 2471."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2471, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2472."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2472, a Bill for an Act making... provide the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Agriculture. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"



Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2473."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2473, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Revenue. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2474."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2474, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vocational and Rehabilitation. Amendment #1 was offered in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to the Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2475."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2475, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of Emergency Services and Diaster Agency. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2476."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2476, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Business and Economic Development. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2477."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2477, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission."



Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2478."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2478, a Bill for an Act provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion with respect to Amendment #1."

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Jaffe, Robinson. Amends House Bill 2478 as amended on page 1 and so forth."

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

Clerk Hall: "Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar on the floor? Is Representative Jaffe on the floor? Take this one out of the record. 2480. Out of the record, yes."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2480, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Aging. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2481."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2481, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Bureau of the Budget. Amendment #1 and 2, failed, 3 and 4 adopted in Committee. 5 filed, 6 was withdrawn, 7 failed and 8 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"



Clerk Hall: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2482."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2482, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Fair Employment Practice Commission. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2484."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2484, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Has anybody picked up Senate Bill 1385? The Order of Business, Amendatory Veto Motions. Who's handling the motion with respect to 232, that Representative Sevcik's Bill? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Lucco and I filed a motion for 231, I was not aware that 232 needed to have a motion but... if I would be in order we would file one on that. Are those companion Bills, 231 and 232?"

Speaker Redmond: "We don't have any indication there is a motion on 231."

Flinn: "Well, there's....."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you filed a motion?"

Flinn: "There is a motion that should be in the Calendar, 231 Representative Lucco and myself."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, do you want to take.... well then it's not on the Calendar today, we can't call 231 until Monday Representative Friedrich."

Flinn: "Well, if the motion...."

Friedrich: "231 was a total veto, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'm on the Order of Amendatory Veto's."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker I would like to know the relationship



between the two Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, take this one out of the record. Figure it out. Well, do you understand that, Representative Flinn? 231 is a total veto."

Flinn: "That is correct."

Speaker Redmond: "231 is amendatory veto."

Flinn: "That is correct but I need to find out the relationship between the two Bills. Take it out of the record...."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll take it out of the record and we'll impose the burden to find out the relationship upon Representative Flinn. When he is satisfied as to the degree consanguinity will you come back and tell us."



Speaker Redmond: "351, is Representative DiPrima on the floor?"

I can't see Representative DiPrima because we have a black caucus in front of him. Will the black caucus please retire to the Speaker's Office."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the outset I want to thank all the Members of the House for their support they have given me in the past. They showed their patriotism by supporting all veteran's legislation, Resolutions pertaining to opposition to giving away to Panama Canal, the opposition to granting amnesty and many other Bills pertaining to disabled veteran's widows and his orphans. And those ingrates that made up that list of the ten worst Legislators of which yours truly was a Member...."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised."

DiPrima: "It's coming up for reprisal. Number one, in all the years I've been here, fifteen years, I have never lost a Bill in the House, whether the Bills were good or bad I don't know. And I only lost two in the Senate and every one of my Bills that went to Governor Kerner up to Thompson has been signed. I've never had one of my Bills vetoed. How much of a better record and acquiescent should you have? Now, this veto, amendatory veto is just a line item there, it changes the date from April 29, to May 7th. That's in conformance with the ruling... with the vote that Congress gave at the end of the Vietnam War and that's all it does and I am happy to accept this technical change. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House except the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 351 by adoption of the Amendment? All 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 are 146 'aye' and no 'nay' and the motion having received



the Constitutional Majority, it prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 351 by adoption of the Amendment. 1216. Representative Bluthardt. Representative Telcser would you please break up the caucus, I can't see Representative Bluthardt. This is a motion to accept."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House I would ask that we consider both House Bill 1216 and 1217. They are really the same, they deal with expenditure and contributions under the Campaign Disclosure Act. The Governor has, I think wisely amended the Bill in two counts... if I can find it. One, it eliminates the provision that news day editorials and such will not be considered a contribution and the other permits the expenditure of up to a hundred and fifty dollars without disclosure for teas and coffees but only one per reporting period. Which would mean that you could have four coffees or other types of gatherings at a cost not to exceed a hundred and fifty dollars during any one campaign. And I would move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bills 1216 and 1217."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor yield to a to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative if someone were to have.... let's say, six coffee hours... I mean, are you saying that six different coffee hours if they totaled a hundred and eighty dollars... are reportable but if.... that's one question. If six coffee hours by six different people are given and they total about a hundred and eighty dollars in expenses. Are they reportable?"

Bluthardt: "I don't think so, I would have to look again at the Amendment. If you have six different persons they would not be reportable but if one person held six, it would be reportable."

Geo-Karis: "I see, thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have 1216 and 1217 considered together? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1216 and 1217 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? It requires 107 votes because of the effective date. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 3 'no' and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation to change regarding House Bills 1216 and 1217 by adoption of the Amendment. 1363... out of the record. 1397, Representative Greiman. Pardon me, I thought you were going to take it out. 1363."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1363 deals with the change in the attempt statute. At the present time the sentence for an attempt to commit murder shall not exceed the sentence for a Class 1, felony. The sentence for attempt to commit a Class 1 felony shall not exceed the sentence for a Class 2 felony. And so on down the line. Because of this wording, shall not exceed, we know that an attempt to commit a crime has a maximum sentence. But it has no minimum sentence. I have changed the wording from, shall not exceed to is, so that the sentence for attempt to commit murder is the sentence for a Class 1, felony. The sentence for an attempt Class 1 felony is the sentence for a Class 2 felony and so on down the line. I think that this change provides minimum sentences and allows a greater uniformity in sentencing which this state desperately needs. This is just one more step closer to that goal and I would appreciate that House Bill 1363 could be passed in spite of the Governor's veto."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall House 1363 pass not



withstanding the Governor's veto? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Breslin... Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, I realize that for some Members of this House the issue of whether or not I sit is of major importance. I would submit to the Members of this House that it is of minimum importance compared to the words of our criminal justice system, compared to the problems of labor and commerce in this state, compared to the problems of social welfare, etc., etc.. I would appreciate if the Members of this House would consider this vote. Forget who the Sponsor is, remember that people who attempt to commit murder, people who attempt other felonies deserve to have minimal sentences. This is not an unimportant issue, the issue is presently before the Illinois Supreme Court on three separate cases. I think we need to indicate to our Supreme Court what this Legislature intends and that is, that a specific minimum.... at least a minimum sentence is required for attempted murder and other felonies. I Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, and if I may address this to Representative Breslin. I think possibly the lack of votes is a misunderstanding of which is precisely occurring here other which you are interrupt. Now, I remember the Bill from Committee and I remember the Committee reaction to the Bill. But, I don't think it is clear as to what the Governor's veto is and he being a law and order man what his objection is. Maybe your soft voice or something didn't get this point across. But, I think if you start from scratch again and explain exactly what you wanted and exactly what the Governor objected to, we might understand what is going on."

Breslin: "Okay, quite frankly....."



Speaker Redmond: "You understand that this is a motion to override the Governor's veto. Representative...."

Breslin: "Thank you, quite frankly Representative, I believe that the Governor's veto message indicates that he has misconstrued the attempt statute in its entirety. And probably in the haste of dealing with all these Bills, this Bill was not given proper attention. The present statute in Illinois governing the sentencing for people who attempt felonies presently reads: The sentence for attempt to commit murder shall not exceed the sentence for Class 1, felony. The sentence for attempt to commit a Class 1 felony shall not exceed the sentence for a Class 2 felony. The sentence for attempt to commit a Class 2 felony shall not exceed the sentence for a Class 3 felony etc., etc. I have changed that language because the shall not exceed language indicates that we have a maximum, we know that the sentence for attempt to commit murder shall not exceed the maximum of the sentence for a Class 1, felony. However, it has no minimum... it is possible to have the sentence not exceed that of a Class 1 felony but the sentence could be nothing...."

Kosinski: "Then interpretation is that the Governor's office misconstrued what your intent was?"

Breslin: "That's correct and...."

Kosinski: "And what did they presume your intent was?"

Breslin: "I haven't figured that out. All I know...."

Kosinski: "Have touched base with the Governor's people in this regard?"

Breslin: "No. Nor did they touch base with me."

Kosinski: "Well, don't you think it might be a better idea to pull this out of the record until you get a clarification of what their thinking is and go at it again?"

Breslin: "Okay, fine. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that I take Postponed Consideration on this Bill and I will. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has asked.... do you want it out of the record or Postponed Consideration?"

Breslin: "Out of the record will be fine. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. Out of the record. 1706, Representative Edgar. 170... it's out of the record. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, it is really quite fortunate that I must bring this parliamentary inquiry to your attention on this particular Bill. But, the rules of this House and the procedures and custom has always been that once a Roll Call has started, a Bill goes on Postponed Consideration, not out of the record. I don't know why you should make that exception at any time regardless who the Sponsor is. As I say, I'm sorry that my inquiry takes place with the present Sponsor. It has nothing to do with what she had mentioned during the course of her explanation of vote. But, you gave a lot of leeway on this particular issue. The Roll Call has started and I really think it ought to go on Postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "The problem, Representative Telcser, is that I never called for a vote, there was never any record taken and...."

Telcser: "The board was all lit up, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk tells me that there was never a record taken, is that right?"

Telcser: "Okay, but just so we know, Mr. Speaker. Once a Roll Call starts, it's a Roll Call. That has always been our practice."

Speaker Redmond: "Put on Postpone....."

Telcser: "And I say that only because....."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll put it on Postponed Consideration and we'll be in Session on the 15th. 1706. We'll be in Session on the 15th. Take this one out of the record. 1397, Representative Greiman, are you ready?"

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



House. House Bill 1397 places the Department of General Services under the Administrative Procedure Act. And the only problem with it was during the Session we changed the name of the Department of General Services to the Department of Administrative Services. And all this amendatory veto does is to conform the name of the... the new name of the agency with the Act that we passed and I recommend that we do adopt the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change in respect to House Bill 1397 by the adoption of the Amendment? All 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 is 149 'aye' and no 'nay' and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for the change regarding House Bill 1397 by the adoption of the Amendment. 1680.

Gréiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1680 was also one of the Bills from the Administrative Study Procedure Committee. This Bill effected the well diggers and placed the well diggers under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act; again, similar to the last Bill. During this Session we changed and transferred the regulation of well diggers from our need to public health and it just merely conforms to the change to public health. I ask that we accept the Governor's recommendation."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1680 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 147 'aye' and 1 'no' and the motion has received Constitutional Majority



prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation with respect to House Bill 1680 by the adoption of the Amendment. 1706... out of the record. 1752...out of the record. Is Representative... pardon me. 1752, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we want to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. This Bill gives the Illinois intra state carriers the same rights and privileges insofar as the publication of joint rates are concerned. They have been enjoyed by interstate carriers for many many years. It provides immunity from antitrust laws to motor carriers who publish joint carriers with another carrier through Motor Carriers Rate Bureau otherwise. It would require, however, that a bureau have a rate agreement approved by the Illinois Commerce Commission. This privilege has been enjoyed by interstate carriers for many years. The Bill we passed had all the built-in protection necessary to insure the Rate Bureau would not protest certificates or rates of other carriers. The Governor's office, however, in its amendatory veto wanted additional language to which we do not object. So the language suggested in the admendatory veto is a further effort by the Governor's office to insure the Rate Bureaus do not engage in any litigation concerning either alternation of rate schedules other than the bureaus own schedule or an application for new authority filed by a carrier. This is all explained and so on by a letter from the Governor's office which I have here. I would move to accept the Governor's admendatory veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1752 by the adoption of the Amendment? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my 'no' vote is indicative of lack of affection for the



Sponsor but it is in recognition that the whole rate bureau concept supplied by the Interstate Commerce Commission is ridiculous, expensive, unwanted intrusion on the right of the licensee. If you have a single truck operator in your district that hauls corn or something, just the smallest of operation, he has to pay fifty or sixty dollars a year to some far away Rate Bureau in Springfield or St. Louis to continue to try to earn a livelihood for himself and his family. The fault is with the Commission. They could remedy the problem in stature by permitting the licensee or the certificate carrier to file his own. But they say no, that's too complicated for plain citizens to do so they have to join the Rate Bureau. If that situation is that ridiculous and that's what you're perpetrating here by giving the official imperator of legality to the Rate Bureau and exempted them from the antitrust provision. What needs to be done is to send a message to the Interstate Commerce Commission that they need to do something more to justify their existance. That's why I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation... oh, pardon me. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 118 'aye' and 6 'no' and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation regarding House Bill 1752 by the adoption of the Amendment. 2069, Representative Antonovych. Out of the record. 2259."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, very much. The Amendment that the Governor placed on 2259 is just clarifying.... it apparently, the Governor's office felt that there was some ambiguity in the language of the Bill. I would move to accept the specific recommendation of change of the Governor and ask for a favorable Roll Call. It takes 107 votes because



its got an immediate effective date on it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hart, I wasn't listening if you moved..."

Hart: "Yes, and I pointed out that by the motion that I filed, I put an immediate effective date on it, so it will take 107 votes."

Speaker Madigan: "The.... any discussion? The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. Therefore the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2259 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Would Mr. Lechowicz come to the floor? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 152 'ayes', 3 'no' and no voting 'present'. This motion having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 2259 by adoption of the Amendment. On the Order of Amendatory Veto: Motions. Consideration of Postponed there is House Bill 286, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 286 deals with the subject of child pornography. And moving to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto which changes the word from 'obscene' to 'pornography' and also increases^s the penalty on those creating it from a Class 4, to a Class 3, felony, which I might add is a penitentiary sentence to one to ten years in Illinois State Penitentiary. He also provided that for those who are distributing these materials, penalty would be Class 4, which is from one to three years and the individual be subject to a twenty-five thousand dollar fine. For the individual selling it it would be a Class 3, and a fifty thousand dollar fine. So, I respectfully ask for a favorable Roll Call on his vote."



Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a parliamentary inquiry, we passed a Bill out of Mr. Getty's yesterday on the same subject. What would be the effect if we now passed this Bill out... changing the same Sections of the statutes?"

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Darrow it's not clear at this time what the effect would be, however, I would suggest to you that the Governor would be in a position to examine both Bills and to base his decision upon the potential impact."

Darrow: "We would be back to the Governor making the decision for us."

Speaker Madigan: "In the event that this Bill passed, you are correct."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 286 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. This will require 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 8 'no', 8 voting 'present' and this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 286 by adoption of the Amendment. For what purpose does Mr. Walsh arise? I'm told, Mr. Walsh, that I'm not in a position to add you to the Roll Call. For what purpose do you seek recognition, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "To seek unanimous consent to be added as 'aye' on the last Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Walsh requests unanimous consent to be



recorded as 'aye' on the last Roll Call. Is there anyone who wishes to object to Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "How could anyone object to Mr. Walsh."

Speaker Madigan: "I see a hand raised in the back. There being no objection, Mr. Walsh will be added to the vote on the last Roll Call. Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the same reason."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests that..... On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears House Bill 2343. Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do adopt and concur with the Governor's Amendatory Veto to House Bill 2343. What the Amendatory Veto did is to raise the amount to fifteen hundred and twenty-five hundred dollars as for to make and compliance with the Purchasing Act. And also that the services which have been reduced in writing before such services are preformed. I have discussed this in Economic and Fiscal Commission and it was the consensus of the Commission Members that we should, do adopt the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 2343."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2343 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Will all Members please record themselves at this time rather than ask the Chair to add them after we have taken the Roll Call? Mr. Barnes is out of his chair and he wishes to be recorded. Will all Members please record themselves now? And Mr. O'Brien is out of his chair and would someone record him? And the Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 168 'ayes' and no 'no' and no voting 'present'. The motion having received a three-fifths



Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 2343 by adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Klosak, do you seek recognition?"

Klosak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 286. I had the light on ever since we honored Mr. Walsh:"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Klosak requests leave to be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 286. There being no objection, he shall be so recorded. The Chair inquires as to who is the Sponsor of House Bill 232? Mr. Ryan, are you prepared to consider House Bill 232 at this time?"

Ryan: "No, I'm not. Take it out of the record."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ryan, do you think that you might want to take it out today or put it over until next week?"

Ryan: "Pardon? Well, you caught me at a bad time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Shall we keep that over until next week?"

Ryan: "No, we can move it now, that's all right."

Speaker Madigan: "Right now? House Bill 232, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "I move to accept the Amendatory Veto of the Governor's..."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 232 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Will all Members please record themselves at this time. Will all Members please record themselves at this time prior to closing roll. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 162 'ayes', no 'no', 2 voting 'present' and the motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 232 by adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Mann, do you wish to consider House Bill 1915



at this time... did you wish to put that over until next week? Mr. Antonovych. For what purpose does Mrs. Martin arise?"

Martin, P: "I was sleeping at the switch and I would like to be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 232, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Which Bill, Mrs. Martin?"

Martin, P: "232, that one."

Speaker Madigan: "You mean the one that is still on the board and you didn't get on?"

Martin, P: "Yes, right. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady requests leave to be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 232. Is there leave? Leave being granted she shall so be recorded. Mrs. Geo-Karis, was your attention diverted also?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. No I have already voted but on a point of parliamentary inquiry. If we have a motion on the Calendar already filed to override a veto, its on the Calendar today, how much more time do we have to act on it? Could we act on it next week?"

Speaker Madigan: "Until Tuesday."

Geo-Karis: "Tuesday?"

Speaker Madigan: "Until Tuesday of next week."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. On the Order of Total Veto Motions there appears House Bill 231. Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When I first came to this august Body I was directed to several people to whom I could look for advise in certain areas. The one Gentleman who I have pointed out as not only being a fine Legislator but an authority in this racetrack business, shall I say. This particular Bill, House Bill 231 was originally Sponsored by Joe Sevcik and passed the House 125 to 4, passed the Senate 46 to 0 and I move that we override the Governor's Veto of this Bill. House Bill 231 deals with the graduated



privilege tax on racing. It is an offshoot of Senate Bill 37, the new Horse Racing Act passed in 1975. Originally Senate Bill 37 set up a privilege tax that gave the smaller downstate tracks a break. But, Governor Walker line itemed the lower proposal for downstate tracks which was not the intention of the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission that sponsored the revamping of the State Racing Act. House Bill 231 equalizes the privilege tax, which would give the downstate tracks a better break. It lowers the smaller of the mutual handle on the state share of the privilege tax but increases it on the higher end. Thus resulting in no loss whatsoever to the State of Illinois simply because what is lost on the first three hundred thousand dollars mutual handle is more than made up for by the increase the state tax has on all mutual handlings above three hundred thousand. So, when Representative Sevcik introduced this Bill it did not particularly help his particular track or tracks in his area but for the interest of racetrack throughout the State of Illinois. He saw the need for this Bill, already one downstate track, Moline Downs is in bankruptcy, Aurora was forced to move and Balmoral in Will County is in deep trouble. Fairmont in Cahokia, which is in our area, Representative Flinn and myself and others, will operate next year because of the dates allotted them. But unless the relief on the privilege tax under House Bill 231 becomes law, both of these tracks could not be in operation in 1979. Their only salvation, the tracks claim because of inflationary dollars and rising labor cost, if House Bill 231 become law over the Governor's veto. The two southern tracks paid presently more than eight million dollars annually to the state. And with such a lost and in the event of closing down, it will affect not only more than five hundred working people but the lost of county fairs, civic auditorium centers and so forth. So, I move that we over-



ride the Governor's veto on House Bill 231. Representative Flinn has some comments."

Flinn: "Well, thank you, Representative Lucco. I thought the Speaker was supposed to give me the privilege of speaking but that's all right. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I along with Representative Lucco filed a motion to override. I thought it would be appropriate that we took Representative Sevcik's Bill since one of the tracks is in my district and one is in Representative Lucco's district along with other Legislators. What Representative Lucco says is absolutely true, there is nearly eight million dollars in taxes coming from these two tracks. Both had an experience in the last few years of losing money. Right now, to date the Fairmont Track is down three hundred thousand dollars. Now, Fairmont is owned by the Odgen Corporation, which is a large corporation, and Cahokia is owned by the Cahokia Land Trust. I'm not interested in either one of those corporations making money but I am interested in the nearly eight million dollar taxes that the state would lose in the event they close. I'm also interested in the better than five hundred employees who would lose their jobs, who have permanent jobs at these two tracks down there. I think the Revenue Department or whoever advised the Governor to veto this was absolutely wrong. They changed the rates on the first three hundred thousand dollars of tax on the low end of the thing and put it on the upper end of the thing and the state stands a chance absolutely nothing, in fact probably gain money in the long run if the bigger tracks make more money. So, I join Representative Lucco and others in asking that we override the veto on House Bill 231."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, although the remarks that were made by the Sponsor of this motion seems



to be in order, it seems to influence this Assembly to go along with the motion. I would simply like to stand before the Members of this House and ask that they do support the Governor's Veto of House Bill 231. I frankly see no object in the State of Illinois going into the business of subsidizing smaller tracks. Although the Gentleman says that there is no revenue loss or no possible revenue loss to the state, I don't think that is necessarily true. The possibilities of state losing revenue because of this Bill is a real possibility. I might also add as I said before, that we ought not be in the business of subsidizing smaller businesses and in this instance smaller racetracks and then perhaps raise the taxes for those tracks that are self-sufficient and that are doing the business. The logical conclusion to this piece of legislation would be for the state to subsidize all small business, no matter what their field is. That certainly isn't logical, that's something we never could afford to do or I think ever will do. I might also add that... who can tell of what other tracks will soon fall into this category with the messenger service as still being in business in this state to spite our efforts I wonder how much business those operations are taking away from present track operations and how long it will be before we windup subsidizing every track in this state. While this Bills may be well-intentioned, it could cost the state an enormous amount of money in the future. And once more it really isn't a logical kind of rational which we ought to get into in this state. And so, I ask and urge every Member of this Assembly to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's motion to override the Governor and that we sustain the Governor's veto of House Bill 231."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I was reading my veto analysis and maybe somebody can tell me if our



analysis is wrong but he tells me that the affect of the Bill would be to decrease the states revenue. It's also my understanding that the larger tax are already paying a heavier burden than the smaller one. Now, one of the questions has to be, is basic fairness. Now, if you're talking about letting tracks in the Chicago area, that's where they are, and the people of Chicago pay a larger tax and help benefit or subsidize the smaller ones elsewhere... I can understand. But I also have to point out to the Body what goes around simply has to come back around again. And you can't get it on all ends at all times while constantly taxing the City of Chicago at a disproportionate rate. Now, I would like to point out to you Gentleman that we in the City of Chicago do have some needs. We are going to have some things that we need and I suggest to you that if you want us to support all of these types of revenue, when I talk about our junior colleges and lack of revenue and disproportionate share of the pie, certainly I'm going to expect some kind of consideration and some kind of thought from you Gentleman. So, I have to question the fact that we're going to decrease the states revenue and we're we going to make it up. And if somebody could tell me that... except telling me we're going to tax people of the City of Chicago more, perhaps I could find it in my heart and soul to go for this kind of thing."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if this Bill is not passed and then it could well be that these tracks will not be in existence at all and the revenue will be lost completely, that's the point here. And in the first place, these tracks are not in competition with the tracks in Chicago and most of the money... a lot of the money from these tracks comes from out of state. So, it is important that you override this veto."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker I spoke on the subject already but I would like to ask Representative Ewell, if I can. I would like to point out to him that the tracks in Chicago are not in disagreement with the idea of doing this. They are not being taxed on the low side additionally, it's on the additional money they would take in on the high side. And what we're trying to do is make the small tracks and businesses downstate, the ones that Representative Lucco mentioned that pay nearly eight million dollars in taxes, if we could be real selfish about this thing and say no to the small tracks we would find out an answer to one of the questions that Representative Telcser raised. We'd find out that there would be a greater loss, a much greater loss if the two tracks were out of business. And I mentioned when I was talking earlier a large corporation owns one of these and a land trust owns the other and neither one are about to stay in business if they are losing money. Fairmont today, the one that is racing down there now in Madison County in Representative Lucco's district, has lost to date three hundred thousand dollars. I cannot imagine the Odgen Corpotaion which is a large conglomerate of losing very much money, very many years. And if they do go out of business the eight million dollars is down the drain, not a few hundred thousand dollars that we're talking about a possibility of losing."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I realize that the people interested in the small tracks vs. so-called the people in the big tracks is what has emerged here and I submit to you, that's not the case. I submit to you that if indeed the small track is given a smaller tax as a percentage of the handle that it would indeed help the track but I don't think that is really the



issue that we ought to be addressing ourselves to. Number one, the salvation of the small track is not going to depend on that. Number two, we here in the Legislature have come to depend on the total amount of revenue from both sources. I submit to you that if you create a disparity I'm sure that the large tracks will then go to court and you might lose the whole ballgame. So, I submit to you that the Governor's override, even though it did not touch on this aspect, should have."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to help small business but I believe I'm going to sustain the Governor's Veto on this one. Perhaps I don't understand the economics of racetracks but it seems to me that if you place a heavier tax on in tracks it will have to effect the God forsaken offer that will have to effect the amount of the prize which they can award. Now, that means if you lower the odds on the big track, it seems to me that would encourage bookmaking operations from those vacancies because the bookmakers are going to be able to escape that tax and be able to offer better odds to their patrons. And so really what we're doing, it seems to me, is encouraging bookmaking operations in the vacancies of the larger tracks. And most of those tracks might be located in the...in or near Chicago and I don't want to report that kind of operation. So, I think I'm going to sustain the Governor's veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Darrow."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Chair recognizes Mr. Flinn to close..... Mr. Lucco to close the debate."

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



I want to remind the Gentleman that has spoken against the Bill that this particular Bill and its graduated tax, the privilege tax that is being purport, was agreed upon by the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission, which Representative Sevcik was only a member. And therefore, larger tracks in the Chicago area which we're speaking about, were aware of this, was cognizant of it and they were in agreement with it. Some of the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle who were speaking against the Bill because they don't want to help small business. My memory sorta.... seems to remind me that we had a Bill here not too long ago to aid some small companies, particularly one known as the Peter Hones Brewery. And the idea was to save the small breweries and we all rallied around the small breweries. so I see no difference in this particular thing. I would urge your support of the vote to override the Governor's veto on House Bill 231."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 231 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. This vote shall require 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Byers to explain his vote."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a very dear question to people from southwestern Illinois, by Representative Flinn and Lucco, I think have talked about this. We have literally hundreds of people who come over from Missouri to Illinois to participate in the leisure time activities at the racetracks. And they spend a lot of money over there in Illinois and there is a lot of sales tax and other tax revenue that is raised as results of that. And we did pass a Bill for the small brewery in the state, up in Chicago and I think this is important that we do this also. I think we're cutting off our nose to spite our face in this case and I think it is a very bad mistake and I think we should vote 'aye' on this particular motion. This was



passed 124 to 4 originally and I don't know what makes it a bad Bill now. Representative Sevcik had this Bill and I think it is a good Bill and I think we should put more 'aye' votes up there so that this can become law."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Lucco to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want you to keep in mind that those of you that are not voting because of the Governor's veto for personal reasons rather than actual reasons... factual ones, I would like for you to keep in mind that southern Illinois is a very important part of the State of Illinois. And I'm sure that the Governor does not want to slight southern Illinois and I think that you should give this another thought before you withhold your votes. I think that this would be beneficial not only to the racetracks of southern Illinois and the racetracks of the northern part of the state that are in the smaller take groups because they would benefit also and it would certainly be beneficial to the income.... the revenue of the State of Illinois. And in the long run, I think it would be beneficial politically to the Governor of the State of Illinois. I solicit your 'aye' vote yet."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jacobs, to explain his vote."

Jacobs: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I happen to live in East Moline where East Moline Downs is located. This is known as Cubs City Downs. This is a track that is in bankruptcy. Yet, this track in the four years that it has been operating is now in bankruptcy, has been averaging a million, seven hundred thousand dollars a year to the State of Illinois. One thing that I think we're losing track of without these smaller tracks in the State of Illinois and if you're worried about Chicago tracks, the big tracks in Illinois... remember that all these horses that are being trained and bred and so on in Illinois get their



racing and are trained on the small tracks and then go to the big tracks in Chicago. And if you want racing in Illinois to suffer, you go right ahead. But, I think we are making a mistake if we do not override the Governor and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if what I have to say will influence another thirty-seven votes but I think I've got to say it before we let this thing go down the drain. I'm sure that a lot of the people over there who support the Governor, do so thinking that they're doing the right thing. I'm positive that they are not aware of the seriousness of the situation and I'm talking simply about the fact that these tracks downstate are losing money. Go to the things that have been touched upon here and not covered very well is that in the St. Louis area where the Cahokia Downs and Fairmont Downs is at, 64% of the patrons come from Missouri, they are not Illinois tax payers at all. Two thirds, almost two thirds of the people come from Missouri. The same thing applies in Representative Jacob's area when the track was running there. A good many of the people come from a neighboring state. We're in the lottery business and a lot of other things in which we let people from out of state buy tickets and help support our state. We think that is a great idea but here we're going to turn down... turn down the opportunity for people from outside the state helping support us. Now, I know of course the people in the metro, east area down there help support St. Louis by going over and trading in St. Louis and their sales tax they collect and that sort of thing and it is sort of a trade off. But I would like to warn all of you here today that if the Odgen Corporation, which is indeed.... black and white figures, losing three hundred thousand dollars now and they have already committed them-



selves to race their racing dates next year will indeed not ask for any the following year. I hope that doesn't happen but I'm awfully afraid it will."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Lucco, I believe you've explained your vote already, haven't you?"

Lucco: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'ayes', 47 'no', 12 voting 'present' and Mr. Lucco requested that it be placed on Postponed Consideration and it shall be placed on Postponed Consideration. On the Order of Total Veto Motions there appears House Bill 245. Mr. Davis, do you wish to take that out of the record? For the entire day? Mr. Stearney. Mr. Stearney, House Bill 375, for today. Do you think you will ever call it? House Bill 413, Mr. Holewinski. Mr. Antonovych, Welcome. House Bill 413, do you wish to call that? No. Mr. Sandquist, House Bill 595."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House this is a... what I feel is a most important Bill. And I would like to ask, especially those on this side of the aisle to give the same consideration of this Bill that was given to the Laetrile and the Abortion Bill yesterday. I know that there is a lot of pressures being put on but I think that this is a Bill that should be considered on its merits and that's what I ask you to do and that's what I know you will do. Now, let's really look at what this Bill involves. This Bill originally was one to.... when I introduced it, to take away the ban on political contribution from liquor licensees. This ban was put into our statutes back in 1934 when the Dramshop Act was first brought into play. And there was a lot of feeling that liquor licensees and people who dealt in this area were some kind of bad people and that we shouldn't deal with them. And what it has meant is, anybody in this business now is really a second class citizen



because this is the only business which makes a total ban on political contributions for political help by not only the licensee himself but anybody who worked for a licensee, anybody who is a director, a stockholder and the statutes says, directly or indirectly. So, even someone who would be on a board of a country club can be stopped from participating in a political process and that's what we're talking about. And if you read the Governor's message on this Bill... just read that message he admits all of these things that I'm saying. The only criticism that he says is that we didn't go far enough. In other words, the Amendments that were put on by the Senate, he doesn't like. Well, I don't have to like them either, I think the Bill was better as it was originally passed. But this is a step in the right direction and that's what we're considering here today. Now, one of the things that the Governor says, I might point out to those of you on this side of the aisle, the analysis made is wrong, the Governor does not say in his veto message that people are going to be disenfranchised if this Bill passes but what he says now in effect does disenfranchise right now, the way the law now stands. And what we're trying to do is correct this. The Governor also says that he believes that this ban is unconstitutional as it is in the statute. I happen to agree that it is unconstitutional also as my opinion as a lawyer. But, unfortunately the people who rule upon this are the judges and they have held that it is constitutional. So, what I'm saying is that.... let's not have second class citizens out of the people in the liquor business. This is an important business. All political contributions at the present time are reported, we have disclosure laws now. Let's not have under the table... let's have it out in the open, let's let this business be the same as all other business and I ask you to vote to override this veto."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to add one other thing to clarify this Bill. I am still in total agreement that no Liquor Commissioner should accept a contribution from anybody holding a liquor license. I agree with that totally, that concept totally but this Bill... all we're asking you to do is have a... anyone holding a liquor license can contribute to a political party and to a local Liquor Commissioner. He is still prohibited from doing that, I want to clarify that Bill and make sure that you understand that this is not a conflict of interest for any local Liquor Commissioner or any Mayor. They still should not accept a political contribution. However, let them make second class citizens out these insurance people and the liquor license holders because there are some two hundred regulatory agencies in the State of Illinois. This would be a wedge and start to stop anyone who was regulated by the State of Illinois in making any political contributions to any political party. Anybody that is licensed by the state should be the same way."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 595 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Ryan, do you wish to change your vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes'.... record Mr. Mann as 'aye'. On this question there are 109 'ayes', 36 'no', 10 voting 'present' and the motion having received a Constitutional three-fifths Majority prevails and House Bill 595 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Mr. Ralph Dunn. House Bill 641."



Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I really kind of hate to come before you with House Bill 641 because it has passed out of here 147 to 4. It's a Bill, if you will recall that allows the American Legion Veterans,.....Lions, Knights of Columbus and others to continue as they have been doing in our downstate and I guess in the Chicago area too to make roadway solicitations inside of municipalities where it is expressly permitted by ordinance and only at a controlled...traffic controlled intersection. The Governor vetoed this and used as his reason... was that the Department of Transportation or the people that are concerned with traffic safety had expressed opposition to the Bill. He said in his veto message, in his opinion a person should not be permitted to enter upon a highway for purpose of soliciting charitable contributions. Even if traffic is at a stand still, this is a way that our downstate organizations and I'm sure many organizations throughout the state choose to raise funds for charitable organizations. And I think notwithstanding the Governor's veto, I would like to ask for an override. My Cosponsor is Representative Larry DiPrima. He would like to speak to the Bill; I think."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "This is a terrible Bill, Mr. Speaker. In my area we have charitable organizations sitting at these intersections and creating a nuisance of themselves, tying up traffic. I've got one intersection that is a six-way intersection and you can count on the busiest week-ends of all, people sitting at this intersection collecting money. And you have to wait for the light to turn three and four and five times to get through the darn intersection. I think this is terrible and I would urge that you sustain the Governor's veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the last Gentleman



who just addressed you, I think if his police chief would enforce the law they wouldn't be there. And secondly, it leaves... this Bill leaves the decision up the municipality whether or not they want to have solicitation on the highways within that municipality. Leave it up to the various cities in the municipality in the State of Illinois. I think the overriding factor here is there is a concern for safety but it is important to remember we have many fine charitable organizations that rely heavily on solicitation, such as the Knights of Columbus, the Lions, Kiwanis, American Legion, Poppy Day Sales and the like. So, I urge you to override the Governor's veto and let the municipalities make their own decision."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr.... any further discussion? Mr. Dunn, to close the debate. Do you seek recognition, Mr. DiPrima?"

DiPrima: "Speak after you know, we get the vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunn, to close the debate. Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Brummer: "Yes, our synopsis on this... I'm confused. Our synopsis says that the Bill allows a person to solicit charitable contributions within a municipality only if it is expressly permitted by municipal ordinance. What is the existing law?"

Dunn: "The existing law is now not being obeyed, I'm sure that you know. The existing law is now that it can't be done any place in the State of Illinois on a state highway."

Brummer: "So, this loosens...."

Dunn: "This would allow it to be done by... if the city passed an ordinance....to that effect, if it were at controlled traffic signs."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Dunn: "Legalizes what they are doing anyway, I think I might say. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit an 'aye' vote on this. As I said awhile ago, it passed the House



by a vote of 147 to 4, passed out of the Senate 48 to 4, I believe it was. And I would like to ask you to override the Governor's veto and let local governments, local municipalities decide whether they want solicitation or not. It would have to pass an ordinance before it would be legal. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Dunn to close the debate. And I'm informed he already closed the debate and therefore, the question is, shall House Bill 641 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Mr. DiPrima to explain his vote."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is to help the veteran organizations when they have their poppy sale. All this money goes toward the rehabilitation of the veterans in the hospital. And as Lee Daniels mentioned, it helps the Lions out with their peanut program but it can't be done unless the municipalities grant the permission to do it. So, that's all in essence what you're doing is just leaving it up to the municipalities that grant the permission for these different organizations to allow them to go out for donations. I would appreciate your wholehearted support in behalf of this piece of legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 82 'ayes', 42 'no', 7 voting 'present'. Mr. Dunn... and the motion having failed to receive a Constitutional three-fifths majority is declared lost. Mr. Beatty or Mr. Houlihan. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman for a motion."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move that we suspend the rules for the six day posting to hear House Bill 2435, which deals in



staggered registration. We need the time to hear this Bill and I'd appreciate support. We have it cleared by both sides of the aisle. This is for the 1978 license plates and it's a Secretary of State's Bill and staggered registration for Monday at 12:30 P.M."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the posting requirements for a meeting of a Committee on Motor Vehicles for Monday at 12:30 to hear the Bill which has been previously enumerated. Is there leave? Leave having been granted the posting requirements have been suspended for purposes of a meeting of the Motor Vehicle Committee on Monday at 12:30, prior to Session. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes arise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For a similar request, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2507, I believe was assigned to our Committee today and I would like to waive the proper rule so that Bill could be heard at Tuesday morning at 10:00 o'clock. An hour before Session time Tuesday...."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Barnes, I don't believe that the Sponsor of that Bill has contacted the Majority Leader's Office yet. Could we hold that motion until we find out what the Bill is?"

Barnes: "All right."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Birchler... out of the record? And, Mr. Holewinski. Mr. McCourt, House Bill 945."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 945 was introduced to correct an inequity as to the application by the Illinois State Scholarship Commission in the distribution of scholarship grants for certain students attending school in May, June, July and or August. Traditionally this period of the year for most students is considered summer school, where a student can accelerate a study program or catch up by taking certain extra courses."



However, there are certain courses of study that have a required attendance for a full twelve month period and have this attendance requirement prior to July 1, 1975 for successful completion. In particular, certain schools of nursing are a twelve month class schedule. The Illinois State Scholarship Commission by not allowing tuition payments for 'summer school', in enrollment has in fact reduced entitlement of nursing students enrolled in a twelve month institution of high learning to two-thirds or three-quarters of the student entitlement. This Bill is mainly to correct an inequity. The Governor's total veto I believe was wrong, he was not correct in his assumption that this is not summer school that we are talking about. This is a twelve month sequential period of study. Therefore, I move that we pass House Bill 945, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. It passed the House originally by a vote of 138 to 10."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to indicate that I have a conflict here as much as my wife is a nurse and she is an assistant professor at the Medical Campus at Circle. But nevertheless, I believe that this conflict will not affect by vote and I am supporting the Gentleman's motion to override."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion the question is, shall House Bill 945 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Byers, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 28 'no', 6 voting 'present'. The motion having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 945 is declared



passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Mrs. Hoxsey. Mr. Tuerk, House Bill 900."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, first of all I would like leave of the House to hear 990 and 991, on the same Roll Call please."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 990. The question is, shall House Bill 990 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?"

Tuerk: "No, that wasn't my.... first of all I want leave of the House to hear 990 and 991 on the same Roll Call at the same time."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman request leave to hear House Bill 990 and 991 together. Is there leave? Leave being granted the Bills shall be heard together."

Tuerk: "Well, House Bill 990, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, has been around this House and this General Assembly for several years and unfortunately because of some misunderstandings and so forth, the Bill whether it be this number or some other number has been vetoed. Now, House Bill 990 requires the state to pay for any benefits state property receives as a result of local improvements by special assessments. Put another way, it puts the state in the same posture as any property owner along any street, any particular parcel where local improvements are made. There are enough safeguards in this Bill requiring the Attorney General and the Department of Local Governmental Affairs to be party to special assessment proceedings and to receive all notices and so forth. And it also requires the Attorney General to certify to the Department of Local Governmental Affairs the Act has been complied with and actually the further safeguard is that the state can be assessed up to twenty-five thousand dollars. Beyond that amount the state would have to pay its share through the present proceeding and that is, by the special appropriation route. I feel that this is equity, this requires the state to pay its fair share of any particular money trans-



actions relating to a special assessment on local improvement projects. And that is why I have made the motion to override the veto. I might add, that back in May of this year this Bill passed the House 141 to 2 and in June it passed the Senate 54 to 1. I would ask this Body to take the same enlightened viewpoint today that it did back in May of this year."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add that this legislation is long overdue. There is really no reason for this veto. The fact that it may cost the state some money merely means that it is requiring the state after long many years to pay for what it gets. Municipalities and all other property owners are required to pay for public improvements that benefit their property. I remember when this Bill was sponsored by Representative Day. It was a good Bill then and it is a good Bill under its present Sponsorship and I see no reason why it shouldn't get as many votes as it did in its original passage. It is absolutely equitable and as I say, it is long over due and there is no reason not to vote 'yes' on this motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Well, I would like to second the motion on this Bill and if Representative Tuerk and Representative Mugalian can agree on a Bill like this, I think it should pass unopposed."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bills 990 and 991 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes', 21 'no', 6 voting 'present' and the motion having received a Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bills 990 and 991, are declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the



Governor. On the Order of House Bills, Second Reading the Chair recognizes Mr. Edgar on House Bill 2478."

Edgar: "Yes, I believe there is an Amendment that was filed to this Bill that has now been withdrawn. The Sponsor wasn't here earlier."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2478, the Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Robinson. Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is one Committee Amendment and I don't think there is any objection to that Committee Amendment."

Jaffe: "No, this is the Second Reading, Adeline, and we're talking about a Committee Amendment and I think the board is wrong. No, it's right now. There is a Committee Amendment that was adopted. It just clarifies the language as to what the thirty thousand dollars was going to be used for. It spells specifically so that we would know where that money was going and I don't think there is any objection to the Committee Amendment. I'm sorry, we're going to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe moves to table Committee Amendment #2. Strike that, Mr. Jaffe moves to table Floor Amendment #2. Is there leave? Leave being granted the Amendment shall be tabled. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. On the Order of Total Veto Motions.... Mr. Collins. Mr. Richmond on House Bill 1183."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1183 introduction stems from a recommendation of a Commission on Economic Development. It would eliminate the requirement that is presently imposed upon those who purchase aviation fuel. And I refer to that very unnecessary imposition that requires a purchaser to pay state motor fuel tax on aviation fuel and then permit application for refunded of the same. The Governor in his veto says that, while it is true that non-



highway uses of motor fuel are not taxable in Illinois, a refund procedure was created by the General Assembly because as a practical matter it is nearly impossible for the Department of Revenue to efficiently determine use at any point in a distribution process other than at the user level. But really because of the refund procedure we have many transcendent flights, they are over flying the State of Illinois to avoid the purchase of fuel and thereby avoid the administrative hassle or the refund procedure. Furthermore, it is extremely simple to determine the use at any point in a distribution simply by virtue of the fact that aviation gas is colored for safety consideration to distinguish it from all other kinds of fuel. The Governor says that the approval of the proposed change for air craft could lead to a proliferation of similar legislation affecting refunds for all non-highway users of motor fuel. But we say that aviation gas is different, it's colored, other gas that is used for non-highway purposes is non-distinguishable in color from regular motor fuel. So an argument could be made in those instances, that it would be nearly impossible for the Department of Revenue to efficiently determine use at any point in the distribution process other than its use of it. But as he said, this isn't the case with the aviation gas because of its color. In addition the Governor points out that.... the danger of diversion of gasoline to... at the point where it is being used. But I say that given the cost of aviation gas there is absolutely no incentive for diversion. It costs more even without the tax than it does to buy your gasoline for your automobile at your service stations. For these and many other reasons, I feel that the Governor was ill-advised in making this veto. And I might point out also that the Illinois Commission for Economic Development, the Illinois Aeronautics Department, Illinois Department of Transportation,



The Illinois Public Airport Association and the Illinois Aviation Trades Association, all recommended that the Governor sign the Bill. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that House Bill 1183 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion for a number of reasons. One of which is the real potential, that the state could lose up to two million dollars in revenue which is generated currently out of the present system of purchasing aviation fuel. In these days of trying to find money for the variety of purpose that all of us need here, I think it is indeed an irresponsible to pass legislation which could cost the state that kind of money. In addition to that, the possibility as the Sponsor of this motion indicated, a diversion is one which we ought to consider and one which... if this Bill becomes law, I contend, would be a temptation to a number of people. The Governor was correct in his veto of House Bill 1183. I think the financial impact upon the state is more than we can afford right now. I believe that the Members of the House ought to vote against the Gentleman's motion and to help sustain the Governor's veto of House Bill 1183."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm reluctant to rise in opposition to our Governor's veto but I believe that Mr. Telcser has just spoken as a person protecting the administration but not as a pilot knowing very little about aviation. I believe everything that Mr. Richmond said just a few moments ago is absolutely correct. No one in his right mind is going to go up to an airport and buy either green or red gasoline and that's how it is colored and put it in their automobile at a dollar five a gallon or ninety-five cents a gallon. The fact of



the matter is, this ridiculous law in the book which we very wisely overruled in Regular Session does nothing but avoid the bureaucracy requirements that every time you buy aviation fuel, if you're going to get your motor fuel tax back you have to go through a whole pile of forms and deal with the Illinois Department of Revenue to get your money back. Now, this is an imposition on the general aviation business and for those of you who are truly interested in helping business in the State of Illinois, it is an unnecessary requirement and I think that so far as those people that say we're going to lose revenue, we're really going to lose that revenue which we have no business keeping. And in fact, we're stealing from the people that are buying aviation fuel because we've established a bureaucratic method of keeping their money. So, I think we should overrule the Governor on this particular matter. It's a narrow matter, it doesn't affect that many people and I don't really think it is going to have any effect upon the other uses of fuel in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Houlihan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Houlihan: "Representative Richmond, what effect would this have as far as the exempting from the motor fuel tax law, motor fuel use for general aviation purposes as far as municipalities are concerned; particularly the City of Chicago for its sales of this type of fuel at O'Hara Airport?"

Richmond: "Well... of course if they are paying tax on it, it would be refundable but as... this law would eliminate the need for that, if I follow your question."

Houlihan: "My concern is that if we adopt what you're seeking here to exempt general aviation from the motor fuel tax, municipalities get a share of that motor fuel tax back."



And this is in effect going to result in the reduction of revenue to the City of Chicago for the sales of this type of fuel at O'Hara Airport."

Richmond: "No, because the tax is not a tax at the present time, that's a misnomer. The motor fuel tax for non-highway purposes is not payable by anyone except those who get it back. And what we're trying to do here is eliminate the necessity of paying the tax which is not really applicable to the aviation industry and then have it refunded. So, there would be no loss to the municipality in sharing in the municipal tax in that..."

Houlihan: "So then our concern is not founded as far as there would be no effect as far as the municipalities are concerned. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I rise to support the Gentleman's motion and to correct to some extent some of the figures that the Governor used in his veto motion. At least insofar as the figures Mr. Telcser quoted. The total amount of dollars in income from the gasoline according to the Federal Energy Administration at a seven and a-half cent rate per gallon, is a million, one hundred and seventy-five thousand. The Governor acknowledges that amount. Five hundred and twenty-five thousand is refunded and six hundred.... which leaves a balance six hundred and fifty thousand of not refunded amount of tax dollars that, in my opinion, simply rather than go through the paper work of asking for the refund they leave the money in the Revenue Department when they send it in and they don't ask for the refund. We're talking about some dollars that should not be in the Road Fund. It seems to me that we're talking about six hundred and fifty thousand dollars that in my opinion probably costs us more than that going through the paper work, collecting it and refunding the five hundred and twenty-five



thousand dollars. I think it is time we got rid of this problem and we can do it right now with this Bill by simply eliminating the collection of the seven and a-half cents per gallon. It is something that we should not be looking for, to add revenue to the State of Illinois because it is really something that we don't deserve. And Mr. Richmond is to be commended in offering this legislation to correct an inequity on those people who do buy airplane fuel at the various airports throughout Illinois. I'm sure that he is absolutely correct that we would find we would have more people landing in Illinois rather than flying over the top going from Indiana to Iowa without stopping. It would help us somewhat with our ability to attract people to come to Illinois. And there are various agencies in Illinois, as Mr. Richmond has already mentioned, the Illinois Commission for Economic Development recommended that we pass this Bill. I urge that we get 107 votes for it. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Darrow."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Mr. Richmond, to close the debate."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very briefly to point out a couple of things that have already been touched upon but to remind you that at this point we are about to vote on this very important issue. That the chance for diversion is very slim because it is a different color, it costs more than gas you would normally use so there is no incentive. It costs much less in state revenue as pointed out by Representative Bradley than what the Governor claims. Apparently the Department of Revenue furnished him the figures which are



totally inaccurate and these figures would indicate that we're collecting some six hundred and fifty thousand dollars from people that don't owe it to us. And we're keeping it, I think this is a very poor way for the State of Illinois to raise their monies. And I think the cost of the administration of this and the cost that is passed on down to the taxpayers far exceeds six hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Therefore, I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall House Bill 1183 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "In explanation of my vote I would like to point out what the Governor's veto seem to me to be saying, that we ought to administer the caution of this tax, that doesn't belong to the State in the first place and then we ought to administer the refunding of the tax that doesn't belong to the State of Illinois. That doesn't seem to be a very efficient process."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 39 'no', 6 voting 'present' and the motion having received a Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 1183 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Mrs. Geo-Karis House Bill 1185."

Geo-Karis: "Pass."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ralph Dunn. Mr. Taylor, House Bill 1432."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House override the Governor's Total Veto of House Bill 1432. The purpose of House Bill 1432 is to encourage employment of junior and seniors in high schools, local in the areas and higher unemployment by business and municipal corporation. Can the Governor by his veto of House Bill 1432, ignore the high schools students in the



areas in the state where unemployment levels exceed 9%. The Governor felt that the Federal Vocational Educational Act and the CETA program provide sufficient monies to schools for work study programs. However, I strongly feel that the state should act responsibly to aid our students gain work experience while in high school when students live in areas where their chances of finding jobs after graduation is very dim. This Bill has been through this House on two different occasions and has been to the Governor's desk on both occasions and each time the Governor has vetoed this Bill for different reasons. I do think this it is a good concept. We passed this Bill out of the House before and I solicit your support for House Bill 1432 at this time... support from the motion of House Bill 1432."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion the question is, shall House Bill 1432 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no' 1432. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Mann to explain his vote."

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that we ought to examine the long run consequences of this legislation. In certain parts of the City of Chicago, particularly on the west side, I'm informed, that unemployment is as high as 40%. Now, if this is true the cost to the state to support those persons must be tremendous and with all of our emphasis on encouraging people to exercise their own initiative and get jobs. And that particular kind of approach to lowering the cost of public assistance and unemployment insurance, I would think that you would respond positively to this legislation which seeks to do just what I've said. And it provides for job training and it provides for people to have the opportunity to have an occupation which is marketable on today's market."



And for all of these reasons I think this is good legislation notwithstanding the Governor's veto. And for Members of the other side of the aisle, you may want to consider your approach to reducing the cost of welfare and unemployment by encouraging people to seek employment. But, they must of course be trained in order to have marketable skills. So, I encourage your support for this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of Representative Taylor. It seems to me that sitting in the House over and over again we hear about people complaining about people on the public aid rolls. Well, the only way you are going to get people off the public aid rolls you're going to get them into the work force. And I think this a very positive step towards getting people off the public aid rolls and into the work force. And it establishes, you know, a work study program in the areas where you have incidents of high unemployment, the unemployment had the 9% or more. And what are we talking about in the way of dollars? We're talking about a mere two hundred thousand dollars out of eleven billion dollar budget. And I noticed in the Governor's statement, the Governor comes out and he says, well, he supports the work study concept and yet he goes and vetoes a Bill like this and vetoes the companion appropriation. Well, I think that is talking out of both sides of your mouth, quite truthfully. When the Governor of this state can't put up two hundred thousand dollars for people who are unemployed into a work study program, I think the Governor is acting irresponsibly. And I think it is incumbent upon the Members of this General Assembly to vote out two hundred thousand dollars and to vote out this particular Bill, you know, to help a problem that we have in the state. I think it ill behooves us to turn our backs



on people for a two hundred thousand dollar appropriation when in fact the Governor has gone forth and increased the Illinois Commerce Commission budget by one million dollars...."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli."

Jaffe: "...employing all sorts of people with political favors and yet he turns his back on people who want to get into a work study program and be productive in our society. I think that if we don't override the Governor's Veto in this particular incident, it is a black mark against the people who sit in this particular Body and I would urge that we certainly support Representative Taylor in his attempt to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have worked hard and consistently with this report. I don't feel there is anything wrong with it. I don't understand the Governor's action for wanting to veto it. He knows when big brother starting giving money to the state we are going to have trouble. It is time that the State of Illinois should stand on its own and try to do the thing that is right for the people of our state. I solicit your support for this Bill, it is important."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 62 'no', 5 voting 'present'... Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I would request that this Bill be placed on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Mrs. Geo-Karis. Mr. Tipword, House Bill 1502."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 1502 was a Bill that originally provided some changes in



statutory rules of the Court of Claim. When this Bill went to the Senate, the Bill was amended to incorporate therein provisions that would require the State of Illinois and the Agencies and Departments of the State of Illinois when they bring action against businesses in the state alleging that they have violated laws or rules or regulations in their conduct to be liable for the cost if they bring these actions without reasonable cause of foundation... when so found by the Circuit Court reviewing that matter. It is not an automatic application of cost to the State of Illinois but it would require the State of Illinois then to be, and the various agencies thereof, to have reasonable grounds for proceeding against businesses in the state alleging that they have violated rules or regulations before bringing such in action and not doing it merely as a harassing effort. The Governor vetoed the Bill for that reason and that reason alone. I would urge you to override the veto of the Governor to this provision of House Bill 1502 and say that we can indicate to small businesses throughout the State of Illinois that we do not want them to be harassed by agencies of state government and to require that agencies of the state act against these businesses only when... they have evidence that indicates they have a reasonable cause of action against businesses' violation of rules and regulations in the State of Illinois. This could save a lot of money to small businesses throughout this state. This could be, of course, a penalty upon the state if the state has acted unreasonably but there would be no penalty against the state when the state at least has a good reasonable basis for proceeding against the small businesses in the state. This would keep the small businesses from being the subject of vexatious litigation by agencies in the Department of the State of Illinois who look... who give a curious look at some matter and say they must be in violation



so we're going to act against them and bring them in to have them substantiate their position. I suspect that you have heard from the State Chamber of Commerce, that you've heard from small businesses throughout the State of Illinois. If you have, I urge you to vote in behalf of these businesses to give them some kind of equity when the State of Illinois and its agencies brings these unreasonable causes of action against them. These costs will only apply when the court has determined that the state has acted unreasonably in bringing its claim against businesses in the State of Illinois. And that is why I urge the override of the Governor's Veto of House Bill 1502."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the Gentleman's motion to override. I was quite confused when I read the Governor's Veto Message as to the logic that the court would not actually be the fact finding board that hears the results. Not being a lawyer, I inquired into court proceedings and my understanding is that, should an administrative review practice or a decision go in favor of the state that if the defendant then went along with it, he would pay his fine or whatever other action the administrative review indicated. If he decided not to pay the fine and go to court, the state would sue them for the fine. It would then go into court, the court would hear the pleadings and should they rule in favor of the defendant then the court could award reasonable attorney fees which were the provision in House Bill 1502. That completely negates the Governor's veto message which said that, the court would not be a party to the pleadings that that court had awarded the reasonable fees if the defendant won. I think the veto... I talked to the Governor's office, I'm just as confused after talking to them, and I think their veto message is



absolutely contrary and to those lawyers who I have talked to regarding court proceedings. They agree and I think the motion to override that.... Representative Tipsword has brought forward has merit and we should override on House Bill 1502."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am compelled to agree with the two prior speakers because I had one agency tell me when they lose a case they will spend everything possible to win and take it all the way up. And this way, whether they are right or wrong, the ordinary taxpayer is just completely helpless because the ordinary taxpayers cannot afford the great fees involved in pursuing a case all the way up. So, for that reason, I feel that the agencies will be more careful if we do support a Bill like this because if they are more careful in the way that they operate instead of using the taxpayers' money to enhance and actualize their egos instead of using common sense, balance and reason. I think the override of this veto should be supported, I so state."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 1502 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those 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 125 'ayes', 20 'no', 8 voting 'present' and the motion having received a Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 1502 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Mr. Walsh. Mr. Friedrich... would someone ask Mr. Friedrich to put the phone down for a minute. Mr. Friedrich on House Bill 1753."

Friedrich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1753 is a Bill which I felt was very much needed and it came about by some things



that happened in my district and I found out it happened in others. This was a situation where in a shelter care home the patient was happy, well cared for. The family of the patient assured me the patient was getting good care. The physician in charge of the case said that this was the kind of care the patient needed. But a nurse from the Department of Health came in and said, 'get this patient out of here, it is not the kind of care they are entitled to, and so on. Well, all this Bill does is.... it says that no higher grade of care can be required, medical attention, than prescribed by the family... physician in charge. It is very simple in its intent. The veto message suggested that there were other programs that this would eliminate but the Bill has been amended so it merely refers to medical care and for the life of me I couldn't understand why the Governor vetoed it. Someone from the Governor's office called me while they were considering the veto and I told him the problem and he said, well he was getting some pressure from the Department of Health. And this is another example where a little agency becomes a bureaucracy and they want to come in and rule the lives of people. And this particular person was not a public aid case, was not being paid for by the state and so on. So, the whole text of this Bill is that the physician in charge of the patient decides the grade of care the patient gets. I think that it deserves your vote on override and I certainly would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to speak in favor of this Bill. I'm personally acquainted with this situation and I have visited the shelter care home and the patients and people in this home. But the Public Health Department tries to move some of these people at times when really the doctor says it is not necessary



and they have a competent medical doctor, I think, and can determine this level of care. I don't believe it is necessary for the Department of Public Health to enter into these, especially where they are private care patients. And I have, as you know, been active in nursing homes in the State of Illinois and this is one place where the Department of Public Health has assumed more power than they should have. And I would recommend that we go along with Representative Friedrich and support his override motion and vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 1753 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "I would like to say to you that when this Bill went to the House and Senate it was almost unanimous, it had a proper hearing in Committee. I would point out to you that the Department of Health said, well we're letting the physician do it, be responsible. Now if they are, it creates no problems for them. If they are not then I think we ought to put the family physician back to determine the grade of care the patient has. I would certainly appreciate sufficient votes to override the veto."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 25 'no', 6 voting 'present' and the motion having received a Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 1753 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. For purposes of an announcement the Chair recognizes Representative Capparelli for an announcement."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to suspend the six and a-half



day Posting Rule to have Executive Committee meet Monday at 12:30 to hear House Bill 2428 and 2429."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli moves that the Posting Rule requirements be suspended to accommodate a meeting of the Executive Committee at 12:30, Monday. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the posting requirements are suspended to provide for a meeting of the Executive Committee on Monday at 12:30. For purposes of an announcement the Chair recognizes, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, previously I had asked for permission to have a Committee meeting of the Motor Vehicles at 12:30 on Monday. We are changing that to 9:00 A.M. Tuesday morning."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli, will you come to the well and give the Bill numbers to the Clerk. And, Mr. Von-Boeckman wishes to announce that the meeting of the Motor Vehicles Committee previously scheduled for Monday has been postponed until Tuesday at 9:00 A.M. Mrs. Breslin, House Bill 1975... out of the record. Mr. Houlihan... out of the record. Mr. Tipword, House Bill 2164."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that makes some minor corrections in regard to the Coal Mine Safety Act and then in the Senate it was amended on to the Act a provision that those persons who were to be appointed to the Committee that review safety operations in the mines throughout the State of Illinois. The application of the Coal Mine Safety Act which includes miners as well as members of the operating companies and an equal number upon this Commission. It provides that of those employee members on that board belonging to a miners organization, that any employee appointed should represent at least.... come from an organization representing at least 15% of the coal miners in the state. The reason for this being that there is one member customarily appointed



and who was now appointed that represents 3.3% of the miners in the State of Illinois who have a... therefore, a voice upon that board approximately five to six times.. oh, no, more like ten times the amount of miners that he represents in the State of Illinois. This Bill would only require that they come from an organization at least representing 15% of miners in the state, so if all three of them came from organization of only 15%, they would still only represent 45% of the miners in the State of Illinois. But certainly a 3% representation is hardly representative of the employee miners throughout the state. Consequently that Amendment came back to this House and the Members of the House concurred with that Amendment in the Senate overwhelmingly. I would ask you to overwhelmingly concur again because this board must represent the actual working miners in the State of Illinois as the employee members of that representative Commission. The operators are adequately represented by true operators in the State of Illinois. So, I call upon you to reverse the Governor's veto and to override him on this House Bill 2164 so that this Commission can be truly representative of real miner employees in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I reluctantly arise to oppose the Gentleman on his motion to override. The 15% is arbitrary and what this would do is eliminate any possibility that a member of the Progressive Mine Workers of America could be... serve on this board. I don't believe that it is necessary for the United Mine Workers and Progressive Mine Workers to get into a fight over this matter through legislation on the floor of this House. So, I would urge that the General Assembly stay out of the matter and leave the Governor veto stand."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Telcser."



Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think the prior speaker stated my sentiments. I really don't see why an arbitrary figure of 15% makes someone more or less representative. There are many Members of this chamber today who represent minority interest in their district. What's wrong with having a minority point of view on any board or anybody. Again, I agree with the prior speaker, I think the Governor's veto was very well in order and frankly I can't imagine the Members of this House would want to deny the rights of a member of that board simply because he or she may come from a membership of less than some arbitrary figure. I don't think that it is proper, it's wrong and I hope that the Members of the House vote to sustain the Governor."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. The argument is made by the Governor in his veto analysis that we are somehow putting a limitation on minority rights and the implication is given that this is somehow intolerable and unknown to us. But, indeed, we already have this sort of limitation in the statute, indeed people in this General Assembly have supported a similar limitation on the State Teachers Certification Board which not only said percentage, as to being able to a member of a board. It says that you've got to have at least twenty thousand members to have a member. And indeed in my area, I know we have many, many miners and I know of none who are represented by the particular organization alluded to on this board. In fact Representative Tipword has pointed out that a particular organization, the Progressive Mine Workers represent only 3% of the miners in the state, yet they could have a member on this board. We're not talking about some sort of substantial minority rights. We're talking about giving them a member when they represent far, far less than



one-tenth and do, as I said, have this sort of provision already in the statutes. And I must rise along with Representative Tipsword and urge that we override the Governor on this particular issue, for those reasons."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Tipsword arise?"

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of requesting of the Chair, due to the fact that a number of Members are off the Floor that this matter might now be taken out of the record."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests that this matter be taken out of the record. It shall be taken out of the record. Mr. Lauer, House Bill 2173.... out of the record. Mr. Sandquist, House Bill 2243... out of the record. Mr. Lechowicz, House Bill 2338... out of the record. How about 2348? 2350... Mr. Taylor.... Would the Parliamentarian please come to the podium. Mr. Epstein. Mr. Bradley moves that we recess the Regular Session. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the Regular Session is recessed. The First Special Session is called to order from recess. And there in on the Order of House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 9. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 9, Second Reading of the Bill, one Committee Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "There is one Committee Amendment on House Bill 9. Are there any motions relative to that Amendment?"

Clerk Hall: "No motion filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any more Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli, is the Sponsor of the Bill as shown on your Calendar, page 2. No further Amendments to this, it will be placed on the Order of Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 20."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 20, Second Reading of the Bill: No



Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Bradley moves that the First Special Session stand in recess. All those in favor signify by say 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The First Special Session shall stand in recess. The Second Special Session is called to order from recess. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hall: "A message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to-wit; Senate Joint Resolution #1. Adopted by the Senate November 4, 1977, Second Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Madigan: "In the Second Special Session on the Order of House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 2, Mr McGrew."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2, Second Reading of this Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Amendments from the Floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Brady. Amends House Bill 2, Second Special Session on page 4, line 24, by inserting the following."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is Representative Brady's Amendment, you probably should recognize him."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. Of those of you who didn't have the opportunity to be at the Higher Education Committee the other night, we had a division on how we could approach a formula Bill that would



be equable for everyone concerned. There was a great fear with the language in the Bill that the minimum basic rate of 1761, might cause a proration because of expected increase in enrollment and, therefore, diminish some funds to downstate community colleges. Because of that... that was sought to be eliminated from the Bill and the Bill that came out of Committee, strikes what existing language is in the Act. What I have done with this Amendment is leave the fact in that the eight distribution rates will take place and they will take place in the full amount of funding according to the enrollment and funds available to the Community College districts throughout the state so there is no opportunity for the Community College districts outside of Chicago to lose any money under my Amendment. What the Amendment says is, at the end if there is appropriated amount of money left over that Chicago be the only district under the rate of 1761, can move up to the minimum average and share in that funding which has already been appropriated and signed into law. It is my firm belief that there is going to be some extra funding available. Chicago is in crisis situation in trying to fulfill its budget and I urge your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I have made a motion on House Rule 52, for a fiscal note and I didn't see that one was applied to this particular Bill. And I would ask him if we were going to keep it on Second Reading for the purpose of a fiscal note, so that I can understand the fiscal implications to this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "It is my understanding in the rules that a request for a fiscal note is filed, the Bill will remain on Second Reading until the note is filed."

Ewell: "Well, that's right. Is there a note filed, I filed one... I would like to ask."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, has a.... the Clerk indicates that there has been a request for a fiscal note filed. Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe under the House rules anytime there is a companion appropriation which in this case has already been signed into law by the Governor that that is out of order."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Ewell seek recognition?"

Ewell: "Parliamentary inquiry. I understand that somebody said something about a companion Bill and I wonder if he could give me the number of the companion Bill? I'm not aware of any companion Bill, what's the lever? Now, I understand that a certain measure has been signed into the law and I surely don't see how that can be considered a companion Bill. We're talking about a law vs. a Bill, this is an entirely new Bill number, Bill #2 and I would ask Mr. McGrew to give me the companion Bill number and tell me where it is."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "House Bill 2417."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker the Governor has already signed after having passed the legislature, House Bill 2417 the appropriation to Junior Colleges. We're now in a process of discussing how it will be divided. That is the matter pure and simple."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, might I point out that that was in the past Session. Under Mr. McGrew's theory, we could go back to ad infinitum and talk about everything that is being a companion Bill. There was a companion Bill to that in the last Session, that Bill did not pass and did not survive. This is an entirely new Bill, a new filing date



It was filed as of this Session and I cannot see the Chair could possibly find that a Bill in the last Session can be a companion Bill to an entirely new Session. We might under that theory relate all Bills in the past to any Bill in the future covering more than one Session and I think we would be in complete chaos. What Mr. McGrew is talking about is a law that is in existence. There has been a court case on it and the court has decided in the Circuit Court that there is no problem spending this money. It can be paid out pursuant to the old formula. and there is no mandatory need for this Bill at all."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell, would you restate your comment regarding a court decision?"

Ewell: "There has been a Circuit Court decision which has allowed the board to pay out the money under the old formula. This case may be appealed, I'm not privy to all the recordings of it but I'm suggesting to the Body here that I don't see how we can possibly relate this Bill between Sessions and call them Companion Bills. The Companion Bill, if it could have been called a Companion Bill, clearly did not pass in the last Session."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGrew, the Bill number that you cited, could you describe that Bill and its status?"

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2417 was the regular and contingent expenses for the Junior College district appropriation in the amount of one hundred point one, two, seven million, I believe. It has already been passed by both Houses of Legislation and it has been signed by the Governor."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "May I point out to Mr. McGrew that there was nothing in that legislation which dictated that there be House Bill 2, House Bill 10 in the Special Session. House Bill 9 or House Bill 7, these are all efforts in retrospect to try to determine a legislative intent as what we possibly



might want to do with the particular Bill or particular money or particular formula. I'm suggesting that the recourse at this particular time is to the court and allow the court to decide this particular issue but Mr. McGrew attempts to inject the feeling of the Legislature. I'm saying again that it is impossible in my mind for Mr. McGrew to relate as Companion Bill... as a Companion Bill, mind you, a Bill that he seeks to put in. I point out to this Body that for... with the exception of the past four years we never have had a differentiated formula for paying out to the Junior Colleges. In other words we could pay out at the flat rate which is now in existence of 1761."

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian informs me that it has been the tradition of this Chair to rule where there is a Bill providing for formula distribution, such as provided in this House Bill 2, then a Companion Appropriation Bill serves in the capacity of a fiscal note. Therefore, the Chair will rule that Mr. Ewell's request for a fiscal note is out of order and McGrew is recognized on the Bill. The Chair has ruled and it is not prepared to further enunciate its ruling. Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On Amendment #1, if I might, what we have at stake here is basically... are we going to stay on a flat grant basis or are we going to categorical grants? What the Sponsor of the Bill reports to do is to say, if there is additional monies left it will have a guaranteed flat rate. Well, the problem is, that that guaranteed flat rate is also 1761 an hour which extremely high because it is also picking up what we have in the past. We have to maintain the eight categorical grants because of the differing expenses in providing for the funding of Junior College systems of various class schedules that we have. We have been fighting for quite some time



in this House saying that it costs much more to put on a nursing program for example than it does for general studies. This is an attempt, a straight forward attempt, to establish eight categorical grants to provide for the funding of Junior College systems. I apologize to the Members of the House for not getting the information out a little bit better than we have. I prepared an analysis of the Bill and traced the history and got it ready for distribution for all one hundred and seventy-seven Members only to have the Page tell me that they could not distribute them on the floor of the House. So, if you would check your mail boxes it is there. I apologize for that, I didn't realize the delay that we would have because of that. But... again what we're talking about is, are we going to have eight categorical grants or are we going to have a flat rate? I therefore, oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The posture of the House is, Mr. Brady's motion on behalf of his Amendment to the Bill and on that motion the Chair recognizes Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sense that maybe we're entering into some dialogue here but as Representative McGrew explained that my Amendment does something that his Bill doesn't, I want to correct that. And if anybody has a copy of the Bill in front them, it's clear fact that this is not just an eight lane distribution grant, right under the eight lanes it has a special categorical \$1.73 per credit hour built in this year. Under that it has a distribution of what they call basic grant. On page 2, it's got a distribution of what they call special grants for equalization. Then it goes down, special grants for disadvantage. He's trying to make a philosophical difference here to say that a base minimum for one school district couldn't be.... would be could contrary to the eight reimbursements. I add that there are certainly more than eight reimbursements, it is interspersed all



throughout the Bill to try and create equity for all the Community Colleges in the state and that's all I'm seeking in this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I, too, would rise to oppose Representative Brady's Amendment. Much of what is in this Amendment was discussed in three hours of debate in the Higher Education Committee of the House. Secondly, the clear intention of the Amendment is to put a four, a minimum credit hour of four into the community College funding program along with the lanes that Representative Brady mentioned. Now, those who have argued for this concept have said that we should chase one student with one dollar in the debate in Higher Education Committee. But, those same people have argued over and over and over on this floor that we ought to put an additional factor in for disadvantaged students around the state. Not one dollar per student but more than one dollar per student on one case and a basic differential for one student in another. Those aren't consistent and those who might argue that there is a floor in the school aid formula ought to look at the fact that this floor is not a basic floor, it's a floor somewhere up in the middle of the credit hour value. As well, it ought to be noted that Representative Brady implied.... implied that this particular Amendment would be using up very likely, left over dollars in fiscal '78's appropriation. But, in fact in any year... in any year this Amendment would apply. And left over dollars would have to be distributed on the basis of his argument and not on the basis of being consistent between the issues of putting one dollar behind the student or adding on to the value of a given student. The basic issue in the courts were whether or not money could be distributed. That was because the Community College Act has always said, that we have to have a rate



to follow the appropriation each year. Now, Representative McGrew's Bill says nothing about that, it takes out that specification that there has to be a rate each year. This Amendment would affect every year where these circumstances arise. This Amendment flies in the face of the other arguments made on other issues on Elementary and Secondary funding and this Amendment ought to be defeated if we're going to be consistent about funding the schools. And to be frank and honest to downstaters, after arguing the equity of this... my view point, I know that others have different ones in Chicago. Every downstate school... every downstate school does better under the lanes and the categorical program suggested in Representative McGrew's Bill than they do under this Amendment or any other that proposes to do this sort of thing. This is a step towards keeping a floor that ought not to be there. This is a step towards moving away from cost related funding. And this is an Amendment that ought to be defeated... an amendment much like what was defeated in the Higher Education Committee and for those reasons, I have to urge that we vote against Representative Brady's Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise in opposition to this Amendment. This is one of those inequity Amendments that might seem to be, rather casual on the surface, what do we do with extra money. It all goes back to the animal farm concept, all pigs are equal but some pigs are more equal than others. And it comes down to a case, Mr. Speaker, that we are trying to... rather than have any left over money allocated evenly throughout the state, rather it would have to go to only one specific Junior College in the state. That of a City College of Chicago. Now, it comes down to a case, Mr. Speaker, of the idea of chasing one student with one dollar is a fine concept if the Gentleman from Chicago were consistent. But un-



fortunately they're not consistent, when you talk about Elementary and Secondary Education, Mr. Speaker, they want all sorts of good goodies. Now, on the college level they also want all sorts of good goodies and the two things are absolutely in opposition to each other. It would seem that the people in Chicago that have to do with education cannot get their act together. This is simply an Amendment that would patently be unfair to every Junior College outside of the City of Chicago. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stuffle is exactly right when he said we discussed this concept, we discussed this whole set of issues for over three hours in Higher Education Committee, Wednesday evening, and it comes down to a case of... I don't think it is necessary to take up the time of the floor. Let's defeat this Amendment rather resoundingly and then get on the merits of House Bill 2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kane."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Kane: "House Bill 2, as it now stands without your Amendment... does that include a formula that applies equally to every Junior College district in the state?"

Brady: "No."

Kane: "Isn't it true that all of the provisions of that formula applied to every Junior College district in the state?"

Brady: "Oh, if you're saying, does the Bill as it is stated in front of us address every college system if in fact they come underneath that with their requirement or their student. The answer to that is, yes."

Kane: "The formula in House Bill 2, applies the same to every district, right?"

Brady: "Well, it applies differently to every district."

Kane: "Well, every kind of student in every course in each district is treated the same. Is that not correct?"

Brady: "No."



Kane: "Could you tell me where it applies to one district differently than to another district."

Brady: "Well, I think if on page 2, you talked about special grants for equalization. It does not apply the same to every district and that is certainly part of this formula Bill."

Kane: "No, but every district that qualifies for equalization grants and it applies equally across the board, right?"

Brady: "Well, what you're saying is...."

Kane: "Depending on property tax...."

Brady: "You're asking me the question.... I'll go back to the answer I started with. In every instance in this formula Bill where a Section applies to a Community College district, it qualifies for it; the answer is, yes. It applies equally to all those that qualify."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the answer of the Sponsor to this Amendment is very informative. We had here a Bill that includes a formula that applies to every Junior College district in the state. It applies the same to every Junior College district in the state and every Junior College district in the state qualifies in the same way and there is no special dispensation for any Junior College district. Now, what the Sponsor of this Amendment wants to do is to say that, if per chance there is money left over after the formula has been distributed around the state, if there is any money left over that that money does not.... is not distributed equally to every Junior College district in the state according to some formula that applies to every Junior College district in the state. But all of that money, every single dollar that is left over after the formula is applied will go to only one Junior College district in the state. I think that is unfair. There is no equity there, if we want to... if we have money left over after the appropriation completed, if we have



money then that money should be distributed according to some formula that is equitable to every school district in the state and it should not be arbitrarily assigned to one Junior College district. And this would apply not only to fiscal 1978, but to every fiscal year subsequent to this. And I would urge the defeat of this Amendment and so that we can work out some system that if there is money left over, that it is distributed equitably around the state and does not go to only one Junior College district."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get your attention ever since you ruled Mr. Ewell out of order because I was going to appeal that ruling."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Gaines, I don't believe that I ruled Mr. Ewell out of order."

Gaines: "You ruled his motion out of order. He asked for a fiscal note and you said that that was out of order... and I was going to appeal that ruling."

Speaker Madigan: "And do you proceed with that appeal, is that your motion?"

Gaines: "A lot of time has passed since then but I'll address myself to this Amendment at this time."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Gaines: "I wish to answer a question that Mr. Kane answered... asked and several others about what their difference, yes, there is a difference. The courses taught in the Chicago Junior College System... academically different. and because of the formula used the seventeen dollars an hour is something that is geared to that type of program. And downstate have a different academic type of program and they prefer the track system. I'm not a academician but there is a difference and since half of the students in the whole system are being taught in the Chicago system, half the students are being deprived of equal rights



and equal benefits under the appropriation, and that is a difference. You have college professor to explain to you the technicality of it but there is a difference and I feel that Mr. Brady's Amendment is only trying to equalize the benefits so that everyone gets an equal share of the pie under the system that they use. And that's why this Amendment is necessary."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What some of us desired with regard to this whole area of financing Community Colleges was to get out a number of Bills onto the floor of the House so that the floor could pick and chose. Unfortunately we only got out House Bill 2 and then the Committee was adjourned by my good friend and colleague from Springfield. And, therefore, we don't have the opportunity to chose from a number of Bills or even hopefully to send a number over to the Senate. We're stuck with one Bill and for that reason.... alone I would think that we would want to support Representative Brady's Amendment. I mean, I just want to mention that because we do have three remaining Bills left in the Higher Education Committee but, given the time factor and the urgency of the need, I would urge that you do help put this Amendment on the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "I'm sorry, sir, I didn't mean to...."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield, Mr. Brady."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Representative Brady, I've noticed that everyone who is speaking in favor of this Amendment is from Chicago and everybody who is speaking in opposition is other than Chicago. Are we in one of those situations by any chance?"

Brady: "It appears that way, Representative."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, let me say that what we're talking about now is just fundamental fairness. I have sat here on this floor and heard people cry about a bridge, a dam, a road and we're going to hear about some fairgrounds that burned down too. In fact we're going to hear about new floods every spring, we don't say that these are Chicago, Cook County, downstate, we talk about it in terms of children and what we attempted to do and we were unsuccessful because there are only three members from Chicago on Higher Education. So, for some strange reason no Bill that would bring about equity from Chicago was able to make it to the floor. The one Bill that did come out was the one favored by many of the people who for some strange reason are from the areas that are grabbing the biggest share of the pie. I want to point out to you the simple equity of what we're talking about. Under House Bill 2 there is ninety-nine million dollars to be distributed. No one will argue that Chicago has a little over one-third of the pupils in the junior college system but they are receiving approximately 28% of the money. The figures are here, the facts are here for you to see. What we have in essence is a mal-distribution of the funds. The Bill that would have been sponsored by the rest of us or any of us from Chicago would have been one student, one dollar. That is as fair as one man, one vote, there are those who interject the idea that there is something magical about a formula. I must be forced to tell you what they mean by the formula. The formulas that they seek to impose upon this appropriation would allow every district in the state, except Chicago, to get over seventeen dollars and sixty-one cents and it would allow Chicago to receive under seventeen dollars and sixty-one cent per credit hour. Now, we have problems in the City of Chicago and we ask for a little bit of



equity, simple... plain equity. Justice if you will, we're asking for one man, one dollar. We couldn't get it so therefore, we said that since you're going to put this formula which allows the payment of up to forty-three dollar and sixty-three cents, for courses that you favor while holding the credits to Chicago down to eight dollars and eight cents on general studies, seven dollars and fifteen cents on remedial and developmental and God knows we need remedial and development in the City of Chicago. You're saying allow us... the rest of the state junior college system to walk away with all the money. That is after our principal hogs, that is the University of Illinois, Northern, Southern, Eastern, Western and a couple in the middle of the state have gobbled up the line share of education. We now come back to the poor unfortunate kids that go to the junior colleges and you say, here again, we want all of the money. I contend that it is unfair, it is unequal and it is unjust, and as many of the Members said but the leader, .. and let me tell you what they mean by leader. It took a Page to tell me, they say when you want to go fishing the first thing that you need is a pole, the next thing that you need is a line... they say now, to the line you attach a leader and right under the leader you put the hook. And I tell you that is exactly where we are today, they are hooking the City of Chicago and the leader for all of the pie. This is the case where not only do the principal pigs eat first... digest all that they want. They then say let's let the little pigs of the junior colleges go at it but they are going to go at it in different troughs. The major trough is a trough filled with all the money, will be piped in the downstate and the colleges, the junior colleges outside the City of Chicago. We in the City of Chicago will receive less money, less dollars and when we finally ask in Representatives Brady's Amendment... if per chance after all



the pigs have eaten all that they can hold, if there is anything left could we of the City of Chicago be allowed a minimum.... a minimum... just up to a minimum to use up any possible surplus and again the hog burps and cry no, we might find a little more room. I suggest that this is unequitable, unfair and anytime that you get into this formula business and I point out to this Body that we operated without a formula except for the past four years. Since the introduction of this formula the City of Chicago and the junior colleges have suffered again and again and again. And I ask you, how long will you inflict this pain upon us? How long will you make us suffer, how long will you place us last in line? I suggest that you remember; you one by one are going to need appropriations for your special interest and I contend that this measure by Representative Dave Brady is the top and the smallest measure that you could possibly give us that would give Chicago any equity in any relief and I plead with you in all fairness and decency to allow us this small measure of relief."

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we're in the situation here where the Members of the Legislature are being asked to reinvent the wheel. The matter of how reimbursement to community colleges should be gained has been one that has been studied very thoroughly in the past. The decision was made that a more equitable system came about through a schedule such as the one included in House Bill 2. I regret that this means that some community college district or in this case, one community college district, will qualify for less money than they would have gotten under the old system. However, that does not negate the value of the new system. We were told in Committee that even though Chicago has been reimbursed at the levels you see in this Bill for the courses



that they hold, that they are not spending that amount of money for those courses. I don't doubt that there is a need to upgrade some the programs, particularly the remedial work programs, in the Chicago Community College System; however, giving additional monies to that Community College is not going to allocate them to the programs where it is most needed. I think this is a matter that has been studied thoroughly by the Community College Board, they have certainly spent far more time than we can as individual Legislators, it has been thoroughly studied by Committee on Higher Education, it has been thoroughly studied through our Appropriation Committee process. These are the recommendations that your Higher Education Committee brings to you without the Amendment that Representative Brady is presenting. I urge you to support the Bill in its original form so that we don't have to continue to invent the wheels here on the House floor. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rigney."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor signify by say 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Mr. Brady, to close the debate."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. A lot has been said here in the last twenty minutes on this piece of legislation and not very much on the Amendment. Representative Satterthwaite, who just proceeded me says it has been throughly debated. An awful lot of time of evaluation has been spent on this by the Community College Board and we know the time and effort they've spent on it. As a matter of fact they've had two meetings within the last month where the Board has voted directly opposite on both meetings. Once they supported it and once they didn't, if we can wait another week maybe they will have



another vote and come up in the middle of the claim. I don't think this is a clear issue at all; I think that Chicago is getting a bad deal in this and I think a lot of people realize it. But, all I'm saying is, it is quite plain and clear that Chicago doesn't have the votes to try and create the equity out of this situation which I think they deserve. So, I'm asking for a compromise. This kind of legislation takes 107 votes and I'm asking for a compromise that won't cost any money to anybody outside of Chicago. We appropriated money last spring, it's signed into law, precise amount is a hundred million one hundred and twenty-seven thousand. The enrollment figures on pay out for the formula as shown would be ninety-nine million, some hundred thousand dollars. I think they are high but even if they are that high there is a million dollars left in that Appropriation Bill. I'm seeking a compromise because right now the formula in the statute is in question in the court of law and the order presently is the pay out has to be on that.... Chicago will gain from this appropriation, five million more dollars than this formula shows. What I'm saying to you is this is a million dollars, it is 20% compromise that I think Chicago would live with and could live with and I'm asking your support of that compromise so that we can truly fund all of the Community Colleges and get on with it. Thank you, very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 to House Bill 2 be adopted? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 48 'ayes', 94 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bill,



Second Reading appears House Bill 3, Mr. Yourell. And for purposes of an announcement, the Chair recognizes Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I seldom arise for the purpose of an introduction. Here with us today is a very distinguished guest, a very distinguished American and a longtime close personal friend of mine. Before acknowledging him and his lovely wife, I simply want to express his thanks and his wife's thanks and my thanks for each and every Member of the House of Representatives, both Democrat and Republican in voting unanimously to place Congressman Ahrens portrait in the gallery outside of the Governor's office...Governor Thompson, Secretary Dixon participated in this today. I simply want to point out in closing that Les is one of four native Illinoisans so honored who have their portrait there... who have not served in state office. Congressman Rainey, a Democrat, Senator Lewis a Democrat, Senator Dirksen a Republican and now Congressman Ahrens. We're delighted to have him, he's going on to a dinner for Congressman Michael. I want to thank you all again and I'm going to ask him to step to this microphone and just say, hello and thanks... for one minute. Before doing that, Mrs. Ahrens would you take a bow? And Les, if you're not nervous at a microphone, I'll turn it over to you."

Congressman Ahren: "Thank you very kindly. Mr. Speaker, this is a mistake letting a politician stand before one of these things because he goes on and on but I'm not going to do that. However, on the great privilege of being like many of you here, like all of you here today... having an opportunity of serving... public servant of the people. And I congratulate you, I know each and every one of you are dedicated to the job you have, serving to the best of your ability and that's all anyone can require or ask of you



to do when you promise you'll do your best. And so, as public servants let me commend you, let me say to you it is an honorable profession. I'm proud of the forty years that I have spent in the Congress of the United States of America. I probably have one regret and Alan Dixon mentioned... slightly mentioned it this afternoon. That during the forty years I was there and being the Republican Whip, thirty-two of the forty years, but four years that we had the horses, we were in power four years out of the forty and I want to tell you something that's tough going. But, we worked very well with Members on both sides of the aisle and it was an experience that one never can forget. And I will conclude with my favorite story which I told out here at the dedication of why I quit. The story of two fellows who each night crawled.. went to the bar crawled up on the stools and got themselves plastered, went on home... no troubles, nothing except enjoying themselves. This particular night they came again, jumped upon the stools and went to work and the little fellow of the two seemed to be a little bit over ambitious that night and he was going faster than his bigger partner. Finally he said, fill them up and they did and he grabbed it and down the hatch... bang... over on the floor he went, he was gone. And the older fellow sat there and he looked at the bartender... a little bit and blinking his eyes and looked down at his friend on the floor like that and he said, well... I'll say this for old Pete, he knows when to quit. That's what I did after forty years I said, that's it. Thank you so much... thank you for what you're doing for the great State of Illinois."

Clerk Hall: "Representative Bradley in the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Ahrens, the Chair would just like to say to Representative Ahrens before he leaves the chamber that I've seen him on the golf course recently and he still swings as sweet a club as he ever did and it is



nice to see him here in Springfield today. I just said, Representative Ahrens, the last time I visited with you was on the golf course and I just acknowledged that you still swings as sweet of a club today than you ever did and it is nice to see you here in Springfield. House Bill 3."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 3, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 5."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 5, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 and 2 were withdrawn in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #3, Barnes. Amends House Bill 5 on page 1, by deleting Section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #3 is a very simple Amendment. All the Amendment does is put into House Bill 5, the exact language that is in the Bonding Bill that sets out in the statute for the bonds for the purpose that is set out for the Capital Development of the Correctional Institutions. The only difference was in House Bill 5, that was differing language. Amendment #3, to House Bill 5 simply translates to House Bill 5, the same language that is now in the Bonding Bill which, I believe, is House Bill 6. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 5."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 5. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. I'm sorry, Mr. Friedrich, the Gentleman from Marion."



Friedrich: "When did we start moving Bills without the Sponsor calling them?"

Speaker Bradley: "This is an Amendment...."

Friedrich: "I know... I know but I'm the Chief Sponsor of this Bill, how can you move it on Second without my being here?"

Speaker Bradley: "We haven't moved it, Sir."

Friedrich: "Well, I know but I thought you..."

Speaker Bradley: "Your Bill was on Second Reading...."

Friedrich: "I know, you just called it. You've called it and I thought the Sponsor had control of his Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Do you wish to not call the Bill on Second Reading, Sir?"

Friedrich: "That's right."

Speaker Bradley: "You are making that objection at this time?"

Friedrich: "Yes, Sir; I am."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, you want to take it out of the record then?"

Friedrich: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll take it out of the record."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, did you adopt an Amendment on my Bill and call it without my calling it? When did we start doing that?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Amendment that I announced evidently... that the Amendment was adopted."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was the prerogative of the Sponsor to handle a Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has graciously consented to reconsider the vote by which we adopted Amendment.... that Amendment and having made that motion... all in favor of reconsideration say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and we are now in a position where the Amendment is not adopted onto your Bill. So now, we'll take the Bill out of the record without the Amendment. We'll go to House Bill..... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell for



what purpose do you arise?"

Ewell: "For purposes of a motion to suspend the appropriate House rule so that the Executive might hear House Joint Resolution 59 on Monday." Leave, could I get leave of the House?"

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave on the suspension? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Could he explain that, I don't know anything about it."

Speaker Bradley: "He's on his way over. Mr. Friedrich, on your House Bill 6, I assume that... you don't want that called either?"

Friedrich: "Take it out of the record, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record. While we're waiting for them to put this on agreement, we'll... Mr. Richmond moves that the.... recess the Second Special Session and all in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed. We will recess until later on this afternoon at.....will be recessed immediately after we recess the First Special Session... at that hour. Now, Mr. Richmond moves that the House.... that the First Special Session reconvene and on the First Special Session..... Mr. Kempiners, on House Bill 20, in the First Special Session. The Gentleman from Will."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to bring House Bill 20 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection we will return House Bill 20 to Second Reading."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Kempiners. Amends House Bill 20 in First Special Session on page 1, line 27 by deleting the period and inserting in lieu of the following."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, of the House. This is a purely clean up Amendment that corrects some spelling errors and punctuation errors and I



would move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 20 in the First Special Session."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? 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 Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Is that the Third Reading now?"

Clerk Hall: "Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Hall: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution the adoption of which I am directed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution 2, adopted by the Senate November 4, 1977, at the First Special Session. Mr. Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 35, Ryan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 36, Ryan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Now, Representative Giorgi moves that the... we recess the First Special Session at the call of the Chair later today. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the First Special Session is recessed. We're back in Regular Session.... Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Hall: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #56, adopted by the Senate, November 4, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the



Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representative to wit: Senate Joint Resolution 58, adopted by the Senate, November 4, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Hall: "Representative Matijevec, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken November 4, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass House Bill 2461, 2492, 2495. Senate Bills 1390 and 1391, do pass as amended, House Bill 2462, 2463, 2494."

Speaker Bradley: "Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 2512, Jaffe, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1385, McClain, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the State Treasurer. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Barnes, will you come up to the podium for a minute? On the Calendar in the Regular Session we have on the Speaker's Table a number of Resolutions. Are any of the Sponsors on the floor who wish to call those Resolutions at this time? Yourell with House Resolution 80. Peg Martin...Kucharski, Taylor, Giorgi. House Resolution 158, do you wish to call that? 213, Mr. Giorgi. McPike on House Resolution 436. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, House Resolution 436 urges the United States and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency to issue the necessary permit variances and enforcement compliance scheduled letters to allow Alton Boxboard Company which is headquartered in Alton, Illinois. To continue operations



while working toward compliance since they have already made good faith effort to meet the compliance schedule, they were led to believe was agreed upon. This Resolution was heard in the Executive Committee, had no opposition and I would move its adoption."

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

Waddell: "Would you mind explaining the Resolution?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Alton Boxboard Company has been under a five year plan to come into compliance with water pollution regulations. They were granted a deviation every year... or one year at a time by both Illinois and the Federal Government for the first four years of the program. When they came to the fifth year, they were denied the permit."

Waddell: "Fine."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. Mr. McPike, do you wish to close?"

McPike: "Only to say that I think both of these agencies have been extremely unreasonable in their approach towards to this problem. Both... all three Representatives from our district, the State Senator along with labor unions and management and maybe... at least a hundred people from the community who testified in the behalf of Alton Boxboard at a recent hearing. All of this was ignored and I think by having the Illinois House of Representative urge these agencies to take another look, I think it might help the situation."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 436, signify by saying, 'aye', opposed by 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 457, Steczo, do you wish... take it out of the record. House Joint Resolution 26, Mr. Stearney.... Senate Joint Resolution 52, Mr. Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any item on the Calendar that any Member wants to have called? That is in the Regular Session."



Adjournment Resolution... and we're in the Regular Session now."

Clerk Hall: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution and in the adoption of which I am directed to ask concurrence with the House of Representatives.

Senate Joint Resolution #58, resolved by the Senate of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn, Friday November 4, 1977, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday November 7, 1977 at 12:00 noon. And the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Monday November 7, 1977 at 1:00 P.M. Adopted by the Senate November 4, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, the Adjournment Resolution."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carries. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, what is our posture at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "What is what?"

Madigan: "Our posture... where are we?"

Speaker Redmond: "Our posture, we're now in Regular Session. We're just polsng to adjourn."

Madigan: "Fine and if we're in the Regular Session...."

Speaker Redmond: "This is to advise the Membership the Senate was unable to pass the Unemployment Compensation Bill, which means that in all likelihood we'll have to be here Wednesday in addition to Monday and Tuesday."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, are there any announcements?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any announcements?"



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until Monday at 1:00."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Regular Session is adjourned. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I just heard the Clerk read earlier the Adjournment Resolution to be 12:00 Monday. Now, the Majority Leader says 1:00, which hour do you want us here, dear?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think that the Clerk, the Assistant Clerk, advises me that it was 1:00. The Senate is 12:00, now you don't want to be premature. They won't seat you over there yet."

Geo-Karis: "Why not."

Speaker Redmond: "They are not sure you're going to be elected."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, ho.... I'm not either."

Speaker Redmond: "The Senate is 12:00, we're 1:00, the Senate has failed to pass the Unemployment Comp., if they do pass it Monday it will take a minimum of three days here which looks like Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. And I understand that there is something going on in Chicago Wednesday and we may have a pretty sparse attendance in Springfield. Jim Edgar doesn't know what it is.... or do you? The First Regular Session will come to order. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Hall: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution. The adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #2, resolves that the Senate of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois at the First Special Session thereof, the House of Representatives concurring herein: that when the



two Houses adjourn on Friday November 4, 1977, the Senate stand adjourned until Monday November 7, 1977, at 2:00 P.M. and the House of Representatives stand adjourned until Monday November 7, 1977, at 1:10 P.M. Adopted by the Senate November 4, 1977, at the First Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that the First Special Session stand in adjournment until....."

Speaker Redmond: "The Adjournment Resolution."

Madigan: "Oh, I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion is carried and the Amendment is adopted. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that the First Special Session stand in adjournment until Monday and until immediately after the adjournment of the Regular Session."

Speaker Redmond: "1:10 P.M., would you amend it."

Madigan: "You would prefer 1:10?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Madigan: "1:10."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. First Special Session stands adjourned until 1:10 P.M. Monday. The Second Special Session will come to order. A message from the Senate."

Clerk Hall: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution. And the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #1, resolved by the Senate



of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois at the Second Special Session thereof; and the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, November 4, 1977, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, November 7, 1977, at 2:30 P.M. and when the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Monday November 7, 1977 at 1:20 P.M. Adopted by the Senate November 4, 1977, at the Second Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that the Second Special Session stand in adjournment until 1:20 P.M., Monday afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adjournment of the Second Special Session, until 1:20 P.M. on Monday. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The Second Special Session adjourns until Monday at 1:20. Have a happy weekend."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	12:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk Hall	Introduction & 1st Reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
2		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond		
3		Hart		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Bluthardt		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Redmond	Committee reports	
		Giorgi		
4		Speaker Redmond	House in recess. 1st Sp. session to order	
		Giorgi	Roll call, etc.	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk Hall	Committee reports	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Redmond	1st Sp. session adjourned	
		Giorgi	Roll Call, etc.	
		Speaker Redmond	Committee reports	
		Clerk Hall		
5	12:10	Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi	Move 2nd Sp. session adjourn	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries	
	12:14	Speaker Redmond	HB Reg. session	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2433, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2434, 2nd, 1 CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	2464, 2nd, no CA	
6		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2467, 2nd 1 CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2468, 2nd no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2469, 2nd, #1 failed	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2471, 2nd no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
	12:17	Clerk Hall	HB 2472, 2nd, no CA	
7		Spekaer Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2473, 2nd, #1 & 2 adopted	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2474, 2nd, #1 adopted	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2475, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2476, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
8		Clerk Hall	HB 2477, 2nd, #1 adopted	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	3.
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2478, 2nd, #1 adopted	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2480, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2481, 2nd	
9		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2482, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2484, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
	12:21	Speaker Redmond		
	12:25	Flinn		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Flinn	Question - 231	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Flinn		
10-11		Speaker Redmond		
		DiPrima	HB 351 - motion	
12		Speaker Redmond	House accepts	
		Bluthardt	Leave to hear HB 1216 & 1217	
		Speaker Redmond		
13		Geo-Karis	Yield	



4.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Breslin	HB 1363 - motion
14		Speaker Redmond	
		Breslin	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	
		Breslin	PPC
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
	12:42	Telcser	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
17		Greiman	HB 1397 - motion
		Speaker Redmond	House accepts Gov. rec.
		Greiman	HB 1680 - motion
18		Speaker Redmond	House accepts Gove. rec.
		Friedrich	HB 1752 - motion
		Speaker Redmond	
19		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	House accepts Gove. rec.
		Speaker Madigan	In chair
20		Hart	HB 2259 - motion
		Speaker Madigan	House accepts Gov. rec.
		Stearney	HB 286 - motion
21		Speaker Madigan	
		Darrow	Parliamentary inquiry
		Stearny	'Speaker'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Speaker Madigan		
		Darrow		
		Speaker Madigan	House accepts Gov. rec.	
		Walsh	Asks unanimous consent	
22		Speaker Madigan		
		Laurino	Same request	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Lechowicz	HB 2343 - motion	
23	1:00	Speaker Madigan	House accepts Gov. rec.	
		Klosak	HB 286, request 'aye' vote	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Ryan	HB 232 - motion	
24		Speaker Madigan	House accepts Gov. rec.	
		Martin, P.	Leave to record 'aye' on HB 232	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Geo-Karis	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Madigan		
25-26		Lucco	HB 231 - motion	
		Flinn		
		Speaker Madigan		
27		Telcser		
		Speaker Madigan		
28		Ewell		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Friedrich		
29		Speaker Madigan		
		Flinn		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
30		Waddell		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Bowman		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Darrow	MPQ	
31		Speaker Madigan		
	1:22	Lucco	To close	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Byers	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan		
32		Lucco		
		Speaker Madigan		
33		Jacobs		
		Speaker Madigan		
34		Flinn		
		Speaker Madigan	HB 231 PPC	
35		Sandquist	HB 595 - motion	
36		Speaker Madigan		
		Conti	Support	
		Speaker Madigan	HB 595, OVR	
37		Dunn, R.	HB 641 - motion	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Kempiners	Oppose	
		Speaker Madigan		
38		Daniels	Support	
		Speaker Madigan		

~~DiPrima~~

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
		Speaker Madigan		
		Brummer	Yield	
39	1:40	Dunn, R.		
		Speaker Madigan		
		DiPrima	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan	HB 641 lost	
40		Von Boeckman	Move to suspend past rule on HB 2435	
		Speaker Madigan	Leave granted	
		Barnes, E.M.	Leave to suspend rules HB 2507	
		Speaker Madigan	Hold that	
		McCourt	HB 945 - motion	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Mann	'Conflict'	
		Speaker Madigan	HB 945 OVR	
		Tuerk	HB 990 - motion - leave to hear 990 & 991 together	
41		Speaker Madigan	Leave granted	
42		Tuerk	Continues	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Mugalian		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Byers		
43		Speaker Madigan	HB 990 & 991 OVR	
	1:55	Edgar	HB 2478 2nd	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Jaffe	Move to table #2	
		Speaker Madigan	Tabled, 3rd reading	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
45-46		Richmond	HB 1183 - motion	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Telcser	Oppose	
		Speaker Madigan		
47		Greisheimer	Support	
		Speaker Madigan		
48		Houlihan, D.	Yield	
		Richmond		
		Speaker Madigan		
49		Bradley	Support	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Darrow	MPQ	
		Speaker Madigan		
50		Richmond	To close	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Brummer	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan	HB 1183 OVR	
51		Taylor	HB 1432 - motion to OVR	
		Speaker Madigan		
52	2:17	Mann	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan		
53		Jaffe	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Taylor		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Taylor	PPC	
		Speaker Madigan		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9..
54-55		Tipsword	HB 1502 - motion to OVR	
56		Totten		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Madigan	HB 1502 OVR	
57		Friedrich	HB 1753 - motion to OVR	
		Speaker Madigan		
58		Byers	Support	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Friedrich	Explain vote	
		Speaker Madigan	HB 1753 OVR	
59	2:37	Capparelli	Announce, leave to suspend	
		Von Boeckman	post rule HB 2428 - 2479	
			Change motor vehicle	
		Speaker Madigan		
60		Tipsword	HB 2164 - motion to OVR	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Hart	Oppose	
		Speaker Madigan		
61		Telcser	Support	
		Speaker Madigan		
62		Stuffle		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Tipsword	TOOR	
		Speaker Madigan	Recess Reg. session. 1st Sp.	
		Clerk Hall	session called to order	
			HB 9, 2nd, 1CA	
		Speaker Madigan	3rd reading	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
63		Clerk Hall	HB 20, 2nd, no CA	
		Speaker Madigan	3rd reading. 1st Sp. session	
		Clerk Hall	recess. 2nd Sp. session to order	
		Speaker Madigan	Messages from Senate	
		Clerk Hall	HB 2, 2nd, no CA. Floor #1	
		Speaker Madigan		
		McGrew		
		Speaker Madigan		
64		Brady	#1	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Ewell	Fiscal note	
65	2:58	Speaker Madigan		
		McGrew	Out of order	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Ewell	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Madigan		
		McGrew	HB 2417, companion bill	
		Speaker Madigan		
66		Ewell		
		Speaker Madigan		
		McGrew	Describes HB 2417	
	3:03	Speaker Madigan		
67		Ewell		
		Speaker Madigan	Chair rules Ewells request,	
			out of order	
68		McGrew	Continues HB 2	
		Speaker Madigan		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
69	3:07	Brady		
		Speaker Madigan		
70		Stuffle	Oppose	
		Speaker Madigan		
71		Lauer	Oppose	
		Speaker Madigan		
72-73		Kane	Yield	
		Brady		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Gaines	Appeal ruling on Ewell's motion	
		Speaker Madigan		
74		Gaines	Address HB 2265, #1	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Mann		
		Speaker Madigan		
		Ebbesen	Yield	
		Brady		
75		Speaker Madigan		
76-77		Ewell		
		Speaker Madigan		
78		Satterthwaite	HB 2350	
		Speaker Madigan		
		Rigney	MPQ	
		Speaker Madigan		
79	3:32	Brady	To close	
80		Speaker Madigan	HB 2 #1 fails, 3rd reading	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		McBroom	HB 2406 - Introduce Les Ahrens	
81		Ahrens		
82		Bradley	In Chair	
		Clerk Hall	HB 3, 2nd, #1 & 2 withdrawn	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk Hall	#3	
		Barnes, E.M.		
		Speaker Bradley		
83		Friedrich	Object TOOR	
84		Speaker Bradley	Vote reconsidered. #1 not adopted TOOR. HJR 59	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan	Explain that	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 6?	
		Friedrich	TOOR	
		Speaker Bradley	Recess 2nd Sp. session. 1st Sp. session to order	
		Kempiners	Leave to bring HB 20 to 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted	
85	3:50	Clerk Hall		
		Kempiners	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted, 3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Bradley	Introduction & 1st reading	
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Bradley	Recess 1st Sp. session. Regular session in order	
86		Clerk Hall	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Bradley	Committee reports	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Bradley	Introduction & 1st reading	
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Bradley		
81		McPike	HR 436	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Waddell	Explains Resolution	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McPike		
		Speaker Bradley		
		McPike	To close	
	4:00	Speaker Bradley	Resolution 436 adopted	
88		Speaker Redmond	Adjourn Resolution	
		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted	
		Madigan	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		
89		Madigan	Adjourn	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Redmond	1:00 Monday. 1st Sp. session	
90		Clerk Hall	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Move Adjournment	
		Speaker Redmond	Adjourn 1st Sp. session	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
		Madigan		
91		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries. 1st Sp. session adjourned. 2nd Sp. session to order	
		Clerk Hall	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted	
		Madigan	Move 2nd Sp. session adjourned	
	4:11	Speaker Redmond	2nd Sp. session adjourned	

