

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives. The House will convene in fifteen minutes. 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. The Members please be in their seats. Let the record show that Representative Walsh is in the chamber. Be lead in prayer by the Clerk, Jack O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Let us pray. Lord, bless this House and all those that serve and work here. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, the pledge of allegiance. Oh, I guess he isn't here. Representative Ropp, the pledge of allegiance. I guess he's not here. Mayor Klosak."

Klosak: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands: one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether you know it or not, but when they refer to the Mayor in Illinois, they mean the former...still Representative Klosak. He's the Illinois Mayor. Roll Call for attendance. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3386, McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend the Worker's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 30..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Sponsor of that?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative McPike. House Bill 3387, Representative McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Worker's Occupational Disease Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3388, Representative McPike. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Worker's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second Reading. On page 3.



The schedule today calls for floor Session from 11 to 3 and then Committees and no evening Session. For those of you that weren't here last night, we had a most productive Session, and everybody who called their Bill was able to have it pass out. House Bill 426. Out of the record. 958. Out of the record. 1294. Out of the record. 1444. Out of the record. 1920. Out of the record. 2349. I guess we had a problem with that one yesterday. Out of the record. Senate Bills, Second Reading. On page 10. Senate Bill 860. Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 860, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retailer's Occupation Tax Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Ropp, amends Senate Bill 860 as amended in Section #1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Ropp here? Representative Rea, the Sponsor of the Bill, what's your pleasure?"

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm opposed to that Amendment. It would exempt the \$1,000 on the parts and also in terms of the purchase of...of the machinery. At the present time the Bill calls for exemptions for anything over \$1,000. So I would ask that you vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, you're not ruling the Amendment out of order or anything, are you?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, I'm not."

Vinson: "I would urge the adoption of the Amendment. This... by adopting this Amendment, we'll make the Bill effective. We'll completely remove the sales tax on farm machinery and equipment, and if we're going to pass this Bill, we ought to pass it in clean form and adopt that Amendment and clean the whole system up so that Illinois farm machinery dealers can compete on an equitable basis with the farm machinery dealers in neighboring states who are not taxed. I would urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand the Sponsor of this Amendment

(continued)



is Representative Ropp. Now, do you want to be shown as the Sponsor, Representative Vinson?" Are you on it also?"

Vinson: "We talked about it and I think it was his intention to file me on the Amendment but if it's not I'm sure it's okay to add me to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe this Amendment has been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Has it been printed and distributed?"

I'm advised by the Clerk that it has not so we'll have to take it out of the record..."

Darrow: "Can I have leave...Mr. Speaker, since the Amendment has not been distributed and since the Sponsor is not on the floor why don't we move it on to Third?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we can't consider the Amendment if it hasn't been distributed. Representative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to move this on to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "When was it filed, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Vinson: "I said, when was the Amendment filed?"

Speaker Redmond: "I have no idea."

Vinson: "Well, can the Clerk indicate to us when that was?"

Speaker Redmond: "Of course it's been the policy of the Chair not to hold up moving these things to Third Reading because of...some infirmity of an Amendment. I think that the...probably what we ought to do is to move it to Third and then you talk to Mr. Rea and see if you can get him to bring it back, but..."

Vinson: "Well it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it's clear that the Amendment wasn't filed today, it was filed yesterday. It's not Mr. Ropp's fault that the Amendment hasn't been distributed and it's a



mistake to penalize his opportunity to amend this Bill by moving the Bill to Third Reading when he filed the Amendment in a timely fashion. And I think you've got an obligation, seeing how the Clerk's under your jurisdiction, to hold the Bill on Second and give a chance to the Gentleman to have his Amendment considered fairly."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe the Clerk is elected by the Membership. What's your pleasure, Mr. Rea? We'll move it to Third Reading. I've always felt that a Sponsor of a Bill has the right to have the Bill pretty much in his own...the way he wants it. So when it's all over talk to Mr. Rea and see if we can't have some understanding. There's no way that this Bill could ultimately pass without cooperation of both sides. So, with that understanding... Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, I can understand Mr. Rea's concern in wanting it to move to Third and if we could get his agreement and he would just...just give me the nod now that he would move it back to Third then I think we would have no opposition. I think...that's all we would ask him to do since it was filed early."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "I will be glad to discuss the possibility of bringing it back, only."

Speaker Redmond: "When you look at the absentees and you realize it takes 89 votes it would seem to me that getting the Bill in the proper place on the Calendar is kind of important and..."

Polk: "Well obviously there's certainly many, many Bills that aren't going to be moved today, as we did not move many of them last evening, as well..."

Speaker Redmond: "That wasn't my fault. That's a problem that I have up here...and..."



Polk: "Nor mine...I was here as well..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster. Will the Gentleman standing between Representative McMaster and the Chair please sit down?"

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it has always been the practice of this House, of the Sponsor of a Bill or the Sponsor of an Amendment, to be fair with other Members of the House. If there is a desire to move this Bill on to Third I think there should be a commitment by the Sponsor of the Bill that he is willing to move it back from Third to Second for the purpose of considering that Amendment. We have always operated in that fashion on the floor of this House. We have shown courtesy to each other and I see no reason to change that practice at this time. If the Sponsor will make that promise then there's no problem with moving it to Third. If he won't make the promise then I think he's completely out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's entirely up to Mr. Rea, I can't force him. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm as anxious as you are to respect the rights of the Sponsor of a Bill, but I also think we have an obligation to respect the rights of anyone to amend a Bill and this was a timely introduction of an Amendment. Now the fact it isn't printed is not the fault of the Sponsor of the Amendment and I don't...you can keep any Amendment off through your Clerk's Office by just delaying the distribution. I think that's...wrong. I think it is contrary to the Rules of the House and I think the Gentleman has the right to have his Amendment heard."

Speaker Redmond: "Well it's at Third Reading now. Representative Darrow... How about Senate Bills, Third Reading"



942. Representative Vinson, do you want to go with that one ? Well, we got it a little...please come to order. Turn the podium over to Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is indeed my pleasure to present to the Members of the House of Representatives the Flaming Hearts Basketball team of Effingham that placed #2 in the Class AA tournament in Champaign two weeks ago. The Flaming Hearts are represented in the General Assembly by Representative Brummer, Representative Robbins, and myself. We were the smallest of the schools that played in the Elite Eight in Champaign, and although they placed #2 in Champaign, they're still #1 in our hearts. I'd like for you to give them a warm welcome. To introduce the team is the head coach of the Flaming Hearts, Jim Maxton. Coach."

Coach Maxton: "Thank you. I'll start over here on my right if I can find all of them. I guess you guys could hold your hand up. Donny 'Dekers', a junior; Brad 'Neet', senior guard; Steve 'Bushou', senior; Jeff Wolfer. He's a senior; Jim 'Shadowins'. Hold your hand up, Jim. Way in the back there is a young man that's going to go play basketball at the University of Illinois. Mitch Arnold. Gale Higgs. He's a junior. Behind him is a sophomore. Kent 'Geckner'. A young man here that's a junior. Chuck Keller. Some of you might know him... at least his father. The big tall boy here from West Germany, Ewe Blab. He's a junior. He'll be back next year. Ted 'Dravenhorse'. He's a junior. We have two other seniors down here. Bill 'Groupie', and another senior, Dallas 'Orsborne'. I have another gentleman up here that is a very important cause on our team. He's my assistant coach and right-hand man, Glen Temple. Thank you."

Bower: "Thank you, Coach. In the galleries we also have the



cheerleaders for the Flaming Hearts and the managers of the team. Would you stand up and be recognized? I believe they're over here. Oh, okay. Also, visiting the House of Representatives today are Mr. and Mrs. Bob Arnold, who are Mitch's parents. Incidentally, Mitch Arnold received just about every honor that is possible for a high school basketball player to receive, and also Mr. and Mrs. Hans Peter Blab, Ewe's parents, who are the guests of our former colleague, Chuck Keller. Chuck is down here, and Mr. and Mrs. Blab, will you stand up, please? His...Ewe's little sister, Judith, is also here and his little brother, Olaf. Would you stand up? Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor. Representative Lechowicz, will you come up here? Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. We have here with us today, sitting in the Speaker's gallery on the Democratic side there, the Director of the Cabinet of the President of the Supreme Court of Abidjan of the Ivory Coast. He's visiting here with us today. I've been visiting with him all morning, and I found out that in his country that they have 65 different dialects, and they are here to learn something about the workmanship of our government, and I'm proud to have him being introduced to you, Mr. Kajar Jiji, from the Abidjan of the Ivory Coast."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. On the Calendar on page 3, House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 100. Mr. Daniels. Out of the record. House Bill 262. Mr. Pierce. Out of the record. 276. Mr...the Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A matter of inquiry."



Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point, ma'am?"

Stiehl: "Senate Bill 860 was on Second Reading, and Representative Vinson attempted to place an Amendment on it. When Representative Frederick objected, the Speaker said it was on Third Reading, but in listening, I do not believe that the Speaker moved the Bill to Third Reading, so it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill would still be on Second Reading. And, since the Amendment is now distributed, I wondered if it couldn't be heard on Second?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll check with the Clerk, and then we'll get back to you. According to the Clerk, he did move the Bill to third, ma'am. The Bill is on Third Reading."

Stiehl: "No, no, no. He said the Bill was on Third Reading, but he did not move it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Clerk, who I just checked with, the Bill's on Third Reading. Why don't you check, okay? According to the Clerk at this time, if you have anything else, would you kindly come up to the Clerk's, and he'll be more than happy to check it out for you, Mrs. Stiehl?"

Stiehl: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to House Bills, Third Reading, is House Bill 276. Mr. Darrow. Take it out of the record. 282. Mrs. Younge. The Lady from St. Clair... Clerk, read the Bill. 282."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 282. A Bill for an Act creating the East St. Louis Depressed Areas Land Use and Community Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, would you move that to Second Reading, and I wish to take no further action on it today?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading."



At the request of the Sponsor, we will take out House Bills 331, 429, 432, 434. House Bill 447. Mr. Reilly. Out of the record. 515. Mr. Stuffle. Out of the record. 582. Piel-Davis. Out of the record. 668. Out of the record. 675. Mr. Katz. Out of the record. 677. Mr. Marovitz. Out of the record. 703. Mrs. Younge. Clerk, read the Bill. Take it out of the record, ma'am? Out of the record. 744. Taylor-Pouncey. Out of the record. 745. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 745. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 745 changes the procedures for issuing working cash fund bonds in school districts. Currently, if a school board wishes to issue working cash fund bonds, they are subject to a back door referendum, which can be called by 20% of the registered voters signing a petition within 10 days. This is actually not at all feasible. It is virtually impossible for 20% of the registered voters of a school district to be gathered on a petition within 10 days. House Bill 745, as it has been amended, changes the requirement to 20%...to 10% of the registered voters rather than 20 and extends the time period for filing to 30 days rather than 10. This is the same requirement as presently exists for other types of school bonds. There were some additional Amendments that made the Bill very much stronger which, last time we met, were removed. And, this Bill is now in the form in which it was approved by the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee. It makes the back door referendum actually a feasible procedure for the issuance of working cash fund bonds, and I urge its passage by this House."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 745 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Fred...Schraeder...Schraeder, kindly vote me 'aye'. Phil, kindly record Mrs. Macdonald as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 748. Mr. Marovitz. Out of the record. House Bill 750. Mr. Skinner. Out of the record. House Bill 757. Mr. Watson. Out of the record. 777. Skinner-Schraeder. Out of the record. House Bill 800. Mr. Hanahan. Clerk, read the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 800. A Bill for an Act creating the State Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hanahan: "Speaker and Members of the House, I know you're all anxiously awaiting House Bill 800 for passage. If you're like I am, you've probably heard from everyone about how bad it is in our society in Illinois that we have no law prohibiting firemen and policemen from striking. Well here's your opportunity, Ladies and Gentlemen, to vote for a Bill prohibiting police strikes and fire strikes. It's also your opportunity in action to legislation of civilized attempts to allow public employees to bargain in behalf by their freely chosen representation with their employers. It is a good Bill. The Bill enacts into law certain provisions called collective bargaining in a public sector. The Bill is a long Bill. It's been long studied. It's been debated. Re-debated. Revised. And, in many ways, attempted to come to grips with the very troublesome problem of what we do with our public employees in labor relations. Now everyone could stick their heads in sand and say that somehow it's going to work its way out, but in the meantime you have garbage strikes. You have public utility strikes. You have other kinds of strikes that affect the workings..?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me Mr. Hanahan. Let's give the Gentleman some order. Please continue sir."

Hanahan: "We still continue to have those kinds of work interruptions and service interruption through our citizens and as being a Legislator representing



all the people I think we ought to pay particular attention. Pay attention to what they're really asking for. They're asking for a civilized approach to solving strikes and work stoppages. Nobody in their right mind in 1980 says that public employees do not have a right to be represented. That's an archaic, uncivilized approach to labor relations. Even the most conservative, the most conservative of those of you who profess to be conservative Legislators have to recognize the rights of employees to seek out and redress of grievances, their employment records, the rights of being an employee, the fights of negotiating their wages and their conditions of employment. Even the most conservative even do that for themselves here in the House of Representatives. Each and everyone of us negotiate in our behalf when we vote on our pay raises. Each and everyone of us vote on our behalf on conditions of our employment. when we decide whether to have a certain amount of money for our district offices and the rest. But we're in this unique position of being able to negotiate for ourselves. This Bill covers those employees who can't do that for themselves. We're talking about now not only the public employee that is a policeman or a fireman or a teacher, but we're also talking about that gardener in the park district. We're talking about that truck driver in the County Highway Department and we're talking about all forms of other public employees in the state. Whether you be a professor at the University of Illinois or one of the other public colleges. This legislation is greatly needed and I might point out it's supported by almost every public employee organization of this state. State troopers and



teamsters and public employee unions such as ASCFME or service employees, but also by the trade unions that are in these building trades and have recognized the need that in today's society they need to have a written contract to negotiate with their employer for the conditions of employment of their Members. House Bill 800 is in answer to a long thought dream. It has been around, the issue has been around a long time and whether or not it's voted up or down today in the House of Representatives is not going to make it go away. The fact is, it's much needed. Now you could beat your breast and you could chant and you could yell and all the other things you want to do about what you're doing to protect the public from unwarranted strikes. This is your opportunity, right here and now, to put it right on the line. If you want to see the continuation of public employee work stoppages for no reason outside of the seeking of recognition in most cases. Outside of the fact that work stoppages, whether it be by prison guards or policemen or my firefighters around this state. If you want to see that continue, vote no or don't vote at all because there is no law in Illinois prohibiting them and you may beat your breast about what you're going to do about it, but the fact remains, this is the only Bill right now sitting alive on Third Reading that offers the people of Illinois some hope to prohibit strikes by people that work in the very sensitive public safety areas. Some of those things... Some of the points in the Bill, it's a very complicated Bill and I know for some Members they just have made up their minds that they're going to vote yes or no without looking for any of the real answers



to our problems in our society today. The fact remains that you can't put your heads in the sand and run away from it. You're going to have work stoppages as long as you do not have law, legislation on the statute book, guaranteeing an orderly process of labor relations. This Bill will put that in order. Now this isn't all pro-labor. Many points of this Bill would be an infringement about the freedom of mobility, the freedom of what people want to do in the area of labor relations when they're a public employee. Both sides of the issue is garnered and somehow corraled under the provisions of this Act. People can't, under this Bill, have wild cat's work stoppages. Under this Bill, no public employee and I mean no public employee can strike during a contract. This Bill completely outlaws and forbids and prohibits through its manners in working any kind of work stoppages for recognition. And that has been about our experience, about 90%, of all work stoppages in the public sector has been over the seeking out of recognition of knowing who is to represent who at the bargaining table. I might point out here in my hand is a letter from Jane Byrne, the Mayor of the city of Chicago, and specifically, in her words in her own handwriting not in typewritten memo..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me Mr. Hanahan. Give the Gentleman your attention please."

Hanahan: "Not in her typewritten memo by some secretary but in her own handwriting she says on February 7, 1979 a letter saying, 'Do you favor collective bargaining?'. She says, 'I am on record with the media for supporting collective bargaining for all city employees if they wish to



join the union'. It says, Do you favor a union shop provision. And she says, 'Yes'. Do you favor a written contract? She says, 'I am also on record for this'. Do you favor arbitration and binding arbitration for grievances? She says, 'I favor'. She goes on and on for four or five pages and signs her name as a candidate for mayor of the city of Chicago saying that she's in support of collective bargaining. This is the opportunity for those Legislators that think the Mayor is their leader. that to follow her dictates, in her own handwriting, on collective bargaining. I might point out that the Governor of this state, Governor Thompson, before convention action, not once, not twice, but; at least a half a dozen times your candidate for Governor, your Governor that you helped get re-elected has time and time again stood up in favor of collective bargaining for public employees. I say to all you right thinking Legislators today you want to get right with God. This is your opportunity. This is a civilized approach to solving a major problem in our society today and I urge your support of House Bill 800."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Would the Gentleman from McHenry yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Simms: "Representative Hanhan, am I to deduct that Governor Thompson and Mayor Byrne have endorsed House Bill 800?"

Hanahan: "I could only deduct from their statements, public and private, that they support collective bargaining



in the public sector and specifically House Bill 800 would meet their condition of their support."

Simms: "Have they specifically, now, you didn't answer the question. Have they specifically indicated publicly or privately to you that they support the passage of House Bill 800?"

Hanahan: "They couldn't because they haven't had House Bill 800 before them. It's an amended Bill. They are in support of the provisions of House Bill 800. Nothing is in this Bill that the Governor said he would not support."

Simms: "This Bill has been on the Calendar now for almost a year. You've had opportunity to discuss this with the Mayor and with the Governor and the answer is no. They have not told you that they have supported this."

Hanahan: "They are in support of collective bargaining for public employees."

Simms: "That is... You're not answering the question. They have not said they're in support..."

Hanahan: "That's like asking me if I'm pregnant. I mean, I am or I'm not."

Simms: "I don't know if you are or not, Tom and that's part of the issue here today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It'd be a first. Please continue Mr. Simms and don't badger the witness."

Simms: "Well, the second question..."

Hanahan: "I want to answer that question as truthfully as possible. The House... They're position is for collective bargaining for public employees. I say to you and say to them publicly, there is nothing in this Bill, no word in this Bill as it's amended before you, to the contrary of their public position. So, I could only deduct from their statements of what they've publicly said that they are in favor of House Bill 800 because this is what they said they're for."



Simms: "My second question of this Bill, does it allow public employee to strike?"

Hanahan: "Only... First of all, it does not for certain persons."

Simms: "But it ultimately does give public employees the right to strike against the salary."

Hanahan: "Not all public employees. No. Policemen, prison guard, firemen and it prohibits them..."

Simms: "Places them under binding arbitration."

Hanahan: "Right."

Simms: "The speaker of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Simms: "This Bill, perhaps, is the most far reaching labor Bill that has been presented before the Illinois General Assembly during the current Session and in many aspects it is a carbon copy of what is introduced since the 1950's. What this Bill does very clearly, it takes from those elected officials throughout the State of Illinois their right as elected officials to bargain collectively with their employees and place it in a new state agency that is being created call the State Labors Relations Board. It takes away from those very elected officials the very local rights to sit down and bargain collectively with their individuals for the different various rights. This legislation, very frankly, takes away, takes away the discretion of the elected officials and turns it over to a large, growing bureaucracy which would be created by this Board. It would take away from the city of Chicago the right to deal with their own employees. It would take away from the Chicago City Council and Mayor ~~Exene~~ the right to sit down and deal collectively with their employees."



Secondly, what it does, it allows public employees with the exception of those categories that the Gentleman from McHenry has alluded to the right to go on strike. To strike against the sovereign And the other group of people, what it does, it places the question of negotiation in the hands of arbitrators and could mandatorily order those units of local government to accept the decisions without the input and the direction and the approval of those elected people. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 800 perhaps is the most dangerous Bill that affects the citizens of Illinois because it takes away from the elected officials the right to run their own government and it turn turns the policy of government over to the employee or their union representatives to govern the State of Illinois, to govern the municipalities of the State of Illinois and this legislation deserves the same type of treatment that it has received since the 1950's and that is to be defeated on the floor of the Legislature and not pass this legislation which takes the basic of rights of individuals away. It proposes a union shop. I think people have the right to belong to a labor union but I think people also have the right not to belong to a labor union and what we are doing, very frankly is, we are taking away that constitutional privilege of belonging or not belonging to an organized labor effort. And I think it goes beyond those terms. It goes beyond the scope of the perimeter of which we are thinking of. We are creating a brand new organization or department of government which will initially cost two point some million dollars which in the future very well could cost 10 or 12 million



dollars. Now to become involved in every labor dispute with every unit of local government in the state. So to preserve the integrity, to preserve the local autonomy to preserve those elected officials that have been chosen at the ballot box to govern their own municipalities, to govern their own units of local government and to govern with the wisdom that has been entrusted, to them by the citizens of the State of Illinois ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Simms: "Yes I will. To pass this legislation would be a front to all the citizens of the state by making one large state organization and turning over to the reins of the organized labor forces the control of state government where it rightly belongs ^{is} with the people of Illinois not with any labor... And for these reasons House Bill 800 deserves to be overwhelmingly defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I believe the prior speaker, has probably hit the nail on the head but I would like to respond to the eloquent comments of the director of the union forces here in the Legislature. He is referred to those of us who consider ourselves as conservatives as being morally bound to support this Bill. There is little doubt that he fails to grasp that there is a large difference between governmental business and a private business. We do not operate on a profit margin. We operate on taxes. Thus, if we are to allow public employees the right to organize collectively bargain and in some instances strike we would have to somehow provide profit margin for



government. Never in the history of any wordly operation of government have they operated on a profit margin. Therefore, there is no reason to give this authority to any public employee. If you give this authority, especially to local government, you will financially destroy them overnight. There is only one message we've been receiving from the people and the people have been saying lower our taxes. The only way we're going to lower their taxes is to lower the amount of government spending which of necessity means paying less, hiring less, and doing something to avoid the obvious union attempt to grab hold of all of our government entities. I would suggest that if we're going to lower our governmental expenses, we should do all we can to defeat this Bill instantaneously and the very last thing we should do is give a close shop right to any group of people that work for government. In the end, the reason the states on the southern part of this country are flourishing economically while those of us in the north part of the state, of the United States, are finding our economic faltering is because we do not have a right to work law. The last thing we need in Illinois is a close shop law for everyone that works for the government. I think we should unanimously vote this Bill down."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, all I'd just like to point out to you is the rising inflation rate. There's no question in my mind but what the right for the unions to control the jobs in Illinois would mean numerous strikes for higher wages. And the people themselves are going to have to pay higher taxes for this kind



of montrosity and increase of our taxes and inflation. So all we will be doing is developing and promoting a higher inflation rate amongst the people of Illinois. We're in bad enough trouble losing our business without adding to it by increased costs of operation through taxes. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to substantiate what Representative Simms and Representative Griesheimer stated. I've been caught in that position and in the county of Cook alone today there are seven referendums by outsiders coming in and asking to cut the taxes and do away with home rules in Cook County. And their strongest argument is that they want tax relief and what's caused the problem in these seven municipalities are your police pension funds, your police strikes, and you blue flus, and the public employees striking bringing out and throwing their budgets out of wack and coming up with some shocking increases in the real estate taxes. And what Representative Simms and Griesheimer says, I couldn't have said it any better as a public official on the local level and if this Board, that this agency is created, we will have absolutely no input into it and you will have more of the Tobin's and the Pat Quinn's trying to tell people what to do in their local community."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm speaking from an entirely different view point than the previous speakers. I am a member of a union. I do believe in collective bargaining but not in this Bill. I have two questions that I



would like to ask the Sponsor if I may."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed ma'am".

Oblinger: "Mr. Hanahan, on page 14 I note that we can have binding arbitration. We get over to page 17 it looks like it's limited to firemen and policemen. Why is this?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan to respond please. Page 14 and page 17."

Hanahan: "On page 14 that would be covering the voluntary binding arbitration that both sides may agree to for any public employee impasse. On page 17 it's specifically the last straw for a binding arbitration specifically for those personnel that cannot strike under any condition. We're talking now of public safety employees. Police, fire, and prison guards."

Oblinger: "I'd like to see the binding arbitration spelled out a lot clearer. On page 12 will you please inform me, at least, how we are going to get people to contribute to a charity, I'd like to know how you're going to enforce that."

Hanahan: "Would you repeat..."

Oblinger: "Page 12. Where it said... the third paragraph. If they have certain kinds of religious beliefs or religious training that they can't join the union and they must make contribution to a charitable organization. How do you enforce that?"

Hanahan: "That is very typical. That's Representative Hudson's specific Amendment in the years past and that is enforceable. It is workable and, take my word for it as a factual matter, it is being done not only in the public section and the United States but in the private sector. These are for Jehovah Witnesses and the other religious tenant believers that cannot contribute to a union because of their religious beliefs. But what they do then



is they must through the union auspices contribute to a charity or to a religion, their own religion specifically, in lieu of paying the union dues that they would have had to pay to the union for representation. This is enforced and it works."

Oblinger: "How is it enforced?"

Hanahan: "It's enforced that the Member will contribute to the union a check in the name of whatever charity and the union forwards it to whatever charity or religion that they want."

Oblinger: "But if a person doesn't do it. How can they be forced to contribute?"

Hanahan: "Because the person signs an agreement to do it. No different than paying off any other contract that they enter into. They are bound by contract to do it. They do believe in contracts. There's no prohibition on that. Take my word that this is a workable and a reasonable solution for those that have religious beliefs against belonging to any organization."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed ma'am".

Oblinger: "This Bill, in its present form I understand, has been introduced for a number of Sessions. I've talked with a number of labor representatives, labor members who say they would support a Bill but not this Bill and that's what I'm questioning. I think it's poorly drafted, poorly written and I don't think this is a Bill we need. I would like to see a different Bill introduced and upgraded."

Hanahan: "You couldn't name those people that said that to you could you ma'am?"

Oblinger: "Not on the floor of the House."

Hanahan: "Why not? You're immune here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

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



House. This Bill, of course, is a perennial one and it's appeared here before us time and time again. It's no better now. The concept is no better now than it was a year ago or two years ago or three years ago. Most of the points have been made but I think that one point needs to be reiterated and that is exactly what we would be doing as Legislators if we passed this Bill. In my opinion, we would be abrogating a responsibility that we now have as Legislators and Representatives of the people and the taxpayers. We would be abrogating those responsibilities to a select group, i.e. the exclusive bargaining agents of unions throughout the State of Illinois and if we think we have trouble with rising prices and costs, wait till this happens. Wait till we do abrogate our responsibilities to the exclusive bargaining agent. And in so doing, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're freezing all of the other taxpayers who should rightfully have a say to their representatives. Rightfully have a say as to what some of our public servants are going to be paid. The price levels and all the rest. It's interesting to me, looking back the history of this, that even Franklin Delano Roosevelt whom I do not consider to be a flaming conservative was adamantly opposed to the concept of strikes in the public sector. Adamantly opposed. He stressed the spirit of volunteerism and so did Samuel Gompers. One of the guiding spirits and guiding lights of the labor movement. The spirit of volunteerism and if we pass House Bill 800, which has been described as one of the most dangerous Bill and this is the term I have used back home to the people that have asked me about it, it is a dangerous Bill. Probably one of



most dangerous, in my opinion, that we have before us here in the General Assembly today. And I believe that if we are well advised we will consider what we're doing. I don't think we want to abrogate our responsibilities, turn those over to a select, elite group of exclusive bargaining agents and say this is your business. This is not the business of the taxpayers at large, but it's the business between these people and some others as to what our public..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hudson, would you kindly bring your remarks to a close?"

Hudson: "Yes sir. I will. So my friends, I would urge you to consider what we're doing. We don't want to introduce compulsion into this area in the public sector and that's what the closed shop will mean. Union compulsion. I don't think we want it. My advise, I urge you to consider carefully and to vote no on this piece of dangerous legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Much has been said about this and all of it true. I think that there are a couple of things that should be mentioned. The original speaker mentioned that there was anti-strike provision in this Bill for some public employees. Presently, the courts have ruled that it's against the law for public employees to strike in the State of Illinois and that really doesn't do any good. You've seen what has happened. These would be the transit strike in Chicago, the firemen strike in Chicago. The State of Ohio has a law very similar to this and I'm sure many of you are aware of the countless school strikes that were held in that state this past year. A couple of other



things that I think have not been mentioned that should be and I'm not anti-union because I run a union shop, but the people who purchase my wares have the right to choose whether or not they buy from me or whether they do not. The taxpayers do not have this privilege as to whether they buy services of a police department from the city or whether they buy them from someone else. We are mandating something that they do not have the free choice themselves. As a local government official, this would completely abrogate their responsibility and place it in the hands of some arbitration board. I might suggest that this legislation is as good as it is proposed to be that it be amended to include the State Legislature so, therefore; anytime that we were in a decision that we could not reach amicably to place it in the hands of an arbitrator. Therefore, we would not even have to be around. We could let the arbitrator solve all the problems and Pat Quinn would not only cut the House by a third but he could cut the whole House out of the way. I urge a resounding no vote."

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

Robbins: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

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

Robbins: "Does this Bill set up another board to mediate and arbitrate any union disputes? Is that correct?"

Hanahan: "No. Arbitration comes about after mediation and fact-finding. And it comes about at the request of both the employer, the public employer, and the employee representatives when an impasse has been reached and no settlement is in sight. Sooner than have a work stoppage or a lock out in the... on the reverse side, it is then mutually agreed upon, an arbitrator or a series of arbitrators,



or a group of arbitrators whatever the case may be that they both agree upon are chosen to settle that specific point that is at impasse. It does not mean like some previous speaker said that somehow we're going to turn over labor relations to some outsiders. That's absolutely an error."

Robbins: "The Section in there that refers to the Circuit Court. Who has the right to take this decision to Circuit Court?"

Hanahan: "The State Labor Relations Board would have the right. Now this is the Board that is neutral between the employee and employer whoever's at dispute, would have the right to enter into Circuit Court. The enforcement provisions of any contract or any law of the State of Illinois to be enforced. That's the only person that would be... that would be the only government entity that would be allowed into the Circuit Court concerning labor relations. That's very good ... Actually, that's one of the better provisions of the Act no matter which side of the issue you're on."

Robbins: "The Governor appoints this fact finding Board."

Hanahan: "The Governor appoints the State Labor Relations Board. They are full-time employees and they can have no other outside income or any other kind of interest in either the public or the private sector. They would be three members that would set up this commission, the Labor Relations Board, to operate as an overseer of decent labor relations between public employees and public employers of this state."

Robbins: "Do they do the fact finding themselves or do they subordinate this?"

Hanahan: "No. The fact finders would be persons that are schooled and educated in the field of fact finding



that would be employed by the Board. They would be specialists, technicians, if I might consider them such, that would operate with that as their basic background to serve as employees of the Board for the specific purposes of coming in to determine fact finding and getting emotion out of the way so that you just don't have a strike or you don't have a lock out or heated exchanges that solve nothing, but to come to the issue of what's separating the public employees and the public employer from resolving a dispute. The fact finders have a unique job of bring to both sides the real issue so it can be resolved."

Robbins: "Where do we find these specialists?"

Hanahan: "They generally graduate and we have a great graduate school here at the University of Illinois that are in labor relations. I happend to participate in it myself. But there are many, many people both working in the private sector and the public sector today that do nothing but fact finding employment. They're generally called personnel directors and such in the private sector. But they are... there are many lawyers. There are many educated people that serve, university professors and the like, that serve as fact finders, not only in the public sector, but in the private sector. And I might point out that there are 28 states with this kind of legislation, collective bargaining, for public employees and some of them states happen to be in the South."

Robbins: "Approximately, what would the cost of this new body be to the taxpayer?"

Hanahan: "That's another simplified statement made. People.. you know, Abraham Lincoln who's pictures up there once said that anyone could say that a dog has five legs but it takes a fool to



believe it. And some of the statements I made here I'd have to be a fool if I believe some of the statements. For example, anyone can get up and say this is going to cost more money. But let me point out, you're losing sight of the issue. The issue is that in Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and New York, four states that have similar legislation; the overwhelming conclusion was that no significant increases in salaries could be attributed to arbitration or to the collective bargaining process. Now, these are facts now. I'm not talking about some guy standing here and beating his chest and saying that he knows what it's going to cost. Once again, remember what Abraham Lincoln said. He could say anything. First of all they're immune. Your seatmates here made a statement. I questioned, "who made the statement?" She wouldn't even answer. The fact is anyone can make a statement if they want. Back it up with conclusive proof. Here is four states that did a study to find out whether or not collective bargaining in the public sector can be attributed to the factor of higher salaries or increased governmental costs. There studies, an independent study, concluded overwhelmingly, it did not."

Robbins: "You mean to say that in those states, the employees would have been paid as much or more if they didn't belong to the union?"

Hanahan: "In most cases, I'm sure that if you read the study, you will find the conclusion was that whether or not they had collective bargaining the cost of government would have increased. And secondly, to answer another Representatives' charges on that same point, the fact is that you're talking about productivity and a good working labor relations



between the public employee and the city or park district or school board so that the productivity goes up. Commensurate with the salary so that you may not need more employees and, therefore, government could reduce its cost. They found this to be a fact, that where they have good labor relations you don't need more employees. You have a greater productivity of the work day by the employees now presently hired than if you have the unrest, uncivilized attempt of agitators both union and anti-union trying to cause disruption at the work place in the public sector. This is a civilized approach to keep taxes down and it has been concluded by four states, that's all I can go by, and their conclusion of an independent study that it did not increase costs to government."

Robbins: "You said the that this... by having this in those four states, it did not raise the benefits to the employees, it just cost them union dues?"

Hanahan: "Union dues are not a cost for the state."

Robbins: "Okay. We'll forget that."

Hanahan: "Now remember, we're talking about four specific states that are very similar to Illinois. We're talking about Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and New York. Where their studies conducted by those four states independent of each other conclude... overwhelmingly concluded that no significant increases in salary could be attributed to arbitration or to the collective bargaining process. Now I can only read what they come out of their studies."

Robbins: "I have a question. We're going to set up a whole new bureaucracy with three people to head at approximately 40 to 50 thousand dollars



a year plus specialists trained and schooled in these fields. How much over a million dollars a year will it cost to maintain that bureaucracy."

Hanahan: "The bureaucracy you talk about is the Labor Relations Board that we're setting up under this Bill. It would cost approximately 2.9 million dollars. Let me point out sir. Let me point out. One strike, one strike in the City of Chicago is estimated to have cost 6 million dollars. One strike. Now we're talking about a whole agency for all public employees of this state. All the cities. All the school boards."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me Mr. Hanahan and Mr. Robbins. Would you kindly bring your remarks to a close? Do you have anymore questions Mr. Robbins?"

Hanahan: "Let me finish this answer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I think you have."

Hanahan: "The point is that it's..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "2.9 million dollars was the cost. Alright. Do have anything else Mr. Robbins?"

Robbins: "I just want to question whether we as servants of the people should spend 2.9 million dollars to do... to create a bureaucracy which he stated in four states brought no additional benefits to the people that they represented and in the states where they have this, they go ahead. They lock up the firefighters in Kansas City but they went ahead and struck the Governor pardoned and everything. They had all the rights there too. But they went ahead and struck and they had the damage and all I ... I hate to think that I'm spending almost 3 million dollars and producing nothing. Thank you."

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



Greiman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I often listen with interest to debates and find that the debate that we have here has little to do with the realities that are out in the real world. To suggest that collective bargaining is not part of the process of our state for public employees is patently absurd. The State of Illinois collectively bargains. School districts collectively bargain. Firemen, policemen, every public employee almost has some process of collective bargaining. There is a fire and an anger in the process in Illinois because we have no process. Because the fire... the police superintendent in one town says that this Act is insubordination. But in another town it's a labor relations matter. We have no uniformity here. We have no process. We start each day, each collective bargaining situation anew. What we need is to take the bite out of this kind of... this area. To have a process that's orderly. That's thoughtful. And that's what is lacking in Illinois. I would correct the Sponsor of this Bill, 28 states have not got collective bargaining. 34 states have some form of collective bargaining similar to this. It is absurd. It... To oppose this... some kind of process flies in the face of reality. It's about time we joined the 20th century."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "I'm confused Representative and would you clarify for me, does the Mayor of Chicago support this legislation or not?"

Hanahan: "I have not spoken personally to the Mayor."



She's in Tel Aviv or someplace in Israel right now but I have her handwritten letter, handwritten not even typewritten in front of me and you could peruse it and if you could draw any other conclusion than her support and I know some people kid about her changing her mind often but it's pretty conclusive when it says; do you favor collective bargaining. She says yes. In favor of union shop and she says yes and put an exclamation mark. I think that's pretty well conclusive. She signs it. I don't. Her signature. I don't think there's any doubt of the authenticity of her saying that she is in support of it and anymore than I've heard Governor Thompson say many times publicly that he is in support of collective bargaining for public employees and this Bill has nothing in it that is contrary to his position."

Vinson: "I wonder. Would you yield for another question? Is there anybody on this floor that you could identify who might authoritatively speak to the question of her position on this Bill?"

Hanahan: "I'm sure that we may hear from them. We may witness their votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'll certainly be brief. I just think there's been a lot of rhetoric one side or the other on this Bill. I think philosophically there's no difference of feeling relative to the rights of people to collective bargaining. I think the key thing the key thing to remember in this whole debate is the fact that what the state law does is mandate collective bargaining among public employees. Public employees now have the right to



collective... to bargain collectively. The key issue in the whole Bill is the fact that it does mandate collective bargaining and I just feel, as a matter of public policy, that it's bad public policy to mandate collective bargaining among the public sector. We have collective bargaining now among many major units throughout the State of Illinois. We do not have a mandatory law that says Thou shalt bargain collectively and I think that's the key differentiation. I think the fact that it is opposed by the Illinois Association of State Employees. The fact that that organization, the second largest organization of public employees within the State of Illinois, opposes this Bill, is key to the whole debate. I think when the Sponsor labels it as a dream come true, I think the fact still remains that it could be labeled a dream but it also could be labeled a bad dream and could also go as far as saying that this Bill, in final analysis, is a nightmare. I would urge your opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry. How many votes are required to pass this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "107 ma'am."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I checked with the Parliamentarian. Parliamentarian told me it was 107 votes. Gentleman from Cook... Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Point of order. That question has been clarified many times. It is 89 votes sir because it does not preempt home rule. And the Parliamentarian the Speaker has ruled not once, but every lawyer has read this, knows it does not preempt



home rule. It needs 89 votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm glad he's back. I'll get back to you. The question was how many votes does it take. 107 and Mr. Hanahan says that previous rulings have been 89. Not on this form Mr. Hanahan. Parliamentarian says 107. Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. Previous question has been moved. Gentleman from Coles (sic), Mr. Stuffle to close."

Stuffle: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Members. I find it interesting the opposition to this Bill that I hear here today and have heard before. People say they're for collective bargaining but not this Bill. When we added another Bill last year they were for collective bargaining but not that Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me Larry. Kindly give the Gentleman your attention."

Stuffle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. People are for collective bargaining but they're never for what's before us. Every possible form of collective bargaining has been here and they've opposed everyone of them. The arguments against the Bill haven't been on the merits of the Bill. The words we here in opposition to the Bill are strikes bossism, unionism, compulsion, even Pat Quinn. What the hell's he got to do with this Bill? It's brought up three times today. Close shop. Nobody talks about majority rule. Nobody wants to admit that where a majority of employees want to form a union and want to bargain and want to be fair and want to have a decent contract that everybody should be



putting the money in. They shouldn't get something for nothing. Nobody talks about fairness. Nobody talks about order. Nobody talks about the fact that we've got collective bargaining, but it's piecemeal. It's district by district and city by city with 500,000 people in chaos, not in order. The need for this Bill is demonstrated over and over and over again with the strike in the City of Chicago. This Bill bans strikes by firemen and policemen. That is clear. That is uncontradictable. Each of you and all of you have received these little cards from the right to work people that say stop 800. Stop compulsory unionism. This Bill isn't compulsory unionism. This Bill provides for majority rule. You can hide from this Bill today and you can hide tomorrow but you can't hide forever. As Representative Hanahan said, 'You can't keep burying your head in the sand and hoping that collective bargaining, that labor disputes will go away'. These 500,000 people are just that, people. They're public employees but they're taxpayers too. They ought to be treated with decency, with fairness and we ought to give the taxpayers what we keep talking about some systematic order instead of unruly chaos and we ought to put this law on the books and have the courage to do so and stop running from those people who don't want to understand and don't want to accept the realities of life. I would urge you to take and forward and not a backward look and to support 800 so we can have some order in this state. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is shall House Bill 800 pass?"

All in favor vote aye. All oppose vote nay.

Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino to explain his vote



Timer's on."

Mautino: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sorry I didn't have the opportunity to speak during debate but I will, very quickly, address two issues I think were brought up in debate that I find very difficult that this House really believes. That is that we in the General Assembly have abrogated our responsibility and have relinquished it with this piece of legislation. As everyone knows, in the State of Illinois, we have basic collective bargaining through executive order six passed in 1974 and '75 and I have listened to Members on that side of the aisle complain, when an appropriation comes in to enforce and enact that executive order six. The main issue at the time was always we have nothing to say about it. It's done by the Governor. It's thrust upon us and we must appropriate the money. Here is your chance to at least have some input into the system that we have to fund at least for our state employees. So I do not believe that we have abrogated any responsibility and I vote aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me also respond to Representative Hanahan. House Bill 800 requires 3/5 vote under Article 7, Section 6-6 of the Constitution. This legislation specifically preempts the power of home rule units in the area of labor relations. Section 15 of the Bill on page 24 contains explicit preemption language. This preemption extends the powers and functions of home rule municipalities and counties which are not exercised or performed by the state itself. House Bill 800 would regulate and limit the exercise of these local functions. For these reasons, House Bill 800 constitutes a limitation on home rule powers



which are not exercised by the state within the meaning of Section 6-G of the Constitution. Consequently, House Bill 800 will require 107 affirmative votes to pass. Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "On that point, I'm not going to ask for clarification of it, Sir. But, I do have access to the tape where this Bill...this language has already been ordered by the Speaker...the permanent Speaker to have only a necessary 89 votes when it was on Third Reading before, specifically, the same language. One of the problems is that when you change Speakers, you sometimes change the rules of the game. That's why we need House Bill 800."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Oblinger: "All I want to...well, when you're mentioned even obliquely by another Speaker I think I can answer. I have, Mr. Stuffle, for your information, voted for other collective bargaining Bills, and I resent your blanket statement saying that we don't".

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "No, I was just going to ask for a poll of the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 76 'ayes', 70 'nays', 10 recorded as 'present', and the Gentleman asks for a poll of the absentees. And, Mr. Simms wants a verification if it gets to 107."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I don't mind a verification if it doesn't get to 107. I don't want anyone to add their names to or for or against this Bill after it's finished today. So, I don't mind a verification now or later, just so that nobody adds their names, because this Bill, as



you...as most people are well aware, constitutes a big labor vote for November."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Capuzi. Ewell. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Kornowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kornowicz, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leinenweber. Leverenz. Margalus. McAuliffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McAuliffe, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom. Meyer. Peters. Skinner. Sumner. Vitek. White. Winchester. Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yourell, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 79 'ayes', 71 'noes'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 276 on page 3. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 276. A Bill for an Act to reduce the State Occupation and Use Taxes on food and prescription medicines and drugs for human consumption. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation removes another percent from the sales tax on food and drugs. It will become effective January 1, 1981. In the past, you realize that we have sponsored legislation which would remove the entire sales tax on food and drugs. With the uncertain economic times, with volatile interest rates, with a possible recession, it would appear more reasonable to remove one additional percent this year and come back next year to remove the remaining sales tax on food and



you...as most people are well aware, constitutes a big labor vote for November."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Capuzi. Ewell. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Kornowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kornowicz, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leinenweber. Leverenz. Margalus. McAuliffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McAuliffe, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom. Meyer. Peters. Skinner. Sumner. Vitek. White. Winchester. Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yourell, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 79 'ayes', 71 'noes'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 276 on page 3. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 276. A Bill for an Act to reduce the State Occupation and Use Taxes on food and prescription medicines and drugs for human consumption. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation removes another percent from the sales tax on food and drugs. It will become effective January 1, 1981. In the past, you realize that we have sponsored legislation which would remove the entire sales tax on food and drugs. With the uncertain economic times, with volatile interest rates, with a possible recession, it would appear more reasonable to remove one additional percent this year and come back next year to remove the remaining sales tax on food and



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 1002 is tabled. House Bill 1016. Mr. McPike. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1016. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table House Bill 1016."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 1016 is tabled. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Bowman, please."

Bowman: "I was seeking recognition to offer an objection. I'd like to Representative McPike about that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's untimely. Wait a minute. 1034. Mr...back up. Go over and talk to him. 1034. Mrs. Braun. Out of the record. Tabled. 1044. Mr. Ewell. Take it out of the record. 1136. Mr. Skinner. Out of the record. 1164. Mr. Hanahan. Hanahan. 1164. Read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1164. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the University Civil Service Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as long as many Legislators are becoming educated in the field of labor relations, I'd like to point out that in House Bill 800 there was specifically an exemption...two exemptions from the coverage. One had happened to be the CTA and RTA, and the other was the non-academic university employees under the University Civil Service Act. The reason for those exemptions is under both Acts there is presently, whether you like it or not, whether you would've voted for it or not, but under today's law the allowance for collective bargaining for those public employees. Now, under that Act in the University Civil Service..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Tim. Would the Parliamentarian come back to the rostrum? Please continue."

Hanahan: "...different than the RTA-CTA, which already has the union check-off and the union provisions for check-off, the University Civil Service Act does not provide for it. It is a much needed Amendment to the law. I'm sure there are some people who, philosophically, would disagree with the provision, but I think most people understand that if you have a service provided for you, whether it'd be by a union or any other organization, that you should have to pay your share of the dues that it takes to keep the organization alive and operable, and this Bill...House Bill 1164 would create the inequity that we now have in the University Civil Service. They already...let me point out, they already have collective bargaining. You're not going to undo that with this Bill by defeating it, so whether you like it or not it's there. It's been there since 1950, whether you knew it or not. It's just that this one provision is not in the Act, and the university employees have petitioned me almost unanimously. There is no great disagreement by the employees for this provision of the Act, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? No discussion. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1164 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 'ayes', 58 'noes', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Sponsor requests a poll of the absentees. Kindly record Mr. Stearney as 'aye', and Mr. Simms wants a verification. Kindly record Mr. Williamson as 'aye', Doctor Capuzi as 'aye', Lieutenant McAuliffe as 'aye'. No, I'm sorry. He is 'aye'. The Gent...kindly record



Mr. Preston as 'aye', Mr. Harris as 'aye', Mr. Brummer as 'aye'. What do you need, Lee? Mr. Preston, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Preston, please."

Preston: "The board still records me as 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Preston. Poll the absentees, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Bowman."

Unknown: "Bowman?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Casey. Donovan. John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Dunn as 'aye', please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewell. Flinn. Friedrich. No, it's...yeah, Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Greiman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Greiman as 'aye'. Mr. Bowman as 'aye'. Greiman. No, Greiman and Bowman. Kindly record Mr. Casey as 'no', and Mr. Ropp as 'no'. Please continue with the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Katz. Leinenweber. Margalus. McBroom. Meyer. Neff. Skinner. E. G. Steele. Sumner. Van Duyne. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ebbesen wants to be recorded as 'no', Farley...wait a minute. Mr. Birkinbine, you are recorded as 'no', Sir. Oh, I'm sorry. Hallock. Kindly record Mr. Hallock as 'no', and Mr. Farley asks leave to be verified. The Gentleman has leave. Kindly record Mr. Donovan as 'aye', Mr. Stanley as 'aye', Mr. McBroom as 'no', Mrs. Balanoff as 'aye'. What's the count? Is there anyone else that wants to be recorded? Mr. Friedrich as 'no'. What's the count, Jack? On this question there are 98 'ayes'; 63 'noes'. Mr. Simms, do you persist?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, could we have the Members take their seats? Maybe we could expeditiously go through it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McGrew asks leave to be verified. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. And, Mr. Leon as well."



Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I won't object to any more leaves, because it becomes too hard to check them off, and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, there's only four people so far. It's not too hard at all. McGrew has got leave. Leon's got leave. Ronan's got leave."

Simms: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Clerk will proceed to verify."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here. Go on."

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. For what purpose does the Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Breslin, seek recognition? Mrs. Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave is granted, ma'am. Please continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Younge: "May I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, ma'am. Leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton. Farley. Gaines. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijeovich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Huff."



Huff: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified."

Hearing no objections, the Gentleman's verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain. McGrew.

McPike. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy.

Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters.

Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond.

Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schlickman.

Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Stanley.

Stearney. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser.

Terzich. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer.

Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. And, Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions of the 98 solid votes?"

Simms: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty. The Gentleman is in his chair as always."

Simms: "Okay. Representative Braun."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Braun is by her chair."

Simms: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummer. He's right...he's in the hall."

Simms: "Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli's here as always."

Simms: "Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Christensen is here in his chair."

Simms: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson. Mr. Dawson. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Domico."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Domico's in his chair."

Simms: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Doyle's in his chair."

Simms: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I told Harris he had leave. Harris had



leave. He's in the back anyway, though."

Simms: "Okay. Representative Kornowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here. He's in his chair."

Simms: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Laurino. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Laurino."

Simms: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here."

Simms: "Representative Murphy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Larry Murphy's in his chair."

Simms: "O'Brien."

Speaker Lechowicz: "O'Brien. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. O'Brien."

Simms: "Patrick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Patrick. He's back there."

Simms: "Representative Pierce."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pierce is in his chair."

Simms: "Representative Polk. Oh, Ben's there. Okay. Representative Preston."

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

Simms: "Rea."

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

Simms: "Richmond."

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

Simms: "Sharp. There he is."

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

Simms: "Stearney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stearney. Mr. Stearney. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stearney. Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Terzich."



Speaker Lechowicz: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Terzich."

Simms: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Simms: "Representative Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Simms?"

Simms: "No further questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Kindly put Mr. Terzich back on."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ninety-four."

Speaker Lechowicz: "94 'ayes'...on this question there are 94 'ayes', 63 'noes'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, asks leave on House Bill 1016, having voted on the prevailing side...there's a motion to table, that it be reconsidered."

McPike: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was tabled in there, and I would ask for that motion to be reconsidered and bring it back off the table. We tabled that about 10 minutes ago."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the Gentleman's motion carries. The Bill's back on Third Reading. House Bill 1016. Would you care to call 1166, Mr. McPike? Out of the record. 1192, Mr. Sandquist. Out of the record. 1202, Mr. Kelly. Out of the record. 1278, Mrs. Younge. Out of the record. 1279, Mr. Marovitz. Out of the record. 1327, Mr. Totten. Out of the record. 1371, Mr. Steczo. It's the intent of the Chair to go about another hour and then we will adjourn until tomorrow. We'll go into our Committees at three, so we'll be leaving here at two o'clock. 1375, Mr. Katz. Out of the record."



1381, Mr. Steczo. Out of the record. 1384. Out of the record. 8...1387, Mrs. Pullen. Out of the record. 1407, Mr. Marovitz. 1410. Out of the record. 1476, Mr. Hoffman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1476. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to instruments. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you remember a Session or so ago, we dealt with an issue in reference to Memorial Day to conform Memorial Day in the State of Illinois with Memorial Day on the federal level. This Bill provides in the Negotiable Instruments Act that Memorial Day will be celebrated on the day designated as Memorial Day by federal law. This is the last of the duplicative areas in legislation which provide duplicate Memorial Days. Therefore, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move for favorable consideration on House Bill 1476 which would conform all of Illinois law on Memorial Day to conform with that day designated by federal law."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, I'd like to tell the Sponsor of this Bill, why don't he let the dead rest in peace? These individuals gave their lives so that we can still go on doing our daily business as we do today. Let's leave a little remembrance in their behalf if nothing else. All it is is a token Memorial Day that exists here in Illinois. We're just waiting until the Congress gets time to change that down in Washington, and then we'll go right in line with the rest of the nation. But, in the meantime, I think we ought to...on behalf of our deceased veterans, retain what little semblance



of Memorial Day we have here and continue going on being as it is. Let's forget these unAmerican guys."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hardly concur with Representative DiPrima that we should do something about retaining our traditional holidays such as Memorial Day. Finally, in Congress there is an awareness and a movement back to the traditional observance of our holidays. They have changed some back. Congress is a long time in admitting their mistakes, but they have partially admitted the mistakes they've made in changing some of the holidays, and there is hope, I believe, at this time, that the Federal Government will also move Memorial Day back into its traditional time. I implore you once again to reject this Bill. Let's keep Memorial Day where we have always celebrated it in Illinois. Illinois among all the states should be the one to take the lead in retaining Memorial Day observance on the day on which it has historically been observed. Memorial Day began in Illinois. It has been celebrated in Illinois from its inception on the day that we have always had it, and I say to you, let's keep it. Let's give Congress time to reconsider this one more mistake that they have made and change their minds and bring it back into concurrence with us. Let's not us follow the lead of Congress like blind sheep. Let's let them admit their mistake and come back and join us."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "All I...Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, historically all I want to remind you is, which has already been stated, that Illinois has a particular effort and a particular pride in the foundation... formation of Memorial Day. However, our every state song about by the ...rivers gently flowing and all that



contains the name of Logan and all his peers, which is ...which means of the General Logan, who is the author of Memorial Day. An Illinois General through the Civil War. I just wanted to add that bit of historical information."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill does not take away from due reverence to those who have died for this country. This Bill does not abolish Memorial Day. What this Bill does is to bring Illinois into conformity with the Federal Government, to bring Illinois into conformity with the vast majority of the states, and to bring Illinois into conformity with itself, because previously we amended the School Code to provide for the same day that the Federal Government designates. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, over the years we've heard that same cry, tradition. There is nothing historical of any value with respect to May 30. That was an arbitrary date that was set. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if the Gentlemen who want May 30 nationally, they should fight that battle at the federal level, and if they are successful, Illinois will revert back to May 30. This Bill does not say a particular date. It simply says the same day as designated by the Federal Government. I think it's a good Bill. It's one that will avoid conflicts within the State of Illinois, within families, and it will be in accord with the concensus within this country. We are one country, and I think this is a step to promote that unity that we fought for just prior to the designation of May 30, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on previous occasions Larry DiPrima had tried to stop this Bill and



then here about three years he indicated, well, we'll just wait a little while longer to...if they don't change that law, then we're going to do it. Now, he's backing down and raising a lot of hell till the VFW get on his back, but he had given his work that he would go along with the change, that we had come to the end of the road, we should be logical and reasonable, and I think we should be, and we should support this Bill. So should Larry DiPrima."

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

Skinner: "The Gentleman standing in front of me suggested that we should wait till Congress decides to change its mind. Well, when I ran in the primary election against Congressman McClory, who was the Sponsor of the Monday Holiday Bill, he beat me. I guess that's about the only way to put it, and so those of you who are waiting for Congress to change its mind, I think may have a long wait, especially if Congressman McClory's district is about the same as it is this time. If I were he, I'd run again."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to close." Hoffman, please. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Frankly, I'm shocked. I am shocked that the Gentleman who passed...the Gentleman who passed this legislation...the Gentleman who passed this legislation for schools has risen today and objected to this reasonable and responsible piece of legislation. That...that is very, very difficult for me to believe, because he stood on this floor of the House and he said, 'Pass this Memorial Day legislation.' And, I said, right on, Representative. Let's pass it, and I handed it over to him. Some of you were here. You remember how well he did, and today...and today he rises, and even under his breath I think he said



something that wasn't very nice about me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...you can believe that. Not Larry. Not Larry."

Hoffman: "I think the point needs to be made that if the Federal Government...if the Federal Government changes this back, we say in the Bill, in conformity with the federal law. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's no reason for us to run on dual tracks on this issue. Let's get this state together on this issue and support it. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1476 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk...excuse me. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Friedrich: "The reason that a lot of people gave for voting 'aye' on this is the very reason I'm voting 'no'. I'm getting sick and tired of doing something just because the Congress of the United States does something. It's obvious they haven't got sense enough to run the United States. I don't know why we think we should let them run the State of Illinois. It's about time we came back to being sovereign states as we were meant to be."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 47 'noes', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1480. Take it out of the record. 1483. Mr. Katz. Take it out of the record. 1500. Mr. Skinner. Out of the record. 1503. Mr. Yourell. Out of the record. 1522. Mr. Hanahan. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill...House Bill 1522. A Bill for



an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1522 amends the Illinois Purchasing Act and requires that the service contracts in excess of \$2,000 or \$200 per month under this Act to be performed by employees working for rates and conditions locally prevalent. To simplify any explanation, it would be specifically alleged that what is happening in one area of our state is service work such as window cleaning and janitorial work, cleaning of the buildings, are being sub-contracted to contractors that are only using the method of reducing the wages paid the employees as a method of taking away the work from other employees. We protect those in the building trades and specifically most of the prevailing wage employees in 19 craft trades that we consider prevailing wage employees from having this exploitation of their wages being in some way subverted. The people that are exempt and need help are the people at the bottom of the economic ladder. These are the people Pete Miller is representing, and he's asked specifically for me to introduce this Bill and mention that Pete needs your vote. The Governor has met with the leadership of the Service Employees International Union and has agreed that this is much needed legislation and is not in opposition...fifteen minutes ago that I know of. I could suggest that the Bill would stabilize a unique area of employment, and that's the people at the bottom of the economic ladder...the janitors, the window cleaners, that work in our buildings. It should not be allowed that in Illinois that we're keeping our tax loads strictly by reducing our wages to people who earn generally less than five dollars an hour. This is not the method nor is it conducive to good government



relations that we somehow use this method to reduce the taxes. It would be much better to have increased productivity and increased technicalities...or technicalologically advances to perform the service work than to try and reduce wages and payments to people who are really just a...just a scan hair above poverty level earnings. This is a good Bill. It has passed the Legislature before. It's by request that I'm handling this Bill. I do have some knowledge of the field of service employment. I did work for the union at one time, and I suggest that knowing it from the bottom up that it would be a good vote to support House Bill 1522. It specifically exempts any professional artistic services, so we're really talking about a unique area, generally speaking in the service area of window cleaning and janitorial service work. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe I need to ask any questions of the Sponsor. I hope that all of the Legislators that are sitting around talking to their seatmates and not listening to this realize this is another attack upon the American free enterprise system. This is the most preposterous concept to require anybody in business to pay a prevailing rate. It does nothing but just erraticate the concept of supply and demand, and the more we erraticate that concept in our society, the more we are doomed to produce people that have to rely entirely upon the labor union concept. If you will note in your analysis, at least, the Republican analysis, they correctly determine that this would be ...turn over the entire process of determining prevailing wage rates to the labor unions. That's the last thing we need. If there's any element of our society today



that has done more to create inflation, it's been the labor unions. In this one particular area, what we are effectively going to find out is that instead of people who are in the lower wage rate having a higher income, they will receive no income, because the small businessmen, the small business people that are trying to make ends meet after we've done everything we can in this Legislature to destroy the business climate will go out and try to do the work themselves, because they won't be able to afford anybody to do this menial labor. So, I would suggest that in another instance we look upon this as an attack upon the free enterprise system, an attack upon the integrity of our economic policies and realize this is another grab by the labor unions and definitely vote 'no' on this terrible Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to close."

Hanahan: "Just very briefly, I never knew that janitors making about four dollars and fifty cents an hour really caused the higher inflation rate in this country. I've always heard that it was government in Washington printing too much money. I've heard that the interest rates that banks are charging for the loaning of money causes inflation, and I certainly have heard that OPEC causes inflation, but I've never heard that some poor window washer causes inflation. I think that's absurd. We're talking about people at the bottom of the economic ladder. We're talking about small businesses that aren't existing anymore, because they don't have this kind of protection. This is a good, solid piece of legislation to help the small businessman not to be exploited. If I ever handled a piece of legislation that was for small business, this is it. It's for the small businessman who is trying to compete and trying to do service work for the state...under state contract.



These small businessmen can't compete with people who are using illegal aliens, using people who don't belong in the work force, and subverting minimum wage and everything else in order to get their work done at substandard contracts. What we'd like to do is stabilize it. This, in no way, allows the union to set the rates. This Bill specifically...no different than with the prevailing wage law for all other prevailing wages are determined by our own bureaucracy...our own Department of Labor, and, in no way, does the union set the wage rate. It is our Department of Labor that does, which is not owned or operated by any union, especially in this administration, that I know of. So, I could just suggest this is a good Bill. It's for small business and small businessmen. I understand that there's a lot of support on both sides of the aisle, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1522 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Tommy. Tommy. Have all voted who wish? Have all... the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this reaches 89 votes, I'll request a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 55 'noes', 2 recorded as 'present'. Mr. Hanahan wants a poll of the absentees. Mr. Griesheimer wants a verification. And, would the Membership kindly be...be in your own seat, so we can expedite the verification, please? Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Jake Wolf as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Bluthardt. Boucek."



Bradley. Cullerton. Donovan. John Dunn. Ewell.
Flinn. Garmisa. Getty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly change Mr. Jake Wolf from 'no' to 'aye'. He realized it was Pete's Bill. Please continue."

Clerk Leone: "Leinenweber. Leon. Madigan. Margalus. McAuliffe. McGrew. Meyer. Molloy. Reilly. Schoeberlein. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Leon as 'aye'. Continue."

Clerk Leone: "Sumner. Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Willer as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Sam Wolf." Younge. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 93 'ayes' and 56 'noes', and Mr. Griesheimer, do you still persist in the verification?"

Griesheimer: "Yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Currie. Darrow. Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, seek recognition?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inherent personal feeling that justice will prevail at some higher level, and I withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Molloy, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Molloy as 'aye'. On this question there are 94 'ayes'...is that right, Tony? On this question there are 94 'ayes', 56 'noes'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1566. Mr. Terzich. Take it out of



the record. Also, 67...70. 1589. Out of the record. 1590. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 1592. Out of the record. 1624. John Dunn. Out of the record. 1625. Mr. Skinner. Out of the record. Oh, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 1625."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1625. A Bill for an Act to prohibit the unemployment in this state for aliens who are in the United States illegally. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Skinner: "For anybody that's not awake, this would be a good time to perk up. You know, we had...well, thank you. I appreciate that, Ted...or Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill which has a strange conglomeration of Sponsors. Myself, Representative Hanahan...where is Representative Hanahan? He said he was going to be here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right there in the back of the chamber, Sir."

Skinner: "Oh, all right. Here we are, Tom. And, Representative Gaines as well as my former running mate, Representative Waddell. We come from the Fox River Valley, Representatives Hanahan, myself, and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Charlie Gaines?"

Skinner: "...Representative Waddell. And, in the Fox River Valley, as in other parts of the state, there's a very large problem of illegal aliens taking jobs from United States citizens and from...and from legal aliens. These are factory jobs most of them. It's not stoop work. It's primarily jobs that are fairly well paying. Unfortunately, in the United States, illegal aliens are a very large part of the unemployment problem. The number of people who are illegal aliens as the percentage of the labor market are estimated to be as large as the percentage of people who are unemployed. Now, let me say that once more in a slightly different way. If we could get rid of all the illegal aliens and if the people



who are unemployed took their jobs, we wouldn't have unemployment in this country. We would have full employment. There are that many jobs involved. Now, I don't stand here to criticize the labor that the illegal aliens give. They're generally very conscientious workers, and they're very conscientious workers for a very good reason, because the employer has a big stick over their head. For that reason, some illegal aliens are not paid the minimum wage. The employers do not pay unemployment compensation insurance. They do not pay workmen's compensation insurance. They don't... they don't follow the state laws with regard to benefits that employees should be able to have. So, what we've done here is build on a Bill that started with Representative Sevcik back in about 1970 in the Illinois Crime Commission before its name was changed. It's gone through several Sponsorships. Representative Borchers was a Sponsor of a Bill like this at one point, and this time around there are several other Bills that have been introduced. This, however, is the Bill that is before us. It is an approach to the subject matter which places the sanctions on the employer who knowingly hires illegal aliens. I believe this is the only way that we can approach the problem from the state government point of view. It seems to me if one looks at that national...the national approach, there is no national approach. We have a sieve for a border between Mexico and the United States and through that sieve come absolutely thousands of people per week. I think the passage of House Bill 1625 would show the State of Illinois is serious about protecting the job opportunities for Illinois citizens, and I ask for your support of the Bill based on that argument and others which other supporters will give I hope."

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



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Darrow: "Representative Skinner, on Section V, the first paragraph, it would appear that if an employer is paying less than a minimum wage, that's prima facie evidence of violation. In other words..."

Skinner: "That's correct."

Darrow: "In other words, the only proof that the State's Attorney or whoever's enforcing this has to do is put someone on and say, the employer's paying less than a prima facie wage, and that's automatically enough. He can rest his case at that point."

Skinner: "That's a very good analysis."

Darrow: "Is that correct?"

Skinner: "Yes."

Darrow: "And, that's your purpose?"

Skinner: "Yes, and there are also some other ones if you'd like to go through them. Failure to pay social security tax, failure to pay unemployment compensation tax, failure to withhold Illinois state income tax. We think these are pretty good clues that an employer is hiring an illegal alien. In fact, they're more than good clues. We think they are evidence of it."

Darrow: "Well, has the Chamber of Commerce or anyone looked at this? I think this will be a hardship on the employers. I'm...I'm trying to think..."

Skinner: "Excuse me."

Darrow: "I'm not being...necessarily I'm not that concerned about the Chamber of Commerce on all issues, but I think they might have an interest in this. Have you discussed it with the Chamber?"

Skinner: "I'm sure the Chamber of Commerce does not favor this Bill. They killed the...the business community has consistently killed this Bill and its predecessor...predecessor Bills to this Bill in the State Senate



which seems to be controlled by the establishment no matter who's in control as far as the party goes."

Darrow: "Well, as long as you understand that, I have no further questions."

Skinner: "I understand that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie. Currie, please."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise to oppose this Bill. I'm concerned not primarily about the effect of the Bill on the employers, but on those potential employees who may indeed be legal aliens in this country but may not have adequate evidence thereof. It is already illegal for an employer in the State of Illinois to fail to pay unemployment insurance, to fail to pay social security taxes, to do all of those things that Representative Skinner would like to use as evidence for the status of an employee as an illegal. I don't think we need additional laws on the books to add to the illegality, which is already quite well established. The problem of illegal immigration is indeed a serious one, but it is one unfortunately that the state really has no role to play in. It's the Federal Government's responsibility to establish and to enforce immigration laws. Unfortunately, indeed, they are not doing an adequate job. Unfortunate for the point...from the point of view of the individual who is here as a legal alien. They are not even able to maintain the kinds of record that would mean that individuals, who perhaps came here quite legally, can show to the satisfaction of the state under Representative Skinner's legislation that they do have every right to be in this country. At least ten thousand legal aliens in the United States do not have records up-to-date with the Federal Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. For us to participate



in this kind of program that Representative Skinner suggests, is only to put a very substantial burden on those individuals who are here quite legally. There is also no question but that many illegal aliens come to this country from countries to the south of us with language problems, with some kinds of differences in skin tone and color. The odds that those individuals quite legally here, perhaps even born in this country, will have trouble gaining legal employment in the State of Illinois if Representative Skinner's Bill is passed. There is an issue of civil rights and liberties. It seems to me that passage of this Bill will make it very hard for individuals, who have every right to be here but perhaps speak a language different from English, perhaps look a little different, from getting the jobs they ought to have. The role of enforcing immigration legislation belongs to the Federal Government. I don't think there is a role for the State of Illinois as described by Representative Skinner in this Bill. I encourage my colleagues to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as one who also represents part of McHenry County, as Representative Skinner does, I, however, rise in total and strong opposition to this legislation. If there's one problem we have in Illinois, it's our business climate. We have businesses, and we hear this over and over again, who are leaving Illinois, and they're going to other states. They're going to Iowa. They're going to Texas. They're going to California. They're going to many other places because of a lot of problems in Illinois. The unemployment, the tax burden, the workmen's comp...compensation tax burden, and now along comes Representative Skinner who wants to add another burden to the business community and that



is, he wants to cut off the work force so that the businesses who do need, and I have had businessmen in my district tell me, particularly in the nursery area, that they could not function. They would have to close down and go to some other state if they could not employ these migrant workers. This is really a federal problem. The Federal Congress should allow for temporary seasonal work permits, so that these people don't have to shift across the border and come up here without the proper papers. One of the problems for our businessmen in the State of Illinois, is people are simply not willing to work. You talk to nurserymen. They place ads in the newspaper. They try to get people from the Waukegan area to come and to plant these plants in the mud and to do this work and perform a lot of functions, and our people simply will not work. And, the businessmen will have to close down and go to other states unless they have this work force. This is another example of a Bill that would drive businesses out of Illinois. This is the worst kind. This is the kind of a Bill that would also try to make policemen and criminals out of the businessmen. It's almost impossible to enforce this sort of a law. I would encourage Members to think carefully about this and not to add to another burden that is going to drive businesses out of the state and eliminate jobs that are available for people who want to work."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. John Dunn."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Dunn: "Mr. Sponsor, how does a citizen...natural born citizen, at the present time, prove that he is a citizen when he applies for a job? Does he have to take a birth certificate? Does he have to take any kind of a card, or paper, or document, or does he just fill out an



application and say, 'I was born in Woodstock, McHenry County, Illinois?'"

Skinner: "That's a good question."

Dunn: "And, if your..."

Skinner: "That's a good question. I can't answer it."

Dunn: "And, if your legislation passes..."

Skinner: "I would prove it with a birth certificate myself."

Dunn: "...how will an employer...how will an employer determine..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Dunn. Mr. Hanahan wants to respond to your question."

Hanahan: "Yes, I'm a..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan."

Hanahan: "...chief Cosponsor. I think I can answer it. If you read the prima facie evidence that we use, this would determine pretty evidently whether a citizen is applying for a job or not. This is somebody who would ...who would not have his social security tax paid, would not be even receiving minimum wage, would not have unemployment insurance, or workmen's comp paid for. These are the evidenciary system that we take as prima facie evidence that the person applying is not a citizen, because they're not trying to comply with other laws. And, they'd have to act in concert with the employer of saying that, 'I will work for you without social security, or without unemployment insurance, and all the other provisions under the statutes being provided for my employment.' This would be pretty well evidence for somebody who is not a citizen."

Dunn: "The question is different though. An employer is out there today, and someone walks in the door. He presumes he's a citizen and hires him. After this becomes legislation, how is an employer going to be entitled to presume that someone was born in Woodstock in McHenry County...?"



Hanahan: "All he has to do is ask the question."

Dunn: "...or whether he was born in Mexico City, Mexico."

Hanahan: "All he has to do is ask the question."

Dunn: "All right. And, if he asks the question, and person happens to have been born in Mexico City, Mexico and lies about it..."

Hanahan: "He's exempt."

Dunn: "...then the employer's in trouble."

Hanahan: "No, he's exempt."

Dunn: "And to protect himself..."

Hanahan: "He's..."

Dunn: "...isn't the employer...isn't the employer going to have to ask for a birth certificate...?"

Hanahan: "No."

Dunn: "...or certified documentary evidence from every person who comes through his door if this becomes law?"

Hanahan: "No."

Dunn: "There's no other way."

Hanahan: "No, no. You're misinterpreting. The interpretation should be that once an employer asks a prospective employee of...whether or not he's a citizen and does not enter into any other illegal activity of not paying social security taxes, not paying unemployment insurance, and other gimmicks that they use to exploit these illegal aliens, then we have to...and the government, and certainly the courts would have to look at the fact that the employer is not responsible if somebody lied. But, is he on top of...lying to..."

Dunn: "Where is this saying...?"

Hanahan: "Well, it's here...Section of our...Section V."

Dunn: "Is that the prima facie evidence Section?"

Hanahan: "That's right."

Dunn: "The prima facie evidence Section says that for the purpose of this Act, any of the following shall constitute prima facie evidence of a violation of this Act."



Hanahan: "Right."

Dunn: "Failure to pay social security tax. It doesn't say anything about an employer asking a question and being given a wrong answer."

Hanahan: "Well, that would..."

Dunn: "As I read..."

Hanahan: "...presumption that he's innocent...your lawyer... presumption he's innocent to be held in any court of law."

Dunn: "A court of law is bound by the law as it is presented in the statute books. This says that all...if an employer has an applicant lie to him, and..."

Hanahan: "And, that wouldn't be a presumption that the employer is..."

Dunn: "It has nothing to do with it."

Hanahan: "Not guilty of employing any illegal alien?"

Dunn: "This Bill may be well-meaning in its intent, but it needs a lot of revision and a lot of further refining before it becomes a Bill that ought to hit the statute books. I agree..."

Hanahan: "Well, I'm sure the Senate will do it."

Dunn: "...with the concept, and I don't trust the Senate. I think this Bill ought to come back to Second Reading in the House for further Amendments or it shouldn't go out of here, and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill in its present form."

Hanahan: "Where were you for Second Reading?"

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

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're having a severe economic downturn in this country. Everyone knows that. We have unemployed people who are American citizens who go to the employment office, can't find a job. They knock on factory doors. They can't find jobs. Yet these factories and small businesses of some sorts as well as big businesses, continue to



hire non-citizens. Then we complain when these citizens get on welfare, and we call them lazy, because there are no jobs for them and no training for them. That is why we need to regulate the employment of non-citizens who are here illegally. No one is opposed to a legal alien coming in, because they have done the right thing, but you are rewarding the person who illegally comes into this country at the expense of a person who was legally born in this country or who legally migrates to this country. The businessmen who do the hiring are in the best position to determine whether a person is or is not a citizen, because when somebody's looking for a job, they'll come up with whatever documents you ask them to come up with, and that is why I cosponsored this legislation, because when persons that I know come to me and say that where they work they cannot be promoted, because there are so many illegal aliens there only someone who can speak their language can be promoted. It concerns me, and it concerns me when American children, black and white alike, have to apply for public aid and you here on this floor say, 'Don't give them any.' And, these illegal aliens are working. Let us take care of those American citizens who would like to work first. Then that will cut down on our relief load. That will cut down on workmen's compensation claims. It will cut down on everything if the Americans who want to work were allowed to work, so that's why I'm asking everyone to vote 'yes' on this measure to put the responsibility where it belongs on the businessmen who do the hiring. If they didn't hire, the illegal aliens wouldn't be coming over here. They come over here, because they know when they get here, somebody's going to hire them. No one goes from a warm climate to a cold climate if they can't find jobs, and then with



this Iranian problem we're finding out that there are other illegal aliens who come here as students and then drop out of school and go into the American work force at the expense of Americans. If we hadn't fallen out with Iran, we wouldn't have known about all these thousands of Iranian students that are over here. They can't find them. They also are illegal aliens, so we have all kinds of classifications of illegal aliens who are working over here and Americans have to get on welfare or get in jail, because they steal in order to feed their family, so I'm asking as a vote to help the Americans who are unemployed to support this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I've been long interested in this problem. I have been contacting the Department of Immigration in Washington since 1972. That's when I put the first Bills in. I would like to tell you that the people that have al... and I've gotten the Bills through the House. I've gotten them up to the Senate where they were killed by what I call the 'peapicker' lobbyist of the canneries. Also, the Waiters...Waiters' Union in the Chicago area. For your information, and some of you must surely know it, you can hardly go to a hotel and speak to any of the people running that hotel and taking care of things unless you understand Spanish. Now, I'm not against the Spanish. I am not against the legal...a legal person coming into this country, but it is ridiculous for us to permit the inflow into this country that's occurring. It may surprise you to know that I have called Washington to find figures. Right now, as we sit here, you lily-white and you ethnic black Members of this General Assembly, we have 500...over 500,000 illegal aliens in this state. Now, I'm not going to go



into the matter of welfare and into the matter of getting on social security and all that. These things are really happening. I'd like to point out to you that a child born to an illegal alien is an instant citizen by our law...federal, and the parents are then able to go and get on our welfare roll and bring their whole families with them. Maybe 14...15 of them at one crack, and we are then paying the freight. I want to point out to you about the government...the fed...about the Federal Government...or the Federal Government being responsible. That is true, but we are responsible for what's happening in Illinois. We have state's rights. Now, we are allowing our sales to be undated...undated by this inflow from the South. There is probably 16 million or approximately illegal aliens in this country. Now, I want to point out and for...have you look at the record of the environmental population impact study just out last year. They state in this study, which I have in my possession and which I have read, that by 1985, and you ebony blacks that I mentioned a minute ago better be thinking about this. There will be more illegal aliens in this United States than there are black citizens who help found the country like the lily-whites, so to speak. Both of us together own this country, and we're giving it away. We're giving it away by handing it away. Right now in Chicago the law is that legal documents must be Spanish on one side and English on the other, because we're doing this right in this House. In but a short time, you're going to see more and more...we have no Hispanics yet, but we're going to have them, because they're already talking about getting together to form a political power to take control. Now, let me tell you one other thing that the environmental impact study had to say. They said that..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to the Bill?"

Borchers: "I will...well, this is all background of the Bill. Why, we're in danger, and we must begin to do something about it, and this is a way to start doing something about it and reducing what's going to happen to this state and this country. I'll close by telling you, according to the impact study, by the year 2030 there will be more descendants of the illegal aliens in this country than the combined population of black and white and their descendants. Think about it, you blacks and you whites. We are really giving our country away."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "We seem to be caught in a Catch-22 in this country. The Federal Government won't do anything, and state government shouldn't do anything. Well, in 1977, one of my local newspapers ran an article which said that Carter was going to solve the unemployment problem by getting rid of the illegal aliens. In 1978, and I perhaps... this article may explain a little bit about one of the ...about the motivations of one of the Legislators who represents Lake County who spoke on the issue. A hundred and forty-five aliens arrested in Mundelein. It wasn't at a nursery. It was at Interstate Industries Incorporated, 111 Washington Avenue, Mundelein. No names. Here's a 1977 article from the State Journal-Register, 'Border Patrol Officers Say Battle with Aliens is Hopeless'. Bob Wedrick column from the Tribune in 1978, 'Respectable Man who Imports Slaves'. Do you



know what a slave is? A slave is somebody who doesn't have his full rights under the laws of this country, and now we've got, right today, federal census officials going around the country counting the illegal aliens for the purpose of determining representation. 'Agents too few for Aliens', out of the Elgin Courier Review. And, here's Secretary of Labor, F. Ray Marshall. He says, 'Unless we can deal with this crucial problem, everything we do about our own unemployment problem could be swamped by the influx of illegal workers from foreign countries.' You walk into a restaurant in Washington, you get a feeling why the Congress won't do anything. You walk into the back room and shout, 'Immigration', and everybody runs out the back room... back door. Apparently, the way we keep our Congressmen in Washington, we keep them so high on the hog that they can't afford to pay a living wage to legal aliens or to United States citizens. Well, I've heard enough of the 'nay' sayers saying, 'We can't do anything.' The State of Illinois can do something. We can fine employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens. We can fine them a thousand dollars for the first offense and larger amounts for subsequent offenses, and we're going into a fairly severe recession, most economists think. And, you can be part of the problem, or you can be part of the solution. I believe this passage of this Bill would be part of the solution, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1625 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. No. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my 'aye' vote, I'd like to point out that we don't need those kinds of business people that exploit and hire slaves to do work in Illinois. If that's the kind of employer you're trying to protect by voting 'no' or



not voting for this Bill, I feel sorry for your mentality in trying to protect those kind of employers. We're talking about here employers who enter into illegal compacts with their employees who are illegally in this country and subvert every law that we uphold whether it be social security, or unemployment insurance, or all the other provisions of minimum wage and everything else and try and beat down the legal, the legitimate employer. All you're doing here by not voting for this Bill is saying it's all right in Illinois to hire a bunch of Iranian students to do a...the meager work and stay in this country illegally and, at least, sneak by. We're talking about people, and I could mention nationalities, whether it's Greek, or Polish, or Iranian, or Mexican, who are living in basements of restaurants doing the work, cleaning up restaurants and washrooms at a dollar an hour or a dollar and a quarter an hour... someplace to hide out from immigration. We're talking about in the nurseries and in the migrant camp around this state where we're going to say that it's all right to hire illegal aliens and keep them working as slaves. I think that we have better things to do than to protect those kind of employers, and if they want to work that way...if that's the kind of employers we need, let them go to South Carolina, or Georgia, or Mississippi. We don't need them in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 32 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Announcements. Kindly record Bradley as 'aye' on the last Bill...1625. The Gentleman from Cook...excuse me. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I made a last...an error last



week and did not request reposting for a Constitutional Amendment in Executive Committee...43. I talked with Representative Capparelli and Representative Ryan about it, and I would request unanimous consent that it be permitted to...to suspend the rule, so that it can be posted for hearing tomorrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's the Constitutional Amendment #43, I believe. He discussed it with Capparelli and Ryan."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't you go over there and talk to..."

Vinson: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Mike?"

Vinson: "I'll go over and talk to him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll be back. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, announcement of importance to many of the Members of the House. The House Rules Committee will be convening today at three p. m. We will, however, be meeting in room 400. Now, that's a room that is now available to us. All of the House rooms are in use, so if the Members would please pay attention and notice that the House Rules Committee will be meeting in room 400 at three p. m. today to consider the various petitions for exemption that have been filed by Members. Now, in that regard, in order to have many of these Bills heard, if Members want them to be heard, they should file with the Speaker's Office the petition to have the Bills heard. If you want your Bills heard next week, you should do that in the Speaker's Office this week. Time is getting very short. We would urge everyone who wants their Bill to have a hearing this Session to immediately file their petition for exemption so that the Bills can be heard next week for those that have been posted this week."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Katz. It's three o'clock in room 400, right?"

Katz: "Right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Good. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have re-discussed the request with Representative Madigan, and he's in agreement, and I would renew the request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill will be heard in Executive tomorrow. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kulas."

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to remind the Members that the Joint Committee on Mandatory Motoring Emissions Instructions will have a demonstration of the mobile equipment for emissions at two o'clock in the parking lot between the Stratton Building and the Capitol, so I would invite all the Members that are interested in cleaning up the environmental air...air pollution, to come see our demonstration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this announcement is in regard to the time at which the Appropriations II Committee will meet tomorrow. We will not meet at 8 a. m. as the schedule provides. Rather, the Appropriations II Committee will meet at 9 a. m. tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, in room 118 as is indicated on the schedule."

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

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for leave of the House to have the Rules Committee hear House Bill 3331 today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Has that matter been posted, Sir?"

Kelly: "No, it has not."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you discuss that with the Minority Leader? There was no objection?"

Kelly: "I did not discuss it with him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You'd better go over and talk to him."



Any further announcements? To give Dick Kelly a little time to discuss it with George Ryan, in behalf of all the Members of the House, I want to wish Representative Elmer Conti a very happy birthday. 39? Okay. Any further announcements? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "The House Revenue Committee will meet promptly at three, so we can get through our business in time for an important meeting we have at 5:30 at the State House Inn in the Governor's Suite on the second floor. It's important that we be there at three to get underway and run through our meeting very fast. So, if you get there about five till three, we'd be able to get rolling right at three o'clock in our usual room. The House Revenue Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I talked to the Minority Leader, and he has given his consent to have House Bill 3331, even though he's not too favorable to the concept, but he has agreed to allow that Bill to be..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "To be heard in the Rules Committee. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Leave is granted. Any further announcements? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Yeah, I would just like leave to table House Bill 1831. I'm the principal Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What was the Bill number, Jack?"

Williams: "1831."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to table House Bill 1831. Hearing no objection, the Bill is tabled. Also, I ask leave to table House Bill 2611. I'm the principal Sponsor. Hearing no objection, 2611 is tabled. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, does the program call for a convening at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, it does."

Madigan: "And, does the Clerk require any time?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Five minutes?"

Madigan: "Providing ten minutes of Perfunctory Session, I move that we stand till 11 a. m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You've heard the motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the House, after 10 minutes of perfunctory time, will stand adjourned until 11 a. m. tomorrow morning. Thank you."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3389, Vinson. A Bill for an Act to authorize the transfer of certain general obligation bond funds. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3390, Epton-et al. A Bill for an Act in relation to medical necessity decisions on claims under accident and health insurance policies and service plan contracts amending certain Acts herein named. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3391, Epton-et al. A Bill for an Act in relation to medical necessity decisions on claims under individual accident and health insurance policies and service plan contracts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3392,..House Bill 3392, Committee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3393, Committee on Environmental, Energy, and Natural Resources. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3394, Committee on Energy, Environment, and Natural Resources. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Soil and Water Conservation Districts Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3395, Committee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3396, VonBoeckman-Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance



Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3397, Yourell-Reilly-Kelly. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3398, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3399, Ryan-et al. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3400, Ryan-et al. A Bill for an Act to amend the Worker's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3401, Steele-Ryan. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3402, Rigney-Swanstrom. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the relation to clerks of the court. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3403, Rigney-Swanstrom. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to natural resources, research data, collection, and environmental studies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3404, Campbell-et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3405, Younge. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3406, Schneider-Campbell. A Bill for an Act relating to advanced dispersements for programs funded under Title XX of the Federal Social Security Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3407, Dawson. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3408, Huskey-Giorgi. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3409, White. A Bill for an Act to exempt receipts from sale of school



districts for certain state and municipal occupational tax on utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3410, Vinson. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3411, Watson. A Bill for an Act limiting the amount of state appropriations which the General Assembly may authorize for any fiscal year. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3412, Watson. A Bill for an Act in relation to ad valorem property tax. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3413, Brummer. A Bill for an Act in relation to the notification of availability of funds for correction of environmental noncompliance violations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3414, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3415, Terzich. A Bill for an Act in relation to sick pay plans for state employees. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3416, Sandquist. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with the sale on credit and lending of money. First Reading of the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3417, Sandquist. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3418, Domico. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3419, Giorgi-Matijevich-Hallock-McClain-Kornowicz-Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Bingo License and Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3420, Borchers. A Bill for an Act to abolish the Office of Multi-Township Assessor. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3421, Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3422, Ropp. A Bill for



an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state revenue sharing with local governmental entities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3423, Reilly-Madigan-McClain. A Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Comprehensive Budget Reform Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3424, Reilly. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3425, Reilly. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3426, Hallstrom. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3427, Peters. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3428, Peters. A Bill for an Act in relation to the creation of...A Bill for an Act in relation to the creation of pneumococcal pilot immunization program. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3429, Vinson. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3430, Ewing. A Bill for an Act in relation to the personal property tax replacement fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3431, Pullen. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Illinois Flammable Fabric and Toy Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3432, Pullen. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3433, Reed-Williams. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to regulation and maintenance of the levels of Lake Michigan and to the deviation and apportionment of water from Lake Michigan water shed. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3434, Steele. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to authorize the transfer of certain state lands in the



Chicago Park District for use as a public park. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3435, Robbins. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3436, Bell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3437, J. J. Wolf. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3438, Campbell. A Bill for an Act in relation to settlements made by the Industrial Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3439, Winchester. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3440, Rigney. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3441, Sandquist. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3442, Swanstrom-Simms. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3443, Swanstrom-Simms. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3444, Swanstrom-Simms. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3445, Swanstrom-Simms. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3446, J. D. Jones-Oblinger. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3447, Marovitz-Lechowicz-Capparelli-Domico. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Treasurer. First Reading of the Bill. Committee reports. Representative McClain, Chairman



of the Committee on Environment and Energy and Natural Resources, report the following Committee Bill for introduction: House Bill 3392, action taken April 8, 1980. Representative McClain, Chairman of the Committee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources, reported the following Committee Bills for introduction: House Bill 3393, 3394, and 3395, action taken April 8, 1980. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution #86 adopted by the Senate, April 9, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills with the following titles and passage to which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bills #1641, 1645, 1649, 1653, and 1655, passed by the Senate, April 9, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 09, 1980

PAGE

| | | | |
|---------|-------------|------|----|
| HB-0276 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 40 |
| HB-0282 | 2ND READING | PAGE | 9 |
| HB-0745 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 10 |
| HB-0800 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 12 |
| HB-0821 | 2ND READING | PAGE | 41 |
| HB-1002 | MOTIONS | PAGE | 41 |
| HB-1016 | MOTIONS | PAGE | 42 |
| | MOTIONS | PAGE | 48 |
| HB-1164 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 42 |
| HB-1476 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 49 |
| HB-1522 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 53 |
| HB-1625 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 59 |
| HB-1831 | MOTIONS | PAGE | 76 |
| HB-3331 | MOTIONS | PAGE | 76 |
| HB-3386 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 1 |
| HB-3387 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 1 |
| HB-3388 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 1 |
| HB-3389 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3390 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3391 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3392 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3393 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3394 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3395 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3396 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 77 |
| HB-3397 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3398 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3399 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3400 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3401 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3402 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3403 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3404 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3405 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3406 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3407 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3408 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3409 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 78 |
| HB-3410 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3411 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3412 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3413 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3414 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 09, 1980

PAGE

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------|------|----|
| HB-3415 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3416 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3417 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3418 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3419 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3420 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3421 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3422 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 79 |
| HB-3423 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3424 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3425 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3426 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3427 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3428 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3429 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3430 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3431 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3432 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3433 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3434 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 80 |
| HB-3435 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3436 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3437 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3438 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3439 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3440 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3441 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3442 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3443 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3444 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3445 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3446 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| HB-3447 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 81 |
| SB-0860 | 2ND READING | PAGE | 2 |
| *HJR-0043 | MOTIONS | PAGE | 74 |

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 09, 1980

PAGE

SUBJECT MATTER

| | | |
|----------------------------------|------|----|
| SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER | PAGE | 1 |
| CLERK O'BRIEN - PRAYER | PAGE | 1 |
| PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE | PAGE | 1 |
| ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE | PAGE | 1 |
| PERFUNCTORY SESSION | PAGE | 77 |
| COMMITTEE REPORTS | PAGE | 81 |
| MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE | PAGE | 82 |
| ADJOURNMENT | PAGE | 82 |