

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be lead in prayer by Father Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O, Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Representative Pullen gave me this fine quotation which is an excerpt from George Washington's Prayer for the Nation; 'I now make it my earnest prayer, that God would have the United States in His Holy protection; that He would incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of affection and love for one another; that He would be most graciously pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy.' Let us pray; Almighty God, we do give Thee our hearty thanks for all the abundant blessings of this life which are ours to enjoy and to share. Above all, we praise Thee for setting before us men and women who willingly give of themselves to serve this nation and its peoples by seeking first and imploring Thy loving care and direction. As we here this day do serve in this House of Representatives, make us acutely aware and deeply sensible of our dependence upon Thee and Thy concern for us and those whom we do serve; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance by Representative Kent."

Kent: "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: "The House will stand in recess for 15 minutes to the call of the Chair."



Speaker Redmond: " Roll Call for attendance. House will be in order. Committee report."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevec, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken April 23, 1980. Report the same back with following recommendations; 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 3001, 3024, 3029 and 3201."

Speaker Redmond: "Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: " Journal for the 112th Legislative Day. The House met pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker in the Chair. The prayer by Father William Krueger, Chaplain..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec. Reading of the Journal."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journal #112 of April 10, 1980, 113 of April 15, 1980 and 114 of April 16th, 1980 be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard.... Any discussion? You've heard the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Journals are approved as if they had been read. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3592, Oblinger, a Bill for an Act making an additional appropriation to the Department of Aging. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3593, Casey, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3594, Slape, a Bill for an Act in relation to small businesses. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3595, Pullen... Pullen-Kelly-Davis, that is, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Abortion Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3596, Bradley, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Product Development Corporation defining its powers and duties. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3597, Bradley, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Small Business Loan



Program. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading, appears on page eight, House Bill 2496. Representative Leverenz. Out of the record. 2502. Patrick? Out of the record. 2704, Representative O'Brien? Out of the record. 2906, Representative Anderson. Anderson, 2906? Out of the record. 3014. Representative Telcser. Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3014, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ry.. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3014 appropriates 13 million, 32 thousand, 500 for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the General Assembly. There were no Amendments offered in Committee. And I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and no 'nay', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3021."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3021, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the furnishings of legislative staff. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 3021 appropriates 4 million and 12 thousand dollars for staff district allowance and equipment for Members of the General Assembly. In the Committee no Amendments were offered or adopted. And I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question. Representative Kelly."



Kelly: "Yes, Art. Can you tell me if there has been any increases in our offices expenses or anything else included in this?"

Telcser: "To the best of my knowledge, no, Representative. It's still the 17 thousand dollars a year office allowance that we currently enjoy. If I'm... Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "That is correct, is it not?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct. Yeah. There was statute out. increasing from the 17."

Telcser: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "That's all."

Kelly: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3022. Representative Neff."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3022, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Financial Institutions; Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is an annual appropriation for the ordinary expenses of the Department of Financial Institutions. This is a five percent increase over last year. They have dropped off two people off the payroll. They're running two people less. I think it's a conservative estimated total of 2 million, 872, 800. And I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3022. Is there any discussion? Representative Pierce, you have your light on. You don't want to discuss on this Bill, do you? If there's no discussion, the



question is, 'Shall House Bill 3022 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'.

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'aye's, no 'nay's, two answering 'present'. And House Bill 3022, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3023."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3023, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Piel ready? I don't see him ready."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3023 is the appropriation of the ordinary and contingent expense of the... operating expense for the Savings and Loan Commission. It's one million, 48 thousand dollars and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, has moved for the passage of House Bill 3023. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3023 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'aye's, no 'nay's, none answering 'present'. And House Bill 3023, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Out of the record, 3028. House Bill 3034, Representative Stearney. I don't see him on the floor. Out of the record. House Bill 3036, Roger McAuliffe. Out of the record. I don't see Roger. 3037, Jane Barnes. Are you ready? Out of the record. 3039, Tim Simms. Are you ready, Tim? 3039. The Gentleman from Winnebago,



Representative Tim Simms on House Bill 3039."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3039, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3039 transfers money that is totally federal funds, CETA funds, from grant to line items in FY '80 appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. It makes additional transfers the grant items to correct a mistake in the introduction of the legislation. There are no increases of funds. It's just reallocation in grant monies that are available. It's a federal grant and I would urge the passage of this legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Simms has moved for the passage of House Bill 3039. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3039 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'aye', 10 'no's, 2 answering 'present'. And House Bill 3039, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3040? Representative Ewing ready? I don't see Tom. Out of the record. Somebody handling 3041 for Representative Ryan? Anybody handling that for the Minority Leader? We don't know. Out of the record. House Bill 3048. Grossi. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Grossi, on House Bill 3048."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3048, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Prisoner Review Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Grossi."

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



House, House Bill 3048 is the annual appropriation for the Prisoner Review Board. And the amount of the appropriation is 607 thousand dollars. I would move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Grossi has moved for the passage of House Bill 3048. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3048 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Camera lights are on for a short while. On.. the Clerk will take the record. On this question there's ... On this question there are 130 'aye's, no 'nay's, no.. nobody answering 'present'. And House Bill 3048, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3053? Oblinger? She's ready. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3053, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging, the Department of Public Aid, and the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger, on 3053."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the authorization to spend 90 thousand, 600 dollars which was awarded by the Robert Wood.. Johnson Foundation to the Department on Aging. There are additional monies to be spent over the next three years from this Foundation. The matching monies must come from the local communities and not from the state."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Oblinger has moved for the passage of House Bill 3053. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3053 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted



who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'aye's, no 'nay's, no one answering 'present'. And House Bill 3053, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3055? Representative Polk. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3055, a Bill for an Act amending an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk, on House Bill 3055."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a transfer from federal funds of 255 thousand, 400 dollars for the contingent expenses and one Amendment which we reduced is originally down from 671 thousand dollars."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk, has moved for the passage of House Bill 3055. If there's no discussion... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "I wonder if the Sponsor might mumble through that again. I didn't hear what it was."

Polk: "I'd be more than glad to. I said 255 thousand, for the contingent expense fund. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Do you want Representative Giorgi to clarify that for you? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3055 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'aye's, 5 'nay's, one answering 'present'. And House Bill 3055, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jake Wolf, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if that was OCE or not, but in the past, it's been the practice that the Sponsor



would tell us the amount and the dollar increase and percentage increase over the previous year and I was wondering if we couldn't have that from the Bills from here on."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's what Polk was trying to do, Jake. Mulcahey 'aye'. House Bill 3063. Swanstrom."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3063, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Law Enforcement Commission and various state agencies which participate in law enforcement assistance administration state-wide plan program. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Swanstrom, on House Bill 3063."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3063 amends the Fiscal Year 1980 appropriation for the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. It's a dollar amount of 570 thousand, 232 dollars for the arson control assistance program, was not previously line item because it was not known whether or not a grant from the federal government would be forthcoming. The grant did come and now we want to make sure that the arson control assistance program has the necessary funds to operate. There is no new money involved here. It is a line item transfer. Passed out of Appropriations II by a vote of 17 to nothing. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Swanstrom has moved for the passage of House Bill 3063. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Mulcahey: "Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I've got the answer right here. I'm sorry."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall House



Bill 3063 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 'aye's, no 'nay's, one answering 'present'. And House Bill 3063, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
House Bill 3180. Mautino. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3180, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the State's Attorneys' Appellate Service Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, on House Bill 3180."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the expense appropriation for the State's Attorneys' Appellate Service Commission. There is one Amendment that was put on in Committee reducing the amount by approximately eight thousand dollars. Last year's appropriation was one point two, two, one million and now we're asking for one, three, nine, four. to cover the equipment and two additional people for the State's Attorneys' Appellate Service Commission. Two-thirds of the funding from the federal.. from the state and fed and one third from the local state's attorney who handles these particular programs. The agency request for head count is 49 people which is five more than the existing head count proposal and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The... Representative Mautino has moved for the passage of House Bill 3180. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor... Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "What does the State's Attorney's Appellate Service Commission do?"

Mautino: "Well, basically, they provide assistance in appellate



criminal cases for participating counties. Any state's attorney would like to have them in plus they have an apprentice program where they pay \$150.00 to students to work in the State's Attorney's Office. The only county that is not involved, it excludes Cook County because they didn't want to get into the program."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3180 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'aye's, six 'nay's, one answering 'present'. And House Bill 3180, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 30.. 3208 out of the record. Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Schneider, Chairman of the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 23, 1980. Report the same back with following recommendations; 'Do pass' House Bills 3072 and 3080. 'Do pass as amended' House Bills 3073, 3075 and 3377. 'Do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 3156."

Speaker Matijevich: "The procedure so that the House Members know what the order of business is going to be now, we're going to first proceed with House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate. Then we're going to go to Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate. And then, House Bills, Third Reading and go right down the Calendar. House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate on page four. House Bill 1828. Stearney. Out of the record. House Bill 1833, Dyer, The Lady from DuPage."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the questions... the Amendment is being prepared that is not ready. Will we be coming back to this order of business later in the day?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm sure we will. "



Dyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "2722, Pouncey? Are you ready? Out of the record. 3003, Lechowicz-Ryan? Out of the record. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate page eleven. House (sic) Bill 617, Cullerton. Out of the record. House (sic) Bill 967, Kornowicz. Out of the record. House (sic) Bill 1038, Pierce. House.. I mean Senate Bill 1038. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1338, Kornowicz. Alright. Now the procedure is going to be on House Bills, Third Reading. With leave of the House, any Member who wants a Bill called on House Bills, Third Reading, come to the podium. Give me your name and Bill number. We've spent so much time going through the Calendar so we're going to try this out today. House Bill 2955. Representative Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2955, a Bill for an Act to authorize the loan guarantee for certain corporations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, on House Bill 2955."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, the Bill before you is the corporate loan guarantee..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we have your attention please?"

Giorgi: "And I think every Member of the General Assembly has received information on the Bill. There's been articles written all over the world on the need for these..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi, would you hold on a minute? Could we have your attention? This is the Chrysler Bill and I think everybody should listen to Giorgi and try to understand him. We can't understand him over this noise. It's tough enough."

Giorgi: "Well, I should tell the Members of the General Assembly that there are ten states that are involved at the request of the Federal Government to help Con... to help the Chrysler Corporation to reorganize and gear up for



a new automobile which we feel is going to do the job for Chrysler. Now, in the Illinois statistics you received on those, there are five structures in Illinois that are Chrysler facilities. There are fifty-five hundred employees at the Chrysler plant, about six thousand employees with the dealers of Illinois and there are seventeen thousand people involved that supply Chrysler with five hundred million dollars worth of parts and accessories to build the Omni and the Horizon and other Chapter products. Now, we're all aware, very well aware, what this would do to the economy of Illinois in the event this happens that we're talking about, the problems of Chrysler, in Unemployment Insurance payments alone... In Unemployment Insurance payments alone the Chrysler employees of the State of Illinois would amount to over twenty million dollars in a matter of seven or eight weeks. So, the loan approximates only eight weeks of unemployment insurance. The loss of tax revenues to the State in sales tax dollars, income tax dollars, the domino effect of the loss of employment, they say that one in every six employees is directly dependent on the automotive industry. You can multiply that unemployment rate by six and every other rate that I've given you by six. We're proud of the way the Bill is written. It allows the Governor...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi, could you stop again? I... Everybody tells me they can't hear a thing. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain?"

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why don't we remove everybody that's not authorized and maybe that will calm everybody down."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's the best idea I've heard. Could I have your attention? All unauthorized persons off the floor. All those with authority to take anybody off the floor including Senator Dawn Clark Netsch, not you



Dawn, all unauthorized persons off the floor. If you're not a Member, nor authorized to be on the floor, please leave. And the rest of us try to remain quiet. Representative Leinenweber, the Gentleman from Will?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, I had a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes does this take to pass?"

Giorgi: "I say 89."

Speaker Matijevich: "107."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Alright, Representative Giorgi, proceed and let's have quiet. Representative Vinson, the Gentleman from DeWitt."

Vinson: "Because I know this is going to be a long and spirited debate, rather than interrupt Representative Giorgi at some point, I'd like to make the point right now, that we have with us today, the fourth grade class.. the seventh grade class, excuse me, from the Chester East Lincoln School'. Standing behind me... sitting behind you and I wish they would stand. They're represented by myself, by Gordan Ropp and by Representative Bradley. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I started to tell the Members of the General Assembly that I think we're very proud of the way the Bill is written, with the advice and counsel of the Chapman and Cutler Firm of Chicago that is expert on bonding. In the Bill, it allows the Director of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Governor to negotiate with the Chrysler on matters of intent in the event there is a failure by Chrysler. The Bill was amended porfusely in the House so that the loan guarantee now reaches 100% collateralization and the Bill is very well thought out. The Bill covers the problems that are inherent in an issue such as this and I think the real problem facing us is the effect of the Illinois



economy in the event this every occurred. Now, I don't think that.. I think we have a lot of faith in the Chrysler game plan. They've given a plan to the Federal Government. They've given the Governor's Office a plan. And all we're asking is that we guarantee a loan for 20 million dollars and all the bonding protection, the loan protections are in the Bill. Other than tell you again that the loss to the State of Illinois would be millions of dollars in sales tax, millions of dollars in state income tax, the job loss might reach 70 thousand people. There are 14 to 15 hundred small businesses and men involved in supplying Chrysler products. The failure of this situation would be devastating to the economy of the State of Illinois and the ten.. some of the ten most populous states in the nation are in this effort to help Chrysler. Now the Bill was written in conjunction with the request from the Federal Government and all the Federal Government wants from the ten states is that, yes, indeed, they will help Chrysler get out of their dilemma and they will grant them the money. If there's any question's, I'd be glad to answer them."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi has moved for the passage of House Bill 2955. On that, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe this Bill is presented by the Sponsor is possibly one of the most dire matters we will vote on in this Session or any other Session of the Illinois Legislature. We are establishing an irreversible process of government stepping in to bail out businesses at a state level. During the questioning of the Chrysler representatives, many fine Members of the Republican party asked, what, if any, help would be given to small businesses in the State of Illinois that face exactly the same problem that



Chrysler does? And the answer is obvious, there was no help to be offered to the small businesses of the State of Illinois. Ironically, the Sponsor of this Bill, who undoubtedly is sincere in his efforts to maintain a business close to his home town, has been one of the leading proponents for legislation that has driven native Illinois business, such as International Harvester and Caterpillar, out of the State of Illinois. Now is no time for the State to start squandering its money, trying to bail out archaic management operations in large executive heavy corporations. Chrysler for years throughout the industry has been noted as an inept corporation that built poor cars that lasted a short time and got bad gas mileage. If this is the kind of business we want to promote in the United States, we're going exactly the wrong direction. It would probably be more profitable for the State of Illinois today to take the Chrysler plant out-right, offer Chrysler the opportunity to move out, forfeiting the plant and authorize the Governor to offer it out-right to Toyota Corporation that knows how to build cars and make money. All of it would accomplish the same end, without putting the state in a bind to come up with 20 million dollars. When the Sponsor of this Bill suggests that the Federal Government is urging states to spend money, I am not surprised in the least. The Federal Government has been one of the most inept areas of spending that any level of business or economics in our country for at least the last century. Now they're going to the states' telling us how we should loan our money. The next thing they'll do is be going into other areas of business, telling us how we should spend our money in those areas as well. I would suggest that if any Member of this Legislature chooses to vote for this Bill that the state require that a note be prepared and that each one



of us sign it as personal guarantors. And when Chrysler goes down the drain, each one of us out of our own personal paychecks starts paying back to the State of Illinois this lunacy and this loan to Chrysler Corporation. We have an obligation to protect the funds of this state, not to give them away. And we are doing nothing more than rat-holing 20 million dollars of taxpayers' money at a time when each one of these taxpayers is telling us, 'You must cut back spending. You must cut back taxes.' And, indeed, these two items go together. I suggest this is a very bad precedent. It's a very bad Bill and it's about time to tell corporations whether they hire 20 thousand people, two thousand people or two people, if they cannot survive in our open economy, then they should indeed close their doors and become history."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I happen to represent the district that Belvidere, Illinois happens to be located in. And I take pride in the fact that in that district we happen to have a good, decent place to work for our citizens called the 'Chrysler Belvidere Plant'. It builds one of the finest automobiles. I don't happen to own one, but according to all expectations of the Motor Trend Magazine, it was the car of the year. And I'm truly concerned about the perceptions somebody is trying to allege here that we're going to lend Chrysler some money. The previous speaker said it twice. I've read it in the papers. I've heard commentations by various people talking about the State of Illinois lending Chrysler some money. That just is not a fact. It's an out and out fabrication of somebody's mind that somehow this Bill is going to lend Chrysler any money. The fact is, we're going to guarantee if the passage of this Bill is your wish, we're



going to guarantee a loan. We're not going to lend taxpayers' money. We're going to guarantee a loan. It's a hell of a difference than what has been said and what the facts are. And let's talk about whether this is innovative and new and something contrary to the past history, not only of Illinois, but of the United States. Do you want to go back to the times when we subsidized and we paid for and we gave away the land to build the railroads? You want to talk about what we do every day in subsidizing the farmers? You want to talk about what we did for Boeing or what we've done for other industries that have failed in this country? The facts are that this is needed legislation and it's not Republican or Democrat. It's not labor versus management. This is whether or not you want to save an industry that is paying its way in Illinois. Now, in Belvidere, I have to admit there are some criticisms of the Chrysler plant there, criticism by Local Government saying that they don't pay their rightful share of their real estate taxes. And I concur with some Local Government officers that are charging them with that, that Chrysler should pay a better real estate tax than they do. But that is no reason to turn your back on the plight of an industry that needs your help and your support now, not your money, but your guarantee of a loan. Now the whole company could go down hill because of your action here today. And then you talk to me about what we're doing for the business community of Illinois. You tell me how we're driving them out of Illinois. You tell me of how all the bad legislation is keeping business from thriving and then I'll watch your negative vote when it comes to business that needs your help. There are thousands and thousands of decent citizens who want a job and want to continue working in Belvidere area at the Chrysler plant. Your vote is going to determine whether or not



we're going to keep these people as citizens, as taxpayers in this state or we're going to make them as tax-eaters on Unemployment compensation, when they shut down the plant. This is nothing new. It has been going on and traditionally since Thomas Jefferson's time. Alexander Hamilton as Treas... Secretary of the Treasury two hundred years ago guaranteed loans to private business for land purchases in America. This is not something new. And I think anyone that puts out the poppy-cock that the taxpayers somehow are lending their money to a private enterprise, just don't know what the hell they're talking about."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff. Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that if we would pass legislation of this type it would probably be starting one of the worst things that we've ever started in Illinois. It's true that Chrysler Corporation.... We don't like to say it, ... stay in business. But from what I've heard, and been able to find out we're only just giving them a temporary life here. If they get all the money that they hope to get from the Federal Government and the states, inside of three years the company is still going to be out of business and I think we're just throwing good money after bad. We talk about the loss of jobs and what about the thousands of businesses we have had go out of business in the United States, small businesses the last few years? Nobody tried to help them or offered them any help. Here, in Illinois, we've had over 200 auto dealers go out of business since the first of the year. And nobody's offered to help them and certainly if we're going to help one company, we have to look at all of them. And, again, I repeat, as far as jobs, this is quite a loss of jobs as has been brought out here."



And yet, if we add up all the small businesses we've had go out in the last six months in Illinois, we would find that there's probably more employees who lost their jobs with these small businesses than this one gigantic corporation. Now, when a company, as they stated, were not even financially able to file and protect themselves under Chapter 13, the Bankruptcy Law, that should point out to us that the company is worse than broke. And when they get in that kind of condition, whether it's a management fault or what that put them into this, then I don't think by this amount of money that we're giving them it's going to.. they're going to be able to survive. In fact there is, I would still venture to say, and if they get all the money they've asked for inside of three years this company will be under. And I think we're throwing good money after bad and I would respectfully urge everyone to oppose this legislation."

Hanahan: "Speaker, was that a former Buick dealer talking?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this concept, the direct concept of subsidizing a major industrial firm, may be new as the Gentleman just said. However, we have dealt on the floor of this House with a particular area of Savings and Loan that we bailed out directly with no guarantee of any .. of any loan. It was a direct payment to bail out the City Savings and Loan and if I recall, it was something like 15 million dollars that we took right out of the Treasury and sent to the Savings and Loan to help the people that had made an investment in that particular area in that particular loan company. The Federal Government, the Federal Government subsidizes the tobacco farmer and then spends millions of dollars on research to tell us that smoking is bad for us and yet



they subsidize the tobacco farmer with direct payments to the farmer. We in this General Assembly are addressing ourselves to a particular area of subsidizing and I am going to support that also of removing sales tax on farm machinery. That helps the farmer. What this Bill is addressing itself to is to making sure that those people who are employed in the Belvidere plant, that they stay employed. And we are not, as you all know, giving them the million... the 20 million dollars. We're only guaranteeing that loan and we have a 100% collateral on that loan. And when we had the opportunity to talk with the people from Chrysler, my question was, are you going to be able to survive? And the answer was to us, take it for what it's worth, is that they will make money the fourth quarter of this year. And they will stay in the automobile manufacturing business and they will continue to do business and they will continue to build automobiles at the Belvidere plant. If you'll just stop and consider all the areas and all the things that we've addressed ourselves to throughout the years, such as the Loan Companies, the.. the machinery.. the sales that benefit when we removed the five cents on farm machinery, the Federal Government subsidizing the tobacco industry; government has got to take a part and my gosh, if we look at what the difference would be of Unemployment comp if this and the subsidiary plants and industry go sour and go bankrupt, what it would cost for Unemployment Insurance some 800 million dollars a week. I think in 25 weeks we'd have already spent the 20 million dollars in Unemployment comp benefits. This is a good risk and I suggest that we vote 'aye' on it. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Representative Giorgi, wasn't there some discussion here recently about some subsidiary plant that was supposed to be sold for three hundred and some million dollars by Chrysler or something like that in negotiations and what happened to that situation?"

Giorgi: "Joe, Representative Ebbesen, there are ten states involved in the type of legislation that we're involved in. The Wall Street Journal and the metropolitan papers of Chicago are writing daily about negotiations between Chrysler and the governmental units because also cities are involved that have Chrysler facilities and I think you're talking.. you're thinking about the Chrysler plant that is valued at three hundred million dollars as the first figure of three hundred million dollars thrown around. But some of the states are directly giving money to Chrysler from their general revenue funds. For example, Delaware is going to give them money from their general revenue fund. So, I'm not really sure as to what state's negotiations you're pointing to."

Ebbesen: "Well, you didn't really answer my question. May be.. I might be confused on it. But there was supposed to be a sale of some plant by Chrysler and that was for three hundred and some million dollars and that was the basis for them being able to proceed with the Federal Government. Now, what's happened with that or am I wrong, erroneous in my thinking?"

Giorgi: "Yes, they are selling some of their lands, some of their extensive holdings to become fluid. And they did sell a piece, I think, to New York, Manhattan, to the city of New York, to raise cash, yes. They were trying to divest themselves of anything they could liquify."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself briefly to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."



Ebbesen: "It was indicated by Representative Hanahan that this was a guaranteed loan for Chrysler and you know, I would just like for the Chicago Democrats over there to give thought. We talk about a guaranteed loan, we know from recent financial disclosures and happenings in the Chicago school system, when we find the Chicago Board of Education very heavily in the real estate business, owning a property on which we have Midway Airport and some buildings in the loop and we're going to talk about guaranteed loans, I think that the people from Chicago, the Representatives in this House, ought to be thinking about perhaps where money was collateral put up with this real estate for a guaranteed loan to the Chicago School District. I think that they should take that under serious consideration because what's more important, the education of these young people in the school systems or building automobiles and bailing out a complete change in the philosophy of government? What we're doing here is a change in the philosophy of government. And I certainly would encourage a lot of those Chicago Democrats to give serious consideration to that for the use of this money for the guaranteed loan for the Chicago schools."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, wants to make a correction of his today."

Bradley: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I inadvertently put the decimal point in the wrong spot on the Unemployment cost to the state per week. I said 800 million. It's 800 thousand, but still that amounts to 20 million dollars in a 25 week period."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have to admit that a couple of weeks ago I was having some very, very serious misgivings about this piece of legislation. And I think I can fully understand



the reluctance of some Members to support this Bill. However, I'm rising in support of this legislation because we have, I believe, amended it into a good Bill. Something that is worth saying that has not yet been said in debate and I would like to make very clear to every Member of the House, that the federal loan guarantee, the federal loan guarantee program is contingent upon participation by State and Local Governments. Now, the Chrysler Corporation to my understanding has guarantees to the tune of about a hundred and fifty million dollars from other states. The Illinois participation is very, very critical in getting Chrysler to the point where they can qualify for the federal program. If they cannot qualify for the federal program, the props are knocked out from under the entire legislation, the entire loan guarantee program and probably the company as well. There is absolutely no question, absolutely none in anybody's mind, that if the federal program is not put into place, and promptly, Chrysler Corporation will go belly-up. Now, I do not want to be the one to have the responsibility for saying that my 'no' vote caused this package to be defeated and caused the Chrysler Corporation to go belly-up. It is the old story, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm sure you've heard it before, that for the want of the nail, the shoe is lost and for the want of the shoe, the horse was lost and for the want of the horse, the rider was lost and for the rider, the battle was lost and because the battle was lost, the war is lost. And I, for one, think that we should take the opportunity we have now to make sure that the shoes stay on the horse and the Chrysler Corporation can have the resources necessary to stay in business. I want to remind the House that we did amend it to protect the loan guarantee. We put additional protections into this Bill. We have a much higher degree



of confidence now that we will be able to get our money back if anything should go amiss. We have 100% collateralization. We have appraisal of the property by independent appraiser. We have other protections in the Bill that are absolutely necessary to protect the taxpayers' interest. I think we've done our job on Second Reading. We've protected the taxpayers' interests. I think now we have to turn to the main job of making sure that we do everything that we can to protect our Illinois business. Thank you."

Speaker Matijewich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, for many years I was a Member of the Labor and Commerce Committee. And the principal Sponsor of this Bill always voted against business and industry and I was surprised to see this particular Bill with his name on it cause now I know it isn't a good Bill. But, we talk about saving the jobs of 5,000 people, the Bills he voted against drove 250,000 employees out of the State of Illinois. Industry, over 300 industries left.. He did not turn a hand to help them, but now he's turning a hand because it's in his own district. Now, let's watch this particular Bill cause it's only the beginning of it.. the give away programs. As one speaker said, we should guarantee the loan and not the State of Illinois, everyone of the Representatives. Now, I have a rating of 89 in helping industry and business. I've had ratings up to 100 because I was with business and you can't have employees unless you have good business. The Gentleman has a rating of 13. He went up to 13 last year, helping business in the State of Illinois. Now what is this Bill for, just to bail out a few people who have been voting wrong and kicking industry out of Illinois and now all of a sudden, they say, 'Why, I'm for business. I'm trying to save one right here.' My vote is 'no' and I



hope there's sufficient number to beat the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the main question is put. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is on the previous question. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 102 'aye's, 47 'nay's, two answering 'present'. And the motion prevails and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't vote to shut off debate as you might note because I am sensitive to the House moods, but I'd like to... There's been a lot of talk about concept and philosophy. Well, last June here we authorized the Industrial Development Authority to issue 100 million dollars in industrial revenue bonds guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the State of Illinois to entice industries into Illinois and I voted for it. Five plants, five plants with the use of that money are being built right now. One in 'Elk Grove Village' and one in Will County, one in Franklin County, one in LaSalle County and one in Mt. Prospect. That's from the hundred million dollars industrial revenue bond issue that we floated here last June. I have applications.. We have applications, you and I, from locations in Melrose Park, Jerseyville, Marion, Hillsboro, Carterville, Chicago, Pontiac, Rock Island... Give it to anybody upon request. Chicago, Rock Island, Zion, Jerseyville,



Dongola , Aurora, Will County, Elk Grove Village.

So, we're in the business of helping industries locate in Illinois. And a lot of that malarky about losing jobs, there was a political analyst in the Rockford newspaper last week that said, 'there were more industries that moved into Illinois last year than moved out and there was an increase in service jobs'. So the net loss is not net loss. It's net gain. But I'd like to say that Chrysler's problems which aren't really my problems, I drive a General Motor product and because of this Bill I may not be able to drive a Chrysler product for ten years, but Chrysler's products are from some of the.. the feelings of the Members of the General Assembly cause we told Chrysler theydhave to control the emissions in their automobiles. We told them they have to make more fuel economic cars. We told them they had to put air bags in them. Now they've promised us in the next ten months if they get the help that they're seeking, they'll build a 27 inch shorter car, a car that's a half a ton lighter and it'll be 37% in fuel economy. So that and the interior will be the same so I feel that they are on the right track. They do know that the buying public is not now going to buy any more big gas guzzlers and I think General Motors and Ford are coming to that realization too. Now I don't want to be redundant and go repeating again all the dire consequences if we don't help Chrysler. But the point is, that if the seven thousand people are directly involved, and that's the one in five ratio that's involved, you have to multiply the seventeen by five because one automotive job, five jobs are dependent upon that one automotive job so it's a domino effect of five jobs. The Unemployment Insurance rate alone would be two and a half million dollars a week if this plant went down or this Chrysler product went down and that amounts to two million, five hundred thousand



dollars a week, in eight weeks use up that 20 million dollars you're worried about. In the meantime, we said, 'Yes . We're going to spend one hundred million dollars in industrial revenue bonds to help industry throughout the entire State of Illinois.' Chicago has their own industrial revenue program. Rockford has their own. Peoria has their own. These are all tax dollars that guarantee private enterprise. And this malarky about losing jobs is not true. Now the problem.. The last quest... The last statement I would like to make is this. One of the reasons that Chrysler's in the problem that it is is because to move to a small car, to get rid of the rear axle joint and to go to front wheel drive to keep the same room in the car and to get the lighter car, they had to retool. To retool it cost nine billion dollars. They found six billion of it, but they're three billion short and that's why they're running to the Federal Government and everywhere in the ten states that have factories for help. In answer to Representative Ebbesen's question of a minute ago, I found the answer. He was talking about Chrysler ten days ago trying to sell a Household Finance, the financing arm of Chrysler, to the tune of three hundred million dollars which that deal fell through. We're all aware of that. Household Finance did not buy the Chrysler financing program. Other than.. I know that everyone here has received information from the principals involved. Everyone here has read the newspaper editorials and I know that everyone's mind is probably made up as to how they're going to vote and I'd like to supp... I'd like support for my Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi has moved for the passage of House Bill 2955. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2955 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'ayé'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman



from Winnebago, Representative Swanstrom, one minute to explain his vote."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very briefly, I am voting against this Bill. I sympathize with the Chrysler Corporation, but I think we're setting a terrible, terrible precedent in doing this. In deference to my distinguished colleague from Winnebago County, he paints a pretty rosy picture. Do not be misled by the word 'guarantee'. Cause after hearing this Bill in Committee I don't think there's any question in anybody's mind of what Chrysler Corporation is going under. Then it becomes the duty of the State of Illinois to try and sell 20 million dollars worth of bonds. We don't sell the bonds, we take out of general revenue. For the sake of our great free enterprise system, I would urge some more 'no' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The House Rules prohibit filming during explanation of vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien, to explain his vote. One minute."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I rise in opposition to House Bill 2955 for two basic reasons. One, I am philosophically against this intrusion into free... free competitive market. And two, on only two instances has the Federal Government ever taken any action of this nature and this was the most hastily drawn one. The first instance when the Federal Government came in and intervened in the free enterprise system was probably the Lockheed Corporation and that was basically because of national security that we kept that company going with federal dollars. The second instance where the Federal Government came in and intervened was when they bailed out New York City which was another governmental entity. With the situation in New York City there were tax anticipation warrants and revenues that could be guaranteed to the Federal Government that would be coming



to the city of New York and that's why they were bailed out. This is absolutely a ludicrous Bill. Chrysler Corporation should go into Chapter Eleven under the Banking Code where they can really reorganize the company and hope that it will make it for the next ten years. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent, one minute to explain her vote."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My fellow colleagues, when are we going to learn the meaning of responsibility? Are we prepared to bail out all business failures? If we are not, then this is the worst kind of discrimination. A bail out is no way to help this business. That only rewards poor management. If we really want to help business, then let's get the cost of doing business lower and cut the red tape and regulation. Let them make a profit. I'm not willing to take the risk of the taxpayers money for this Bill. I will vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, one minute to explain his vote. This measure takes 107 votes."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Chrysler's not in trouble because of government. Chrysler's in trouble because of incompetent management. Their share of the market has gone from 25% after World War II to less than 10% today. This Bill, however, is in trouble, not only because it doesn't have enough votes, but because it is blantly in violation of Article IV, Section 13 of the Illinois State Constitution. That Article is entitled, 'Special Legislation'. It says the General Assembly shall pass no special or local law when a general law is or can be made applicable. Amendment #1 which was offered by Representative Bowman references this Act into Public Law 96-185, which is entitled, 'The Chrysler Corporation Loan Guarantee Act of 1979.' There is no company but Chrysler



that can get a loan guaranteed under this Act..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Skinner: "... For that reason, the Bill is blatantly unconstitutional."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi, I just learned from the Clerk, this is Roll Call #13. If that means anything to you for the day. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder, one minute to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I wasn't going to speak on this. My mail and the conversation with constituents certainly has been a very minimal amount on this subject matter. But I think we ought to get away from the parochial issue that's been engendered today. This is not just an issue to the northern part of the state in one location in one Legislative District. This is part and parcel with the entire economy of the State of Illinois. And those of you know who I favor the free enterprise system should know that this is not an infringement upon that. It is an infringement upon the philosophy that we must support the economy of the State of Illinois. You can't look at this as a Chrysler product or a Giorgi Bill or as a Rockford area Bill, but as Bill for the whole State of Illinois. And let me say that..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Schraeder: "... Precedent, start a precedent, but that may be. And if so, let it happen. But we do have to protect the employees in this area and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson, one minute to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I oppose this measure because I believe we will be aiding and abetting the first steps in this country of the establishment of corporative state socialism and I believe that's what the Federal Government



did when they entered into a contract along with capital and labor, corporate state socialism. And we're aiding and abetting the process. Chrysler is always the first and strongest in its opposition to government interference. It was a constant battle between Chrysler and the fourth branch of the Federal Government of the bureaucracy. But Chrysler was the first to be enrolled in the corporative state. It had been a free enterprise corporation subject to the rules of supply and demand, of the laws of competition and customer acceptance or rejection. Free to make its own mistakes. Now Chrysler, has lost its freedom to..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Hudson: "...Make to buy or to sell to borrow because now all of its operating plans are subject to scrutiny and control by a newly created federal review Board. You say this has no impact on the free enterprise system, I say my colleagues, you are wrong. It does and we are aiding and abetting the process."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston, one minute to explain his vote."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. There are many of those.. many of us in this room who have serious misgivings about this Bill. I, for one, wonder what would happen to a business in my district, in Rogers Park, in Evanston, who had similar problems and were they to come here to Springfield and ask for assistance from this Body, they'd be laughed at because they're a small business entity and they can't come here with lobbyists. They can't send in mail.. mailings to all the Representatives in this Body. But we cannot permit the kind of massive unemployment that would occur if Chrysler was permitted to close its doors. This is not just a Bill for Chrysler. It's not just a Bill for Belvidere. It's a Bill for the many suppliers of Chrysler Corporation



It's a.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Preston: "It's a Bill for the many people who work for Chrysler Corporation and work for those suppliers and indeed, it's a Bill for the people of the State of Illinois. The unemployment that would occur in this state would injure the state greatly. A 'no' vote..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Preston: "Will add to a dismal economic picture in the State of Illinois. We must not permit that to take place. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote and I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, to explain his conflict of interest."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do have a conflict of interest in this Bill. Nevertheless, as always, I'll vote my conscience. In addition, however, I want to state that I agree with many of the remarks that have been made. We cannot be parochial. There will be a business entity from my own district coming to the State Legislature asking for funds, Wisconsin Steel will be here in the not too distant future. And it would be rather hypocritical for me to vote for one and not for the other. I feel badly about this vote because I think it's a terrible responsibility and for the first time in my years in the Legislature, I'm going to vote to send this Bill to the Governor and let him decide how and whether we have the funds to do it. I'm not happy about abdicating my responsibility, but for that reason, I'm going to vote in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Young. One minute to explain her vote."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am voting in favor of this Bill because I think as onaspeaker said earlier, it is true that the capitalistic free enterprise system is at



stake. And if we do not do something to aid and support and stabilize that system, it is in grave jeopardy. I think the sum of the matters that caused the problem to Chrysler are matters outside of the corporate control. They're matters having to do with the oil embargo. They are matters having to do with the Arabian world trying to squeeze the life out of the economy of the United States of America. And I think that the main reason I'm voting for this Bill is that it might cause a triple effect. If Chrysler goes under, who is next? Every person in this room knows that the banking system in Illinois and Chicago is..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close..."

Younge: "... Is very.. is at a state of disorder. And it is appropriate in those circumstances for the state to come in and try to help a business..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close..."

Younge: "... That is one of the three largest businesses in the United States."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine, one minute to explain his vote."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are on this floor right now at least eight people who attended the 1970 Constitutional Convention, including the distinguished Majority Leader, Mr. Madigan. I would ask him or anyone else who was there what Section of the Illinois Constitution gives this Body the right to go into the business of making loans to failing businesses? Secondly, Mr. Bowman, a few minutes ago, said that he did not wish to be the person to say 'no'. I would suggest that government, both at the state and federal level needs more people who will say 'no'. We have been totally irresponsible, both at the state and federal level in always saying 'yes' to everything that comes across our desks. Perhaps a 'no'



is needed. Lastly, the names of Jefferson and Hamilton were bandied about earlier. Certainly the early Constitutional Government had to purchase land float some loans to do that..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Bring your remarks to a close.."

Birkinbine: "... Yes, I will. If I could, I would just like to quote the definition of good government of Mr. Jefferson who said, 'Its' a wise and frugal government, that shall restrain men from injuring one another, leaving them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits on industry and improvement and shall not take from the mouths of labor the bread it has earned.' I suggest that with this Bill we are not only taking from the mouth of labor that bread".

Speaker Matijeovich: "Bring your remarks to a close.."

Birkinbine: "... We are gambling it on a bad risk gamble. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Campbell, one minute to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the House Bill 2955. What ever happened to the free enterprise system where you risk your capital money, time and effort to make more money, the alternative being that you fail? Are we saying we can no longer fail? If that be true, then the reverse would also be true that you can't succeed. I want to know what we're going to do for the elderly and the widows that are on Social Security that can't pay their utility bills. What about the automobile dealers, the farmers and the small businessmen that are going broke in the next 12 months? I tell you this, you could give Chrysler a 100 billion dollars, but if they don't build a product that people will buy, then they're going to surely fail. And another thing, we're throwing 20 million dollars right down the drain. Believe me. And I ask you to vote



'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, one minute to explain his vote."

Robbins: "I'm.. I'm so happy that we're offering funds to replace the fenders on the 67.. the '76's and the '77's due to poor engineering. It is really sad that Chrysler is in this position, but it is in this position because we have so many environmental regulations, safety regulations, that adds another thousand dollars to every car that you drive. It's time that .. that the government get themselves out of the business of helping Chrysler out, but get themselves out of the business of trying to run Chrysler and every other company in our..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close..."

Robbins: "... I think that the environmental regulations should be changed so we can burn Illinois coal and that way we can create enough jobs to replace Chrysler."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp. One minute to explain his vote."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, two things why I am voting against this Bill. One is that we have government both State and Federal have caused more regulations to this and other industries which also include Unemployment Comp and Workman's Comp which has caused business to extremely look elsewhere. I'm saying in this area we should do the idea of compromising and coming up with some other proposals which would help total business rather than just one in this area. The other American philosophy which ..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Ropp: "... Was stated several times is that America is great because we live in a nation where we have the opportunity to fail and those who succeed don't. "

Speaker Matijevich: "God bless General Motors. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."



Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think any vote that I've cast since I've been in the Legislature has caused me to think so hard or agonize as much as this one has. Like everybody else who's spoken today, I believe in the free enterprise system. I don't believe that requires us to erect a Chinese wall between business and government. In such areas as the land grant system for the rail roads, the Homestead Act for the farmers, government has helped business and help create a strong economic climate. I would vote for this Bill to save Chrysler if we did one other thing first and that was, if we would relax some of the restrictions which have placed Chrysler and other business in this condition. Some of that's a federal responsibility, but some of that, Representative Giorgi, is the State's responsibility. And as soon as you will come forward with meaningful reform on.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close.."

Vinson: "Workman's Comp and Unemployment Insurance, I am prepared to change my vote which will be noted to a 'yes' vote on this.. But.."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman..."

Vinson: "... at the time I must vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "From Marion, Representative Friedrich, one minute to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think the encouraging thing about this Bill is the Gentleman from Rockford finally admits that Unemployment Compensation is a very costly thing in the State of Illinois. For 30 years, we have had almost full employment. Car sales have been at a record high throughout the United States and all this time, Chrysler finally woke up to the fact that they had a product they couldn't compete with. I don't know where their research people have been, but it reminds me of the dog food company that had trouble



getting off the ground and they tried everything and they finally discovered the dogs didn't like their dog food. And I think that's the problem with Chrysler. If Chrysler can't come up with a product in 30 years that beats..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close..."

Friedrich: "... Toyotas and so on, then they deserve to fail".

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 'aye's, 81 'no's, 15 answering 'present'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that you place it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to place it on Postponed Consideration. He has leave and House Bill 2955 is placed on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 262. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce. Read the Bill. House Bill 262 on page four."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 262. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Minority Leader's on deck. House Bill 262. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 262 expands a tax relief program for homeowners that we found so successful here in the General Assembly. Two years ago, the Senate, under the Sponsorship of Senate President Tom Hynes instituted the universal homestead exemption in the amount of 1500 of increase in assess valuation for homes residences only. The Governor, by Amendatory Veto, indicated that it should be unequalized assess valuation so when the State Department of Revenue increased the multiplier, state multiplier, and peoples taxes went up, they would benefit from this homestead exemption. The Bill... We accepted the Governor's amendatory veto in the 1500 homestead exemption, universal homestead exemption, went into law in 1978. When the Governor called a Special Session for tax relief last year, the only thing we could agree on in January when we met was to increase that 1500 dollars to 3,000 dollars effective with 1979 assessments. Now we found in our areas in the northern part of the state and I think in many parts of the state is the increases in equalized assessed valuation have gone right through that \$3,000 barrier. So the purpose of this Bill, which was introduced in January of last year and was approved in Revenue Committee and placed on the Spring Calendar, is to increase that universal homestead exemption to 5,000 dollars and that is only on increases in assessed valuation. No taxing body loses their present tax base. It's only the first 5,000 dollars of increase in equalized assessed



valuation that will be... that will be an exemption for... a universal homestead exemption providing meaningful tax relief to homeowners throughout our state. You're familiar with the homestead exemption and how it works. I don't have to belabor it. I, therefore; ask that we approve House Bill 262 meaningful tax relief for your constituents and send it over to the Senate."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, has moved for the passage of House Bill 262. On that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is another example of state government giving tax relief at the expense of local government. And if you believe in that principle, you certainly ought to vote yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the question is shall House... Oh. I'm sorry, the Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed. He indicates he will."

Hallstrom: "Fine. Representative Pierce, as you know, I'm very interested in education and I'd like to hear from you please. How would this affect the school districts who are now already under a bind through proposed tax limitation to federal mandates and state mandates? How would you see that this would affect the local school districts?"

Pierce: "The local school districts would not lose their present tax base as this homestead exemption only applies to increased assessments. And it will take away some of the increase that they might receive but only on homeowners, not on... not on shopping centers, not on office buildings, not on commercial industrial buildings. It will only give relief to homeowners. They're the people that deserve that relief. If their assessments go up by this margin



their taxes won't go down. What'll happen is that their assessment will remain the same until the increase passes greater than 5,000 dollars over what it was in 1978. Most of them have already upped to that margin now because of either of increased quadrennial assessments or because of increased state multipliers imposed on their counties. And so it is homeowners relief. It does take away some money the schools would get from increased assessments. At the same time, it doesn't lower any assessments that now exist for local government and the schools will find a personal property replacement tax that we passed last year is going to generate more money for them than they expected and that they're not going to be hurt by the universal homestead exemption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Cal Skinner said it very briefly, but this is another good example of we are trying to take care of the poor people back home. The advantage of this Bill, it gives the homeowners tax relief. The disadvantages of this Bill, it's going to be a tremendous loss to local government. With every municipality having the blue flu and all kinds of labor problems, every school district looking for more funds and that is the reason why local governments are called the tax eaters. We here in the Legislature are trying to help the poor people back home. For every dollar in tax relief we give them here in the legislative halls of Springfield, the local municipalities have to give them a dollar and a quarter to a dollar and a half increase in the local property taxes and other hidden taxes where they have to make up the replacement of whatever relief we give them here. Take a good look at this Bill. As my seatmate said, this is a reverse mandate



for tax relief trying to help the poor people back home when the poor people back home in the local governments are going to have to increase the taxes that we replace them with here in Springfield."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative McGrew."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

McGrew: "Representative Pierce, do you simply change the dollars in this Bill or are there any substantive changes?"

Pierce: "Mr. McGrew, we just changed the dollars... Okay right now, the first 3,000, this would make it 5,000."

McGrew: "May I bring a problem to your attention then that perhaps could be addressed in the Senate. Currently under the Homestead Exemption Act for the elderly, we provide for those that own their homes but lease the lot that they are eligible for that homestead exemption, the 1500 dollars for the elderly. We have many areas... many places in my district that, for one reason or another, it started as a lake for the railroads or something like that. They formed a corporation. They leased the lots on 99 year leases. Now the people own their homes but they lease the lot, they are eligible for the senior citizen exemption but not for the general homestead exemption. Can I get you to address that, at least, consider it in the Senate sir? I have a Bill in the House that I'm trying to bring up to 3,000 but... Okay thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there's several things you should keep in mind in considering this Bill. First, it's been pointed



out that it is detrimental to local government. Second, we ought to point out that it's detrimental to downstate as compared to Cook County. Cook County homes are not assessed at 33 1/3% like downstate homes are. Therefore; it'll take a lot longer for them to use up the homestead exemption which we're promising them here than it will downstate homes. Third, this Bill fails to address the problem created by our unfair property tax system and only perpetuates it. I am very glad to hear the Sponsor admit that we are collecting more than we needed to replace the personal property tax and maybe he'll be willing to do something about that too. But I will suggest that we keep a very close eye on this Bill and vote no."

Speaker Matijeich: "Could I have your attention? There's a cute little Page here that's confused because somebody's ordered a beef-lettuce combination and she doesn't know who gets it. Who... It's paid for. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell. She's right here. The Page in the blue. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, we're trying to do something for everyone at no cost to quote, 'no one'. That's not exactly true and we ought to realize this. All we're simply doing is shifting the burden of increased taxation to the industries, to the businesses, and to the commercial establishments. We have to ask ourself a question, how many students do the businesses, the commercial establishments, and the like contribute to the school systems. The answer is none. We are now attempting to shift the burdens to these agencies and we ask them consistently to pick it up. At one point, we must look at the basic fairness of the proposition.



This is a very good Bill to vote on and to go back to your constituency and say that, 'I'm for relief for you. I want no-cost of government to be borne by you, and we have now found a magic formula where the next generation will pick up 'the tab'. This is not true. It is not representative of statesmanship on our part. It's simply an effort to shift the burden to the next generation and ask them to handle the problems. I say that this will come back to haunt the Members of the new assemblies because of our cowardice today. If we don't have the guts, the courage to stand here and say that we're going to increase the state income tax, then we know that all of this is coming to naught because the expenses of government continue to grow because of inflation and because of increased demands by our constituencies. I suggest what we're doing here is very popular but we are, in essence, killing the beast of burden who must carry us over the long haul. You don't kill your camel in the desert and you don't waste the donkeys that haul your goods up the mountain. Or the oxen who carries them across the plain. And for all of these efforts that we hear to shift this burden to those who can't vote meaning the corporations, the businessses, the commercial establishments will only, again, serve to drive them further from the state and whom shall we turn to when our people are unemployed? Whom shall we turn to when we have no other sources of revenue? I suggest we're postponing a problem simply to gain expediency and economic advantage for the next election. It is not worthy of us if we ever intend to be statesmen and I, for one, will not vote for this measure."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."



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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

McMaster: "Representative Pierce, do you recall a law that we passed last year that if we mandate various laws of local government, the state must pay the expense of those mandates?"

Pierce: "Yes. A very good Bill."

McMaster: "Would you not then be in agreement with me that if we mandate this to local government, in the year 1980 that we as a state will be responsible for paying the cost of that or, in other words, local government loses because of it?"

Pierce: "As soon as we do that on the farm assessment Bill that we passed and the farm freeze Bill that's up today in my Committee, if the farmers are willing to do it, I might be able... willing to do it on the homeowners."

McMaster: "I don't quite know whether that was an answer to my question or not. Would you say that this..."

Pierce: "This Bill is aimed at giving relief to homeowners. If you're against it, vote against the Bill. Go back and tell your homeowners you refused to give them additional homestead exemptions. I'm going to vote to give them homestead exemption and I think the local government will continue to exist as they have in the past when we created this at 1500 and increased it to 3,000 dollars."

McMaster: "Dan, you're doing a very good job of refusing to answer my question in that it will be the responsibility of the state to pick up this amount of money that we are taking away. Is that true?"

Pierce: "We're not taking away because this only takes place if there's an increase in assessment. It doesn't reduce any assessments. It only eliminates a part of increases in future assessments."

McMaster: "It reduces the taxes of the individual pay. Is



that not right?"

Pierce: "Only if he gets an increased assessment. If his assessment stays the same, then he gets no relief."

McMaster: "In regard to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

McMaster: "I think it will be the responsibility of the state to replace this money, and I think Representative Pierce understands that but he continues to evade the answer to that question. I urge a no vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pierce to close."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to postponed consideration today. We're going to get a Roll Call today and who favor tax relief for the beleaguered homeowner on increases in assessments and who does not. You all go back and campaign with the little homeowner, the widow, the man that's out of work, the retired people on their homes and say, 'Oh, you poor homeowners. The schools, local governments, are making you pay a disproportionate share.' But when you come down to Springfield some of you will vote differently. Now your homeowners will have a chance to see whether you favor an increased homestead exemption for them. And although I respect the last Gentleman that spoke, I want you to know this doesn't reduce the assessment base of any district in the state. The homestead... universal homestead exemption, unlike the senior homestead exemption, only comes into play when there's an increase in equalized assessed valuation. If there's an increase in equalized assessed valuation, under present law, the first 3,000 dollars of increase is exempted. Under this Bill, it would be the first 5,000 dollars of increase over the 1978 base. It's not like the senior citizens homestead exemption that applies whether or not your assessment is increased."



It even applies if your assessment is lowered. That's the senior citizens homestead exemption. This universal homestead exemption applies to everyone regardless of age in a... who owns their residence in a residential, single-family type residential building or a building, I believe, of less than six apartments. It's a way of giving the homeowner some recognition of the fact that he's bearing an undue burden of supporting our schools and yes, our other local government units. I happen to believe the homeowner does bear a disproportionate burden of supporting our schools and local government through real estate taxes on homes that do not produce income for people but are a necessity for them in order to exist. In this inflationary time, all we're doing is eliminating a portion of the increase in assessed valuation caused by inflation home values that don't help people because they don't intend to sell their home. They're living in their home. They must continue to live in their home, and they're not getting any benefits from increased values. All they're getting is increased taxes. And that's the purpose of House Bill 262. Let's stand up and be counted for the homeowner and give him that tax relief we always tell him that he deserves, and we go to meetings in our district but sometimes we forget about them down here in Springfield when we're worried about Chrysler Corporation and other big companies. Let's vote for the homeowner. Vote for House Bill 262."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, has moved for the passage of House Bill 262. The question is shall House Bill 262 pass. Those in favor signify by voting aye, those opposed by voting no. The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative



Robbins. A minute to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we come into Springfield and we mandate salary increases for school teachers. We mandate salary increases for elected officials then we say that there shall be no tax increases at home. The money has to come from someplace and I don't... I just cannot vote for a Bill which does not speak responsibly for the people."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?"

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 ayes, 29 nays none answering present and House Bill 262, having received the Constitutional Majority,... Wyvetter Younger aye... is here... Ropp

aye. Election's coming. Jones aye. Stanley aye. Leinenweber aye. Leverenz aye. Conti no. Meyer aye. Winchester aye. Harris, did you hear that? Winchester aye. Let's take another Roll Call.

The Clerk can't get them. I didn't think so.

On this question, those in favor signify by voting aye, those opposed by voting no. Richmond aye.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 voting aye, 21 voting no, and none answering present and House Bill 262 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Matijevich: "House Bill .. Richmond, 'aye'. Oh, the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Someone's lunch has been mistakenly delivered to my desk. If they would claim it, they can certainly have it."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's a young Lady. Somebody put it on your desk. House Bill 3268, the Minority Leader, Representative Ryan."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3268, a Bill for an Act concerning limits on the amount of interest to finance charges which may be charged in connection with revolving credit sales retail installment contract, retail charge agreements, and certain installment loans. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Minority Leader, Representative George Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have leave to take this Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to return House Bill 3268 to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave. Return the Bill to Second Reading."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute, George. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Ryan, amends House Bill 3268 as amended by inserting immediately after the enacting clause, the following. "

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, on Amendment #2."

Ryan: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3268 allows banks and savings and loans and other licensed lenders to charge any interest rate



that they.. they have to charge on revolving credit, with an effective date of December 31st, 1981. Amendment #2 includes credit unions in there and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3268. On that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Representative Hanahan would be the traditional one to ask this question, but you're telling me you're taking off all... the lid on revolving credit like credit cards?"

Ryan: "Yes."

Skinner: "It won't be 18% per year? It could be 100% per year?"

Ryan: "Well, I don't know... whatever... I don't know what it will be. But there will be no limit on it."

Skinner: "This is not just a temporary suspension?.. It's..."

Ryan: "Yes, it is. Till December 31st of '81."

Skinner: "Oh. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any further discussion? If not, all in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 say 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Former.. Former House Member, City Clerk of Chicago, Walter Kozubowski. He says... He says it's much quieter here in Springfield. The ... Representative Ryan, are you going to ask leave now to hear the Bill?"

Ryan: "Yes, if we can do that..."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's back on Third Reading."

Ryan : "I'd like to move the Bill if I could."

Speaker Matijevich: Alright. The Gentleman asks leave to suspend the appropriate rule so that House Bill 3268 can be heard on Third Reading. Does he have leave? Leave. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

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



House. I just explained the Bill. It removes the limit on interest rates on revolving credit for savings and loans, banks, credit unions, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan has moved for the passage of House Bill 3268. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill...' Oh. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane.!"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "What is the effect of the recently passed federal legislation on interest rates in Illinois and how does this Bill tie in with that?"

Ryan: "Has no effect as I understand it."

Kane: "Well, as I understand it, the federal legislation was passed recently which suspended all state limits on usury. Is that not correct?"

Ryan: "It's a phase out, Representative, and as I understand it, there will be no major effects for at least three years."

Kane: "As I understood it, the Federal Government took off all of the state limits on usury unless the states acted to reinstate the limit during a one year period which would seem to indicate that if this Bill is passed, which removes any limits for a year, it would pre-empt the state from putting a limit back on again once this year is completed. Is that not correct?"

Clerk Leone: "Lechowicz in the Chair."

Ryan: "No, that's not correct."

Kane: "Could you explain to me then the.. the interaction between the recently passed federal legislation and what we're doing here today if this Bill passes?"

Ryan: "I can't hear you, Representative."

Kane: "Could you explain the interaction between..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."



Kane: "Would you explain to us the interaction between the recently passed federal legislation and the Bill that we're getting ready to pass today?"

Ryan: "Well, as I explained the federal legislation as I understand it, Representative, will not have an effect. It's a phase in program and it won't.. there will be no effects for at least three years. It's a six year phase in, as I understand it."

Kane: "Well, the newspaper articles on it when that Bill passed said that it removed the usury limits, all state usury limits, unless the states reinstated them within this coming year."

Ryan: "We have an option to preempt the federal legislation as long as we do it..."

Kane: "But, if we pass this today we no longer have that option. Is that not correct?"

Ryan : "No, that's not correct."

Kane: "Could you take it out of the record until we clear that up?" "Could you take it out of the record until we clear that up?"

Ryan: "No, I'd like to move the Bill, Representative. You'll have a shot at it in the Senate."

Kane: "Somebody else may. I won't."

Ryan: "You have no influence in the Senate?"

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, could I address the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we're acting precipitously on this Bill at this point. I think that we ought to know specifically what the interaction between the federal legislation which preempted state usury laws and whether if we take this action now, whether we're foreclosing any action that we could take on usury in the State of Illinois for a long period of time. I'd urge a 'present' vote or a 'no' vote at this time."



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

Ryan: "I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3268 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, briefly to explain my vote. I'm glad to see the credit unions are included in here because I think we should treat everyone alike. But we shouldn't treat the consumers this way. Taking... Sealing completely off interest rates on installment loans means the sky is the limit. These high interest rates are what has brought the problems on that we have today. We shouldn't be doing this with installment interest rates. If we have to get the simple interest rate up, that's one thing. Because that's the interest rate that's charged commercial people and charged home owners. Installment loans are made by the short loan people and those rates always have been exorbitant. To make them even worse now is wrong and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is confusion here and everyone hasn't seen the new federal regs. Representative Ryan's correct however. We can come back and set a statutory interest rate without being preempted by the feds and I believe the limitation is 1983. The date in the Bill of 1981 was put in to coincide with the other Usury Rate Moratorium Bill that was passed last year that Representative Ryan worked on. This does not prevent us from coming back and doing something as to consumers. This, in fact, is tighter for the consumer than the federal regulations. We're taking a step towards state action



that is tighter for the consumer than the federal action by the Federal Reserve and it deserves a green light for those reasons."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye's, 20 'no's, 29 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar under consideration Postponed, is House Bill 1299. Read the Bill."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1299 has been previously read."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope that we don't have two hours of debate on this Bill and I hope that it doesn't evolve around the emotional aspect of what we've heard thrown from various sides of this Bill for the last three or four years. I hope that we address ourselves simply to the facts on this Bill and try to vote on the facts. And for that reason I'll try to keep this explanation as simple as possible. You've probably been presented this Bill numerous times through various lobbyists or through the mail from your local banker. What the Bill does is allow ...it will allow banks to affiliate, under common ownership, to a multi-bank holding company. In other words, one, two, three, four, five banks can decide to join together as a common corporation. We have divided Illinois into five sections and I think you've all been given a map and I think you know what those sections are. One is Cook County, two...area two is the surrounding counties and then the rest of the state is divided into three regions. You can form a multi-bank holding company in your own region and in a contiguous region and that is all. Not throughout the state, not in more than two regions, but only in yours and in one contiguous region. You cannot charter ...you cannot charter new banks as a holding company nor can you acquire new banks. A bank must be in existence for ten years before it can be acquired by a holding company. This Bill, in addition, allows one additional facility. Under current law banks are allowed two facilities, one within fifteen hundred feet and one within thirty-five hundred yards. All banks have a six hundred foot home office protection



from these facilities. This Bill will allow one additional facility and only one additional facility. That facility can be in your county or within ten miles if you happen to be on the border line of a county. But in addition to that, we have provided a one mile home office protection for this third facility only. Now why is this Bill necessary? I could probably stand here and list twenty-five reasons but I think it's summed up best by listening to some of the mail that you receive and I receive. Here is a letter from Bloomington, Illinois, from a bank in Bloomington. It says we have the largest downstate Illinois financial institution, which is a savings and loan association, in my city of Bloomington. In the past two years that association has branched and merged from Decatur on the south to Streator on the north, Champaign to the east and Morton to the west. While that activity has gone on I have continued in my efforts to find viable facilities within thirty-five hundred yards. Now obviously he's being facetious. Here is a savings and loan that's banking half way around the state and he is trying to compete by branching within two miles. A second reason. This is a letter from a contractor. It says for more than... it says for more than the past ten years, the local area bank with which we do business has been unable to meet our credit requirements because their maximum single loan limit is not sufficient to meet our needs. They are forced to use out-of-state correspondent banks. Another reason that we would like to see this, we want ...we would like to provide more and better services to bank customers. And what would some of these services be? For example, if one bank of assets of twenty million dollars may not be able to hire experts in various areas. But if five banks affiliate



and they can hire and provide specialists in areas like trust service, agricultural lending, farm management, financial planning, advice for small business, as well as advice to individuals. They can also handle larger loans themselves quickly and efficiently without having to go out of state. The additional facility that we provide, I think, is extremely important to various communities in downstate Illinois, communities of two hundred, three hundred, four hundred people or maybe even a thousand people that could not support...do not have the population to support a new bank but they can support a facility. There are many small towns in Illinois that simply have no banking facilities in town and they never will have. This will allow a bank that's maybe twenty miles away to open a facility in that unbanked community and provide them services that they have never had before. And finally let me read...let me read a small article out of the Federal Reserve Bank Bulletin. This is a bulletin that comes out monthly from all the Federal Reserve Banks in the United States. The people that write for these banks are independent economists. They are not swayed by the emotional arguments of...of multi-bank holding companies and various issues related to it. This article concluded as follows: 'Recognizing that it is too early to appraise all of the ramifications of the multi-bank holding company, the weight of the evidence seems to indicate that the net affects of holding companies ...of the holding company movement have favorable to the general public. The fear that commercial banking would become less competitive if holding companies were permitted has not been substantiated. In many local markets affiliates of multi-bank holding companies have increased competition and the independent banks



response to the introduction of a holding company competitor has frequently also been to intensify competition. So the Bill itself is actually very simple. It allows multi-bank holding companies in certain designated areas of the state, it does not allow those holding companies to expand statewide. That is...that is the essence of the Bill. If you own a bank and wish to affiliate, you may do so in a given geographical area. If you own a bank and do not wish to affiliate, that is your choice. No one is going to be forced to sell a bank. The second provision of the Bill allows one additional facility. And that's all the Bill does, nothing more, nothing less. It's a Bill to provide increased services, it's a Bill to provide increased competition. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, to begin with it's probably easiest to say what isn't in this Bill as opposed to what is. First of all, however, I want to go through briefly some discussion of what the banking groups are doing and thinking about this Bill. First of all, it is not a compromise among banking groups as some have been led to believe here. A recent survey of a thousand banks in Illinois showed that nearly 70% oppose any form of holding company Bill. And with the exception of only 6% of the polled banks, they opposed this Bill's provision, if not this Bill itself, because it lacks specific deposit percentage limits, it lacks a limit on the number of bank acquisitions and it lacks the tightening of controls except on a regional basis as to the formation of holding companies. As I said, only 6% of a thousand banks in this state would support the provisions of



the type of Bill that we have before us. But let's look at the Bill itself. Page one of the Bill clearly opens itself to international banking. It defines banks with regard to the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa and so forth. It opens the door to federal control to interstate and international banking without question. You heard what Representative McPike said about limits. Look at the Bill. The original Bill, page eight. It's still in the Bill on a different page with an Amendment. But specifically what the Bill says is, there's a limit on chartering within the regions...within the regional limits in the Bill. There is no specific prohibition in this Bill at all against the chartering of banks outside of those regional limits by holding companies, absolutely no prohibition implied or stated outside of the regional limits in the Bill. The original Bill, page nine, is still in the Bill as well. You can still have a holding company acquire another holding company. You can still merge, you can still consolidate banks one to another, achieving the exact same purpose that this Bill alleges to eliminate. But it does not eliminate it. Again, there's no prohibition against one holding company, either, acquiring another holding company. There is a specific provision in the Bill that lets a bank buy another bank, hold that bank and sell that bank before resuming operations achieving the exact same purpose that the Bill and the Sponsor alleged would be achieved and limited. That is not the case. This Bill clearly is anti-consumer, no question about it. Even with regard to the new facility. The polling of those same thousand banks showed that even those banks in the majority oppose the new facility. And basically because we passed the electronic funds transfer Bills last year, they see no need, that is a



majority don't, even for that new facility provision that Representative McPike argued for a few minutes ago. In conclusion I would say in opposition to this Bill that I believe that it is anti-community. Groups all over the state, community groups and small business groups oppose it because assets would be combined. There is no jurisdictional certainty as to who can go where in this Bill as I pointed out. There's no limit on merges and consolidation. There's no prohibition against taking over and putting out of business little community banks. Small business groups have argued against it simply because they know that conglomerates and large banks and the like have their own agencies, their businesses, their own travel features, their own small businesses within their own large businesses and they don't deal with local communities unless they have to and they wouldn't have to under this Bill. In conclusion I would say this in opposition to 1299. I think most of you know that the big banks don't want to help us. The big banks want this Bill, not for the consumer, they want it for themselves. They want it to bail out a few investors, a few bad bankers and several bad banks that would go under if this Bill doesn't pass. There's nothing in this Bill to help people in the small rural communities of downstate Illinois. I don't believe there's anything in this Bill that in the end would help the communities within the City of Chicago or East St. Louis or the inner cities of this state. It's a bad Bill from start to finish. You ought to look, as I said, at what's not in the Bill and what is still allowed outside of the regional structure. And remember that even within the regional structure, banks can go hundreds of miles away from their community to charter new banks, to acquire new banks and to make acquisitions of banks they



don't already have. It's not a good Bill. It does not do all that the Sponsor says it does. It does not prohibit the same thing he says are covered. It simply is not the case and the Bill ought to be defeated if you believe in the small unit banking structure and the fact that that unit structure has served and continues to serve this state well.

Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This type of legislation is just hurting the little people and hurting the consumer. There's nothing to indicate here that the consumer is going to be benefited by holding company Bills or any type of branch banking Bills. Just a few large banks in the State of Illinois are the ones that are pushing this. And as Representative Stuffle brought out, I believe very clearly, that we have over twelve hundred banks in the State of Illinois. And to the best of my surveys there are over eight hundred of these banks that are opposed to it. Now we're not here just to represent the banker's view but we're here to represent the consumer's view. And I don't think any of us can visualize what could happen in our area if we had a few large banks that controlled the whole banking industry like the State of California. There you've got about three or four banks that control the state and we could have that same thing here in Illinois. This particular branching Bill...multi-holding company Bill is just a foot in the door to start out and have branch banking. And for the protection of the consumers, I would hope we would all oppose it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, to close."



McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know I think if I owned a grocery store in a small town and that was the only grocery store in town, I suppose I wouldn't want someone to come in and open another grocery store. I wouldn't want them to open another grocery store in the whole county. It's really nice to have a monopoly. There are four hundred towns in Illinois that have only one bank in that town. And I understand that a lot of those banks are against competition and are very much in favor of keeping the monopoly situation that they have. A few minutes ago we debated the Chrysler Bill...and all the elegant speeches on the House floor about the free enterprise system. These four hundred banks have been isolated from competition for the last fifty years. And if they have it their way they'll be isolated from competition for the next fifty years. The question is, is that good for the free enterprise system and is it good for the consumer? It isn't and you know it isn't. You should try to vote, as I said, not on the emotionalism of this but on the facts. Now do these small banks serve their community? Well, I guess if you know the bank president you can get a loan. If you're good friends with one of the bank's officers you can get a loan. But if you look at the statistics, they really don't serve their community. The loan to deposit ratio of the banks in Illinois, I'll say that again, the loan deposit ratio...that is do they make loans, the loan to deposit ratio of the banks in Illinois that belong to AMBI is about .85%. They make a lot of loans. They don't invest in government securities or California securities or Federal Government securities, they invest in Illinois. And how about the small banks? They don't. The loan to deposit ratio is around .5, it's 60% less than



banks that are pushing for change, that are pushing for competition. They don't invest in thier community. They don't invest...they're not able to meet their own demands in their community. They don't have to because there's no competition. All this Bill simply says is that for the first time in fifty years, we are going to slowly begin to open the door to competition every place in the state. You know it's good and I know it's good and it's only a matter of whether or not you're willing to stand up to a number of people that have monopoly situations. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 1299 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill said that there were four hundred towns in this state that had only one bank. Well there's four hundred towns in this state that only have one grocery store too. And there's nothing in the present law that keeps you going...from going into any town, if you've got the money, and start another bank. Now anything contrary to that is certainly misleading. I think it's important that the banks be locally owned and operated because they have an interest in that town. One of the people who is for this Bill, a banker, wrote me and told me that they were going to cut down the number of banks...of ownerships in this state from about fifty percent, which means that it's going to be controlled by fewer people, not more people as the Sponsor would have you believe. Now when that happens, these people that own these banks are not going to be interested in the local businessman or the local farmer. They're going to suck that money out



and loan it someplace at the highest rate they can get and the local community be damned. This is a bad Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The decision we have to make is exactly, I think, as Mr. Friedrich presented. The fact is are we going to allow a controlling interest in financial institutions to become controlled by fewer and fewer people. If you talking about competition, where I come from that's not the way to do it. We're discussing the issues of availability and services. And I have yet to see consumer groups come in to our financial institutions and tell me they wanted this type of a system, a multi-holding bank company system or branch banking. And I think what we've done in 1979 with electronic funds transfer system was the first step in that direction. This would be the second step and I'm very fearful that the control of 90% of the total...liquid assets in the State of Illinois are going to be controlled by probably five major financial institutions. And then you're going to find competition extremely difficult. You're also going to find interest rates and availability almost to a nil. So what we're looking at is who do you want controlling the money in the State of Illinois, fewer and fewer people or more and more people. And I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I know many people that have had a small interest in small banks. And I know of no bank in my area that cannot adequately take care of the needs of the community in which they are located. My banks, by great majority,



are thoroughly against this Bill. And I feel it's my obligation to help protect and preserve the small town banks because...inevitability the large banks from the northern part of the state will absorb to their interests the banks in the southern part, in the downstate part of this...of our state and will get control of them to the detriment of the people in the small communities. All the money will be directed to the biggest interests, the highest interests, in the northern part of the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a very good Bill. We've debated it before but I think there's one issue that needs to be perhaps put into perspective. House Bill 1299, in my estimation, is a Bill that will enable our urban areas in times of high inflation and high interest rates to be rehabilitated. They will enable the banks in our local communities to have access to equity. And we know that many of those banks today do not have access to equity and cannot service their consumer in the community. House Bill 1299 is a Bill that has a safeguard to protect any bank or financial institution against the so-called gobbling up of the big fish. And I think that Representative McPike again and again has indicated that this Bill is a Bill whose time has come and certainly we in the State of Illinois have reached the point where we must move beyond parochial, provincial and, needless to say, to take the blinders off. We're one of only two states that has the dubious distinction of not allowing this kind of arrangement to take place. And I think all of you that is listened to the debate and certainly have read the analysis of both staff could come to only



one conclusion. And that conclusion, in my estimation, is logical. It's that now is the time...now is the time for us to have this type of financing, this type of banking..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Bell, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a possibility of a conflict of interest here but feel that I must vote my conscience."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that it is very appropriate that this Bill does follow the Chrysler Bill as we just had all the arguments from the other side about the free enterprise system. And then we have an opportunity to vote for that free enterprise system where we could have competition and it turns that the... the other side is saying that we can't do that. I submit to you that all of the little banks in my district, and I have many, many, many of them, there isn't a single one that would provide...that would lose any services...that would lose any customers if they are indeed providing the service which they are supposed to provide. The only way that any company from any other financial institution that will be coming to town...is frankly, if you're not doing the job. That's when you will get the competition. I submit to you that this is a good Bill. It's a good Bill throughout the state and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a potential conflict of interest but that notwithstanding, I have



serious concern for the local banks, the banks in my district, who may be unable to compete when, in fact, those banks have grown up through a vital concern for the people of the local commun...local neighborhoods of their own community. I have to question to what extent the larger banks, the conglomerates, the banks that would be built up if this were to pass, what concern they would have with the small communities around this state, in Chicago and in the various neighborhoods in Chicago. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. Now I won't go into the thing about the free competition or that...that we heard here before on the Chrysler Bill but that's what we're talking about now. The people that have got the monopolies want to keep them. And when...a year ago when we voted on this Bill we one short of passing it and at that time the banks who were...a competitive disadvantage with the savings and loans. And what happened this year in Congress, they will be at a further disadvantage with the savings and loans. I don't think that's fair in our free competitive system and I think that this is a consumer Bill. There are protections in there for the downstate Bill so that the big banks in Chicago cannot go throughout the state. And I therefore urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I understand the dilemma that a lot of the Representatives who represent rural areas are faced



with today. But what I would ask you is a question, what you polled the banks in your area besides asking them how they feel on the issue but on the services that they offer to their customers? I would venture to guess...to say that you haven't...or checked their rates. Are their rates competitive? If you were to check some of the downstate areas, these people who are against competition are paying far below the guidelines...the Federal rate when it comes to interest. A very good case and point. One of the groups who is opposing this happens to have a officer, a high ranking officer, I won't mention him by name, who owns a group of four or five banks. They are paying three quarters of a percent on their savings below what the going rate is right now. Why? Because he doesn't have to. He has no competition in his area. You tell me that competition in the market place doesn't help stimulate business and you're wrong. Check with your banks and you will find there are some banks in Illinois that are paying three percent, four percent on their savings. Why? Because they don't have to worry about competition. Think about this. You stimulate competition in your area and these people are going to have to become more competitive and have to start paying interest the way it should be paid. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 59 'noes', 14 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask for a poll of the absentees and a verification of the Roll Call... a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Oh, it'll



take 107, excuse me, Sir, I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "89."

Dunn: "I think we ruled on that last year."

Speaker Lechowicz: "89."

Dunn: "Yeah, right, right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees."

Dunn: "How many did it have, 98?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's got 93. 93 'ayes', 59 'noes', 14 as 'present'. There's been a request for a poll of the absentees and a verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alexander. Capuzi. Dawson. Farley. Johnson. Emil Jones. Margalus. Peters. Schoeberlein. Slape and Watson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birkenbine. Bluthardt. Boucek. Bradley. Braun. Bullock. Burnidge. Capparelli. Casey Chapman. Christensen. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Davis. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Dyer. Ewell. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hoffman. Huff. Dave Jones. Kane. Karpriel. Katz. Keane. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Mahar. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Patrick. Piel. Pierce. Polk. Reed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Jack. Kindly record Representative Schoeberlein as 'no'. Please continue with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Reilly. Rigney. Ronan. Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Schneider. Schraeder Simms. Stanley. Steczo. E.G. Steel. C.M. Stiehl. Terzich. Totten. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Walsh. Willer. Williams."



Williamson and J.J. Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dunn, are there any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bell. He's here."

Dunn: "Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bluthardt. He's in his chair, Sir."

Dunn: "Representative Currie."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She is in her chair, Sir."

Dunn: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Lechowicz: Domico is by his chair."

Dunn: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Garmisa. Mr. Garmisa. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Giorgi. He's here."

Dunn: "Representative Kane, he is in his..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane is in his chair."

Dunn: "Kosinski. Representative Kosinski. He's..."

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

Dunn: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McAuliffe is in his chair."

Dunn: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McBroom."

Dunn: "McBroom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Gene, would you move over there first. Mr. Schlickman. Gene, I can't...how is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. McBroom?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. McBroom. Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kucharski is in his chair."



Dunn: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leverenz. Mr. Leverenz. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Leverenz in the Chamber? Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Ted Meyer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ted Meyer is right behind you."

Dunn: "There you are. Representative George Ryan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "George Ryan. He's right over here."

Dunn: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Leverenz back on the Roll Call."

Dunn: "Representative Totten."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Totten."

Dunn: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Totten."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Totten. Put McBroom back on the Roll Call. Mr. Totten. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Dunn: "Representative Younge. Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She is back in the Chambers, Sir."

Dunn: "Jack... Representative Williams."

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

Dunn: "I have no other questions, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 91 'ayes', 60 'noes', 14 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1327. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a motion on the last Bill before you called...I wanted to make a motion



to lay the Bill on the Table. Oh, I'm sorry, move to reconsider the vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1299 passed. The Gentleman...Mr. Leon moves that motion lie on the Table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed...the Gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill 1327, Mr. Totten. Oh, you're back. The Gentleman has...too late."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1327, a Bill for an Act reorganizing and consolidating various legislative Committees. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1327 is a Bill in similar fashion to ones we have debated in this Body before. But, it probably is more appropriate at this time than any of the times in the past that we have considered it. This is a Bill that reorganizes the legislative function or branch of government. We have many of us sat here and seen the Executive Branch reorganize and restaff and become the most influential branch of government. And we haven't really addressed our own House as to how we can be more competitive or more equal. The measure that is before you today, House Bill 1327, attempts to do that. How many times have we been criticized for our own operations and at the same time refused to do anything to reform, streamline or make them more efficient? House Bill 1327 does that. This Bill would allow the Legislative Branch to compete with the Executive Branch on a more equal footing, by providing continuous efficient oversight capabilities. It would provide a more efficient and even distribution of the legislative work load. And it would fix responsibility for specific legislative tasks. In addition, it would provide the mechanism for a more thorough, integrated and coordinated sunset review. The Bill would provide more comprehensive services for the General Assembly at no additional costs. The main features of the Bill are the establishment of 12 oversight joint Committees of the House and Senate which would absorb most of the present functions of the existing Legislative Commission System. Most of the major Commissions would be mandated into the various joint Committees that are set up in the Bill. Other existing



Commissions may or may not be absorbed by that joint Committee system and that is left for the joint Committees to determine. The Bill also creates an office to integrate the basic legislative functions to Members by establishing the Illinois Legislative Service Commission. The Service Commission would combine the functions of the Reference Bureau and the Legislative Council. And it would coordinate an overview all research and Bill drafting services. The Bill also would streamline our present library system and I think on balance would be a measure that would well serve this General Assembly and the people of the state that we represent and I would solicit your support and be happy to answer any questions."

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

Hudson: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Hudson: "Don, I.. are there any Commissions that are exempt under .. Is the Status of Women Commission included in your Bill to be eliminated? Or is that exempt from.. from excising?"

Totten: "I believe... I'm looking at the list. The Status of Women, what we tried to do in the Joint Committee was to assign existing Commissions to appropriate Joint Committees From the look... From looking at the list of the Commissions that would be replaced, we apparently found no place that the Status of Women would be appropriate so we exempted it. And not eliminated it."

Hudson: "Is the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations exempted?"

Totten: "The Intergovernmental Cooperations Commission?"

Hudson: "Yes."

Totten: "Is redefined and put into the organization structure as it exists."



Hudson: "Are there any other Commissions that have been exempted besides the Status of Women Commission?"

Totten: "There are a number of others that are exempted other than the Status of Women and that.. I can give you the list of the ones that are replaced and you can figure it out from there. Okay?"

Hudson: "I'd rather have a list of the ones that are exempt."

Totten: "Let me see if I can find that a minute. Joint... Representative Hudson, probably the best way that I can answer that is to do it this way; there are a number of Commissions such as Economic and Fiscal, Intergovernmental, that were absorbed into the reorganization continuing their present subject matter. The Commissions such as School Problems, were absorbed into the Committee.. Joint Committee on Education with its existing structure. Committees such as the Chicago World Fair of 1976 were abolished. Commissions such as the Little Calumet River Flood Control Coordinating Commission were made permissive into the existing Joint Committee structure. If the Legislative Joint Committees decided that they needed to continue the 'Little Calumet, they may do so. It was not mandated. Other Commissions with similar functions such as Judicial Advisory, Election Laws Commission for Economic Development, Commission to visit and Examine State Institutions, Legislative Investigative, Bi-State Developmental Legislative Advisory Committee, the Illinois Energy Resources Commission, Illinois Recreation Council, the Advisory Committee on Tourism, Science Advisory Committee, Illinois Special Events Commission, Swine Disease Control Committee, State Audit Advisory Board, Water Resources, Creve Cœur Tri-Centennial Commission, were all permissively included in the legislation if the Joint Committee would like to. No Commissions were officially abolished by this Bill. They were... those that we arbitrarily determined, and I say arbitrarily,



had significant functions for mandating into the Joint Committee structure. The others were permissively put into that Joint Committee structure at the determination of the Joint Committees."

Hudson: "Okay. Thank you very much, Don."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Were all those eliminated, Mr. Totten?"

All those Commissions were eliminated?"

Totten: "Was that the Speaker talking?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah. I was listening to the debate, but I'd like to hear the answer..."

Totten: "Those..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I missed it."

Totten: "All the Commissions that I mentioned there were permissively mandated, permissively placed into the Joint Committee structure with the Joint Committee to determine whether those Commissions should continue with their functions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to ask Representative Totten a question please and then make a comment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Ma'am."

Hallstrom: "Representative Totten."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Totten?"

Hallstrom: "Am I reading our analysis correct? Is.. Are you saying that there will be no public Members on any of these Commissions?"

Totten: "No, that is not true. The.. The legislation specifically recognizes the functions and the play that public Members have made into the Commission system. And, the legislation allows the Joint Committees to place public Members in specific areas of study where they think public Members' input may help. The Joint Committee structure also would allow us to absorb most of the staff that the Joint Committees feel would be needed to function, to maintain



the functions that would be absorbed into the Joint Committees and in addition, there would be allowances made for travel, etc, that the Joint Committee structure would need so that we could continue to study problems with the same input that we've had in the past."

Hallstrom: "Then, what you're saying really is that the public Members would only be selected for specific tasks, that they would not be continuing Members of any particular... there would be no Commission.. I'd like to speak to that."

Totten: "No, that's not true. They may or may not be. That would be up to the Joint Committee. But if's the Joint Committee studied a problem and used public Members on their Sub-Committee to do it when that problem was terminated, the public Members would be terminated, which is not the way our existing system does it."

Hallstrom: "I'd like to speak, excuse me, as..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, 'Ma'am. Mr. Donovan? Would you kindly get off the rail? Mr. Donovan? Tim Donovan. Please proceed, Ma'am."

Hallstrom: "Thank you. Representative Totten, excuse me. I'd like to say as a public Member for 15 years on a Commission, the Commission on Children, and having observed the importance of having public Members contributing at no salary of course, just for expenses, I would hesitate to vote for something that's going to change that kind of structure so that we don't have an ongoing input from public Members throughout the state. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Satterthwaite : "Representative Totten, my questions are somewhat in line with the previous questioner. Are you saying that if public Members were involved in a Sub-Committee way, that they would only have a vote as far as that Sub-Committee Membership was concerned, but not



as full voting Members of the Joint Committee itself?"

Totten: "I believe that would be correct."

Satterthwaite: "And, so, in fact, they would not be full Members of the Joint Committee. If that is the case, then I think I would reiterate the previous speaker's concern. It is a definite asset for the Members of the Legislature to serve in full equal partnerships with non-legislative Members in many of our Commissions. And I would hate to see that system disrupted to the point where the nonlegislative Members felt that in some way they were only in second class Membership. I think the type of input that we would get and the type of commitment that we've had on the parts of those nonlegislative Members would deteriorate substantially under this system. I agree with what I think the attempt is, to eliminate and consolidate some of the functions of our current Commissions, but I cannot support something that would really be detrimental to the public sector input."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's been my experience as a Chairman of the School Problems Commission that a great deal of the valuable input received by that particular Commission, the only that with which I have been associated with for some time, the participation of the public Members has contributed a great deal to the work and the work product of the Commission as a whole. I would also suggest to all of you that this is one of the significant ways in which citizens can participate in a direct and constructive and contributive way to the development of the legislation which will affect the entire common wheel. I would suggest to you that with the exception of testifying before Committees, that the participation in the Commissions is one of the most significant opportunities for the public to participate. I think



one of the other great strengths of the Commission is the fact that we have Membership from both the House and the Senate. This one concern would be addressed, as I understand it, by this legislation, but it does not address the issue on a public participation on equal footing. I think that's important. And for that reason, I rise in opposition to this legislation."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this measure. If you believe in legislative oversight, you will support House Bill 1327. It provides a mechanism for ongoing consistent responsive legislative consideration of the issues confronting the state. It will do away with the hodge-podge of miscellaneous Commissions that we now have. Some of those Commissions are very good Commissions and do very good work. And those... their functions will be preserved under this legislation. What we will be getting rid of, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, are all of the bad Commissions, the Commissions that sully the .. the name of this Legislature and of its intent and of its function, those Commissions that don't function, that take taxpayers' dollars and don't produce a product. There are enough of those on the list read out by Representative Totten to cause us all great concern. Now, we have no way of knowing what happens with some of the money that goes into these Commissions. We have no way of tracking what they do. This will provide a mechanism to actually give this Legislature some teeth, to actually give this Legislature some ability to address long-range concerns and long-range issues. But there's also a pocket-book issue involved here, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And that goes to the funding of these various Commissions. I had the privilege, and I say the privilege, of serving on a Conference Committee that



considered the Commission Bills this last time. I sat in that room which resembled the star chamber and watched people divvy up the dollars on these various Commissions consistent with what the Sponsors... who the Sponsors knew and how much they wanted and what they thought they could do with the money. I just don't think that that's the way that this Legislature should operate. We have... We are talking about protecting taxpayers' dollars. We are talking about coming up with a product that they can be proud of. I think we should be about preserving the important work of Commissions, and I would say, by the way, Representative Totten, that the Commission on the Status of Women has done a good job for the state. But I would also say that we can protect the .. the interests and the issues and the goals of those functioning, well-meaning, economical, if you will, Commissions in this state by adoption of this legislation and rid ourselves of a lot of dead weight that is still hanging around in this state. I encourage an 'aye' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge support of this Bill. There's nothing easier around here than to get everybody to agree that our present system isn't very good. There's nothing harder around here than to get anybody to change any of it. The fact is I think for years there has been a consensus among people in the Legislature and people studied the Legislature that this kind of change needs to be made. There's been a lot of talk about public input. The fact is that standing Committees of this House and of the Senate get better public input, more public input on the specific problems they face by hearing witnesses than the Commissions really the standing Commissions that I'm on. It is nonsense to say



Representative Totten is eliminating public input. Not only will there be Members of the Sub-Committees on particular problems, but obviously the Joint Committees can do what we all do to get public input. We ask the public to come and tell us on this particular problem that you know something about, what are your feelings? What are you doing on this? We have lots of good Commissions and I'm on some of them myself. And they meet and they study and they produce very pretty reports which comes to our desk, which we then throw in the wastebasket and nothing happens. The whole point of this reform that Representative Totten is trying to accomplish is to say that at least when a report comes out of one of these standing Committees, made up of Members of the House and the Senate who must take action, if any action is to be taken, that at least when a report comes out of that, it will have a substantial base of support on the floor." And something might actually happen. We are not and should not be in the business of just paying people to go through the pleasant process of studying things. If we have any excuse to have Commissions or Joint Committees, it's so something gets done, some action gets taken. Everybody can sit here and nit-pick this Bill to death. Everybody can say, well, it gets rid of too many Commissions. It gets rid of mine. It doesn't get rid of my.. somebody I don't like. You know, it will change it this way, it will change it that way. I come back to what I said at first. We all know the system needs to be changed. This Bill may not be perfect, but it's a long step in the right direction. You all talk about change, now's the time to vote for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen," moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed? The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Totten, to close."

Totten: "Very short debate, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recognize and I pay tribute to the innumerable accomplishments of the many Legislative Commissions and their Memberships. But, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe the time has come that we assign the authority we have granted to Commissions to the Legislative Committees to which it rightfully belongs. Unfortunately, there is nothing to require that a Legislative Commission Member also be a Member of the Legislative Committee that is responsible for acting on the recommendation of the Commission. Too often under our present system Commission reports that come down in the form of legislation go to Committees and on those Committees there were no Members of the Commission that originally studied the problem. And so, we start the study process over and over again. And we waste time and we waste money doing it. This measure that is before you today is one that has culminated from an original Bill a number of years ago that just absolutely abolished all Legislation Commissions. This measure recognizes the contribution that Members have made or that Commissions have made to our system of governing. It is a compromise between that position of many that we should just abolish all Commissions and that position that says there are some things that Commissions do that ought to be transferred into our present system in a more efficient manner. May I submit to my colleagues in the House that this measure does that in the most moderate way that we can and it does it in a way that will enable us to be more efficient. It does it in a way that will enable us to be more competitive and it does it in a way that will make us better informed on the issues and better to compete with the other branches of government. May I submit to you that this measure qualifies



on all those measu... on all those matters and it deserves your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1327 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Marco, vote me 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Marovitz: "I had a question, Mr. Speaker, but I maybe in his explanation he could explain it. This may have been asked before. If all Commissions will be incorporated in... not selected Commissions, but all Commissions, so that somebody with a little more clout won't be able to get.. retain their Commission rather than have it incorporated under your legislation? And perhaps you could answer that while explaining your vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think this is the most responsible piece of legislation we've seen yet this year and perhaps in many years of past years. Much work has been done on this piece of legislation and I dare say that over the years, every single Member of this House at one time or another has been a Sponsor or a Cosponsor of this type of legislation. It's a time that we must pass it. It's very responsible. It puts the burden where it should be on the Committee system. And I think the Sponsor should be commended for his effort. We should give him the 89 votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill at a time when we in the General Assembly find ourselves under criticism for sky-rocketing costs to operate the General Assembly. I think Representative Totten has put together an excellent proposal and most of the emphasis can be placed on the Committee structure and



we can abolish a lot of the Commissions that no longer really are necessary, but quite frankly, our plums for individuals in this chamber. I, for one, am not going to vote for an omnibus Bill that finances all of the Commissions at 11:30 on June 30th of this year. I think this is a good measure. It's a step in the right direction. I encourage everybody to support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about the 29th of June? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am voting for this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's enough."

Preston: "I'm voting for this Bill in the reverent hope that the number of reports and pretty bound items that are sent unsolicited to all the Members of this Body will be reduced and that the taxpayers of Illinois will save the expense of these numerous reports and fancy bound items that no one, in fact, reads. Therefore, I am voting 'yes' in that hope."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, the vote on this Bill gives the public a pretty good idea. It ought to give us a pretty good idea of why Pat Quinn is able to get signatures. He's able to get signatures on a petition to do away with one-third of this Body because we're unwilling to reform ourselves. Now this is a reform that just has been crying for enactment since I've gotten here in 1973. It's still crying. We'll probably save more money if we pass this Bill than if we abolish one-third of the Legislature. May I appeal to your good judgment? Why don't we preempt the rabble rouser in the street and reform ourselves?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote. Timer's on."



Kane: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill because Commissions came from the old Constitution. That Constitution has been out of effect for the last ten years. It's time, I think, to bring the Legislature up to date with our current Constitution and put our resources where our decisions are being made and that's with the Committees and not with the Commissions. There's no point at all in having duplicate activity and paying for things twice and I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to explain his vote..Timer's on."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker, probably like a reed shaking in the wind and crying in the wilderness, let me suggest to the Members of the Assembly that in spite of what Representative Skinner says, probably the most constructive things that have ever come out of this Assembly have come out of it not in the name of 'reform', but in the name of common sense and helping people. We've pretty near reformed ourselves into a situation where we can't get a decision made. And we have reformed ourselves into a situation where people end up running for office because of somebody out in the street screaming about something and coming in and putting legislation in this General Assembly as some quick band-aid solution to the problem when you and I know in our quiet moments that that ain't the answer and that legislation comes back to haunt us like the reform on county hospital and a load of other reforms we end up making in the heat of the minute. What are we doing in this legislation? You tell me and I don't have any Spanish constituents in my district to speak of, but who, in this Legislature outside of the Spanish speaking Commission, speaks for the Spanish people? Don't they have a right to be heard by some group



that takes hearing and testimony?? Who speaks in this council here for the aging? The Commission on Aging is being abolished, the Commission on Spanish speaking people, the Commission on Aid to Public Aid Recipients. Look through on what you're voting for.. the Commission on Children. Who, outside of the Commission on Children whether you think they're lunatics or whether they're right or whether they're wrong, who comes here with legislation to at least twinge our conscience, to at least suggest something that maybe of some merit or not in terms of dealing with some kind of problem? This is another one of those reform measures that's going to end up costing not the ten million dollars or the eight million dollars these present Commissions cost us, but are going to end up costing us 20 or 30 million dollars because you're building a larger and huger bureaucracy which interest groups that have a right in our pluralistic society to be listened to and to be counted on, the aged, the public employees, the people who are interested in audit of public records, the people who are interested in pension. They have a right to be heard. And you and I know that the Committee system as much as we end up talking about it, cannot operate in that kind of situation to do those kind of things. If you want to end up giving another reform to go home to put out another press release about the great things you have done, I suggest you end up voting for this. If you want to end up going back home saying that, in fact, you have had some concern for the problems of the Spanish people, some concern for the problems of the elderly, have given some voice to Public Aid recipients, some voice to those who have no voice anyplace, you will reconsider your votes on this. I don't know how much longer I'm going to end up being..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote. Timer's on. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree entirely with Pete Peters. What you're really talking about here is we have no system in our Assembly, I'll give you two points, where we asked for public Members to join us in our thought processes as part of our thought processes rather than just as witnesses. Commissions offer us a great tool of us generating not only good legislation, but good common sense thought processes. My second point is that if you want to be a full time Legislator, and you want to be here 365 days a year, because that's what the Committee process will have to be done in order to have this kind of system that Mr. Totten is suggesting, well, then you should be voting 'aye'. But for those two main reasons, I suggest the proper vote is 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've listened with great interest to this debate and especially what Representative Peters said and to me, it was my understanding, in the course of the discussion in explanation of the Bill and what it does, all we are doing is restructuring new framework to accomplish exactly what we're accomplishing now only with more efficiency and probably less costly. And, listening to debate, I'm convinced that it is good legislation and for that reason I am going to vote 'aye' and encourage others to help this Bill get the necessary number of votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this issue is as phoney as the petitions to reduce



the size of the Illinois House from 177 to 118. In much of the discussion and dialogue and rhetoric issued by the Gentleman who's promoting the coalition petition, he mentioned that one time in the media that if we would reduce the size of the Illinois House we would also at the same time reduce the Commissions and the cost of those Commissions by 14.2 million dollars. Experience has shown us where the coalition has been successful such as the State of Massachusetts. It reduced their House from 260 .. from 240 to 160. In the first year's operation it cost them five million dollars more to run their Massachusetts! House of Representatives. Now if you will get rid of all the Commissions and place the standing Committees... standing Joint Committees with the responsibilities and direction that the Commissions now assume, I can guarantee you that those Commissions will blast about and those standing Committees will blast them out with legislative staff that'll come out your ears. And instead of saving 14.2 million dollars, you'll be actually spending more money. Experience has proven that you don't save any money by reducing a Legislative Body, you provide more work on less people and that means more staff and more dollars. And I urge you to vote against this Bill. It's as phoney as the Coalition for Political Honesty petition and their efforts."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers. Timer's on."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, there's been a lot of good reasons given why we should vote for this Bill. However, here is just matter that I happen to have in my desk. Look at the glossy cost and the high cost of putting out these Commission reports. Completely unnecessary, throwing the taxpayers' money away. I bet you most of you fellows don't even read them. You don't have time in the first place. You just file them away and



eventually, and maybe a month or so into the waste-paper basket. Just millions of dollars uselessly thrown away. I'll hold up a couple of more cause my time is .. it will be going.. Beautiful, just beautiful artistic covers. Don't mean a damn thing to us. Look at this beauty right here. We don't need this kind of stuff and this is what we're doing today, throwing this kind of money away. It's logical to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. The Sponsor has never indicated that this Bill is predicated on saving money. As a matter of fact, to the contrary, this Bill will increase the efficiency and productivity of this Legislative Body. And I think this Bill will go a long way to sending a message to the citizens of Illinois that, in fact, the Coalition for Political Honesty is, in fact, a hoax, that this Body is deliberative and it can be efficient. For I feel that if this Bill fails to pass and fails to get the kind of recognition that the Sponsor desires, that we will in fact indeed be, to use Representative Conti's words, 'operating by mass hysteria'. This is a responsible approach to State Government and I think the Sponsor has a sincere intention of making this Body efficient and deliberative and I certainly urge my colleagues to support it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... I'm not surprised at the rhetoric about what this Bill may or may not do. But let me point out to the Members as I thought I pointed out in my explanation of the measure, that this is a compromise measure between those who think that we can abolish all Commissions just in an out and out cut-throat



manner... We can't do it in this Body. This has... This is a resolve of that position that recognizes that there are some activities of Commissions that should be continued. All it does is take those functions and put them into a more efficient system. That's within our existing substantive Committee structure. And it does it so that the Members of this House and the Members of the Senate can deliberate those matters that are important in a more efficient manner..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Get up there. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Deuster: "One point that hasn't been made is that Representative Peters very thoughtfully pointed out that he was afraid that this might cause us to lose some good ideas for improving the law. Actually, each of us gets \$17 thousand to run a District Office. There's no place in the State of Illinois that doesn't have access to a Representative's District Office. There's no group, whether they be farmers or Latinos, or anyone else that can't find their way to our District Office, sit down and come in and discuss the need for improving Illinois law and we don't have to pay for their meals and we don't have to pay for their travel and we don't have to pay for their tours from one end of the state to the other, and by the way of a 'boondoggle', the way the Committee or the Commissions do function. We can do it through our District Offices in addition to the Committees. And I think that we will see an improvement in the efficiency of the General Assembly if we support this Resolution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'aye's, 48 'no's, and nine recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."



Speaker Lechowicz: "And, Mr. Totten, wants a poll of the absentees. Proceed in that vein, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Alexander. Dawson. DiPrima. Farley. Getty. Hanahan. Johnson. Emil Jones. Karpiel. Keane. Laurino. Madigan. Matijevich. Mautino. McMaster. McPike. Patrick. Pouncey. Schuneman. Stanley. Taylor. Watson. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed to verify the Affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman.."

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

Stearney: "May I have leave to be verified? I have a constituent outside that wishes to see me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman is verified. Mr. Laurino wants to be recorded as 'no'. Mrs. Younge wants to be verified. Leave is granted. I'm sorry. What, Jack? Mr. Davis wants to be verified. Leave is granted. You're voting the wrong way. Mr. White wants to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Brummer, verified. Alright. Poll the absen... I'm sorry. Verify the Affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Excuse me. That was absentees. Affirmative Roll Call; Ackerman. Anderson. Balanoff. Beatty. Bell. Birchler. Birkinbine. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge. Campbell. Capparelli. Casey. Christensen. Conti. Cullerton. Daniels..."

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

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I was out talking to constituents in the rotunda in regard to a certain Federal Amendment at the time this was being voted on. And I just came back in and please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. McMaster as 'aye'. Continue with the verification."



Clerk O'Brien: "Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Deuster. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewell. Ewing. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoxsey. Huskey. Dave Jones. Kane. Kelly. Kent. Klosak. Kosinski. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Mahar. Matula. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Neff. O'Brien. Pechous. Piel. Polk. Preston. Rea. Reilly. Richmond...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Clerk? Jack? Change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Dawson? Record Mr. Dawson as 'aye'. Record Mr. Domico as 'aye'. Mr. Leon as 'aye'. Mr. Terzich as 'aye'. Mr. Krska as 'aye'. Mr. Ronan as 'aye'. Mr. Leon as 'aye'. Mr. Stanley as 'aye'. Mr. Kornowicz as 'aye'. Mr. Doyle as 'aye'. Mr. Schuneman as 'aye'. Mr. Murphy as 'aye'. Mr. Yourell?"

Yourell: "I don't know where the word came from, but it sure as hell is effective. I withdraw my motion for verification..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws his motion for verification. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Kulas wants to be recorded as 'aye', too. And, Mautino. On this question there's 110 'aye's, 48 'no's, nine recorded as 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Madison Mr. Steele, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Steele: "On page .. May we call back 1952?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're going to get to that in a minute, Sir. On the Calendar is House Bill 158. Mr. Huskey wants to bring that Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment. Hearing no objection, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, O'Brien, amends the engrossed House Bill 158 on page three, line twenty-one, by inserting



immediately after..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's Amendment is it, Jack? O'Brien?
The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Amendment #3 to House Bill 158 will bring that Bill in line with a previous Bill that was passed, regulating automobile towing carriers that dealt with private property. This Bill does the same thing only it deals with public property. The Amendment makes both Bills similar in terms of the rules and regulations. The Amendment sets a ceiling not to exceed 35 dollars for those automobiles that are towed off of our highways." "I move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey? On the Amendment? Mr. Huskey, please."

Huskey: "I don't have any opposition to the Amendment.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to Third Reading. I'm sorry. Consideration Postponed. House Bill 3040. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, asks to bring the Bill back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. 3040. Chalkie, the next one is 1833. It's on Second Reading. Any Amendments? Let's go."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Yourell, amends House Bill 30..."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #5 to House Bill 3040 is an agreed Amendment between the Sponsors of the Department of Revenue and provides for additional sum of \$275,000 to pay to as a refund to Cook County due to overpayments by the County to the Department of Revenue as a result of a Bill that we passed ... involving... relative to the Real Estate



Transfer Act. The Department of Revenue has requested the Amendment so that we can get even with the County of Cook. I move the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 3040."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to Third Reading. House Bill 703, Mrs. Younge requests the Bill be brought back from Third to Second for the purpose of Amendment. 703. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?" "703."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Younge, amends House Bill 703 as amended by deleting the underscored sentence at the end of Section 5 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, on Amendment #6."

Younge: "Amendment #6 would change the language of this Bill to read that the authority shall establish a demonstration project in East St. Louis rather than a branch office. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? Amendment #6 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1833. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Dyer. DuPage, I'm sorry. "

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3... First I must request that 1833 be moved back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill's on



Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Dyer, amends House Bill 1833 on page two, line 12 and so forth."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, this simply responds to the questions when this Bill was presented yesterday. It clarifies the penalty Section. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? The Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to Third Reading. House Bill... And the Lady asks leave to keep the Bill on Short Debate. Hearing no objections, it's back on Short... Oh, there is an objection. Regular Calendar. House Bill 1952? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele, asks leave of the House to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, E.G. Steele, amends House Bill 1952 on page one by deleting lines 22-25 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who's Amendment? Mr. Steele on the Amendment."

Steele: "House ... Amendment #2 puts in better legal language the terminology of the fair market value which we adopted last night in Amendment 1. Therefore, I move that we table Amendment #1 first."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House table Amendment #1. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, E.G. Steele.."

Steele: "Yes, I move now that we adopt Amendment 2 which puts in better legal terms the same provisions of Amendment 1."



And I so move."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 842, Mr. Marovitz asks leave of the House to bring the Bill back from Third to Second? What's your... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. There are two Amendments, one of which is on file with the Clerk. The Second Amendment has not been filed and distributed yet. I would rather leave the Bill on Third at this juncture since the Amendment has not been printed and distributed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. I couldn't understand you up here."

Marovitz: "There were two Amendments to this Bill that it was being pulled back for. One was my Amendment. One was another Member's Amendment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine..."

Marovitz: "... Which..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 821. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second Reading. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, amends House Bill 821 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof and so forth."

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

Younge: "This Amendment becomes the Bill and basically it gives the Illinois Industrial Development Authority the power to develop industrial parks. I move for the adoption of



the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is on Amendment #3. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back to Third Reading. House Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate, appears House Bill 2211. Page two of the Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2211, Schneider, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted... was adopted previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Schneider..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schneider, you in the chamber? The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 3102."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3102, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the construction, operation, regulation and maintenance of systems of toll highways. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3103."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3103, a Bill for an Act to repeal authorities for the 'risk' management revolving fund and remove all references thereto. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3105."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3105, a Bill for an Act in relation



to planning by the Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3108."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3108, a Bill for an Act authorizing temporary inter-agency transfers for state employees. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz; "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3109."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3109, a Bill for an Act to change the frequency of certain audits required of the Auditor General from semi-annual to annual. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3110."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3110, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois State Auditing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3113."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3113, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois State Auditing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar on page ten, Third Reading, appears House Bill 3041."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3041, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."



Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3041 adds 27.2 million dollars to the FY '80 appropriation for the Illinois Department of Transportation. I would be glad to answer any questions or at least attempt to and if there are none, I would like to have a favorable Roll Call."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains a 12.2 supplemental... million dollar supplemental appropriation which will end up going to the RTA. And the RTA's FY '80 budget... only 84 million was budgeted and this 12.2 million dollars will be a total and complete windfall to the RTA and I don't think they've earned it. I'm not going to vote for the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, that 12 million that Representative Skinner's talking about is the last of three thirty-seconds that we're obligated to pay and I don't know what he means by a 'windfall', but I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3041 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yeah, he's voting. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye's, 32 'no's, two recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Who was that? Who was that? On the Calendar appears House Bill 282. No, it's on Third, right? Oh, on the Order of Second Reading. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Young. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 282, a Bill for an Act creating the Metro-East Depressed Area Land Use and Community Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted previously."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed." "Floor Amendment #2, Younge, amends.!"

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

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 adds to the Bill the power of the authority to develop low income housing and to issue general obligation bonds upon approval of referendum by the people. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Opposed? Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Also on Second Reading appears House Bill 1590. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1590, a Bill for an Act to amend Small Business Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien; "Amendment #1 was adopted previously. No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2... "

Younge: "There's no further Amendments other than Amendment #1.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine..."

Younge: "And I move it to Third Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Yes, Sir."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 800. I'm sorry, 860. Couldn't read David's writing. Third Reading. It's on page 11 of the Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 860. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Realtors Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Senate Bill 860 exempts from state and local sales tax the sale of any tangible personal property costing more than 1000 dollars used in producing agriculture. Replacement parts would also qualify for the exemption. This piece of legislation is very important to the State of Illinois and especially important to the southern third of the state. There are 15 states that exempt farm equipment from sales tax. Five states have no sales tax and there eight states that have a lesser varied sales tax on farm equipment. We have many farmers in Illinois and we are the leading state in agriculture production. But many farmers are going out of state to purchase farm equipment as well as buying parts and having repairs made outside the State of Illinois. We're losing millions of dollars each year as a result of farm machinery being purchased in neighboring states. Our neighboring states of Indiana, Kentucky, and Wisconsin exempt farm equipment from sales tax. Missouri started exempting farm machinery from sales tax as of January 1 of this year and is already having quite an impact in Illinois. Missouri is advertising in Illinois to come there to buy farm equipment where you will pay no tax on farm equipment. Over the last few years we have lost dealer contracts in Illinois. Each loss is a drastic loss to our economy. Each dealer employs approximately 13 people at an average salary of 14,000 dollars which amounts to over 4,000,000 dollars. And whenever you consider



that, this amounts to quite a loss in terms of annual total wages. As a result, we are losing money from income taxes which would otherwise be going into state revenue. We lose an average of 75,000,000 dollars of sales to surrounding states annually. Twenty percent of that, if we gained in Illinois, would be taxable because of part sales. This piece of legislation is very important to our farming communities as well as to the survival of implement dealers throughout the state. The exemption would begin July 1, 1980 and would be phased in over a period of three and a half years. This will be phased in at the same percentage and time as that of the exemption for industrial machinery and equipment that was passed earlier. This would exempt the state sales tax on items costing more than 1,000 dollars used and consumed for agricultural production. Local government, with this Bill, would have the option of keeping the local sales tax on these transactions. The local government would not lose any sales tax. Let me point out a few other important items as it relates to Senate Bill 860. Of the 45 states that have a sales tax, 21 of them now fully exempt farm equipment from that tax. Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska are considering such an exemption. With exception of Iowa where 3% sales tax applies, all states surrounding Illinois fully exempt farm machinery from a sales tax. During each of the last two years, approximately 75,000,000 dollars worth of farm machinery was sold to Illinois farmers by out of state retailers. A 5% savings on a 50,000 dollar tractor or 80,000 dollar combine is certainly a strong inducement for any Illinois farmer to buy out of state. Illinois farmers must now pay a premium to buy at home. Illinois



farm equipment retailers only want the opportunity to compete equally with retailers from the neighboring states and every effort must be made to keep Illinois equipment dealers in Illinois. Illinois farmers cost of production must be made competitive with those of surrounding states which will benefit all consumers. Farm equipment is production equipment and is deserving of the same exemption as any industrial equipment. Farm equipment is one of the most important elements of agricultural production. Farm equipment should be exempt as our agricultural fertilizers and chemicals. Senate Bill 860 provides for the three and a half year phase out of sales tax thereby reducing the financial impact of such revenue loss. It provides for the retention of the 4% use tax still to be paid by farmers who buy out of state. It provides for local option of retaining the 1% municipality tax and it provides for the exclusion from sales tax exemption any single unit or repair item which costs 1,000 dollars or less. We are concerned, primarily, with higher investment cost items. The 13,000,000 dollars which is an inflation, and let me emphasize inflated figure, that a director of revenue has provided to us as resulting revenue losses for the first year will be offset by other revenues generated by the recovery of sales now going on out of state by increased employment, by taxes on the small parts that will be purchased in Illinois that we will... and we will recover 20% of the sales that are going out of state. An increase in personal income taxes as well. As a result because of the importance of this legislation to the ongoing economy of our state, I would urge all of you to support Senate Bill 860."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wonder if the Gentleman would take this Bill out of the record for now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rea."

Rea: "I would not like to take it out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He does not want to take the Bill out of the record."

Ryan: "I wonder if the Gentleman would be willing to take the Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment."

Rea: "No sir. I'd like to..."

Ryan: "You won't cooperate at all."

Rea: "I would like to keep the Bill..."

Ryan: "Let me address the problem Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed sir."

Ryan: "Representative Ropp had an Amendment and he filed with the Clerk when this Bill was on Second Reading. The Speaker and I don't know who was in the Chair at the time moved the Bill to Third Reading knowing that that Amendment had been filed but hadn't been printed. It took 24 hours for that Amendment to be printed and distributed which is extremely unusual I might add Mr. Speaker. And I think in the interest of fair play and... that we ought to give Representative Ropp an opportunity to better Representative Rea's Bill with an Amendment. And that's what the Amendment would do and I would ask that he at least give him that opportunity."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I took this Amendment when I saw the Bill over to the Sponsor, Representative Rea, and showed it to him and I thought, at that time, he gave me the impression that it was a good Amendment and I merely took it up to the Clerk's desk, introduced it and it was more



than 24 hours before we ever got it on our desks. I was not here on the floor just momentarily when that Bill was called and the Speaker, not you, the Speaker at that time stated that since it was not on the desks and since I wasn't on the floor that they move it to Third Reading. Within 24 hours prior to that I had a Bill which certain other Members of the Legislature was not on the floor and we decided not to move my Bill or act on it because the Sponsor of the Amendment was not present and so I withdrew that Bill until the Sponsor was here. Now, I'm very much in support of eliminating sales tax on farm machinery because farmers have been paying this for a long time. We're in a severe financial crunch now and my Amendment would really help this particular Bill. I'm not like some Legislators who try to put Amendments on to make Bills look like bad pieces of legislation. This is an extremely good Bill and this Amendment, in this time in 1980 when farmers will not be in fact buying new pieces of machinery because of high costs and high interest rates, they will in fact by buying..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me sir. What's your point of order Mr. McClain?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ropp is explaining the Amendment, explaining the Bill. That's not the point of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point's well taken. Bring your remarks to a close Mr. Ropp. Fine. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels. On the Bill now."

Daniels: "Just on the Bill, many of us were entertaining favorable support of this Bill the possibility of supporting it. I don't think we can now unless we have a reasonable response to our leader's request."

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

Vinson: "What's necessary under the rules Mr. Speaker for a Bill to be moved from Second to Third Reading?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. What?"

Vinson: "Under the rules, what's necessary to move a Bill from Second to Third Reading?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Sponsor."

Vinson: "The Sponsor's doing what?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Sponsor of the Bill requesting the Bill to be called at the Amendment... I don't believe I have to... Surely you know the procedure."

Vinson: "My question is, does the Speaker have to say that the Bill is moved to Third Reading?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, that's correct."

Vinson: "I think if you examine the transcript from the day here in Session from this issue you'll find that at no point did the Speaker say that the Bill was moved..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's not the point. The Bill is called on Third Reading. We're in the process in debate on House... on Senate Bill 860 and that's the posture of the House. If you want to speak against the Bill or for the Bill that's your prerogative at this time. We have called the Bill. Is there anyone that wants to speak either in behalf or opposed to Senate Bill 860? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Skinner: "May I ask..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rea, there's a question for you sir."

Skinner: "As much as I hate to interrupt this partisan brouhaha, assuming this Bill does not pass would you and your colleagues who are supporting this concept entertain the possibility of licensing farm machinery so that the same use tax which is now collected on automobiles and other motor vehicles bought out of state which are now licensed could be



collected when it comes into the State of Illinois?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rea."

Rea: "By law, whenever you buy out of state you do have to pay the users tax. Now this Bill does have an exemption and it does not exempt the sales tax on trucks and motor vehicles that are registered under the Illinois Vehicle Code."

Skinner: "Do you intend to answer my question?"

Rea: "In terms of licensing... I didn't hear all of the question. Would you repeat."

Skinner: "As you know, there's no problem with automobile dealers and truck dealers along the borders of our state because their competitors in the surrounding states cannot sell a car to an Illinois resident and that Illinois resident cannot... Unless the Illinois resident pays the use tax which is enforced by the Illinois Secretary of States Office and the Department of Revenue. It seems to me that an alternative no-cost... an alternative solution to the problem which is very real which this Bill points to is to impose a use tax on the farm..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, what purpose seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "I'll yield to Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, those speakers aren't speaking to the Bill. Now Skinner, Ropp, and Vinson all three voted against the Chrysler Bill. The money's going to come out of the General Revenue Fund that this money's going to come out of and I'm going to support this Bill to show them that I am for the farmer and I'm for free enterprise. But those three guys refused to vote for the Chrysler Bill and they're out of order on the Amendment. So rule them out of order and let's get on with the farmers help. Tell them."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Skinner, would you kindly address your remarks to the Bill sir."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think I perhaps am the only one in this entire floor who is addressing the content of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed sir."

Skinner: "What I'm suggesting is that there may be an alternative solution which would cost the State of Illinois nothing in lost tax revenue, nothing whatsoever and what I'm asking the Sponsor is if that alternative has been considered. If it has, why it's been rejected. If your Bill doesn't pass, would you consider it again?" Or consider it for the first time. If the answer's no, that's, you know, it's a simple way to put it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rea, please, to respond. Mr. Rea."

Rea: "The users tax is only 4% and in terms of licensing farm equipment vehicles there had been some discussions of it in terms of the savings. No, it doesn't look like a good... At least what information we had didn't look like a very good alternative."

Skinner: "Well, I don't know why it would work for cars and not for farm machinery. I represent a border district in this state. I certainly intend to vote for the Bill unless there is a hopeless partisan brouhaha that develops after I sit down. but there will be substantial losses in state revenue, I believe, if this Bill is passed as opposed to the alternative. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "In response to Representative Skinner. Farm machinery is used in the field and is not used on the road. That's the reason you don't need to license it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea to close."



Rea: "I believe that this Bill will bring more money into Illinois than the state will lose because of the tax exemption. I know that many farmers, especially those living near state lines, are now going to bordering states which have no sales tax to make their farm machinery purchases. In turn, when the equipment needs parts and servicing, the farmers return to their dealer in the neighboring state to buy the parts and have the servicing performed. The sales tax on small parts combined with income tax from increased profits of implement companies will more than offset the loss in sales tax collection. I might also say that there are many organizations and farm groups and implement dealers that are in support of Senate Bill 860 including the Illinois Retail Farm Equipment Association, Illinois Farm Bureau Federation, Illinois Farmers Union, Illinois Agricultural Association, Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical Association, Illinois Corn Growers Association, and I just have a few of the petitions that they have submitted in terms of the Illinois Corn Growers Association. There are many others that are in great support of this and I only have a few of those petitions here today. Included in the Illinois Pork Producers the Grain and Feed Association of Illinois and the Mississippi Valley Farm Equipment Association. I would... I would call for a favorable Roll Call at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall Senate Bill 860 pass? All in favor vote aye, all opposed vote nay. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins." Mr. Collins

Collins: please."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Give the Gentleman some courtesy."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I have filed a motion, as you know,



to suspend Rule 35B so that this Bill may be returned to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Now Mr. Speaker, we're only on a Roll Call because I was not recognized prior to your calling for the Roll Call. I don't think you would deny me that courtesy. The Sponsor of the Bill denied Representative Ropp the courtesy of consideration on Second Reading. I think you will extend me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevidch, what's your point of order?"

Matijevidch: "Point of order Representative Collins. The leader ought to know the rules and he knows we're in the middle of the Roll Call. This motion's out of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's correct. Your point is well taken. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my present vote I, at the same time, want to indicate that if this Bill gets anywhere near 89 I'll request a verification and simply, that request is being made because of the utter lack of courtesy to the Member on this side of the aisle who had an Amendment to offer. Now we know from experience every once in a while we try the railroad technique in this House and it backfires. It's just a shame that the merits of this legislation have to be embroiled in a problem because the Sponsor on that side is not willing to at least have an Amendment offered. You fellows have got the Majority over there. You can roll this back, have a vote on this Amendment and defeat it..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Laurino, vote me aye please."

Deuster: "... if you want to. But to completely ignore the right of a Member to have an opportunity to improve a Bill, a Member who's really motivated to improve a Bill I think is wrong and for that reason I will



exercise my right to request a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer. I'll get back to you Mr. Collins. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I had some questions on the Bill and you called for closing so I have no..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you Mr. speaker. I thought perhaps this is the day you were only going to recognize those you wanted to. I'm in favor of this Bill. I am a farmer. Let me point out something to the Sponsor of this Bill. I think that he is using tactics to defeat the Bill when he is obviously trying to save in support of it by his actions and refusing to bring it back to Second Reading. He is doing something that is showing his utter discourtesy, disrespect for any Member of this House. I think it's a very, very shoddy way to treat other Members of this House and I want the Sponsor of this Bill to know that. I think that he is being very pusillanimous when he says he's for the Bill when obviously he wants to create a problem. And he wants to create a situation where he can't get the votes to pass it. And still he has guts enough to stand up there and say that he is trying to help the farmers. And I think every one of the Sponsors, people who he named as being in support of this Bill should recognize the shabby treatment that he is giving them. And believe me Mr. Rea, I mean that."

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

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, without regard to the substance to this legislation I know from my Legislative Digest that this Bill came over to the House from the Senate on May 22 of



last year. It came over... it was amended in the Revenue Committee and by Amendment #1 on March 27. Not until April 9 was a second Amendment attempted to be filed. It seems to me, in all fairness, to this Sponsor, rather than have him castigated on the floor of this House that some efforts would have been taken to amend this Bill in a timely motion... in a timely manner. That some action would have been taken to move expeditiously to promote the interest of the Amendment that is proposed in the Committee or earlier on the floor. I would encourage that the ... and I vote on this Bill, for those of you who are concerned about the farmers, I must say I don't know anything about farm equipment. Wouldn't know a tractor from a combine if I saw it but the matter is that this is an important Bill as I understand for downstate Illinois and the farmers are getting caught in the political..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "I think that last speaker is not recognizing the fact that we move Bills back to Second Reading today..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Williams, Mr. McClain, what purpose seek recognition?"

McClain: "The Gentleman explained his vote. Mrs. Braun did not mention his name in debate so he has no right to speak again."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point's well taken. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I was cut off in the midst of my motion. You know Representative Matijevich's point of order was specious at best. However, since you ruled it in order I'd like to withdraw my motion to suspend the rule. This is a Bill I had intended to support and I would hope that



everybody in this House who is interested in the sense of fairness would vote against this Bill at this time."

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

The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was a Sponsor of a Senate Amendment identical to this Bill. We weren't successful with it in the Committee. I support this concept and I support the Bill but right now because of my friend, Representative Ropp, not having what I feel is his right as a Member to offer an Amendment to a Bill, not having that opportunity then I would have to vote present at this time with the idea that if the Bill gets to Third Reading that I would support it but right now I urge all my Members to vote present to give Representative Ropp an opportunity to offer his Amendment."

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

Richmond: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of my vote, I'm definitely in favor of this type of legislation. It certainly is needed. As a chief Sponsor of a very similar Bill, I can tell you that I worked hard to try to see that this type of thing get passed in the House. And that Bill will be heard this afternoon. I... And I think it really entails some of the things that Representative Ropp is interested in. But in the meantime, here is a Bill on Third Reading so I will vote for it."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House in explaining my vote and I guess I'm addressing some people in the gallery because I see how interested they are in this. They can't even sit down



they're so interested and they should be. I want to tell you what this brouhaha is all about. This brouhaha is happening because Governor Thompson does not want this Bill. Governor Thompson is laying it on them to make it look like we are killing a Bill that we are being unfair with. Now you might as well tell the truth about it. Your Governor doesn't want to help those farmers. Your Governor doesn't want to help the farm implement people. And you're trying to put the blame over here by making it look like there's a phony side issue. Now, if you... You ought to take the lesson that Senator Friedland learned. Senator Friedland learned that we don't give a damn what the Governor says. Senator Friedland learned that he can win without the Governor. So when we call this Roll Call forget about Governor Thompson and help those people up there and vote aye."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, as usual, a tale told by Democrats full of sound and fury and signifying exactly nothing. The Republicans will support this Bill. I think maybe the people up there in the gallery who are farm implement dealers, Representative Matijevich, and not farmers are particularly interested should know that Representative Ropp's Amendment dealt with removing the sales tax on used equipment. That's what you're going to be selling this year. You're not going to sell any new equipment. That's a good Amendment there. Look what they're doing to you over there. Go back and tell your people back home what the Democrats have done to you. To not clean up a Bill and make it a good Bill for you this year and for all the farmers this year who haven't got the



money to spend 80,000 dollars for a combine.
The Governor will sign this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Harris. Mr. Harris. You want to explain to the Membership that you've got a Bill that they can amend? The Gentleman from Williams, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Richmond and I had a Bill last Session very similar to this piece of legislation. We've talked to many farmers in the area. You notice I'm voting green on this Bill. Some type of legislation, I want to emphasize 'some type' of legislation', of this nature is needed. This, in my understanding, would cost approximately 60,000,000 dollars. That's why I was told by the Sponsor just as recently as yesterday. Our legislation that we had and will be in Committee today is very similar. I'll vote for this Bill at this time but I really don't feel like I should in my heart."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I can tell you that Senate Bill 860 was on Second Reading for quite some time and had an opportunity of an Amendment being filed in plenty of time. We did move it on to Third Reading. I do not intend to place this on postponed consideration. I feel this is a very important Bill to the farmers and to the implement dealers and to the people of the State of Illinois. And if we really believe in providing assistance to our losing economy and we want to help all the people of the state, this is a very good Bill to do it. We're serious about it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I urge you Mr. Rea, this is too important to the farmer and to the implement



dealer to play with games. This has nothing to do with the Governor and you know it. I'm ashamed of the man who spoke. It has nothing to do with the Governor. I would hope that you would recognize what you're doing because we want this to pass. It has to pass. And so I urge you and use your common sense. Try and help the farmer. Don't just stand over there and be a Democrat."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, living on a border district of Wisconsin, I'm surprised to see my colleagues not standing up in support of this Bill that talks so often when you campaign about chasing business out of Illinois. Once again, the truth is here. People are going from McHenry County into Wisconsin to buy their farm implements by your negative vote on that board or your present vote. If you want to do..."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is just absolutely appalling to me that the Sponsor of this measure could be so concerned about the tight election he faces that he would flush the farmers of this state down the drain to preserve a partisan brouhaha Shame, shame on you Mr. Sponsor, Mr. Rea."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's 177 requests for a copy of this Roll Call. The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I'm telling the Sponsor of this legislation I'm surprised that he won't let this Bill go back to make a good Bill that he has a lot better. And I would hope that he would let this go back to Second Reading and let us put this Amendment on and



make what is now a fair Bill a good Bill.

Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What I can't understand is why don't you just amend Harris's Bill? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster." Deuster, you've got your light on. You want to talk or not? Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my present vote it's certainly not because we're not in support of it. If the Sponsor was really in support of it this year there's going to be more people that are in a position that they cannot afford new equipment anyway. So it's not any benefit to farmers. The Amendment, should it be in a position to get on, is the thing that will give farmers some benefit. That Amendment is the thing that's got to be on here in order to give farmers the benefit that they justifiably need in 1980."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question... Excuse me. Let's have a little order in the House. Let's have a lot of order in the House. On this question there are 78 ayes, 11 nos, 78 present and only 10 absent. Let's call the absentees. No. Mr. Rea requested it. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alexander. Bianco. Epton. Johnson. Emil Jones. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Walsh."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Walsh as present."

Clerk O'Brien: "Watson. And Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count? 78 ayes, 11 nos, 79 present. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Announcements. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock. Mr. Bullock please. Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to have leave to hear House Bill 3233 in the Rules Committee?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 3233 has leave."

White: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kelly?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Counties and Townships Committee which was scheduled for today will be cancelled and there will be a meeting next week and we will inform the Members of the Committee on other concerned persons."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "You talk about courtesy..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

McMaster: "You don't know what the word means, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Casey."

Casey: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the posting rule so that House Bill 3582 can be heard in Rules Committee this afternoon. We've checked with the Democratic Leadership on both sides. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, the Bill will be posted for Rules. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like leave to have House Bill 3591 heard in Rules. I've checked with both Leaders on both sides and they have no objections."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3591, are there any objections? Hearing none, the Bill will be posted for Rules. The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape. Slape, please. "

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like leave to suspend the appropriate rule so I can hear ... have House



Bill 3594 heard in Rules this afternoon? I have talked to the Leadership on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to have House Bill 3591.. wasn't that Mike? 3594. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Chairman of the Rules Committee or Vice Chairman if now that Counties and Townships will not be using D-1, if we could move Rules to D-1?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz. Mr. Katz, please."

Katz: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to moving Rules to D-1 if the Minority Leader and the Majority Leader have no objection. The Minority Leader... It has been suggested that Rules this afternoon meet in D-1 instead of on the House floor? Does that meet with your approval, Sir?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Yes, I object to that, Representative Katz. I have a meeting that's going to be on-going in my office and it's a lot closer than D-1 or the office building and I understand there's another meeting in D-1 anyway. I'd just as soon stay on the House floor."

Katz: "Alright. Well, since the two Gentlemen don't speak on the other side..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz. Elections is meeting in D-1. So..."

Katz: "The meeting, Mr. Speaker, will .. of Rules will take place on the House floor immediately after adjournment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Very good. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson. I'm sorry. Mr. Friedrich, do you have anything else? Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would request leave to suspend the appropriate rule to post both House Bill 3389 and House Bill 3554 for



Rules this afternoon. I've checked that with the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader and neither one of them have any objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any objections from the floor? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Members ought to at least have the courtesy to let us know what the Bills do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes. House Bill 3554, Representative Kane, deals with funding for the priority primary highway system and House Bill 3389 deals with a rather obtruse matter of how you credit bond interest to various accounts. It's a very technical Bill. If you want to defeat it in Rules, it won't make me sad, but it's requested by the people that deal with these things."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, the Gentleman's request is granted for those two Bills. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to have the rule suspended that House Bill 1848 be heard in Rules today. This concerns the Auctioneer's Licensing Act. I've talked to Leadership on both sides."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Hearing none, the Gentleman's request is granted. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request leave to suspend the appropriate rules to hear House Bill... have House Bill 3600 posted in Rules Committee today. I have the agreement of the Minority Leader and the Majority Leader."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly, briefly explain the Bill?"

Totten: "The Bill amends the Election Code providing for some changes with party enrollment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hearing no objection, the Gentleman's leave



is granted. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner. I'm sorry. I'm sorry, on that last request Representative Kane objected. I'm sorry, I can't hear you. Put Mr. Kane on.

Kane: "I would object unless there's some explanation other than the change of the Election Code to do something with primaries."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, was the question the subject matter of the Bill? Yeah, I indicated that it amends the Election Code and it provides procedures for enrollment of party affiliation."

Kane: "I would object."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman objects. "

Totten: "My only course of action is to move. And I so move."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Takes 107 votes. The Gentleman moves that House Bill 3600 be posted ... leave to have the matter heard in the Rules Committee. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Takes 107 votes. The Gentleman has moved to suspend the posting rule to have House Bill 3600 heard in Rules for today. Have all voted who wish? Tom, vote me 'aye' please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye's, 15 'no's, one recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I just point out this is a courtesy that has normally been extended to everybody and I need one more vote on that and that's the only courtesy I ask, that we get it to the Rules Committee so that we can hear it. We discussed..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Ackerman as 'aye'. And, Mr. Huskey, as 'aye'. And, Mr. Schlickman as 'aye'. Mr. Williamson as 'aye'. And, Mr. Doyle as 'aye'. Doyle and Williamson. And, Mrs. Hallstrom as 'aye'. On this question there's 112 'aye's, 13 'no's, one recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion is granted."



And carries. Now, the Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you. May I have leave to suspend the appropriate rule to have House Bill 3585 heard in Rules today?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Was that 3585, Ma'am?"

Sumner: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you briefly explain the Bill, Ma'am?"

Sumner: "Yes. It allows a corporation or individuals to be represented in a court of claims by a nonattorney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Lady's request carries... is granted. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "I ask leave to suspend the posting rule, Mr. Speaker, to permit House Bill 3595 to be heard in the House Rules Committee today. It relates to the definition of viability of a fetus."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, The Lady's request is granted. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley. Mr. Stanley please?"

Stanley: "Yeah, I'd like to request that the appropriate rules be suspended to hear House Bill 3589 and 3590. Both of the Bills deal with changes in the school aid formula. One deals specifically with the weighting for K through 3 students."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Hearing none, both of those Bills will be... have leave to be posted and heard in Rules today. The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Chairman, may the appropriate rules be suspended to hear 3592? It's an appropriation Bill that was filed late."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't believe appropriation Bills have to go Rules, Ma'am."

Oblinger: "They told me up here this because it was late."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Fine. The Lady asks leave to have House Bill 3592 heard in the Rules Committee. Hearing no objection, leave is granted."



Oblinger: "Thank you."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for a suspension of rule... posting rules so that we might hear House Bill 3596, 3597, 3598, and 3413. I've cleared this with the Leader and on the other side. For the benefit of Mr. Kane, 3598 creates the Illinois Small Business Assistant Act to provide various assistance to Illinois small businesses and creating with the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, a small business division 3597 establishes a small business loan reserve fund in the State Treasury in the... would be tied in to the same small business division. 3596 creates the Illinois Product Development Corporation and defines its powers and duties, and grants the corporation powers to enter into venture agreements with persons doing business in Illinois for the advancement of financial aid. And, the last... I'm sorry. The... House Bill 3413 has already been posted so it's only on those three Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion or any objection? Hearing none, those Bills that the Gentleman mentioned will be able to be heard in Rules this evening. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Committee on Appropriations II will meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning in 118. Democrats will hold a briefing meeting at 9:00 a.m. in 122-B. I'll repeat; the meeting will not be held at 8:00 a.m. as indicated. Appropriations II will meet at 9:30. Preceding the meeting, there will be a briefing meeting for Democrats at 9:00 in 122-B. Thank you."

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

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, the first and Pensions Committee will meet at 4:15. That's 4:15, that's 15 minutes after our regular meeting time in room 122-B. It should be a short meeting."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce. Any further announcements? Change of votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Karpziel requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 262. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there unanimous consent? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Jones requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3055."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the request is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Sharp requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3268."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the request is granted. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Karpziel requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1327."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the request is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Preston requests to vote 'no' on House Bills 3048, 3022, 3023, and 3039."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the request is granted." Any further announcements? Any further announcements? Mr. Giorgi moves that the House stand adjourned till 12:00 noon tomorrow after giving the clerk five minutes in perfunctory Session. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed? Now the House stands adjourned till 12:00 noon tomorrow after giving the clerk five minutes for perfunctory Session."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills; House Bill 3598, Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act in relation to Illinois small business. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3599, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to Fire Protection Districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3600, Totten-Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Elec-



tion Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3601, Ryan, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3602, Schneider, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3603, Ropp, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 23, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0158	2ND READING	PAGE	92
HB-0262	3RD READING	PAGE	39
HB-0282	2ND READING	PAGE	99
HB-0703	2ND READING	PAGE	94
HB-0821	2ND READING	PAGE	96
HB-1299	3RD READING	PAGE	55
HB-1327	3RD READING	PAGE	73
HB-1590	2ND READING	PAGE	100
HB-1833	2ND READING	PAGE	94
HB-1848	MOTIONS	PAGE	120
HB-1952	2ND READING	PAGE	95
HB-2955	3RD READING	PAGE	12
	3RD READING	PAGE	12
HB-3014	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3021	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3022	3RD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3023	3RD READING	PAGE	5
	3RD READING	PAGE	5
HB-3039	3RD READING	PAGE	6
	3RD READING	PAGE	6
HB-3040	2ND READING	PAGE	93
HB-3041	3RD READING	PAGE	98
HB-3048	3RD READING	PAGE	6
	3RD READING	PAGE	6
HB-3053	3RD READING	PAGE	7
	3RD READING	PAGE	7
HB-3055	3RD READING	PAGE	8
	3RD READING	PAGE	8
HB-3063	3RD READING	PAGE	9
	3RD READING	PAGE	9
HB-3102	2ND READING	PAGE	97
HB-3103	2ND READING	PAGE	97
HB-3105	2ND READING	PAGE	97
HB-3108	2ND READING	PAGE	98
HB-3109	2ND READING	PAGE	98
HB-3110	2ND READING	PAGE	98
HB-3113	2ND READING	PAGE	98
HB-3180	3RD READING	PAGE	10
	3RD READING	PAGE	10
HB-3233	MOTIONS	PAGE	118
HB-3268	2ND READING	PAGE	49
	2ND READING	PAGE	49
	3RD READING	PAGE	50

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 23, 1980

PAGE 2

HB-3389	MOTIONS	PAGE	119
HB-3413	MOTIONS	PAGE	123
HB-3554	MOTIONS	PAGE	119
HB-3582	MOTIONS	PAGE	118
HB-3585	MOTIONS	PAGE	122
HB-3589	MOTIONS	PAGE	122
HB-3590	MOTIONS	PAGE	122
HB-3591	MOTIONS	PAGE	118
HB-3592	MOTIONS	PAGE	122
HB-3593	1ST READING	PAGE	2
HB-3594	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	MOTIONS	PAGE	119
HB-3595	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	MOTIONS	PAGE	122
HB-3596	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	MOTIONS	PAGE	123
HB-3597	1ST READING	PAGE	2
	MOTIONS	PAGE	123
HB-3598	1ST READING	PAGE	124
	MOTIONS	PAGE	123
HB-3599	1ST READING	PAGE	124
HB-3600	1ST READING	PAGE	124
	MOTIONS	PAGE	120
HB-3601	1ST READING	PAGE	125
HB-3602	1ST READING	PAGE	125
HB-3603	1ST READING	PAGE	125
SB-0860	3RD READING	PAGE	101

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 23, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. KENT - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	2
APPROVAL OF JOURNALS	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	11
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	11
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE	124
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	124
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	125